

“C”

Initial Study/Negative Declaration

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

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated February 2015)

1. **Project Title:** Chanticleer Winery, Use Permit P14-00304-UP and Variance P14-00305-VAR
2. **Property Owner:** George Grodahl, 4 Vineyard View Drive, Yountville, CA 94599
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number, and Email:** Emily Hedge; (707) 259-8227; emily.hedge@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and APN:** The project is located on a 40 acre parcel on the west side of Solano Avenue, approximately a half a mile south of the intersection with California Drive. 4 Vineyard View Drive, Yountville, CA 94599; APN: 034-150-045.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Jeff Redding, Land Use Planning Services, 2423 Renfrew Street, Napa, 94559.
6. **General Plan Description:** Agriculture Watershed and Open Space (AWOS) Designation and Agricultural Resource (AR) Designation.
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Watershed (AW) and Agricultural Preserve (AP).
8. **Background/Project History:** The 40 acre parcel includes an existing residence, guest cottage, personal wine cave, agricultural equipment building, and storage barn. Approximately 6.8 acres out of the 40 acres are planted in vineyards.

May 20, 1994 – Erosion Control Plan #93472 – Ag Track I Replant

December 1, 1998 – Erosion Control Plan #98088 – ECP for grading associated with the construction of a residence, cellar, and a 250 foot driveway.

May 24, 1999 - Use Permit Stream Setback Exception Request #98334 was approved by the Zoning Administrator to allow for construction to widen and re-construct a 150-foot long section of existing driveway located within the 65-foot stream setback along an unnamed creek. The existing dirt driveway served the single family residence.

January 15, 1999 - Environmental review of Special Design Sewage System #98317.
9. **Description of Project:** Approval of a use permit to allow the construction of a new 10,000 gallons annually winery with the following characteristics:
 - a) Demolition of an existing approximately 3,500 square foot barn (to be replaced by new winery building);
 - b) Approximately 5,400 square foot winery building consisting of 4,800 square foot first floor and 600 square foot mezzanine, with a "living vegetated" roof;
 - c) Approximately 1,500 square foot covered crush pad and outdoor work area;
 - d) Approximately 8,900 square feet of caves including an approximately 550 square foot bottle storage room;
 - e) Covered storage, trash, and recycle enclosure;
 - f) Tours and tastings by appointment only with a maximum of 10 people per day;
 - g) Marketing program of one (1) marketing event per month for a maximum of 25 persons per event and events may be catered;
 - h) Hours of operation daily 8 am to 6 pm (production) and 10 am to 6 pm (visitation);
 - i) Two (2) full-time and two (2) part time employees;
 - j) Six (6) parking spaces for visitors and employees;
 - k) One (1) loading dock;
 - l) 50,000 gallon fire water tank and 5,000 gallon domestic water tank;
 - m) Improved access driveways and walkways;
 - n) Installation of storm drainage facilities and water conveyances;
 - o) Wastewater treatment and disposal facilities; and
 - p) Fire suppression equipment and facilities.

The project also includes an Exception to the Napa County Road and Streets Standards Exception request to the Public Works Director to allow for an exception to install a left turn lane on Solano Avenue.

The project also includes an application for a variance to allow the construction of the winery within the required 300 foot winery setback from Vineyard View Drive (private road). The winery is proposed approximately 55 feet from the centerline of Vineyard View Drive on the footprint of the existing storage barn.

10. **Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses:**

The 40 acre parcel is located on the west side of Solano Avenue, south of the City of Yountville. The property is accessed off Vineyard View Drive, a private driveway located approximately a half mile south of the intersection of Solano Avenue and California Drive.

Existing land uses include a residence and garage, guest cottage and carport, personal wine cave, and storage barn. Approximately 6.8 acres out of the 40 acres are planted in vineyards.

Elevation on the site ranges from approximately 135 feet above mean sea level at the base of the property on the eastern property line to approximately 775 feet above mean sea level at top of the hillside on the western property line. The existing residence is sited on a knoll at approximately 300 feet above mean sea level. The guest cottage is sited on a flat area of the property at approximately 225 feet above mean sea level. The existing storage barn, proposed to be replaced by the winery, is located at approximately 150 feet above mean sea level.

The property is made up of a combination of soils including forward gravelly loam (9 to 30 percent slopes) as the base of the property, kidd loam (15 to 20 percent slopes) and sobrante loam (30 to 50 percent slopes) on the hillside, and felton gravelly loam (30 to 50 percent slopes) at the top of the hill.

The property is located in the Veteran's Creek drainage basin. There is an unnamed drainage near the driveway to the main residence (Use Permit Stream Setback Exception Request #98334) and a drainage ditch beginning near the western side of the barn driveway that enters a culvert under the driveway and continues to Solano Avenue. There is no development proposed near the residence. Development of the winery structure and associated improvements will not impact the drainage near the roadway.

Surrounding land uses include the Veterans Home of Yountville, rural residential properties, agriculture, vineyards, and wineries. The area of the Veterans Home directly north of the proposed winery site is a parking lot and the hospital. Vineyard View Drive is lined with trees, providing screening of the property to the north. Nearby wineries include Keever Winery on the adjacent parcel to the south, with Dahl Vineyards, Chateau Chevre Winery, Elyse Winery, and Joel Gott Wines approximately a half a mile south on Hoffman Drive. The nearest offsite residence is located on the hillside, approximately a quarter of a mile to the southwest of the proposed winery location.

11. **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 modification. The project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County, including but not limited to building permits, grading 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

None Required.

Other Agencies Contacted

ABC, TTB, Town of Yountville

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.

Emily Hedge

Signature

8/16/16

Date

Name: Emily Hedge, Planner II

Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services
Department

	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:

Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms, geological features, water, trees and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of a beautiful or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken in. As generally described in the **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses** section above, the surrounding land uses include the Veterans Home of California, Yountville, rural residential, agriculture, vineyards, and wineries. The nearest offsite residence is located on the hillside, approximately a quarter of a mile from the proposed winery location.

a-c. The project site is currently developed with a residence and garage, guest cottage and carport, personal wine cave, and storage barn. Approximately 6.8 acres out of the 40 acres are planted in vineyards. The proposed project would not be located in an area which would damage any known scenic vista, or damage scenic resources, trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings. The winery would be setback approximately 3,000 feet from Solano Avenue and approximately 55 feet from the centerline of Vineyard View Drive. The project includes an application for a variance to allow the construction of the winery within the required 300 foot winery setback from Vineyard View Drive (private road).

The proposed winery building would replace the existing barn that is located on the flattest portion of the property at the bottom of the hill. Approximately 0.25 acres of vineyards will be removed for site improvements. The winery has been designed as a single-story building with a low profile. The winery building is proposed to have a "green" living vegetated roof which will blend into the hillside.

The "green" living vegetated roof is a component of the stormwater plan and therefore must be maintained. A condition of approval will require the living room to be maintained. If a change is proposed a revised stormwater plan must be submitted to the Engineering Services Division for review and approval. Pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approval for wineries, colors used shall be limited to "earth tones" to blend into the colors of the surrounding vegetation. If the green roof were to be redesigned or removed, the condition of approval would require the use of earth tones colors and the structure would not have a significant impact to aesthetics.

Placement of the structure on the footprint of the existing barn will reduce the impact of having an additional structure on the property in a new location. The location is already partially screened by trees that line both sides of Vineyard View Drive. These trees help screen views of the structure from the Veterans Home, located directly north of the project site.

d. The winery would replace the existing barn and will remain a potential source of nighttime lighting. The winery hours of operations are 8am to 6pm (production) and 10am to 6pm (visitation); therefore nighttime lighting associated with the winery would be limited. Although the project is in an area that has a certain amount of existing nighttime lighting, the installation of new sources of lights, if they were to remain on past daylight hours, 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, shall be the minimum necessary for security, safety, or operations, shall be on timers, and shall incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. No flood-lighting or sodium lighting of the building is permitted, including architectural highlighting and spotting. Low-level lighting shall be utilized in parking areas as opposed to elevated high-intensity light standards. Lighting utilized during harvest activities is not subject to this requirement.

Prior to issuance of any building permit pursuant to this approval, two (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 the California Building Code.

Mitigation Measures: 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:

The project site is split-zoned Agricultural Preserve (AP) and Agricultural Watershed (AW), which both allow wineries upon grant of a use permit. The 40 acre parcel includes an existing residence and garage, guest cottage and carport, personal wine cave, and storage barn. Approximately 6.8 acres out of the 40 acres are planted in vineyards. The proposed winery would be located on the existing footprint of the barn and the caves would be dug into the hillside.

a/b/e. The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. The property is designated Unique Farmland and Grazing Land (based on GIS layer Department of Conservation Farmlands 2012). 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. Therefore, this application will not result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use. The subject parcel is not currently under a Williamson Act contract. There are no other changes included in this proposal that would result in the conversion of Farmland beyond the immediate project site.

c/d. The proposed project will not conflict with existing zoning for or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps (based on the following layers – Sensitive Biotic Oak Woodlands, Riparian Woodland Forest and Coniferous Forest) the hillside above the proposed winery contains oak woodlands. The proposed winery would be located on the existing footprint of the barn and the caves would be dug into the hillside. There is no development proposed on the hillside area.

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.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a-c. 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. 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. However, on August 31, 2013, the Court of Appeals reinstated the Air District's thresholds of significance provided in Table 3-1 (Criteria Air Pollutants & Precursors Screening Levels Sizes) which are applicable for evaluating projects in Napa County.

For purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, a winery is considered comparable to a combination of a high quality restaurant (winery tasting room) and general light industrial (office, barrel storage, and production). The Air District's thresholds of significance provided in Table 3-1 of the Bay Area Air Quality Management Plan has determined that high quality restaurants that do not exceed a threshold of 47,000 square feet and/or general light industrial projects that do not exceed a threshold of 541,000 square feet for NOx (oxides of nitrogen), will not significantly impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2010, page 3-1, 3-2 & 3-3).

Compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion, the approximately 1,875 square foot tasting room and associated accessory space and the total project size of approximately 15,800 square feet, comprised of the winery building and outdoor work areas (6,900 square foot including tasting room) and cave (8,900 square foot), the project would contribute a less-than-insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan.

The 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 winery trip generation sheet included in the application calculates the proposed conditions for a typical weekday at approximately 16 total daily trips and 5 PM peak trips. Proposed conditions for a typical Saturday area calculated at 10 total trips and 5 PM peak trips and proposed conditions for a typical Saturday during crush are calculated at 15 total trips.

Vehicle trips generated are significantly below BAAQMD's recommended threshold of 2,000 vehicle trips/day for purposes of performing a detailed air quality analysis. Given the relatively small number of vehicle trips generated by this project, compared to the size of the air basin, project related vehicle trips would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan.

There are no projected or existing air quality violations in this area to which this project would contribute, nor would it result in any violations of any applicable air quality standards. As discussed above, the existing vehicle trips associated with the project are well below the thresholds of significance. The proposed project would not significantly increase vehicle trips from the existing levels and 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. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plan.

- 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 adheres 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:

During all construction activities the permittee shall comply with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Basic Best Management Practices, as provided in Table 8, May 2011 Updated CEQA Guidelines.

- a. *Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible.*
- b. *All exposed surfaces (e.g. parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access (road) shall be watered two times per day.*
- c. *All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.*
- d. *All visible mud or dirt tracked 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.*
- e. *All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.*
- f. *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.*
- g. *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 [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.*
- h. *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.*

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 when average wind speeds exceed 20 miles per hour.

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				

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

Discussion:

The 40 acre parcel includes an existing residence, guest cottage, personal wine cave, agricultural equipment building, and storage barn. Approximately 6.8 acres out of the 40 acres are planted in vineyards. The project would result in the removal of 0.25 acres of vineyards. The proposed winery would be located on the existing footprint of the barn and the caves would be dug into the hillside.

a/b/d. As noted in the Agricultural and Forest Resources section above, according to the Napa County Environmental resource maps (based on the following layer – Sensitive Biotic Oak Woodlands) the hillside above the proposed winery contains oak woodlands. Review of the Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Spotted Owl Habitat) shows potential habitat for spotted owls along the western parcel boundary in the forested area at the top of the hill. The Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Natural Diversity Database (F&G) and US Fish and Wildlife Critical Habitat) does not show any additional potential candidate, sensitive, or special status species.

The potential spotted owl habitat is denoted on the westernmost portion of the property, approximately 0.4 miles (2,000 feet) uphill from the proposed winery site. As stated above, the winery would be located at the base of the property on the developed footprint of the existing barn. The area has been previously disturbed by the barn, which is in constant use for vineyard activities. Existing development between the proposed winery location and the potential habitat area includes more than 300 feet of vines on the gently sloping hillside to the guest cottage and carport on the first knoll. The main residence is located on the second knoll, approximately 200 feet uphill from the guest cottage. Vineyard View Drive runs behind the residence and bisects the property, leading to additional residences and a winery. Tree removal would be limited to approximately six trees adjacent to the existing barn in preparation of the new parking lot. There is no development proposed on the hillside portion of the property and therefore, the project would not have a significant impact on the potential spotted owl habitat.

There are no site conditions, in the location of the proposed winery development area, which would be considered essential for the support of a species with limited distribution or considered to be a sensitive natural plant community. The potential for this project to have an impact on special status species is less than significant. The project activities will not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with their corridors or nursery sites, because no sensitive natural communities have been identified on the property. Therefore, the project as proposed would have no impact to biological resources.

c. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – wetlands (NWI), wetlands & vernal pools) there are no wetlands on the property or on neighboring properties that would be affected by this project.

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. The project does not conflict with any County ordinance or requirement to preserve existing trees, and therefore is considered as not having potential for a significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

The proposed winery is located on an area that has previously been disturbed by the construction of the barn and the planting of vineyards; therefore it is unlikely that cultural resources would be present at the proposed site. 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 construction, work shall cease in a 50-foot radius surrounding the area of discovery. The permittee shall contact the PBES 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 shall be contacted by the permittee to obtain recommendations for treating or removal of such remains, including grave goods, with appropriate dignity, as required under Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

d. No human remains have been encountered on the property 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 Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Faults, West Napa Fault, West Napa anno) approximate locations of active faults are shown on the adjacent property to the east, approximately 750 feet from the proposed winery location. The maps do not show faults on the subject property. As such, the proposed project 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 project 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.
 - iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layer – Liquefaction) the property is in an area generally subject to a “very low” to “low” tendency to liquefy. All proposed construction will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction. Compliance with the latest editions of the California Building Code for seismic stability would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible, resulting in result in less than significant impacts.
 - iv.) According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layer – Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) there are no landslide deposits on the property.
- b. The proposed winery would be located on the existing footprint of the barn, which would result in minimal grading, and the caves would be dug into the hillside. The proposed project will require incorporation of best management practices and will be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance, which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable.
- c/d. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Surficial Deposits, Geology), the property is underlain by Pre-Quaternary deposits and bedrock, with Late Pleistocene-Holocene fan deposits at the base of the hillside. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (based on the following layer – liquefaction), the property is in an area generally subject to a “very low” to “low” tendency to liquefy.

The property is made up of a combination of soils including forward gravelly loam (9 to 30 percent slopes) as the base of the property, kidd loam (15 to 20 percent slopes) and sobranite loam (30 to 50 percent slopes) on the hillside, and felton gravelly loam (30 to 50 percent slopes) at the top of the hill. The soil types have an expansive index less than 20 percent (Soil Survey of Napa County, California, 1978).

All proposed construction will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction. Compliance with the latest editions of the California Building Code for seismic stability would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible, resulting in less than significant impacts.

- e. Information from Napa County Environmental Health files shows two existing septic systems; one system serves the main residence and guest cottage and the other is an abandoned system that previously served the guest cottage. RSA+ prepared a winery wastewater feasibility report, dated June 18, 2013-Revised September 10, 2014, to demonstrate the feasibility of utilizing a subsurface drip system for treating the domestic wastewater and either a surface drip irrigation system or a hold and haul tank system to treat the winery process wastewater.

The site currently has an estimated usage of 600 gallons per day of "domestic" waste. As a result of the project the site has an estimated usage of 940 gallons per day of "domestic" waste and 500 gallons per day of "other" waste (winery process waste). The winery domestic wastewater system has been sized to accommodate the unit values for the number of visitors and employees presented in the Use Permit application, and is designed for a capacity of 1,200 gallons per day.

The report demonstrates that a subsurface drip system is feasible and that there is enough dispersion area available for treating the domestic wastewater. The report also concludes that it is feasible to treat the winery process wastewater using a surface drip irrigation system or that an adequately sized hold and haul system could be installed. The designs proposed in the report meet the Napa County Environmental Health Division's design standards for the treatment of winery and domestic wastewater. The Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the application and determined that the proposed wastewater systems are adequate to serve the facility's septic needs. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality.

Mitigation Measures: 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:

Napa County has been working to develop a Climate Action Plan (CAP) for several years. In 2012 a Draft CAP² (March 2012) was recommended using the emissions checklist in the Draft CAP, on a trial basis, to determine potential greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with project development and operation. At the December 11, 2012, Napa County Board of Supervisors (BOS) hearing, the BOS considered adoption of the proposed CAP. In addition to reducing Napa County's GHG emissions, the proposed plan was intended to address compliance with CEQA for projects reviewed by the County and to lay the foundation for development of a local offset program. While the BOS acknowledged the plan's objectives, the BOS requested that the CAP be revised to better address transportation-related greenhouse gas, to acknowledge and credit past accomplishments and voluntary efforts, and to allow more time for establishment of a cost-effective local offset program. The Board also requested that best management practices be applied and considered when reviewing projects until a revised CAP is adopted to ensure that projects address the County's policy goal related to reducing GHG emissions.

² County of Napa, March 2012, Napa County Draft Climate Action Plan, Prepared by ICF International. Sacramento, CA

In July 2015, the County re-commenced preparation of the CAP to: i) account for present day conditions and modeling assumptions (such as but not limited to methods, emission factors, and data sources), ii) address the concerns with the previous CAP effort as outlined above, iii) meet applicable State requirements, and iv) result in a functional and legally defensible CAP. On April 13, 2016 the County, as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP, released Final Technical Memorandum #1: *2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016*³. This initial phase included: i) updating the unincorporated County's community-wide GHG emissions inventory to 2014, and ii) preparing new GHG emissions forecasts for the 2020, 2030, and 2050 horizons. Additional information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or <http://www.countyofnapa.org/CAP/>.

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 (Table 3-1 – Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors & GHG Screening Level Sizes) and Significance of Thresholds [1,100 metric tons per year (MT) of carbon dioxide and carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e)]. 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.)

For the purposes of this analysis potential GHG emissions associated with winery 'construction' and 'development' and with 'ongoing' winery operations have been discussed.

GHGs are the atmospheric gases whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for the greenhouse effect, including carbon dioxide, methane, ozone, and the fluorocarbons, that contribute to climate change (a widely accepted theory/science explain human effects on the atmosphere). Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) gas, the principal greenhouse gas (GHG) being emitted by human activities, and whose concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity, also serves as the reference gas to compare other greenhouse gases. Agricultural sources of carbon emissions include forest clearing, land-use changes, biomass burning, and farm equipment and management activity emissions (http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/glossary/letter_c.html). Equivalent Carbon Dioxide (CO₂e) is the most commonly reported type of GHG emission and a way to get one number that approximates total emissions from all the different gasses that contribute to GHG (BAAMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2012). In this case, carbon dioxide (CO₂) is used as the reference atom/compound to obtain atmospheric carbon CO₂ effects of GHG. Carbon stocks are converted to carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e) by multiplying the carbon total by 44/12 (or 3.67), which is the ratio of the atomic mass of a carbon dioxide molecule to the atomic mass of a carbon atom (<http://www.nciasi2.org/COLE/index.html>).

One time "Construction Emissions" associated with the winery development project includes: i) the carbon stocks that are lost (or released) when existing vegetation is removed and soil is ripped in preparation for the new winery structure and associated infrastructure; and ii) emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area and construct the winery, including construction equipment and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as Equipment Emissions). These emissions also include underground carbon stocks (or Soil carbon) associated with the existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed.

In addition to the one time Construction Emissions, "Operational Emissions" of the winery are also considered and include: i) any reduction in the amount of carbon sequestered by existing vegetation that is removed as part of the project compared to a "no project" scenario (hereinafter referred to as Operational Sequestration Emissions); and ii) ongoing emissions from the energy used to maintain and operate the winery, including vehicle trips associated with employee and visitor trips (hereinafter referred to as Operational Emissions). See Section XVI, Transportation/Traffic, for anticipated number of operational trips. Operational Emissions from the proposed winery would be the primary source of emissions over the long-term when compared to one time construction emissions.

³ Supersedes February 2, 2016, version.

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 has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds Table 3-1 (Operational GHG Screening Level Sizes). Given the size of the entire project, which is approximately 15,800 square feet, comprised of the winery building and outdoor work areas (6,900 square feet), and cave (8,900 square feet), compared to the BAAQMD's GHG screening criteria of 121,000 square feet for general industrial, and the tasting room and associated accessory space which is approximately 1,875 square feet within the winery building, compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 9,000 square feet for high quality restaurant, the project was determined not to exceed the 1,100 MT of CO₂e/yr GHG threshold of significance.

The proposed floor area is below the screening levels for similar uses in the District's Guidelines, therefore the proposed use would not generate GHG above the significance threshold established by the District, and further analysis (and quantification) of GHG emissions is not warranted.

Furthermore, the applicant has indicated that the project will incorporate the following voluntary best management practices:

- pre-plumbing for installation of rooftop photovoltaics;
- providing priority parking for efficient transportation;
- bicycle incentives;
- installation of energy conserving lighting;
- a "green" living vegetated roof to reduce heating and cooling requirements;
- utilization of caves for barrel storage to reduce cooling requirements;
- installation of water efficient fixtures;
- planting of water efficient landscaping; and
- utilization of recycled process waste water for irrigation

Greenhouse Gas Emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the Cal Green Building Code, vehicle fuel efficiency standards, and the project-specific on-site programs identified above would combine to further reduce emissions below BAAQMD thresholds.

As indicated above the County is currently preparing a CAP and as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP has released Final Technical Memorandum #1 (2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016). Table 1 of the Technical Memorandum indicates that 2% of the County's GHG emissions in 2014 were a result of land use change.

The increase in emissions anticipated as a result of the project would be minor and the project is in compliance with the County's efforts to reduce emissions as described above. Accordingly, the project's impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 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 the 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. There are no foreseeable reasons the project would 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 project 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. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the layer – Fire hazard severity) the parcel is located in an area denoted as a Moderate to High fire hazard severity. There is existing development on the property and the surrounding area. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires.

Mitigation Measures: 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

On January 14, 2014 Governor Jerry Brown declared a drought emergency in the state of California. That declaration was followed up on April 1, 2015, when the Governor directed the State Water Resources Control Board to implement mandatory water reductions in cities and town across California to reduce water usage by 25 percent. These water restrictions do not apply to agricultural users. At this time the County of Napa has not adopted or implemented any additional mandatory water use restrictions. The County requires all Use Permit applicants to complete necessary water analyses in order to document that sufficient water supplies are available for the proposed project.

On June 28, 2011, the Board of Supervisors approved creation of a Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee (GRAC). The GRAC's purpose was to assist County staff and technical consultants with recommendations regarding groundwater, including data collection, monitoring, well pump test protocols, management objectives, and community support. The County completed a county-wide assessment of groundwater resources (Napa County Groundwater Conditions and Groundwater Monitoring Recommendations Report (Feb. 2011) and developed a groundwater monitoring program (Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2013 (Jan. 2013). The County also completed a 2013 Updated Hydrogeologic Conceptualization and Characterization of Groundwater Conditions (Jan. 2013).

In general, recent studies have found that groundwater levels in the Napa Valley Floor exhibit stable long-term trends with a shallow depth to water. Historical trends in the Milliken-Sarco-Tuluca (MST) area, however, have shown increasing depths to groundwater, but recent stabilization in many locations. Groundwater availability, recharge, storage and yield is not consistent across the County. More is known about the resource where historical data have been collected. Less is known in areas with limited data or unknown geology. In order to fill existing data gaps and to provide a better understanding of groundwater resources in the County, the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan recommended 18 Areas of Interest for additional groundwater level and water quality monitoring. Through the well owner and public outreach efforts of the GRAC approximately 40 new wells have been added to the monitoring program within these areas. Groundwater Sustainability Objectives were recommended by the GRAC and adopted by the Board of Supervisors. The recommendations

included the goal of developing sustainability objectives, provided a definition, explained the shared responsibility for Groundwater Sustainability and the important role monitoring as a means to achieving groundwater sustainability.

In 2009 Napa County began a comprehensive study of its groundwater resources to meet identified action items in the County's 2008 General Plan update. The study, by Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE), emphasized developing a sound understanding of groundwater conditions and implementing an expanded groundwater monitoring and data management program as a foundation for integrated water resources planning and dissemination of water resources information. The 2011 baseline study by LSCE, which included over 600 wells and data going back over 50 years, concluded that "the groundwater levels in Napa County are stable, except for portions of the MST district". Most wells elsewhere within the Napa Valley Floor with a sufficient record indicate that groundwater levels are more affected by climatic conditions, are within historical levels, and seem to recover from dry periods during subsequent wet or normal periods. The LSCE Study also concluded that, on a regional scale, there appear to be no current groundwater quality issues except north of Calistoga (mostly naturally occurring boron and trace metals) and in the Carneros region (mostly salinity).

Minimum thresholds for water use have been established by the Napa County Department of Public Works, using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS) and the studies prepared by LSCE. 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 subject property is located at the boarder of the Western Mountains subarea and the Valley Floor subarea of Napa County according to the Groundwater Monitoring Plan. The property has three wells on site. Two wells, located on the knoll near the guest house, are not in use. The third well, proposed to be used for the project, is located at the base of the hillside. Because the proposed project well is located on the flattest portion of the property, the project was originally submitted with the County Water Availability Analysis - Phase One Study form and designated as "Valley Floor". Upon further review, staff determined that because of the proximity to the hillside, the project should be reviewed as an "all other area" and should include a recharge rate analysis and well interference analysis.

- a. The proposed project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. RSA+ prepared a winery wastewater feasibility report, dated September 19, 2014, to demonstrate the feasibility of utilizing a subsurface drip system for treating the domestic wastewater. The report also concludes that it is feasible to treat the winery process wastewater using a surface drip irrigation system or that an adequately sized hold and haul system could be installed. The report demonstrates that a subsurface drip system is feasible and that there is enough dispersion area available for treating the domestic wastewater and that it is feasible to treat the winery process wastewater using a surface drip irrigation system. The designs proposed in the report meet the Napa County Environmental Health Division's design standards for the treatment of winery and domestic wastewater. The Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the application and determined that the proposed wastewater systems are adequate to serve the facility's septic needs. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality.

No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality. Any earth disturbing activities will 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. For this project a Water Feasibility Study (September 19, 2014), a County Water Availability Analysis - Phase One Study form (March 13, 2015), and a Water Availability Analysis (January 8, 2016) were prepared by RSA+. The analyses included a water demand analysis detailing the existing and proposed groundwater uses, an analysis of the aquifer recharge rate, and a Tier 2 well interference analysis.

The water demand for the existing residential structures, existing vineyard, and proposed winery was determined to be approximately 5.05 acre feet per year. The winery results in a water use increase of approximately 0.45 acre feet per year above existing conditions.

The Water Availability Analysis calculated the groundwater recharge rate by examining the annual rainfall, runoff, and evapotranspiration during winter months. Only the winter months were considered because it was assumed that evapotranspiration in summer months will be from irrigation water. Based on the analysis of these factors, the recharge rate was calculated at 0.66 acre-feet per acre per year, resulting in a total parcel recharge of 26.4 acre-feet per year. The estimated ground water recharge on this parcel is greater than the estimated water use and therefore the Tier 1 Water Criterion is met. Based on review of County Environmental Health Division records for adjacent properties, there are no non-project wells within 500 feet of existing project wells. The Tier 2 analysis showed that there were no non-project wells within 500 feet of the proposed project well.

The report concludes that based on the analysis completed, the project meets both Tier 1 and Tier 2 Criteria and is therefore in compliance with the requirements of the WAA. Based on the evidence provided, the project will have a less than significant impact on groundwater supply and recharge rates.

Tier 1 Analysis

RSA+ prepared a Water Demand Analysis, dated March 13, 2015, detailing the existing and proposed ground water uses. According to the analysis, the winery would create an overall increase in annual water demand from 4.60 acre feet per year to 5.05 acre feet per year, totaling approximately 0.45 acre feet per year.

Existing Property Water Demand	
Use	Acre feet per Year
Residential	1.05
Landscaping	0.13
Vineyard	3.42
Total	4.60

Proposed Property Water Demand	
Use	Acre feet per Year
Residential (existing)	1.05
Landscaping	0.29
Vineyard	3.42
Winery (process water)	0.22
Winery employees	0.03
Winery visitation	0.03
Marketing	0.01
Total	5.05

Tier 2 Analysis

Based on review of County Environmental Health Division records for adjacent properties, there are no non-project wells within 500 feet of existing project wells. Tier 2 well interference criterion is presumptively met per Napa County Water Availability Analysis Tier 2 screening criteria.

Consistent with current County practices, the project would be subject to the standard condition of approval limiting water use to the levels requested and analyzed with the use permit application (and accompanying CEQA document), and requiring well monitoring with the potential to modify or alter permitted used on site should groundwater resources become insufficient to supply the use.

In response to regional drought and the general Statewide need to protect groundwater resources, the Governor enacted new legislation requiring local governments to monitor and management groundwater resources. Napa County's prior work on the Napa Valley Groundwater Management Plan provides a strong foundation for Napa County to comply with this State mandated monitoring and management objective. As a direct result, the project site is now subject to this new legislation requiring local agencies to monitor groundwater use. Assembly Bill - AB 1739 by Assembly member Roger Dickinson (D-Sacramento) and Senate Bills 1168 and 1319 by Senator Fran Pavley (D-Agoura Hills) establish a framework for sustainable, local groundwater management for the first time in California history. The legislation requires local agencies to tailor sustainable groundwater plans to their regional economic and environmental needs. The legislation prioritizes groundwater basin management Statewide, which includes the Napa Valley/Napa River Drainage Basin, and sets a timeline for implementation of the following:

- By 2017, local groundwater management agencies must be identified;
- By 2020, overdrafted groundwater basins must have sustainability plans;
- By 2022, other high and medium priority basins not currently in overdraft must have sustainability plans; and
- By 2040, all high and medium priority groundwater basins must achieve sustainability.

The State has classified the Napa River Drainage Basin as a medium priority resource. Additionally, the legislation provides measurable objectives and milestones to reach sustainability and a State role of limited intervention when local agencies are unable or unwilling to adopt sustainable management plans. Napa County supports this legislation and has begun the process of developing a local groundwater management agency which is anticipated to be in place and functioning within the timeline prescribed by the State.

The proposed project would not result in a substantial increase the demand of ground water supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge or lowering of the local groundwater level. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Water Deficient Areas/Storage Areas*), the project site is not located within a water deficient area and the County is not aware of, nor has it received any reports of groundwater deficiencies in the area. Potential impacts from the project would be less than significant.

- c-e. The project proposal will not substantially alter any drainage patterns on site or cause an increase in erosion on or off site. There is an unnamed drainage near the driveway to the main residence and a drainage ditch beginning near the western side of the barn driveway that enters a culvert under the driveway and continues to Solano Avenue. There is no development proposed in proximity to the drainage near the residence. Development of the winery structure and associated improvements will not impact the drainage near the roadway. The culvert under the driveway will be replaced with a similar structure. The project would be required to incorporate an erosion control plan to manage onsite surface drainage and erosion of onsite soils during construction and winter months (October to April). By incorporating a Standard Measures erosion control plan, this project would have a less than significant impact on drainage and siltation. There are no existing or planned stormwater systems that would be affected by this project.
- f. The proposed project would implement standard stormwater quality treatment controls to treat runoff prior to discharge from the project site. The incorporation of these features into the project would ensure that the proposed project would not create substantial sources of polluted runoff. As discussed above, the Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the application and determined that the proposed sanitary wastewater system is adequate to serve the facility's septic needs. In addition, the proposed project does not have any unusual characteristics that create sources of pollution that would degrade water quality. Impacts would be less than significant.
- g-i. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Flood Zones and Dam Levee Inundation) the project site is not located within a flood hazard area, nor would it impede or redirect flood flows or expose structures or people to flooding. The project site is not located within a dam or levee failure inundation zone.
- 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 150 feet above mean sea level. There is no known history of landslides or mud flow on the property. The project will not subject people or structures to a significant risk of inundation by tsunamis, seiche, or mudflows.

Mitigation Measures: None.

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

Discussion:

- a. The proposed winery is located in an area dominated by agricultural, rural residences, and wineries. The project is in support of the ongoing agricultural use in the area. This project will not divide an established community.
- b/c. The project site is split-zoned Agricultural Preserve (AP) and Agricultural Watershed (AW), which both allow wineries upon grant of a use permit. 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. The proposed project is compliant with the use limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance. The project includes an application for a variance to allow the construction of the winery within the required 300 foot winery setback from Vineyard View Drive (private road). The winery is proposed approximately 55 feet from the centerline of Vineyard View Drive.

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), which allows "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. There are no applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the property.

Mitigation Measures: 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. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: 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 project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during limited project construction. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. The project would not result in potentially significant temporary construction noise impacts or operational impacts. The nearest offsite residence is located on the hillside, approximately a quarter of a mile to the southwest of the proposed winery location. The Veterans Home of California, Yountville, is located adjacent to the property on the north side. The area directly across from the proposed winery site is a parking lot and the hospital. Vineyard View Drive is lined with trees, providing screening of the property to the north. Given the proximity to the residential neighbors, there is a relatively low potential for impacts related to construction noise to result in a significant impact. Furthermore, construction activities would generally occur during the period of 7am-7pm on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity. All construction activities will be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). The proposed project will not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts. Conditions of approval would require construction activities to be limited to daylight hours, vehicles to be muffled, and backup alarms adjusted to the lowest allowable levels.

c/d. The area surrounding the subject property primarily features properties containing vineyards, rural residences, and wineries. Wineries are the predominant non-residential land uses within the County. Noise from winery operations is generally limited and intermittent, meaning the sound level can vary over the course of the year, depending on the activities at the winery. The primary noise-generating activities are equipment associated with wineries include refrigeration equipment, bottling equipment, barrel washing, de-stemmer and press activities occurring during the harvest crush season, and delivery and delivery trucks and other vehicles. Community noise is commonly described in terms of the "ambient" noise level which is defined as the all-encompassing noise level associated with a given noise environment. The Napa County General Plan EIR indicates the average, or equivalent, sound level (Leq) for winery activities is 51dBA in the morning and 41dBA in the afternoon. Audibility of a new noise source and/or increase in noise levels within recognized acceptable limits are not usually considered to be significant noise impacts, but these concerns should be addressed and considered in the planning and environmental review processes.

The standard conditions of approval require that any exterior winery equipment be enclosed or muffled and maintained so as not to create a noise disturbance in accordance with the Napa County Code. Continuing enforcement of Napa County's Noise Ordinance by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff would further ensure that winery activities do not create a significant noise impact. The proposed project would not result in long-term significant permanent noise impacts.

e/f. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impacts would occur.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The Association of Bay Area Governments' *Projections 2003* figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase some 23 percent 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 percent. The project proposes two full-time and two part-time employees. 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. The existing residence onsite will not be impacted by the proposed winery. This project 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. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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 site 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 Marshal 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. The project would not significantly increase the use of recreational facilities, nor does the project include recreational facilities that may have a significant adverse effect on the environment. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system and/or conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-16, which seeks to maintain an adequate Level of Service (LOS) at signalized and unsignalized intersections, or reduce the effectiveness of existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-23, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The project site is located at 4 Vineyard View Drive, directly south of the Town of Yountville. A Traffic Impact Study, dated March 16, 2015, was prepared by Whitlock & Weinberger Transportation, Inc. (W-TRANS). The study looked at collision history for the study segment of Solano Avenue, trip generation rates, trip distribution, roadway segment operations, site access, and County left-turn lane warrants. The future traffic scenario represents a General Plan buildout at an estimated time horizon of the year 2030. The study utilized projected traffic volumes from the Solano

Transportation Authority (STA) Napa County/Solano County 2010-2030 Travel Demand Forecasting Model. The Study used the County's Winery Traffic Information and Trip Generation sheet to estimate daily trips and peak PM trips.

- a/b. Site access to the project would be via Vineyard View Drive, a gated, private road that intersects Solano Avenue approximately a half mile south of the intersection of Solano Avenue and California Drive. The study determined that the proposed project would generate an average of 16 new weekday trips, including five weekday p.m. peak hour trips and five Saturday midday peak hour trips. Solano Avenue is expected to operate at LOS B under Future 2030 volumes, with or without the project.

Revised 8/31/16 consistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15073.59(c)(4)

Earthwork estimates for cave and portal construction (5,200 cubic yards) and site improvements (500 cubic yards) will generate approximately 5,700 cubic yards of spoils. The applicant proposed to dispose of the spoils offsite under an approved Napa County Grading permit or to Clover Flats Landfill. Based on an average commercial dump truck carrying approximately 10 to 14 cubic yards of dirt, the total of 5,700 cubic yards of spoils would result in approximately 570 trips. This would represent approximately 19 daily trips over a four-week construction period. However, these potential construction impacts would be temporary in nature and subject to standard conditions of approval from the Engineering and Conservation Division as part of the grading permit review process. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c. No air traffic is proposed and there are no new structures proposed for this project that would interfere with or require alteration of air traffic patterns. No impact would occur.
- d-e. Sight distance along Solano Avenue at Vineyard View Drive was evaluated based on sight distance criteria contained in the Caltrans *Highway Design Manual*. The stopping sight distance criterion for private street intersection was applied. Site visit observations indicated that available sight distance is in excess of the minimum stopping sight distance of 500 feet.

The need for a left-turn lane on northbound Solano Avenue at Vineyard View Drive was evaluated using Napa County's Left-Turn Lane Warrant. According to the Warrant calculations, under existing conditions, a northbound left-turn lane is warranted. The need for a left-turn lane was also evaluated based on criteria contained in the *Intersection channelization Design Guide*, National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report No. 279, Transportation Research Board, 1985, as well as an update of the methodology developed by the Washington State Department of Transportation. This more detailed analysis indicates that there is no apparent need for a left-turn lane to address operational or safety issues with or without the proposed project.

Because of the difference in findings between the two methodologies, consideration was given to the potential drawbacks of installing a left-turn lane. The report found potential drawbacks to include potential environmental impacts on the stream immediately north of Vineyard View Drive due to increased paving and associated run-off; impacts to existing plant aquatic life due to widening of the culvert north of Vineyard View Drive; jurisdictional constraints for widening portions of the roadway within the Town of Yountville; and reduction in the separation between Solano Avenue and the planned Napa Vine trail planned east of Solano Avenue.

Based on the analysis, performed together with the character of the roadway, installation of a left-turn lane at Vineyard View Drive was not recommended by the traffic consultant. The applicant submitted a letter, dated July 15, 2015, to the Public Works Department requesting an exception to the requirement for installation of a left-turn lane. That request has been reviewed and tentatively approved by the Public Works Department, as stated in their memo dated August 3, 2015. Formal action will be taken by the Public Works Director after the Planning Commission makes a decision on the Use Permit application as a whole.

The Fire Department and Engineering Services Division have reviewed the application and recommend approval, as conditioned.

- f. The project is proposing 6 parking spaces. Staff believes this will provide adequate parking.
- g. There is no aspect of this proposed project that would conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. The applicant has indicated that the project will incorporate bicycle incentives and providing priority parking for efficient transportation as part of their voluntary best management practices:

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a-b. The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and will not result in a significant impact. Wastewater disposal would be accommodated on-site or utilize a hold and haul system in compliance with State and County regulations. The project will not require construction of any new water treatment facilities that will result in a significant impact to the environment. Water will be provided through an existing well.
- c. The project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, which would cause a significant impact to the environment. The preliminary grading and drainage plan and storm water control plan have been reviewed by the Engineering Division. As conditioned, impacts would be less than significant.
- d. As discussed in the Hydrology and Water Quality section, according to the water studies, the proposed water use (inclusive of existing residential, landscaping, and vineyard uses) is approximately 5.05 acre feet per year and the groundwater recharge rate was calculated at 26.4 acre-feet per year. Based on the evidence provided, no new or expanded entitlements are needed and the project will have a less than significant impact on groundwater supply and recharge rates.
- e. Wastewater will be treated on-site and will not require a wastewater treatment provider. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- f. According to the Napa County Baseline Data Report, all of the solid waste landfills where Napa County's waste is disposed have more than sufficient capacity related to the current waste generation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- g. The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Impacts would be less than significant.

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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

a. As discussed in Section IV above, the project site has previously been disturbed with residential development and vineyards, and does not contain any known listed plant species. Possible spotted owl habitat is denoted on the western portion of the property, approximately 0.4 miles (2,000 feet) uphill from the winery site. The winery would be located at the base of the property on the footprint of the existing barn, and no development is proposed on the hillside portion of the property. The project as proposed will not 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. As identified in Section V above, no historic or prehistoric resources are anticipated to be affected by the proposed project nor will the proposed project eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. In the event archaeological artifacts are found, a standard condition of approval would be incorporated into the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and traffic impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The analysis determined that all potential impacts were less than significant and would not contribute significantly to cumulative impacts.

The potential impact from an increase in air pollution is being addressed as discussed in the project's Greenhouse Gas Voluntary Best Management Practices including but not limited to pre-plumbing for installation of rooftop photovoltaics, providing priority parking for efficient transportation, bicycle incentives, installation of energy conserving lighting, a "living vegetated" roof to reduce heating and cooling requirements, utilization of caves for barrel storage to reduce cooling requirements, installation of water efficient fixtures, planting of water efficient landscaping, and utilization of recycled process waste water for irrigation.

The project trip generation was calculated from winery operations, where the calculated trips reflect on-site employees, visitation, and wine production trips generated by the project. Under the Napa County General Plan, traffic volumes are projected to increase and will be caused by a combination of locally generated traffic as well as general regional growth. The General Plan EIR indicates that much of the forecasted increase in traffic on the arterial roadway network will result from traffic generated outside of the County, however the project will contribute a small amount toward the general overall increase. General Plan Policy CIR-16 states that "The County will seek to maintain an arterial Level of Service D or better on all County roadways, except where the level of Service already exceeds this standard and where increased intersection capacity is not feasible without substantial additional right of way." The proposed project would not lead to a deterioration of the level of service on Solano Avenue because it would add less than one percent to the existing volume. Potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

The project does not propose new development that would have a significant impact on the environment or substantially change the existing conditions. With the imposition of standard and project specific conditions of approval, the project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

c. All impacts identified in this Initial Study are less than significant and do not require mitigation. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in environmental effects that cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None Required.