

“C”

Initial Study/Negative Declaration

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

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated October 2016)
Revised per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15073.5[c][4]

1. **Project Title:** Truchard Family Winery, Use Permit #P14-00330-UP and Variance #P14-00331-VAR
2. **Property Owner:** Anthony M. and Jo Ann Truchard; 3234 Old Sonoma Road, Napa CA 94559; (707) 253-7153
3. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Anthony Truchard II; 3234 Old Sonoma Road, Napa CA 94559; (707) 253-7153;
Anthony@truchardvineyards.com
4. **Representative:** Katherine Philippakis, esq. and Kirsty Shelton Gerosa; Farella, Braun + Martel; 899 Adams Street, St. Helena, Napa, CA 94574; (707) 967-4000; kgerosa@fbm.com & kp@fbm.com
5. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Charlene Gallina, Supervising Planner; (707) 299-1355;
charlene.gallina@countyofnapa.org
6. **Project Location and APN:** The project is located on an approximately 11.52 acre parcel, within the AW: Agricultural Watershed zoning district approximately 1,320 feet south of Congress Valley Road and Old Sonoma Road intersection approximately 225 feet on the east side of the Old Sonoma Road located at 4062 Old Sonoma Road, Napa CA.; APN: 043-040-001. The project will rely on the adjacent 26 acre vineyard parcel (APN: 043-040-003) to dispose of the treated wastewater and on-site water storage tanks and utilizing the existing connection to the Congress Valley Water Department and/or well on the adjacent parcel (APN 043-061-022).
7. **General Plan Description:** Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space (AWOS)
8. **Zoning:** Agricultural Watershed (AW) District
9. **Background/Project History:** Truchard Family Winery has been a local grape grower since 1970, and currently farms 270 acres of grapevines out of the 400 acres on 15 parcels. They have produced world-class estate wines since their first vintage in 1989 in the Carneros region.

The subject parcel (APN: 043-040-001) is the first parcel they bought and it had a house and a barn. The house was demolished and the barn continued to be used for used on site for agricultural operations. A total of 4.58 acres of vineyards currently exist on the property. With this application request, a member of the Truchard Family is requesting the establishment of new winery on this property.
10. **Project Description:** Approval of a Use Permit to allow the construction of a new 100,000 gallon winery with the following characteristics:
 - a. Construction of a 33,702 sf winery building and a 1,200 sf attached covered crush pad;
 - b. Tours and tastings by appointment with a maximum of 40 visitors per weekday and 60 visitors on weekends/holidays for a maximum weekly total of 320 visitors;
 - c. A marketing program, which consists of two (2) events per month for up to 30 people and four (4) annual events for up to 150 people. Portable restrooms to be provided for events over ~~60~~ 90 people;
 - d. Establishment of commercial catering kitchen for food and wine pairing activities;
 - e. Provision of food and wine pairings for the tours and tastings;
 - f. Employment of four (4) full time and three (3) part time employees;
 - g. Establishment of hours of operation: visitation 10:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m., and non-harvest production 8:30 a.m.- 5:30 p.m.;
 - h. On premise consumption of wines produced on site within the winery building and adjacent patio areas in accordance with Business and Professions Code Sections 23358, 23390 and 23396.5 (AB2004-Evans Bill);
 - i. Construction of ~~42~~13 parking spaces;
 - j. Improvement of the southern existing driveway dedicated to winery visitors in conformance with the Napa County Road and Street Standards. The northern driveway to be dedicated for agricultural purposes, employees and production activities of the winery;

- k. Construction of a new entry gate and winery signage for the southern driveway;
- l. Replacement of the existing wooden bridge with a clearspan bridge in compliance with California Department of Fish and Wildlife and Napa County Conservation Regulations;
- m. Construction of an on-site wastewater system with disposal of treated wastewater on vineyards on the adjacent 26 acre parcel (APN: 043-040-003);
- n. On-site water storage tanks and utilizing the existing connection to the Congress Valley Water Department and/or well on the adjacent parcel (APN 043-061-022).

A Variance application (P14-000331-VAR) is also requested to allow construction of the winery 178 feet within the 600 foot winery setback of Old Sonoma Road.

11. Environmental setting and surrounding land uses:

The project is located at 4062 Old Sonoma Road on an 11.52 acre parcel, within the AW: Agricultural Watershed zoning district and approximately 1,320 feet south of the Congress Valley Road and Old Sonoma Road intersection. The project area to be disturbed is greater than 1 acre, and the proposed new winery building will be located near the existing agricultural barn in the northwest corner of the property. The site topography is relatively flat with gentle slopes to the west toward an unnamed seasonal creek on the property. The project site is located approximately 2.20 miles to the east of the Napa River and outside the boundaries of the 100 and 500-year flood hazard zones. Native vegetation of the site includes grassland; however the entire site is disturbed and primarily planted with vineyards and developed with one existing barn structure and an irrigation reservoir. The predominant soil type on the project site is Bressa-Dibble complex, which is the Hydraulic Soil Group C. As a result of the 2014 South Napa Earthquake that occurred on August 24, 2014, it was discovered that an earthquake fault traverses the northeast corner of the property, which required redesign of the project to ensure no buildings would be constructed on this fault.

The neighboring parcels include rural residential and agricultural development and are mostly used as vineyards agricultural land. The winery in close proximity to the project site is Truchard Vineyards. The closest residence is approximately 640 feet to the southwest from the proposed winery.

The parcel is within the service area of the Congress Valley Water District, which will continue to provide water to the project site within the capacity of the existing meter. However, it should be noted that the Water District does not have complete control over water service within its boundaries and Water District is set to terminate on July 1, 2017, and until the Contract terminates, the Water District is bounded by its terms and Contract does not provide terms of water service after the Contracts terminates. After the contract is terminated, City of Napa Water District will maintain the existing water services.

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

The project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County, including but not limited to building permits, grading permits, waste disposal permits, and an encroachment permit, in addition to CalFire. Permits may also be required by the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, & Firearms.

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

Department of Fish and Wildlife

Other Agencies Contacted

Federal Trade and Taxation Bureau

Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control

13. Tribal Cultural Resources. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

Invitation for tribal consultation was completed pursuant to AB 52 and two responses were received. The first response was from the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation dated January 6, 2017 stating that they had cultural interest on the project site, but were not aware of any

known cultural resources near the project site and, therefore, cultural monitoring was not needed. The second response dated January 26, 2017 came from Middletown Rancheria Tribal Historic Preservation stating that they had no specific comments at that time, however, should any new information or evidence of human habitation be found as the project progresses, all work should cease and contact them immediately. A standard project condition of approval will be incorporated to address this Tribal Cultural Resources stipulation.

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.

Charlene Gallina

Charlene Gallina, Supervising Planner
Napa County Planning, Building, and Environmental Services

March 30, 2017

Date

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

Discussion:

a-c. Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms, geological features, water, trees and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of a beautiful or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken-in. As generally described in the **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses** section, above, this area is defined by a mix of vineyard, winery, and residential uses. The project would not result in substantial damage to scenic resources or substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The site topography is relatively flat with gentle slopes to the west toward an unnamed seasonal creek on the property which is heavily landscaped with natural vegetation. Furthermore, the site is currently developed with vineyards, a barn structure and surrounded with vineyards. Proposed physical improvements as part of the project consist of the construction of a 33,702 square foot new winery building, construction of a 1,200 square foot attached covered crush pad in which a variance of is being requested to allow construction of the winery 178 feet within the 600 foot winery setback of Old Sonoma Road. Because of the proposed project is set at a lower elevation and screened by natural vegetation, it will have minimal visual impact from the road with a less than significant impact to a scenic vista.

d. Hours of operation of the winery are proposed to be 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. (excluding harvest season), so that late, nighttime lighting (after 6:00 p.m.) would not occur for most months of the year. The marketing program involves two (2) events per month for up to 30 people and four (4) annual events for up to 150 people. The closest off-site sensitive receptor (a residence) to light and glare is approximately 640 feet to the southwest from the proposed winery. Vineyards will be located between the proposed winery and the residence; thus, the project will not have a significant potential to result in lighting impacts. The proposed winery use, if approved, would be subject to the County's standard condition of approval for wineries that limits the amount of outdoor lighting to the minimum necessary for operational and security needs. Up-lighting of buildings and landscaping is prohibited. The winery operators must keep lighting as low to the ground as possible and include shields to deflect the light downward. Avoidance of highly reflective surfaces would be required, as well, by the County's standard condition. This condition would apply to all winery activities (excluding harvest), including any events that would occur outdoors:

6.3a. ~~LANDSCAPING~~ LIGHTING – PLAN SUBMITTAL

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 CBC.

6.3b. ~~LANDSCAPING~~ LIGHTING – PLAN SUBMITTAL

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; on timers; and shall incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. All lighting shall be shielded or placed such that it does not shine directly on adjacent properties or impact vehicles on adjacent streets. 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 exempt from this requirement.

4.16a. GENERAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE - LIGHTING

All lighting shall be permanently maintained in accordance with the lighting and building plans approved by the County. Lighting utilized during harvest activities is exempt from this requirement.

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:

- a/e. The project site is designated Farmland of Statewide Importance and Urban and Built-Up Land and would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Important as shown on the Napa County Important Farmland Map 2002 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. There is no existing agricultural contract on the property. The project site currently has 4.58 acres of vineyards and only 0.98 acres of vineyards would be removed and 0.20 acres planted for a net reduction of 0.78 acres as part of the proposed project. There are no other changes included in this proposal that would result in the conversion of Farmland beyond the immediate project site. General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use policies AG/LU-2 and AG/LU-13 recognize wineries, and any use consistent with the Winery Definition Ordinance and clearly accessory to a winery, as agriculture. As a result, this application would not result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use.
- b. The County's zoning of the property is Agricultural Watershed District (AW), and the General Plan land use designation is Agriculture, Watershed, & Open Space (AWOS). The proposed winery is consistent with the property's zoning, as Napa County Code Section 18.20.030 lists wineries and related, accessory uses as conditionally permitted in the AW District. General Plan Policy AG/LU-20 also identifies processing of agricultural products (grape crushing/winemaking) as a use that is consistent with the AWOS designation. There is no Williamson Act contract applicable to this property.
- c/d. According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps (based on the following layers – Sensitive Biotic Oak Woodlands, Riparian Woodland Forest and Coniferous Forest) the project site does not contain woodland or forested areas. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

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

Discussion:

a-c. On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Board of Directors unanimously adopted thresholds of significance to assist in the review of projects under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). These 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 2012 updated CEQA Guidelines.

On March 5, 2012 the Alameda County Superior Court issued a judgment finding that the Air District had failed to comply with CEQA when it adopted the Thresholds. The court did not determine whether the Thresholds were valid on the merits, but found that the adoption of the Thresholds was a project under CEQA. The court issued a writ of mandate ordering the District to set aside the Thresholds and cease dissemination of them until the Air District had complied with CEQA. The Air District has appealed the Alameda County Superior Court's decision. The Court of Appeal of the State of California, First Appellate District, reversed the trial court's decision. The Court of Appeal's decision was appealed to the California Supreme Court, which granted limited review, and the matter is currently pending there.

In view of the trial court's order which remains in place pending final resolution of the case, the Air District is no longer recommending that the Thresholds be used as a generally applicable measure of a project's significant air quality impacts. Lead agencies will need to determine appropriate air quality thresholds of significance based on substantial evidence in the record. Although lead agencies may rely on the Air District's updated CEQA Guidelines (updated May 2012) for assistance in calculating air pollution emissions, obtaining information regarding the health impacts of air pollutants, and identifying potential mitigation measures, the Air District has been ordered to set aside the Thresholds and is no longer recommending that these Thresholds be used as a general measure of project's significant air quality impacts. Lead agencies may continue to rely on the Air District's 1999 Thresholds of Significance and they may continue to make determinations regarding the significance of an individual project's air quality impacts based on the substantial evidence in the record for that project.

Over the long term, emissions resulting from the proposed project would consist primarily of mobile sources, including production-related deliveries and visitor and employee vehicles traveling to and from the winery. The 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 and Traffic Impact Report prepared for the project calculates the proposed conditions for a typical weekday at approximately 50 total daily trips with 19 PM peak trips. Proposed conditions for a typical Saturday are calculated at 52 total trips with 30 PM peak trips and proposed conditions for a typical Saturday during crush are calculated at 50 total trips with 38 PM peak 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 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. The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

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

7.1c. **AIR QUALITY**

During all construction activities the permittee shall comply with the most current version of BAAQMD Basic Construction Best Management Practices including but not limited to the following, as applicable:

1. *Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. The BAAQMD's phone number shall also be visible.*
2. *Water all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) two times per day.*
3. *Cover all haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site.*
4. *Remove all visible mud or dirt traced onto adjacent public roads by using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.*
5. *All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.*
6. *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.*
7. *Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting off equipment when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five (5) minutes (as required by State Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.*
8. *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. Any portable engines greater than 50 horsepower or associated equipment operated within the BAAQMD's jurisdiction shall have either a California Air Resources Board (ARB) registration Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) or a BAAQMD permit. For general information regarding the certified visible emissions evaluator or the registration program, visit the ARB FAQ http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/perp/perfact_04-16-15.pdf or the PERP website <http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/portable.htm>.*

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:

7.1b. **DUST CONTROL**

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. The closest residence is approximately 640 feet from the existing winery building site. Construction-phase pollutants would be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. The project would not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. 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
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Discussion:

a/b. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers - plants CNPS points & polygons, plant surveys, red legged frog core area and critical habitat, vernal pools & vernal pool species, Spotted Owl Habitat – 1.5 mile buffer and known fish presence) no known candidate, sensitive, or special status species have been identified as occurring within the project boundaries. The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any special status species, or species of particular concern, as there are none identified in the project area. The proposal and associated construction are minimal with no significant grading required. In addition, the site has been previously developed with vineyards, and an agricultural barn structure. Furthermore, there were no species or site conditions which would be considered essential for the support of a species with limited distribution or considered to be a sensitive natural plant community. The site has not been identified in any local/regional or State plans as being a sensitive community. The potential for this project to have an impact on special status species is less than significant.

c/d/e. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – water bodies, vernal pools & vernal pool species) there is no existing structures beside the agricultural barn, irrigation pond and the vineyards. The irrigation pond is one of those features identified as artificially excavated freshwater ponds and are not considered natural habitat for species. No change to the existing ponds is proposed.

A USGS blue line stream traverses the western and northern central portions of the property. The existing wooden bridge that spans an unnamed tributary to Congress Valley Creek will be replaced with a more substantial spanning structure bridge. A spanning bridge will allow for removal of existing concrete pier supports, removal of revetment piers and supporting walls, and removal of most of the concrete retaining walls that form a narrow weir in the vicinity of the existing bridge. As a result of the bridge replacement, approximately 1240 square feet of ruderal grassland are proposed to be temporarily impacted resulting in the proposed removal of 720 square feet. Furthermore, one yellow willow (*Salix Lutea*) and two white oak (*Quercus Lobata*) trees are proposed to be removed. To further protect the streambed, construction exclusion fencing will be installed forming a perimeter around trees and other native plants requiring protection. The applicant has incorporated into the project landscape plan any required removal or pruning of native trees or shrubs to be replaced at a 3:1 ratio. A Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement, (LSAA) will be required by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, (CDFW) prior to construction. Notification of the LSAA has already been submitted by the applicant to the Department of Fish and Wildlife. As a part of the LSAA process, CDFW requires that environmental planning and engineering plans be presented to demonstrate that the new bridge and associated construction will not cause harm to the creek environs and associated riparian plant and animal species. The LSAA will also require that environmental enhancement vegetation be monitored for a period of 5 years following construction and that success of plant establishment be reported to CDFW 2 to 3 times during that period. A project specific condition will be included with project approval ensuring processing of the LSAA and compliance with final implementation prior to the issuance of a Final Certificate of Occupancy. Therefore, as conditioned the potential for this project to have an impact on special status species is less than significant. Furthermore, no winery development is proposed near the identified stream or within the required Creekside setback. All proposed improvements would occur within a previously developed footprint that is not a wildlife corridor. Therefore, project activities would

not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with their corridors or nursery sites nor conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Impacts would be less than significant.

- f. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans because there are no plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

Based on the Historical Resources Study of the Property dated January 19, 2017 conducted by Tom Origer & Associates, it was anticipated that prehistoric-period resources could be found within the project area and, an invitation for tribal consultation was completed independently pursuant to AB 52. The Native Heritage Commission, Cortina Band of Indians, Middletown Rancheria of Pomo Indians, Mishewal-Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley and the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation. Via an email dated December 14, 2016, the Native Heritage Commission responded stating that a search of the Sacred Land Files showed the presence of a tribal cultural resource; however, their search area consists of the entire township and range within the project site lies. They suggested that Scott Gabaldon of the Mishewal-Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley be contacted for additional information. An email was sent to Mr. Galbaldon on December 21, 2016 to that effect. Mr. Salsedo called on December 28, 2016 in response to the letter addressed to Mr. Gabaldon requesting the address for the project site so that the tribe could search their records. On January 18, 2017, Mr. Salsedo called back to say that the tribe had no record of any resources within the project site.

A letter dated December 14, 2016 was received from Mr. Leland Kinter with Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation stating that the project site is within the tribe's aboriginal territory; however, they were not aware of any cultural resources near the project site area. The letter further recommended that if new resources are found during the development of the project, they must be contacted. No responses were received as of the date of this report from Cortina Band of Indians and from the Middletown-Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley.

On December 12, 2016, County Staff also sent out three consultation letters to Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation, Middletown Rancheria of Pomo Indians and to Mishewal-Wappo Tribe of Alexander. On January 6, 2017, Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation responded via a letter stating that they had reviewed the proposed project and concluded that it was within the aboriginal territories of the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation and, therefore, they had cultural interest and authority in the proposed project area. The letter further stated that based on the information provided, Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation was not aware of any known cultural resources near the project site and, therefore, a Cultural Monitor is not needed. However, if any new information or cultural items are found, we should contact James Sarmiento, the Cultural Resources Manager for Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation at (530) 723-0452, Email: jsarmiento@yochadehe-nsn.gov

The following standard project condition of approval has been incorporated to address the Tribal Cultural Resources requirements and stipulations:

7.2 ARCHEOLOGICAL FINDING

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 project development, all work in the vicinity must be 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 permittee shall comply with the requirements of 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. All construction activities would occur on previously disturbed portions of the site. However, if resources are found during project grading, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard condition of approval noted above. 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
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. i.) The project site lies along an active faulty zone within the West Napa Fault Lines which runs along the east side of Old Sonoma Road as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. Based on the project's Geological Study Report dated November 23, 2015 prepared by RGH Consultants, the nearest Fault Lines to the project site are distributed as follows: San Andreas 31 miles west, Healdsburg 10 miles west, Concord-Green Valley 8 miles east and West Napa Fault is 4 miles south. However, it must be noted that, RGH Consultants believe that further risk of fault rupture at the site is high. Based on their subsurface exploration program, they identified a surface fault rupture resulting from the South Napa Earthquake, and recommended to the applicant that structures not be constructed over active traces of the fault.

- ii.) According with the project's Geological Study Report that was done by RGH Consultants dated November 23, 2015, data presented by the Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities (2007) estimates the chance of one or more large earthquakes (Magnitude 6.7 or greater) in the San Francisco Bay region within the next 30 years to be approximately 63 percent. Therefore, future seismic shaking should be anticipated at the site. It will be necessary to design and construct the proposed improvements in strict adherence with current standards for earthquake-resistant construction. All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Additionally, the site is within an area affected by strong seismic activity. Several northwest-trending Earthquake Fault Zones exist in close proximity to and within several miles of the site (Bortugno, 1982). Given this, 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. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.
 - iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Compliance with the latest editions of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.
 - iv.) According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) there are no landslide deposits in the proposed development area.
- b. The limited proposed improvements would occur on slopes of five percent or less. Based upon the Soil Survey of Napa County, prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the soils on site are comprised of Bressa-Dibble complex which is Hydraulic Soil Group C. The applicant has submitted a Stormwater Control plan as part of their application, which was reviewed and approved by the Engineering Division. The project would require incorporation of best management practices and would be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable. The site plan identified the fault and development is out of the required 30 foot setback. Therefore, as designed potential impacts would be less than significant. The predominant soil type on the project site is Bressa-Dibble complex, which is the Hydraulic Soil Group C.
- c/d. According to preliminary geologic mapping of the St. Helena Quadrangle performed by the California Geologic Survey (CGS-2004), the property is underlain by alluvial deposits and the majority of the site is underlain by early or mid-Pleistocene fan or terrace deposits. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the project site has a very low susceptibility for liquefaction on the entirety of the property. Development would be required to comply with the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- e. According to the Septic feasibility Study prepared by R.S.A. Engineering dated December 12, 2016, the adjacent parcel has adequate capacity to serve the project. The study concluded that the soil will be capable of disposing the wastewater onsite.

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:

GHGs are the atmospheric gases, including carbon dioxide, methane, nitrogen dioxide, and synthetic fluorinated gases, whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for global warming and that, contribute to climate change, a widely accepted theory/science explaining human effects on the atmosphere. Carbon dioxide (CO₂) is the principal GHG being emitted by human activities, and whose concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity. Commercial and industrial sources of GHG include space conditioning and other metal and chemical production processes. Agricultural sources of carbon emissions include forest clearing, land use changes, and burning of fossil fuels related to goods movement and gas and diesel-powered vehicles and farm equipment (<https://www3.epa.gov/climatechange/science/causes.html>). CO₂ also serves as the reference gas to which to compare other greenhouse gases. The effect that each unit of the other GHGs (methane, nitrogen dioxide and synthetic fluorinated gases) has on causing the global warming effect is exponentially greater than the impact of a unit of CO₂, to the degrees of

tens to tens of thousands of times. Thus, GHG emissions are measured in “carbon dioxide equivalents.” Carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e) is a unit of measurement of GHG emissions that uses carbon dioxide as a common denominator, and it is a way to get one number that approximates total emissions from all the different gases that contribute to GHG emissions (BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2012). CO₂e are measured in units of metric tons, equal to approximately 2,204 pounds.

Napa County has been working to develop a Climate Action Plan (CAP) for several years. In 2012, a Draft CAP (March 2012) was recommended using the emissions checklist in the Draft CAP, on a trial basis, to determine potential 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 GHG, 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, in order to ensure that projects address the County's goal related to reducing GHG emissions.

In July 2015, the County re-commenced preparation of the CAP to: 1) account for present day conditions and modeling assumptions (such as but not limited to methods, emission factors, and data sources); 2) address the concerns with the previous CAP effort as outlined above; 3) meet applicable State requirements; and 4) 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 No. 1: *2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016*. This initial phase included updating the unincorporated County's community-wide GHG emissions inventory to 2014 and preparing new GHG emissions forecasts for the 2020, 2030, and 2050 horizon years. Table 1 of the Technical Memorandum indicates that two percent of the County's GHG emissions in 2014 were a result of land use change.

Additional information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or online at <http://www.countyofnapa.org/CAP/>.

a/b. Overall increases in GHG emissions in Napa County were assessed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the Napa County General Plan Update and certified by the Napa County Board of Supervisors 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.

As discussed in the Air Quality section of this Initial Study, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors & GHG Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, including GHG emissions. The BAAQMD's threshold of significance for proposed projects' potential GHG emissions was set at 1,100 metric tons of CO₂e (MTCO₂e) per year. Though the BAAQMD cannot endorse the use of the 1,100 MTCO₂e threshold due to a court decision, agencies may choose to use the threshold as best available information; thus, the 1,100 MTCO₂e threshold 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 with “ongoing” winery operations are discussed. One-time construction emissions associated with the winery development project include 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 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.

The proposed project consists of construction and operation of a new winery on a portion of a site, the majority of which is currently developed with a vineyard and a barn for agricultural purposes. Using comparable land use categories as described in the Air Quality discussion, a project with 9,000 square feet of hospitality area or 121,000 square feet of barrel storage/production area would potentially generate more than 1,100 MTCO₂e annually and would be considered to have a potentially significant impact on the environment; the proposed winery is smaller than those screening criteria. More specifically, given the size of the proposed winery's hospitality spaces (approximately 8,960 square feet compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 9,000 square feet) and production/barrel storage and ancillary use areas (approximately 24,018 square feet compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 121,000 square feet), the proposed winery and its associated trips would not contribute a significant amount of air pollution to the region and thus would not have a significant air quality impact.

The applicant proposes to incorporate additional GHG reduction methods including: recycling 75 percent of all waste; installing water efficient fixtures; and using of recycled materials. The following GHG reduction methods have already been implemented at the project site: pre-plumb to accept photovoltaic panels in the future; compliance with CALGREEN Tier 1 energy efficiency standards, use of LED lighting, as well as motioned sensor/automatic times to reduced unwanted light, bicycle parking and locking facilities for guests, compost 75% food and garden material, planting of shade trees on the south side of the building elevation, installation of electrical vehicle charging stations with the parking area, serve locally grown food products as part of our food and wine pairings, educate staff and visitors on sustainable practices, use 70-80% cover crop, and retain biomass removed via pruning and thinning by chipping the material and reusing it rather than burning on-site. 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. For these reasons, project impacts related to GHG emissions are considered 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"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts utilized in typical winery operations. A Business Plan would be filed with the Environmental Health Division should hazardous materials reach reportable levels. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. Hazardous materials such as diesel, maintenance fluids, and paints would be used onsite during construction. Should they be stored onsite, these materials would be stored in secure locations to reduce the potential for upset or accident conditions. The proposed project consists of a modification to an existing winery that would not be expected to use any substantial quantities of hazardous materials. Therefore, it would not be reasonable for the proposed project to create upset or accident conditions that involve the release of hazardous materials into the environments. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site. According to Google Earth, the nearest school to the project site is Irene M. Snow Elementary School, located approximately 1.02 miles to the east. No impacts would occur.
- d. Based on a search of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control Database, the project revealed some deposits of chlorinated pesticides and/or other hazardous materials contamination in the soil from the previous property owner that operated a structural pest control business from 1992 to 2003. However, reports on file in the Napa County records provided testimonial evidence that site investigative reports of contaminated soil removal, and a request for a case closure were instituted in 2005 and the Case Closure Report was completed by CSC Engineers on November 15, 2005. After the completion of its review of the referenced reports, Napa County Department of Environmental Management issued a Case Closure Letter dated August 24, 2006 to Mr. Anthony M. Truchard. Based on all the evidence provided by SCS Engineers that is on file with Napa County, it can be determined that necessary site cleanup was properly carried out to the satisfaction of Napa County's Department of Environmental Health Management. Therefore no further mitigation is required.
- e. No impact would occur as the project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.
- f. The project site and the surrounding vineyards are all located within the AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district of the Napa County which allows wineries and uses accessory to wineries subject to use permit approval.
- g. Based on the project site location and the traffic analysis conducted for the proposed project, no left-turn lane on Old Sonoma Road is warranted. The existing two access driveways - one dedicated to winery visitors and the other dedicated to winery employees/production activities and the agricultural purposes will meet Napa County Road and Street Standards upon construction of improvements. Therefore, the proposed winery building and existing agricultural barn would not obstruct emergency vehicle access. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division and found acceptable, as conditioned.
- h. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. The project currently complies and would continue to comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. 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
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. According to the Winery Wastewater Feasibility Report prepared by R.S.A. Engineering dated October 13, 2016, the project site and proposed system has adequate disposal capacity to serve the project. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings.
- b. On January 14, 2014, Governor Jerry Brown declared a drought emergency in the state of California. The declaration stopped short of imposing mandatory conservation measures statewide. Mandatory water restrictions are being left to individual jurisdictions. On April 1, 2015, Governor Brown issued Executive Order B-29-15 imposing restrictions to achieve a statewide 25 percent reduction in potable urban water usage through February 28, 2016. However, such restrictions were not placed on private well users in rural areas. At this time, Napa County has not adopted or implemented 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 their proposed projects.

To better understand groundwater resources, on June 28, 2011, the Napa County 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 retained Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE), who completed a County-wide assessment of groundwater resources (Napa County Groundwater Conditions and Groundwater Monitoring Recommendations Report, February 2011); developed a groundwater monitoring program (Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2013, January 2013) and also completed a 2013 Updated Hydrogeologic Conceptualization and Characterization of Groundwater Conditions (January 2013).

Groundwater Sustainability Objectives were recommended by the GRAC and adopted by the Board of Supervisors. These objectives acknowledged the important role of monitoring as a means to achieving groundwater sustainability and the principles underlying the sustainability objectives. 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, conducted by 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 (Milliken Sarco Tulocay) 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). LSCE prepared the 2014 Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report, presented to the Napa County Board of Supervisors on March 3, 2015.

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

There are no active wells on the winery parcel. Currently, there are two wells on the parcel, located in the south and in the west of the winery parcel. These two wells were never fully developed and have been abandoned per Napa County standards. The Truchard family own parcels APN: 043-040-001 with 11.52 acres and APN: 043-061-022 with 126.1 acres which are both included in the water demand and are located at 4062 Old Sonoma Road. The two parcels are included in the groundwater demand analysis. The proposed project well will be located on Parcel 043-061-022. The Groundwater Recharge Report prepared by RSA, dated October 13, 2016 identified a water use criteria of .53 ac-ft. per year, and an annual of 6.3 ac-ft. in an average rainfall year. In accordance with the Napa County Availability Analysis (WAA), the estimated groundwater recharge rate in a dry year is assumed to be 75% of the average year.

In accordance with the Napa County Water Availability Analysis (WAA) prepared by RSA, also dated October 13, 2016, two water supply alternatives were analyzed. Alternative One analyzes relying on the existing municipal water connection for winery domestic and process from Congress Valley Water District, irrigation water from an existing project well located on APN 043-061-022. However, the water supplier is changing from Congress Valley Water District to the City of Napa. There is a current "will serve" from the Congress Valley Water District to serve the expected water demands. Because of the reasonable and foreseeable uncertainty the project demonstrated that the proposed new winery can be also provided by Alternative two, relying on groundwater from a new well for winery domestic and process water and irrigation water from an existing project well all located on APN 043-061-022. Therefore, in either scenario, it is determined that the project will have dependable and enough water supply sources. The water availability calculations for the two alternatives are presented below

Alternative 1-Winery Domestic and Process Water from Congress Valley Water District

APN 043-040-001 – Usage Type	Existing Usage [af/yr]	Proposed Usage [af/yr]
Vineyard Irrigation	2.29	1.95
Winery:		
Process Water	0.00	1.53
Landscaping	0.00	1.36
Domestic Water	0.00	0.24
-Employees		• 0.104
-Visitors		• 0.10
-Events		• 0.04
Water Supplied from Congress Valley Water District	0.00	-1.77
Net Water Supplied from Well	2.29	3.31
Groundwater Recharge	6.30	6.30

APN 043-061-022 – Usage Type	Existing Usage [af/yr]	Proposed Usage [af/yr]
Vineyard Irrigation	41.20	41.20
Water Supplied from Well	41.20	41.20
Groundwater Recharge	59.59	59.59

Total (Combined Parcel) Water Supplied	Existing Usage [af/yr]	Proposed Usage [af/yr]
Water Supplied from Congress Valley Water District	0	-1.77
Water Supplied from Well	43.49	44.51
Groundwater Recharge	65.89	65.89

The proposed well water demand of 44.51 ac-ft. per year is less than the estimated annual recharge of 65.89 ac-ft. per year in an average rainfall year and less than the estimated annual recharge rate of 49.42 ac-ft. per year in a dry year. It is proposed that winery domestic and process water will be supplied from the Congress Valley Water District. A "will serve" letter, dated March 24, 2016 from the Congress Valley Water District has been provided to the applicant. If the above alternative is to be implemented to supply water to two parcels, the existing water usage will be 65.89 ac-ft. per year and the proposed water usage will remain at 65.89 ac-ft. year.

Alternative 2- All Winery Water Supplied by the Water Well

APN 043-040-001 – Usage Type	Existing Usage [af/yr]	Proposed Usage [af/yr]
Vineyard Irrigation	2.29	1.95
Winery: Process Water Landscaping Domestic Water -Employees -Visitors -Events	0.00 0.00 0.00	1.53 1.36 0.24 • 0.104 • 0.10 • 0.04
Net Water Supplied from Well	2.29	5.08
Groundwater Recharge	6.30	6.30

APN 043-061-022 – Usage Type	Existing Usage [af/yr]	Proposed Usage [af/yr]
Vineyard Irrigation	41.20	41.20
Water Supplied from Well	41.20	41.20
Groundwater Recharge	59.59	59.59

Total (Combined Parcel) Water Supplied	Existing Usage [af/yr]	Proposed Usage [af/yr]
Water Supplied from Well	43.49	46.28
Groundwater Recharge	65.89	65.89

The proposed well water demand of 46.28 ac-ft. per year is less than the estimated annual recharge of 65.89 ac-ft. per year in an average rainfall year and less than the estimated annual recharge rate of 49.42 ac-ft. per year.

- c-d. The project would not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off the cultivated agricultural vineyard site. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. The preliminary grading and drainage plan and stormwater control plan have been reviewed by the Engineering Division. As conditioned, impacts would be less than significant.
- f. There is nothing included in this proposal that would otherwise substantially degrade water quality. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality.

g/h. No portion of the project site is located within the FEMA-designated 100-year floodplain. No impact would occur.

i/j. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. Impacts would be less than significant.

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 project site is currently developed with vineyard and an agricultural barn. Surrounding land uses are also predominantly agricultural and rural residential and would not be physically modified (as by demolition of an existing structure or division of land), such that the vineyard and winery uses would integrate with the property's surroundings rather than divide an existing, established community.

b,c. The project site is zoned Agricultural Watershed (AW), which allow a winery 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 600 foot winery setback from Old Sonoma Road. The winery is proposed approximately 178 feet from the centerline of Old Sonoma Road.

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 AWOS (Agricultural, Watershed, and Open Space), 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 impacts 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. The project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during grading and construction of the proposed new driveway and parking area. This project is not subject to a left-turn lane requirement, and therefore, the noise level during construction would be reduced. Construction activities would be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. As such, the project would not result in potentially significant temporary construction noise impacts or operational impacts. Because the nearest residence to the project site is approximately 640 feet to the southwest of the proposed project site, there is a low potential for impacts related to construction noise to result in a significant impact. Further, construction activities would occur during the period of 7am-7pm on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity. All construction activities would be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). The proposed project would 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. Impacts would be less than significant. A standard noise condition of approval applied to use permits is as follows:

7.3 CONSTRUCTION NOISE

Construction noise shall be minimized to the greatest extent practical and feasible under State and local safety laws, consistent with construction noise levels permitted by the General Plan Community Character Element and the County Noise Ordinance. Construction equipment muffling and hours of operation shall be in compliance with the County Code. Equipment shall be shut down when not in use. Construction equipment shall normally be staged, loaded, and unloaded on the project site, if at all

practicable. If project terrain or access road conditions require construction equipment to be staged, loaded, or unloaded off the project site (such as on a neighboring road or at the base of a hill), such activities shall only occur daily between the hours of 8 am to 5 pm.

- c/d. 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 (L_{eq}) 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 as indicated above would 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. The proposed marketing activities could create additional noise impacts, with the submitted marketing plan including an additional 24 events of 30 guests and four (4) events of up to 150 guests on an annual basis. The Napa County Noise Ordinance, which was adopted in 1984, sets the maximum permissible received sound level for a residence in a rural area as 45 dBA between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. While the 45 dBA limitation is strict (45 dBA is roughly equivalent to the sound generated by a quiet conversation), the area surrounding the subject property is developed, with large lot residential uses and vineyards with the nearest residence located approximately 640 feet from proposed project site. The potential for the creation of significant noise from visitation is significantly reduced, since the tasting areas are predominantly within the winery (hospitality building) itself. Continuing enforcement of Napa County's Noise Ordinance by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff, including the prohibition against amplified music, should further ensure that marketing events and other winery activities do not create a significant noise impact. Events and non-amplified music are required to finish by 10:00 p.m. The proposed project would not result in long-term significant permanent noise impacts. A standard noise condition of approval applied to use permits is as follows:

4.10 AMPLIFIED MUSIC

There shall be no amplified sound system or amplified music utilized outside of the approved, enclosed, winery buildings.

- e/f. The project site and its vicinities are located within Zone AW, and are located more than two miles away from the influence area of the Napa County Airport or any private airstrip. Based on this information, 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
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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. Staffing for the winery would include up to a maximum of four (4) full time and three (3) part time employees. The Association of Bay Area Governments' *Projections 2003* figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase some 23% by the year 2030 (*Napa County Baseline Data Report*, November 30, 2005). Additionally, the County's *Baseline Data Report* indicates that total housing units currently programmed in county and municipal housing elements exceed ABAG growth projections by approximately 15%. The four (4) and three (3) part time employees which are part of this project could lead to minor population growth in Napa County. Relative to the County's projected low to moderate growth rate and overall adequate programmed housing supply that population growth does not raise to a level of environmental significance. In addition, the project would be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs.

Cumulative impacts related to population and housing balance were identified in the 2008 General Plan EIR. As set forth in Government Code §65580, the County of Napa must facilitate the improvement and development of housing to make adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community. Similarly, CEQA recognizes the importance of balancing the prevention of environment damage with the provision of a "decent home and satisfying living environment for every Californian." (See Public Resources Code §21000(g)) The 2008 General Plan sets forth the County's long-range plan for meeting regional housing needs, during the present and future housing cycles, while balancing environmental, economic, and fiscal factors and community goals. The policies and programs identified in the General Plan Housing Element function, in combination with the County's housing impact mitigation fee, to ensure adequate cumulative volume and diversity of housing. Cumulative impacts on the local and regional population and housing balance will be less than significant.

- b/c. This application would not displace a substantial volume of existing housing or a substantial number of people and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. 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 area and the additional demand placed on existing services as a result of the proposed project would be minimal. Fire protection measures would be required as part of the development pursuant to Napa County Fire Marshall conditions and there would be no foreseeable impact to emergency response times with compliance with these conditions of approval. The Fire Department and Engineering Services Division have reviewed the application and recommend approval, as conditioned. School impact fees, which assist local school districts with capacity building measures, would be levied pursuant to building permit submittal. The proposed project would have minimal impact on public parks as no residences are proposed. Impacts to public services would be less than significant.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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. The project would not significantly increase use of existing park or recreational facilities based on its limited scope. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. No recreational facilities are proposed as part of the project. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-23, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b A Traffic Analysis, dated January 28, 2016, was prepared by W-TRANS in accordance with the criteria established by the Napa County, and is consistent with the standard traffic engineering techniques. The project-related traffic impacts to the intersection of State Route (SR) 12/SR 121/SR 29 were also considered. Old Sonoma Road is a two-lane undivided highway that runs north-south in the study area, with eleven-foot travel lanes in each direction, and a posted speed limit of 45 miles per hour (MPH). Based on mechanical tube counts collected in October 2013, the average daily traffic (ADT) on Old Sonoma Road is approximately 4,500 vehicles per day on weekdays and 3,600 vehicles per day on weekend days. The study looked at existing and proposed trip generation rates, trip distribution, roadway segment operations, cumulative conditions, impacts to Old Sonoma Road intersections, and the County left-turn lane warrant.

The proposed project would generate an average of 50 new weekday trips and 52 new weekend trips, including 19 weekday PM peak hour trips and 30 Saturday PM peak hour trips. Proposed conditions for a typical Saturday crush are calculated at 67 total trips and 38 PM peak

trips. The Old Sonoma Road is currently operating acceptably and would be expected to continue operating acceptably under Cumulative Conditions with or without the proposed project. The marketing events proposed for the project would be held outside of traffic peak periods. Events would be scheduled to begin and end outside of normal traffic peak period of 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. for weekdays and 12:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m. for weekend days. As a result, no significant event-related traffic impacts would be expected during the weekday p.m. or Saturday peak periods.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Cumulative operating conditions were determined by the calculating the project's percentage contribution to the total growth in traffic from existing conditions. The 2007 update to the General Plan identifies Old Sonoma Road to operate at a LOS C under the 2003 conditions as well as under projected 2030 cumulative conditions. As compared to Napa County's LOS Standard of LOS D, Old Sonoma Road is expected to continue operating better than the County's standard with the higher volumes projected for the horizon year of 2030. Based on the limited number of project trips generated as well as the available capacity of Old Sonoma Road, Old Sonoma Road would be expected to operate acceptably under cumulative conditions. Regionally, the project is located northwest of the intersection of SR12/SR 121/SR29. Old Sonoma Road, can be accessed from Napa, north of SR12/SR121/SR29, or at SR12-SR121/Old Sonoma Road, west of SR12/SR121/SR29. Based upon the submitted W-Trans Traffic Analysis, Old Sonoma Road is currently operating acceptably and would be expected to continue operating acceptably under cumulative conditions with or without the proposed project. Furthermore, the proposed project would be expected to result in minimal, if any, change to intersection delay at SR12/SR 121/SR29

Access to the project would be through two existing driveways on Old Sonoma Road, located approximately 650 and 1,000 feet south of Congress Valley Road. One driveway would be for winery operations and employee use/agriculture purposes only and the other driveway would be used exclusively by tasting room visitors. Sight distance along Old Sonoma Road at the project driveways were evaluated based on sight distance criteria contained in the *Highway Design Manual* published by Caltrans. The recommended sight distance for minor street approaches that are a driveway are based on stopping sight distance. The approaching travel speeds are used as the basis for determining the recommended sight distance. Additionally, the stopping sight distance needed for a following driver to stop if there is a vehicle waiting to turn into a side street or driveway is evaluated based on stopping sight distance criterion and the approach speed on the major street. The posted speed on Old Sonoma Road is 45 miles per hour which would require a minimum stopping site distance of 360 feet. The available site distance from both driveways are greater than or equal to 360 feet in both the north and south directions. Therefore, the site distances at both project driveways are adequate.

The need for a left-turn lane on southbound Old Sonoma Road at the project driveways was also evaluated using Napa County's Left-Turn Lane Warrant, which is based on the ADT of the roadway and the projected ADT of the proposed use, as well as safety criteria. Based on the intended users of each driveway, the employee driveway is expected to generate an ADT of 19 vehicle trips while the tasting room driveway has an anticipated ADT of 31 vehicle trips per weekday. Under Existing plus Project conditions, with approximately 4,500 vehicles per weekday on Old Sonoma Road, the proposed project volumes would not exceed the left-turn lane warrant threshold on Old Sonoma Road at either driveway.

- 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. The site is currently accessed via two existing driveways located approximately 650 feet and 1,000 feet south of Old Congress Valley Road. The project will not result in any increased hazards or in inadequate emergency access. The Fire Department and Engineering Services Division have reviewed the application and recommend approval, as conditioned.
- f. The project is proposing 13 parking spaces. Staff believes this number of parking spaces is commensurate with the proposed number of employees and visitation. The proposed parking will meet the anticipated parking demand and will avoid providing excess parking, and will therefore have no impact.
- 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
XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k); or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology surveys, sites, sensitive areas, and flags) no historic sites or tribal resources have been identified on the property. Invitation for tribal consultation was completed in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1, and two responses dated January 6, 2017 and January 26, 2017 were received as discussed above under the Section V. Cultural Resources. Consultation with representatives of local Native American tribes who have a cultural interest in the area was not requested. As discussed in Section V of this initial study, if any resources not previously uncovered during this prior disturbance are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the proposed project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist must be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the standard county conditions of approval.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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. Wastewater disposal would be accommodated on-site in compliance with State and County regulations. The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and will not result in a significant impact. 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 located by Congress Valley District/City of Napa and an existing well and/or through a new well located on APN 043-040-001. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

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.

The project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements nor substantially deplete local groundwater supplies. The facility's domestic water system is classified as transient, non-community and is managed by employees of the winery. There are no active wells on the winery parcel. Currently, there are two wells on the parcel, located in the south and in the west of the winery parcel. These two wells were never fully developed and have been abandoned per Napa County standards. According to the Water Availability Analysis (WAA) prepared by R.S.A. Engineering, there is sufficient ground water for both irrigation and domestic water purposes to be provided by the new project well in the event that the Congress Valley Water District or City of Napa are not able to supply the needed water for the daily winery operations.

d. Wastewater will be treated on-site and will not require a wastewater treatment provider. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

e. 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
XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. As discussed in **Section IV** above, all potential biological related impacts would be less than significant. As identified in **Section V** above, no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified within the project site. In the event archaeological artifacts are found, a standard condition of approval would be incorporated into the project. Impacts would be less than significant with the incorporation of the biological resources mitigation measure and standard condition of approval related to cultural resources.
- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology, and traffic impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The project would also increase the demands for public services to a limited extent, increase traffic and air pollutions, all of which contribute to cumulative effects when future development in Napa Valley is considered. Cumulative impacts of these issues are discussed in previous sections of this Initial Study, wherein the 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: recycling 75 percent of all waste; installing water efficient fixtures; and using of recycled materials. The following GHG reduction methods have already been implemented at the project site: generation of on-site renewable energy; restoration on an on-site seasonal creek by replanting natural vegetation; use of energy conserving lighting; availability of on-site bicycle parking; located on a primary class II bicycle route with an existing class II bicycle lane; installation of a metered connection to the Los Carneros Water District recycled water line; installation of rock lined vegetated swales on the southern site boundary; south of the production building; and in the seasonal creek; installation of drip and drought tolerant landscaping; composting 75 percent of food and garden material; abiding by a responsible procurement code; certification as a Napa Green Winery and Napa Green Land; education to staff and visitors on sustainable practices; retaining biomass removed via pruning and thinning rather than burning on-site; and certification under the Certified California Sustainable Winegrowing (CCSW) program.

Potential impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The project trip generation was calculated from winery operations, where the calculated trips reflect total visitation, on-site employees and wine production trips generated by the winery. 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 would 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." Old Sonoma Road currently operates at a LOS C. With the proposed new traffic Old Sonoma Road will continue to operate at a LOS C and will not contribute to potential cumulative impacts and therefore is a less than significant level.

State Route 12/121 is listed as two-lane Rural Throughways on the General Plan Circulation Map and already operates at a LOS E. As discussed above under Section XVI Transportation, the project's additional traffic at the peak hours would avoid a deterioration of the level

of service on Highway 12/121 by adding less than one percent to the existing volume, reducing potential cumulative impact to a less than significant level.

- c. All impacts identified in this initial study are either less than significant after mitigation or 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 being either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None Required.