

Project Revision Statement & Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Flynnville Wine Company

Use Permit Major Modification Application No P12-00222 and Variance P12-00223

Assessor's Parcel Nos 0-320-015, 020-320-016, 020-320-003, 020-320-004, 020-320-006, 020-320-006, 020-320-009, and 020-170-012
3180 State Highway 29, Calistoga, California

I hereby revise my request to include the mitigation measure(s) specified below:

AIR QUALITY

1. The project shall comply with BAAQMD Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, inclusive of the following:
 - All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
 - All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off site shall be covered.
 - All visible mud or dirt track out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
 - All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
 - All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
 - Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations). Clear signage requiring same shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
 - All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.
 - Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Method of Mitigation Monitoring: This Mitigation Measure was drafted by the Air District and is intended to be self enforcing. Complaints or concerns will be addressed by the Planning Division or the Air District as required by law. **RESPONSIBLE AGENCY(IES)-** Planning Division, BAAQMD

BIOLOGY

2. Prior to the issuance of demolition permits, grading permits, and/or building permits for any work associated with this approval, the project biologist shall follow all recommended mitigations discussed on pages 1-6 in the November 19, 2012 Bat Habitat Assessment by Greg and Trish Tatarian. Methods for removal of bats from structures and from trees require different mitigations.
3. Prior to the issuance of the demolition, grading or building permit, the permittee shall submit an executed contract with a qualified biologist providing for the required monitoring for the review and approval of the Planning Director (or her designee).
4. Any widening or replacement to the existing culvert, crossing the drainage near the waste water treatment system, consultation and permitting must be obtained from the California Fish and Wildlife, U.S Army Corps of Engineers, and Regional Water Quality Control Boards prior to and during the construction.


Method of Mitigation Monitoring:

- Demolition of structures: Under direct supervision and guidance of a certified biologist specializing in bat removal, the Mitigation measure requires that the bats be removed from the structures by either or both by what is defined by the biologist as "humane eviction" which relies on the bats ability to fly from the roost. Unused entry points are sealed. Active entry points fitted with one-way exits, left in place 7-10 days to allow all bats to emerge normally during night time feeding. The one way exists are then removed and the remaining openings are sealed until demolition if it will occur more

- **Tree Removal:** Under direct supervision and guidance of a certified biologist specializing in bat removal, a two step method must be conducted, over a two day period. The first day will entail removal, with use of a chainsaw, creating noise and vibration by cutting non-habitat branches and limbs from habitat trees. Day 2 allows for the removal of the remaining tree. **RESPONSIBLE AGENCY** – Planning Division.
- **Culvert:** Obtain required permits and consultation for any widening or replacement of the existing culvert identified on Site Plan page UP2, and located near the waste water system, from California Fish and Wildlife, U.S Army Corps of Engineers, and Regional Water Quality Control Boards. **RESPONSIBLE AGENCY(IES)** – Planning Division, California Fish and Wildlife, U.S Army Corps of Engineers, and Regional Water Quality Control.

7 D Properties
Signature of Owner

Dan Price
Print Name


Interest

Member

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

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

1. **Project Title:** Flynnville Wine Company; Use Permit #P12-00222 & Variance P12-00223.
2. **Property Owner:** PD Properties LLC, 995 Vintage Avenue, St. Helena, CA 94574.
3. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Jeffrey Redding, 2423 Renfrew, Napa, CA 94558
4. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and E-Mail:** Linda St. Claire, Planner, 299-1348, linda.stclaire@countyofnapa.com.
5. **Project Location and APN:** The proposal will include consolidating eight parcels of various sizes into one 11.84 acre project site. The site is located on the east side of State Highway 29, bordered on the south by Maple Lane and on the north by Drew Lane, approximately 0.88 mile north of the Larkmead Lane / State Highway 29 intersection. APNs: 020-320-015, 020-320-016, 020-320-003, 020-320-004, 020-320-005, 020-320-006, 020-320-009, and 020-170-012. 3180 State Highway 29, Calistoga.
6. **General Plan description:** Agricultural Resource (AR) and (Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space)
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Watershed (AW) & Agricultural Preserve (AP)
8. **Background/Project History:** A variety of industrial uses have been operating on the parcels since the early 1960s. In 1968, the original Zoning, M (Manufacturing), which allowed for industrial uses, was changed to PD (Planned Development). In 1977 Industrial uses were excluded from PD zoning and in 1985 the zoning was changed to AW (Agricultural Watershed) and AP (Agricultural Preserve). At that point, the majority of the uses (commercial and light industrial) on the site were non-conforming.

1986-1991: The owners of the site were denied two separate requests to the Planning Commission for amendments to change the General Plan designation from AR (Agricultural Resources) to Commercial and/or Industrial. Each decision was appealed to the Board of Supervisors and each appeal was denied by the Board.

August 1997: Use Permit application 96629-UP was approved by the Planning Commission to establish a PG&E public utility service yard on APN: 020-320-012.

9. **Project Description:**
 1. A Variance (P12-00223) to allow:
 - (a) construction of a winery 136 feet within the 600 foot winery setback from State Highway 29; 94 feet within the 300 foot setback on the west and 123 feet within the 300 foot setback on the east; and,
 - (b) coverage of 32.9 % of the site, exceeding the allowed 25% coverage.
 2. Approval of a Use Permit to allow the following for Flynnville Wine Company:
 - (a) construction of an 82,236 square foot winery to be divided into a maximum of 14 small individual wineries under a single ownership, in four phases. Phase One consists of the welcome center, a 16,900 square foot winery structure, south parking lot with 42 spaces, and associated landscaping, phase two consists of an 18,000 square foot winery structure and associated landscaping, phase three consists of a 16,650 square foot winery structure and associated landscaping and the west parking area with 51 spaces and phase four consists of a 9,000 square foot winery structure and the 4,015 square foot hospitality building and commercial kitchen and the east overflow parking area with 16 spaces. Phasing will occur with visitation, water use, employees, production, and traffic as described below;
 - (b) construction of a 4,015 hospitality building and commercial kitchen for use by all of the wineries, in phase four;
 - (c) construction of an approximately 1,600 square foot two story welcome center to contain an information center, office/conference room, storage and bathrooms;
 - (d) construction of 5,730 square feet of crushpad, each approximately 410 square feet, divided among the 14 wineries, in phases 1 through 4;
 - (e) construction of approximately 5,600 square feet of office space, approximately 400 square feet per winery, divided among the 14 wineries in phases 1 through 4;

- (f) construction of approximately 2,198 square feet of lab space, approximately 157 square feet per winery, divided among the 14 wineries in phases 1 through 4;
- (g) allow a total production of 300,000 gallons per year, to be phased. Each phase would be allowed a maximum of 75,000 gallons of production per year;
- (h) allow on-site pervious parking of 109 spaces, to include four (4) handicapped space, also phased as described in B above;
- (i) allow thirty (30) total employees, phased for approximately 7.5 employees per phase;
- (j) allow by appointment only daily visitation of a maximum of five hundred (500) persons per day, also phased for 125 by appointment only visitors per phase;
- (k) allow a marketing plan for one (1) event per year with a maximum of 500 persons, five (5) events per year with a maximum of 250 persons, eight (8) events per month for a maximum of 100 persons per event, eight (8) events per month for a maximum of 50 persons per event, and (2) events per month for a maximum of 25 persons per event; Food service for up to 50 people, food will be prepared on-site. Food for larger events will be catered within the commercial kitchen facilities, located in the hospitality building, used for preparation and staging only. Until the Hospitality Tasting Room has been constructed in phase four, each separate winery will be allowed to conduct marketing events in their structure, or designated outdoor space, for one (1) event per year with a maximum of 36, (5) events per year with a maximum of 18 persons, eight (8) events per month for a maximum of 7 persons per event, eight (8) events per month for a maximum of 4 persons per event, and (2) events per month for a maximum of 25 persons per event, or less if State Building Code Occupancy requires. Because the hospitality room also houses the kitchen, any food/wine pairing with tastings or marketing will be catered.
- (l) on-site consumption of wine consistent with AB 2004 and food/wine pairings with tastings to occur in the Hospitality Tasting Room and/or designated Outdoor Space;
- (m) allow winery hours of operation from 7 am to 7 pm daily for production and to 10:00 am to 6:30 pm, Monday-Sunday for visitation;
- (n) allow existing commercial/light industrial uses to continue their use until the phasing occurs;
- (o) demolition of a total of nine existing structures: one existing residence, carport, and seven commercial/light industrial structures;
- (p) modification to an existing drive to serve as direct access to the winery;
- (q) approval of a landscaping plan;
- (r) approval of a comprehensive sign plan;
- (s) abandon 5 existing wells and construction 3 new wells;
- (t) installation of a new winery process and domestic wastewater system with a 12,000 square foot wastewater pond and a 20,000 gallon storage tank;
- (u) install a 30,000 gallon fire protection/irrigation water tank;
- (v) install a westbound right-turn taper from State Highway 29 to Maple Lane, and;
- (w) merge all eight parcels to create the 11.84 acre single parcel prior to issuance of the building permits.

10. Environmental setting and surrounding land uses:

The 11.84 acre project site is located on the east side of State Highway 29 approximately one mile northwest of the Larkmead Lane / State Highway 29 intersection. The project site is an irregularly shaped grouping of five parcels, to be merged upon project approval. Approximately six acres is currently developed with an existing residence, carport, and seven commercial/light industrial structures, to be demolished, and replaced with the proposed winery structures. During the construction of the winery, the businesses will continue to operate, and will be phased out and demolished as the winery is constructed. Three remaining parcels, a total of approximately six acres, are undeveloped with some tree coverage. A 2.4 acre parcel borders the Napa River. These parcels will be utilized for the wastewater system and a 3.2 acre vineyard on slopes of less than 5%. The six parcels nearest to State Highway 29 are zoned Agricultural Watershed (AW) and the remaining parcels are zoned Agricultural Preservation (AP).

Surrounding land uses consists of rural residential, oak and Napa River riparian woodlands, wineries, and vineyards within the Agricultural Watershed (AW) and Agricultural Preserve (AP) Zoning Districts. Parcels located adjacent to the project site generally vary in size from 1.22 acres to 12.16 acres and consist of rural residential and vineyards all located within the AP and AW Zoning District. Producing wineries within the vicinity of the project site include Villa Amarosa and to the south, Sterling Vineyards and Paolet Estate Winery to the northwest, Larkmead and Frank Family Wineries to the east. Azalea Springs Winery, located to the southwest was recently approved, but not yet producing wine.

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

Discretionary approvals required by the County consist of a use permit and variance. The project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County, including but not limited to building permits, grading permits, well permits, and waste disposal permits. Permits may also be required by the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, & Firearms.

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

Caltrans

Other Agencies Contacted

Federal Trade and Taxation Bureau

Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Name: Linda St. Claire, Project Planner
Napa County Planning, Building & Environmental Services Department

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

	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, this area is defined by a mix of vineyard, winery, and residential uses and the Napa River situated along the floor of the Napa Valley. The project would not result in substantial damage to scenic resources or substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The project site is currently developed with nine existing commercial/light industrial structures, one residence, and a carport on eight separate parcels, which will be merged once the use permit approval has been gained. The proposal includes demolition of the existing structures. New structures would be constructed for a winery, hospitality functions and incidental retail and office uses. This structure proposes to be set back 136 feet from SR 29. However, parking would be located within this setback. Parking and structures are proposed to be screened by existing trees and shrubs. There are no rock outcroppings visible from the road or other designated scenic resources on the property.

d. Although the site is currently developed with structures, the proposed demolition of the structures and the addition of winery uses may result in the installation of additional lighting that may have the potential to impact nighttime views. Although the project is in an area that has a certain amount of existing nighttime lighting, the installation of new sources of nighttime lights may affect nighttime views. 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. As designed, and as subject to the standard condition of approval, below, the project will not have a significant impact resulting from new sources of outside lighting.

All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward, shall be located as low to the ground as possible, and 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 for construction of the winery, two (2) 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 California Building Code.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than 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 (*Department of Conservation Farmlands, 2008* layer), the proposed winery development area is located on land classified as “urban and built up land” and “prime farmland.” The winery will utilize the 8.64 acres of “built up land”. The proposal includes using the remaining 3.2 acres of “prime farmland” for vineyards and a wastewater pond. 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. The existing property is not subject to a Williamson Act contract.
- c/d. The winery site is zoned AP (Agricultural Preserve), and the vineyards and wastewater pond parcels are zoned AW (Agricultural Watershed) which allows wineries upon grant of a use permit. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Sensitive Biotic Oak woodlands, Riparian Woodland forest, and Coniferous forest) the project site does not contain woodland or forested areas. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.
- e. As discussed in item “a.”, above, the winery and winery accessory uses are defined as agricultural by the Napa County General Plan and are allowed under the parcels’ AP (Agricultural Preserve) and AW (Agricultural Watershed) 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): None required.

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 Wildlife, 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 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 30 employees, 500 Saturday and Sunday tours and tastings visitors, and 300,000 gallons per year of production phased over time (Phases 1 through 4 - up to 31,500 cases or 75,000 gallons per year for each phase) resulting in 328 maximum daily trips on a typical weekday, and 418 trips on a Saturday by total build out of all phases. The subject application also proposes marketing events, with up to 500 people at the largest event; at 2.6 persons per car, and additional staff of five persons, which would add up to 197 additional trips on the day of a large marketing event which does not exceed the threshold of 2,000 vehicle trips per day.

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 sq. ft. 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 82,236 sq. ft. of enclosed floor area, including about 23,496 sq. ft. of floor area for tasting/hospitality uses compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47ksf (high quality restaurant) and 541ksf (general light industry) for NO_x (oxides of nitrogen), the project was required to proceed through a modeling process to determine the effects the project will have on air quality. The results found that the proposed reductions in energy, mobile and solid waste are enough to reduce air pollution to an insignificant amount and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. The total amount of proposed reductions equals 29%. (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-, May 2011 Updated CEQA Guidelines. (see #1 below).

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.

1. **Mitigation Measure(s):** The project shall comply with BAAQMD Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, inclusive of the following:

- All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
- All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off site shall be covered.
- All visible mud or dirt track out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
- All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations). Clear signage requiring same shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.
- Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Method of Mitigation Monitoring: This Mitigation Measure was drafted by the Air District and is intended to be self enforcing. Complaints or concerns will be addressed by the Planning Division or the Air District as required by law. **RESPONSIBLE AGENCY(IES)-** Planning Division, BAAQMD

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<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) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/d. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – The Dept. of Fish & Wildlife Natural Diversity Database, Biological points, surveys and areas, Biological Critical habitat, and spotted owls) activity for three types of special status bats have been identified as occurring within the project boundaries and a Bat Habitat Study was submitted by Daniel Kjeldsen and written by Wildlife Research Associates Greg and Trish Tatarian. This study concluded that bats are roosting in the six of the ten buildings onsite and includes roosting activities by Townsend's big-eared bat, a California Special Concern species. The potential for this project to have an impact on special status species and movement of special status species is less than significant, with the Mitigation Measures 1 & 2 below.

According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – water bodies, vernal pools & vernal pool species) there are no wetlands on the property that would be affected by this project. The Napa River borders the northern end of the subject proposal but County setback requirements will ensure effects to any migratory fish and riparian habitat and corridors will be less than significant.

A Biological Resources Survey was conducted for the site in January 2013 by Kjeldsen Biological Consulting and recommended that if any widening or replacement to the existing culvert, located on Site Plan UP2, crossing the drainage near the waste water treatment system, consultation and permitting must be obtained from the California Fish and Wildlife, U.S Army Corps of Engineers, and Regional Water Quality Control Boards prior to and during the construction (see Mitigation Measure #3 below).

e/f. This project would not interfere with any ordinances protecting biological resources. There are no tree preservation ordinances in effect in the County. 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. Napa County does require a 2:1 replacement, as specified in the General Plan, for all Oak trees, of which there are 18 oak trees proposed for removal. The applicant will be required, through a project specific condition, to plant 36 replacement oak trees.

Mitigation Measure(s):

1. Prior to the issuance of demolition permits, grading permits, and/or building permits for any work associated with this approval, the project biologist shall follow all recommended mitigations discussed on pages 1-6 in the November 19, 2012 Bat Habitat Assessment by Greg and Trish Tatarian. Methods include encouraging bats to voluntarily leave the roosts over a two day period of time by creating an environment inconducive to bat habitat by creating noises and vibrations. These methods will not harm them. Methods for removal of bats from structures and from trees differ slightly and require different mitigations. (see below)
2. Prior to the issuance of the demolition, grading or building permit, the permittee shall submit an executed contract with the qualified biologist outlining the bat removal mitigations for the review and approval of the Planning Building & Environmental Services Director (or her designee).
3. Any widening or replacement to the existing culvert, crossing the drainage near the waste water treatment system, consultation and permitting must be obtained from the California Fish and Wildlife, U.S Army Corps of Engineers, and Regional Water Quality Control Boards prior to and during the construction.

Method of Mitigation Monitoring:

Demolition of structures: Under direct supervision and guidance of a certified biologist specializing in bat removal, the mitigation measure requires that the bats be removed from the structures by either or both by what is defined by the biologist as “humane eviction” which relies on the bats ability to fly from the roost. Unused entry points are sealed. Active entry points fitted with one-way exits, left in place 7-10 days to allow all bats to emerge normally during night time feeding. The one way exits are then removed and the remaining openings are sealed until demolition if it will occur more than 30 days after demolition. If the interval between successful eviction and demolition will be short (less than 4 weeks) and the one way exits may often be left in place until demolition. If the physical condition of the structure is so poor that humane eviction is not possible, the building must be carefully and selectively dismantled, also under the guidance of the certified bat biologist.

Tree Removal: Under direct supervision and guidance of a certified biologist specializing in bat removal, a two step method must be conducted, over a two day period. The first day will entail removal, with use of a chainsaw, creating noise and vibration by cutting non-habitat branches and limbs from habitat trees. Day 2 allows for the removal of the remaining tree.

Culvert: Obtain required permits and consultation for any widening or replacement of the existing culvert identified on Site Plan page UP2, and located near the waste water system, from California Fish and Wildlife, U.S Army Corps of Engineers, and Regional Water Quality Control Boards. **RESPONSIBLE AGENCY – Planning Department.**

	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-c. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology surveys, sites, sensitive areas, and flags) no historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified on the property.

However, if resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with 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 and 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.”

c. 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): None 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a.
 - i.) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed facility would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.
 - ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the facility will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible.
 - iii.) Subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground liquefaction. Compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code for seismic stability would reduce any impacts to a less than significant level.
 - iv.) The Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) did not indicate the presence of landslides on the property.
- b. Based upon the Soil Survey of Napa County, prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the site is composed of Bale loam soil which is found on land with 0-2% slopes. Soils in the Bale series are characterized by slow runoff with a slight hazard of erosion. Bale soil is nearly level and is generally found on old alluvial fans and flood plains. Project approval 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. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Surficial Deposits layer) the majority of the site is underlain by undifferentiated Holocene alluvium. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Liquefaction layer) the project site has high susceptibility for liquefaction. The proposal includes constructing a new winery and they will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would 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 to support the proposed septic improvements including the winery's pond and process waste as well as the proposed number of visitors to the winery.

Mitigation Measure(s): None 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 District or the California Air Resources Board which may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with a county-adopted climate action plan or another applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. 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: composting and recycling, planting additional trees, bike access and parking, and a charging station for electric vehicles.

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 annual emissions of 576 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 Cal Green Building Code, tightened vehicle fuel efficiency standards, and more project-specific on-site programs including those winery features noted above would combine to reduce emissions by 123 MT CO₂e or 29% below "business as usual" levels 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 Measure(s): None 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"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts normally used in demolition and construction of the buildings and subsequent winery operations. A Business Plan will be filed with the Environmental Health Division should the amount of hazardous materials reach reportable levels. However, in the event that the proposed use or a future use involves the use, storage or transportation of greater than 55 gallons or 500 pounds of hazardous materials, a use permit and subsequent environmental assessment would be required in accordance with the Napa County Zoning Ordinance prior to the establishment of the use. During construction of the project some hazardous materials, such as building coatings/ adhesives/ etc., will be utilized. However, given the quantities of hazardous materials and the limited duration, they will result in a less-than-significant impact.
- b. 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 two miles of any public airport.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.
- g. The proposed project will not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan.
- h. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires.

Mitigation Measure(s): None 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"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not violate any known water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. New on-site domestic and process wastewater systems, including a pond, are proposed. The Napa County Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the proposed domestic and process wastewater systems and recommends approval as conditioned. Additionally, any earth disturbing activities would be subject to the County's Stormwater Ordinance which would include measures to prevent erosion, sediment, and waste materials from entering waterways both during and after any construction activities. Given the County's Best Management Practices, which comply with RWQCB requirements, the project does not have the potential to significantly impact water quality and discharge standards.
- 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 assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels. The project is located on the valley floor in an area that has an established acceptable water use criteria of 1.0 acre foot per acre per year.

Minimum thresholds for water use allow 1 acre foot of water per acre for parcels on the valley floor. The 11.84 acre parcel has a water availability calculation of 11.84 acre feet per year (af/yr). Based on the submitted Phase One Water Availability Analysis, the existing water usage on the parcel is approximately 2.78 af/yr (0.75 for residential, 0.9 for commercial, and 1.13 af/yr for landscaping). This application proposes to demolish existing buildings and replace them with the construction of a new winery with hospitality functions and incidental retail and office uses. Five existing wells will be abandoned due to their inability to meet Napa County Standards for a public water system and their proximity to the proposed waste water system. Three existing wells will in place or used for vineyard and/or wine production. A new well will be installed to meet County Standards for a public water system, as well as, a new 30,000 gallon storage tank to provide storage capacity for fire

protection/irrigation uses. As a result of the foregoing, annual water demand for this parcel would increase from 2.78 to 10.96 af/yr (7.08 for winery, 1.88 af/yr for 3.2 acres of vineyards, and 2.0 af/yr for landscaping). Based on these figures, the project would remain below the established fair share for groundwater use on the parcel. The County is not aware of, nor has received any reports of, groundwater shortages near the project area. This project is not located in the Milliken Sarco Tulocay (MST) ground water deficient area. Because the proposed water use could potentially affect groundwater supplies or nearby wells, Napa County conditions of approval will require metering on all wells and monitoring on a regular basis for approximately three years beginning with the construction of phase one and continuing after the completion of phase four of the winery and/or upon reaching their maximum level of production and visitation, to ensure water usage remains within allowable limits.

- c.-e. The proposed project will not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off site. There are no existing or planned stormwater systems that would be affected by this project. If the project disturbs more than one acre of land, the permittee will be required to comply with the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board addressing stormwater pollution during construction activities. The project site includes vineyards, and other pervious areas that have 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 Health has reviewed the sanitary wastewater proposal and has found the proposed system adequate to meet the facility's septic needs as conditioned. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality.
- g.-i. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Floodplain* and *Dam Levee Inundation* layers), a portion of the site does fall within the floodplain, a FEMA designated floodway. Subsurface drip irrigation fed to vineyards and the pretreatment/overflow pond fall within the 500 and 100 years flood zones. Additional vineyards will be planted in a section slightly overlain by the 500 year flood zone. If the overflow pond were to fail all employees and visitors would have to evacuate to an area of refuge. No housing is proposed as a part of this project.
- 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 300-ft. to 312-ft. above mean sea level and there is no known history of mud flow in the vicinity. The project will not subject people or structures to a significant risk of inundation from tsunamis, seiche, or mudflow.

Mitigation Measure(s): None 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project is located in an area dominated by agricultural, open space and rural residences. The proposed use and the improvements proposed here support of the ongoing agricultural use in the area. This project will not divide an established community.
- b. The proposal includes a variance to allow coverage to exceed Napa County Standards for wineries from required 25% to 33% has a less than significant environmental effect.. The Napa County planning Commissioners will review the requested variance to the standards and make a decision based upon the Napa County General Plan and the Napa County Zoning Ordinance. A decision will be rendered based upon the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

The subject parcels are located in the AP (Agricultural Preserve) and AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning districts, which allow wineries and uses accessory to wineries subject to use permit approval. The proposed project is compliant with the physical limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance. The County has adopted the Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO) to protect agriculture and open space and to regulate winery development and expansion in a manner that avoids potential negative environmental effects.

Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU 1 of the 2008 General Plan states that the County shall, "preserve existing agricultural land uses and plan for agriculture and related activities as the primary land uses in Napa County." The property's General Plan land use

designation is AR (Agricultural Resource) and AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space), which allow “agriculture, processing of agricultural products, and single-family dwellings.” More specifically, General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-2 recognize wineries and other agricultural processing facilities, and any use clearly accessory to those facilities, as agriculture. The project would allow for the continuation of agriculture as a dominant land use within the county and is fully consistent with the Napa County General Plan.

The proposed use of the property for the “fermenting and processing of grape juice into wine” (NCC §18.08.640) supports the economic viability of agriculture within the county consistent with General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-4 (“The County will reserve agricultural lands for agricultural use including lands used for grazing and watershed/ open space...”) and General Plan Economic Development Policy E-1 (The County’s economic development will focus on ensuring the continued viability of agriculture...).

The General Plan includes two complimentary policies requiring wineries to be designed generally of a high architectural quality for the site and its surroundings. The proposed winery will convey the required permanence and improving the buildings overall attractiveness.

- c. There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the property.

Mitigation Measure(s): None 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 (*Mines and Mineral Deposits*, BDR Figure 2-2) indicates that there are no known mineral resources nor any locally important mineral resource recovery sites located on or near the project site.

Mitigation Measure(s): None 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 the project construction phase. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles; noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. The proposed project would not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts. Construction activities would generally occur during the period between 7 am and 7 pm on weekdays- normal waking hours. All construction activities will be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (N.C.C. Chapter 8.16).

c/d. Noise from winery operations is generally limited; however, the proposed marketing plan could create additional noise impacts. The submitted marketing plan includes a number of events on a weekly, monthly and annual basis, some of which would include up to 500 visitors (1 per year). The Napa County Noise Ordinance, which was adopted in 1984, sets the maximum permissible received sound level for a rural residence as 45 db between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. While the 45 db limitation is strict (45 db is roughly equivalent to the sound generated by a quiet conversation), the area surrounding the subject property is developed, with a scattering of homes located in the immediate vicinity and directly adjacent to the site with the nearest residence located to the northeast. The proposed winery building is set back 136 feet from the centerline of State Highway 29 and the residence is approximately 500 feet from the nearest proposed structure. Continuing enforcement of Napa County's Noise Ordinance by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff, including the prohibition against amplified music, should ensure that marketing events and other winery activities do not create a significant noise impact. Events and music are required to finish by 10p.m. every evening.

e/f. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan nor is it within two miles of a public airport or private airstrip.

f) The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	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"/>
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. Staffing for the winery would include 40 or fewer employees. The Association of Bay Area Governments' *Projections 2003* figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase some 23% by the year 2030 (*Napa County Baseline Data Report*, November 30, 2005). Additionally, the County's *Baseline Data Report* indicates that total housing units currently programmed in county and municipal housing elements exceed ABAG growth projections by approximately 15%. Employee positions which are part of this project will almost certainly lead to some population growth in Napa County. However, relative to the county's projected low to moderate growth rate and overall adequate programmed housing supply, that population growth does not rise to a level of environmental significance. In addition, the project will be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs.

Cumulative impacts related to population and housing balance were identified in the 2008 General Plan EIR. As set forth in Government Code §65580, the County of Napa must facilitate the improvement and development of housing to make adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community. Similarly, CEQA recognizes the importance of balancing the prevention of environment damage with the provision of a "decent home and satisfying living environment for every Californian." (See Public Resources Code §21000(g).) The 2008 General Plan sets forth the County's long-range plan for meeting regional housing needs, during the present and future housing cycles, while

balancing environmental, economic, and fiscal factors and community goals. The policies and programs identified in the General Plan Housing Element function, in combination with the County's housing impact mitigation fee, to ensure adequate cumulative volume and diversity of housing. Cumulative impacts on the local and regional population and housing balance will be less than significant.

b/c. This application will not displace a substantial volume of existing housing or a substantial number of people and will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	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 project area and the additional demand placed on existing services would be marginal. Fire protection measures are required as part of the development pursuant to Napa County Fire Marshall conditions and there will be no foreseeable impact to emergency response times with the adoption of standard conditions of approval. The Fire Department and Engineering Services Division 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 building permit submittal. The proposed project will have little to no impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from any building permit fees, property tax increases, and taxes from the sale of wine will help meet the costs of providing public services to the property. The proposed project will have a less than significant impact on public services.

Mitigation Measures: None 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 demolition of existing commercial structures and replacing them with the construction of a new winery, hospitality functions and incidental retail and office uses, tours and tastings by prior appointment, marketing events, and some additional on-site employment. No portion of this project, nor any foreseeable result thereof, would significantly increase the use of existing recreational facilities. This project does not include recreational facilities that would have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

a.-b. The 11.84 acre project site is located on the east side of State Highway 29 approximately 0.2 mile north of the Larkmead Lane. The applicant has submitted an updated traffic study *Focused Traffic Analysis for the Proposed Flynnville Winery Project*, prepared by George W. Nickelson P.E., for Omni-Means, dated December 15, 2012, which analyzes existing, proposed, and cumulative traffic conditions and provides the basis for this analysis. The project includes the demolition of existing structures and construction of a new winery in four phases to house a new 300,000 gallon/year winery (128,205 cases), hospitality functions, and incidental retail and office uses. The study analyzed thirty full-time and twenty part-time employees on site after build out in Phase 4 with the ability to park 109 vehicles, bicycle racks, a potential of 14 small wineries with offices, a lab and small tasting rooms with up to 500 daily visitors by appointment and the proposed marketing plan. Marketing activities would occur outside the weekday and Saturday peak traffic periods (7-10 AM and 4-6 PM). Access to the proposed winery would be from accessing an existing driveway on Maple Lane off SR 29. The existing driveway would be widened to 18-feet with two one foot shoulders to meet County Standards.

Traffic conditions on roads and at intersections are generally characterized by their "level of service" or LOS. LOS is a convenient way to express the ratio between volume and capacity on a given link or at a given intersection, and is expressed as a letter grade ranging from LOS A through LOS F. Each level of service is generally described as follows:

LOS A- Free-flowing travel with an excellent level of comfort and convenience and freedom to maneuver.

LOS B- Stable operating conditions, but the presence of other road users causes a noticeable, though slight, reduction in comfort, convenience, and maneuvering freedom.

LOS C- Stable operating conditions, but the operation of individual users is substantially affected by the interaction with others in the traffic stream.

LOS D- High-density, but stable flow. Users experience severe restrictions in speed and freedom to maneuver, with poor levels of comfort and convenience.

LOS E- Operating conditions at or near capacity. Speeds are reduced to a low but relatively uniform value. Freedom to maneuver is difficult with users experiencing frustration and poor comfort and convenience. Unstable operation is frequent, and minor disturbances in traffic flow can cause breakdown conditions.

LOS F- Forced or breakdown conditions. This condition exists wherever the volume of traffic exceeds the capacity of the roadway. Long queues can form behind these bottleneck points with queued traffic traveling in a stop-and-go fashion. (2000 Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board)

According to the traffic analysis, SR 28 west of Larkmead Lane has an average annual daily traffic volume of approximately 12,600 vehicles and a peak month daily volume of 13,700, based on the most recent Caltrans records. The peak month daily volumes are well within the carrying capacity of a rural two lane highway and indicative of a LOS C conditions (traffic study, page 3). The proposed winery is expected to generate 328 daily trips on a typical weekday and 120 week day PM peak hour trips (45 in, 75 out) would be expected. On a typical Saturday, 418 daily trips with 109 peak hour trips (45 in, 64 out) would be expected. Traffic conditions at the study intersections of SR 29/winery access/Maple Lane would remain satisfactory (Level of Service C) with short vehicle delays (18.3 seconds) for near term conditions. The project trips would add minimally (about 3.3%) to daily traffic flows on SR 29 in the project vicinity and continue to operate at a LOS B. The Maple Lane intersection would change from a LOS B to a LOS C during weekday and weekend peak periods. The combination of traffic volumes on SR 29 and traffic volumes in/out of the proposed winery would not warrant a left turn on SR 29 based on CALTRANS standards or Napa County standards. The Maple Lane/SR 29 intersection was evaluated for right-turn lane from SR 29 onto Maple Lane and based upon traffic volume guidelines, the intersection would qualify, and has been recommended for installation of a westbound right-turn taper from SR 29 to Maple Lane to ensure traffic flows with project traffic. Traffic operations were also analyzed for cumulative (Year 2030) conditions. Based on the transportation model's forecast volumes on SR 29, operations along the entire SR 29 corridor would be affected. The intersection at SR29/Maple Lane will be operating at a LOS F during peak hours and would qualify for signalization. Engineering judgment should ultimately be used when deciding the appropriateness of signal controls and additional signal analyses would be necessary. Additional measures implemented by the County, including vehicle trip reduction strategies by the project such as providing bicycle racks for visitors and working with employees to encourage use of public transit and scheduling options to facilitate carpooling, would further mitigate long term conditions.

- c. This proposed project would not result in any change to air traffic patterns.
- d.-e. Access to the proposed winery is from an existing driveway entrance at Maple Lane and would be improved as needed to meet County Road and Street Standards and CALTRANS requirements. The submitted traffic study indicated that sight distances at the project driveway would exceed the recommended distances and a westbound right-turn taper from SR 29 to Maple Lane should be installed. An eastbound left-turn lane currently exists. As further analyzed the width at SR 29 will accommodate inbound and outbound truck turn paths with the right-turn taper lane installation.
- f. The project proposes a total of 109 parking spaces. These parking spaces would be sufficient to accommodate parking needs during normal business days for employees and visitors. Additional parking will be required for the larger marketing events. The applicant will provide a shuttle service from nearby legally established parking areas. No parking will be permitted within the right-of-way of SR 29 or on the adjacent Heitz and Maple Lanes.
- g. There is no aspect of this proposed project that would conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.

Mitigation Measures:

		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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of 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. The project will not require construction of any new water or wastewater treatment facilities that will result in a significant impact to the environment. Wastewater disposal will be accommodated on-site in compliance with State and County regulations.
- c. The project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, which will cause a significant impact to the environment.
- d. The project has sufficient water supplies to serve existing and projected needs. No new or expanded entitlements are needed.
- e. Wastewater will be treated on-site and will not require a wastewater treatment provider.
- f. The project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the projects demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the project.
- g. The project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Mitigation Measures: None 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. With the mitigations included in Biological Resources, the project will have a less than significant impact on wildlife resources. Bat habitats have been identified at the site but with the mitigation measures included, the project will not result in a significant impact, either individually or cumulatively. The site has been previously developed with numerous structures over the years which will be demolished and a new winery constructed in four phases. A culvert exists which crosses a drainage. Any widening or replacement of the will require consultation and permitting from agencies as described in Section IV. As analyzed above, 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. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, green house gas emissions, and traffic impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The project would also increase the demands for public services to a limited extent, increase traffic and air pollution, all of which contribute to cumulative effects when future development in Napa Valley is considered. Cumulative impacts of these issues are discussed in previous sections of this Initial Study.
- 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.