

“D”

Addendum to Previously-Adopted  
Mitigated Negative Declaration



A Tradition of Stewardship  
A Commitment to Service

Planning, Building & Environmental Services

1195 Third Street, Suite 210  
Napa, CA 94559  
[www.countyofnapa.org](http://www.countyofnapa.org)

David Morrison  
Director

MEMORANDUM

To: Planning Commission	From: Dana Ayers, Contract Planner Charlene Gallina, Supervising Planner
Date: November 20, 2019	Re: Brasswood Winery Use Permit Major Modification, Application No. P19-00004-MOD; Addendum to Adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration

**Project Title:** Brasswood Winery, Use Permit Major Modification, Application No. P19-00004

**Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number.:** 3125 St. Helena Highway North, St. Helena;  
Napa County Assessor's Parcel No. 022-070-028

**Project Sponsor, Mailing Address and Phone Number:** Marcus Marquez, 3111 St. Helena  
Highway North, St. Helena, California 94574; phone number 707-968-5434

**Project Sponsor's Representative, Email Address and Phone Number:** Jeffrey Redding, Land  
Use Planning Services, [jreddingaicp@comcast.net](mailto:jreddingaicp@comcast.net); phone number 707-255-7375

**Napa County Contact Person, Email Address and Phone Number:** Charlene Gallina,  
Supervising Planner, [Charlene.Gallina@countyofnapa.org](mailto:Charlene.Gallina@countyofnapa.org); phone number 707-299-1355

**Introduction:**

On June 6, 2012, the Planning Commission adopted a mitigated negative declaration pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA, Public Resources Code Section 21000 *et seq.*) and approved a use permit application (Use Permit P11-00298-UP) and a variance request (Variance P11-00299-VA) allowing construction and operation of a winery with an annual production of 50,000 gallons of wine per year. The winery, originally named Cairdean, is located at 3125 St. Helena Highway North, north of the city of St. Helena. The winery facility was estimated to encompass approximately 21,900 square feet in two attached production and administration buildings; a 13,000 square foot wine cave; 5,700 square feet of outdoor

production areas; and 14 on-site parking stalls, along with other aboveground and underground utilities infrastructure. The variance application that the Commission approved allowed the winery buildings to have a 259-foot setback from the centerline of State Route 29, where a 600-foot or greater setback was required; and it allowed the buildings to have a 100-foot setback from the private access driveway shared by the winery and adjacent Brasswood commercial and restaurant complex, where a 300-foot or greater setback was required.

Operations of the winery were approved to include 14 employees (four full-time, six part-time and four harvest season employees); daily tours and tastings (by appointment, with catered food) for up to 25 guests per day; on-site consumption of wine purchased at the property; and a wine marketing program consisting of up to 51 events annually, for 25 to 100 people per event. Construction of the winery necessitated demolition of existing structures on the site, including a single-family residence, agricultural barn, garage and pool house.

On January 18, 2013, the Planning Director approved Use Permit Very Minor Modification P12-00402-VMM, modifying the layout of office and tasting room space in the approved accessory use area, and increasing the size of the approved wine cave from 13,000 square feet to 14,400 square feet with the addition of two tunnels and a tasting room. Included within that approval was a new outdoor tasting terrace and a change to pedestrian circulation paths on-site. The size of the cave was increased again to 16,500 square feet and the spaces in the cave were reconfigured with approval of Use Permit Very Minor Modification P13-00215-VMM on October 14, 2013. On May 22, 2014, the Planning Director approved Use Permit Very Minor Modification P14-00137-VMM, which consisted only of utility infrastructure changes that resulted in consolidation of water storage tanks into one utility service area along with a 180 square foot pump shed. None of the very minor modification approvals resulted in any changes to the operating characteristics of the winery, and all very minor modifications were exempt from CEQA under Napa County's Local Procedures for Implementing CEQA (Appendix B, Section 3).

In April 2015, construction of the winery buildings and cave was complete, and both the winery and cave were inspected by County staff for occupancy (Building Permits B13-01722 and B13-00626).

### **Statutory Background:**

Under CEQA, an addendum to an adopted mitigated negative declaration (MND) is appropriate if minor technical changes or modifications to the proposed project occur (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164). An addendum is appropriate only if these minor technical changes or modifications do not result in any new significant impacts nor a substantial increase in the level of significance of previously identified impacts. The addendum need not be circulated for public review (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164[c]); however, the decision-making body must consider the addendum along with the previously-adopted environmental document prior to making a decision on the project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164[d]).

This Addendum demonstrates that the environmental analysis and impacts identified in the previously-adopted MND remain substantially unchanged by the circumstances described herein and supports the finding that the proposed project does not raise any new issues and does not exceed the level of significance of impacts in the previously-adopted MND.

### **Applicable Reports in Circulation:**

This Addendum is prepared as an addition to the Cairdean Winery MND adopted by the Planning Commission on June 6, 2012. A copy of said document is available for review at the offices of the Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department, 1195 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, Second Floor, Napa, California, in the custody of the Planning Director.

### **Project Description:**

The applicant requests approval of a modification to the current entitlements (Use Permit P11-00298-UP, as modified by Very Minor Modifications P12-00402-VMM, P13-00215-VMM and P14-00137-VMM) to increase the annual production capacity of the winery approved to operate at 3125 St. Helena Highway North, from 50,000 gallons of wine per year to 95,000 gallons of wine per year. With the requested increase, the applicant also requests to modify the approved staffing of the winery, from four full-time and six part-time employees to 10 full-time employees; harvest employment would remain unchanged at four employees. The applicant does not request any increases in permitted visitation or marketing event allowances. Other than upgrades to the equipment of the existing Lyve winery process wastewater treatment system to increase its treatment capacity, there are no physical changes proposed to be made to the winery facilities.

### **Minor Technical Changes or Additions to the Cairdean Winery Mitigated Negative Declaration:**

#### ***Air Quality:***

The proposed project includes an increase in the wine produced at the winery; however, no significant air quality emissions from construction would occur because expansion of existing winery buildings would not be necessary for the project. The equipment in the existing, Lyve process wastewater treatment system unit would need to be upgraded to accommodate a peak daily flow of 2,500 gallons related to the requested production increase, but no new tanks would need to be installed. Contractors doing any work on-site would continue to be subject to standard Napa County conditions of approval pertaining to air quality best management practices of construction.

The proposed change in staffing of the winery would not increase the number of employees that currently drive to the property but would change the status of the wineries' six part-time employees to full-time. The proposed staffing change, added to the increase in truck

trips associated with the requested increase in wine production, would increase the number of vehicle trips to the winery from an estimated 161 trips per day to an estimated 169 trips per day based on Napa County Trip Generation estimates for wineries. This number of daily trips would be less than the average trip generation for a single-family residence and would not exceed the 2,000-trip screening criterion for projects with potentially significant air quality impacts that was analyzed in the Cairdean Winery MND.

***Greenhouse Gases:***

The Cairdean Winery MND analyzed the original project's estimated greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions of carbon dioxide and carbon dioxide equivalents, gases that contribute to the natural global warming effect and that, in excess, contribute to global climate change. For typical development projects, GHG emissions are generated from: a) construction, including carbon stocks that are released from removal of vegetation and grading, as well as emissions from construction equipment; and b) ongoing operations, which include emissions resulting from building energy use and customer, employee and business vehicles.

The project involves no new construction that would result in new ground disturbance, although, as described above, the requested production increase and staffing changes could result in a five percent increase in the number of daily vehicle trips that was analyzed in the Cairdean Winery MND. The Cairdean Winery MND estimated that the unmitigated project would result in 297 metric tons of carbon dioxide and carbon dioxide equivalents per year. Accounting for the estimated five percent increase in GHG emissions resulting from vehicle trips, the revised project would still not exceed 1,100 metric tons of GHG emissions per year, the screening criteria recommended by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District for projects with potentially significant GHG impacts (BAAQMD Revised Draft Options and Justification Report, 2009). As noted in the Cairdean Winery MND, the winery facility has existing elements—including a landscaped green roof, retained mature trees for building and parking lot shading, and wine caves with natural climate control—that have the effect of reducing the winery's GHG emissions as estimated in the original analysis.

***Hydrology:***

No new impervious surfaces with the potential to generate additional storm runoff would be created with the proposed use permit modification. As noted in the Cairdean MND, the project site is outside of areas of potential flood, tsunami and dam/levee failure inundation.

The proposed increase in wine production would increase the winery's demand for water. The applicant's engineer submitted with the use permit modification application an estimate of water use associated with the requested production increase and winery staffing change, and an analysis of potential impacts to groundwater.

Starting with an estimated annual rainfall of 35 inches per year on the 50.31-acre site (146.74 acre-feet), the report deducts estimated annual runoff volume based on slope and soil types (99.73 acre-feet) and estimated evapotranspiration from existing vineyard, grassland and

oak woodlands (20.89 acre-feet), to arrive at an estimated groundwater recharge rate of 26.16 acre-feet per year.

An estimated 0.42 acre-feet of the 1.46 acre-feet of water needed for the requested increased wine production would be treated and recycled on-site as vineyard irrigation. The water availability analysis indicated that with the proposed increase in production, and accounting for recycling of treated process wastewater, estimated water use at the site for the proposed project would be 2.08 acre-feet per year. This estimated water use would be an increase of 0.3 acre-feet from the water demand under currently permitted conditions. Both the proposed and permitted water usage are less than the 3.88 acre-feet of water that was analyzed in the 2012 Cairdean Winery MND, and all three estimates of water use are within the estimated 26.16 acre-feet of groundwater recharge of the property. (Note: The lower estimated water use for the permitted condition in 2019 versus the 2012 water availability analysis can be attributed in large part to lower assumed water demand for irrigation of established landscaping and vineyard on the property, as compared to higher water needs of new plantings.) Thus, while water use on the site would increase as a result of the proposed production increase and employment change, the estimated increase in water demand would not exceed the estimated level of groundwater recharge nor the water demand that was analyzed for the project in 2012.

***Transportation:***

With the change in production, the applicant requests a change to the permitted staffing of the winery, so that all 10 of the winery's employees would be full-time. According to Napa County's Winery Trip Generation formulas, this change is estimated to generate eight new vehicle trips per day, an estimated two of which would occur during the evening peak commute hour. The requested production increase would result in an estimated one to two new daily trips for delivery of grapes and winemaking supplies. The estimated increase in the number of daily vehicle trips is roughly equivalent to the 9.5 daily trip average for a typical single-family residence. There is an existing left-turn lane that provides vehicular access to the winery property from the northbound lane of State Route 29.

***Utilities:***

Neither the approved daily visitation nor the approved winery marketing program is proposed to be changed with the requested modification. As a result of the requested winery staffing change, peak domestic wastewater flows from the requested winery operations would increase from an estimated 705 gallons per day to 725 gallons per day. The existing domestic wastewater treatment system, which was designed to accommodate a peak flow of 760 gallons per day, would require no modifications to accommodate the proposed project. To accommodate the peak flow of 2,375 gallons of process wastewater estimated to be generated from the requested production increase, the applicant proposes to increase the design capacity of the existing Lyve treatment system from 2,000 to 2,500 gallons per day. Other than upgrades to the existing Lyve unit, no new tanks for storage of effluent or treated wastewater would need to be installed for the proposed project. Treated process wastewater from the on-site system would be discharged on-site as irrigation to the existing on-site vineyard area.

***Other Resource Areas:***

With no change in the existing land use (winery); no increase in entitled winery visitation or marketing event operations; no physical expansions to the existing winery building, parking lot or landscaping; and no ground disturbance outside of the existing developed area of the winery proposed with this current request, the aesthetic, biological, cultural, forest resources, geological, land use, noise and water quality impacts of the proposed project would be no greater than those evaluated in the initial study prepared for the Cairdean Winery. The requested Use Permit Major Modification would facilitate continued the use of the property for winemaking, an agricultural use of land as defined in the Napa County General Plan, and the scope of the current request does not include any tree or vegetation removal. Standard conditions of Napa County approvals (no. 4.16) regulating lighting and building colors would remain effective with any modification to the existing entitlements.

The Cairdean Winery MND analysis concluded that the winery would not result in population growth that would substantially increase demand for housing or recreational facilities. While status of the winery's existing employment is proposed to change from a combination of full-time and part-time to all full-time, the overall number of employees is not proposed to change and thereby, would not change the conclusions of the original environmental analysis with respect to population, housing and recreational amenities. Likewise, the Cairdean Winery MND analysis concluded that hazard, mineral resources and public services impacts of the winery were less than significant due to the property's distance from known mineral deposits, sensitive receptors and airports, as well as its location within service areas of police and fire emergency responders. As the location of the winery has not changed from the original entitlement and would not change with this request, potential impacts in these and other location-based resource areas would also be no greater than that analyzed in the Cairdean Winery MND. The proposed project includes no building expansions that would necessitate payment of additional school impact fees.

**Summary and Findings:**

Review of the project has concluded that the proposed project will not result in new impacts beyond those analyzed in the Cairdean Winery MND adopted in 2012, as further explained in the discussion above. None of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines calling for preparation of a subsequent negative declaration has occurred, and thus, an Addendum to the 2012 Cairdean Winery MND is appropriate to satisfy CEQA requirements for the proposed project.

The following findings are provided in accordance with CEQA Section 15164(e) concerning the decision not to prepare a subsequent negative declaration pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162:

- (1) None of the following conditions calling for preparation of a subsequent negative declaration have occurred:
  - (a) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the... Cairdean Winery MND due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in severity of previously identified significant effects;
  - (b) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken which will require major revisions of the... Cairdean Winery MND due to involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in severity of previously identified significant effects; or
  - (c) New information of substantial importance which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the... Cairden Winery MND was adopted, shows the following:
    - (i) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the Cairdean Winery MND;
    - (ii) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than previously shown in the Cairdean Winery MND;
    - (iii) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
    - (iv) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the Cairdean Winery MND would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.
- (2) Only minor technical changes or additions are necessary to make the Cairdean Winery MND under consideration adequate under CEQA.
- (3) The changes to the Cairdean Winery MND made by this addendum do not raise important new issues about the significant effects on the environment.



This Addendum to the Cairdean Winery Mitigated Negative Declaration finds that actions under the proposed project, as identified herein, will not result in any new significant environmental effects nor result in the substantial increase of any previously identified impacts in the previous MND.

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, other sources of information listed in the file, and comments received; conversations with knowledgeable individuals; the preparer's personal knowledge of the area; and, where necessary a visit to the site.

**COUNTY OF NAPA**  
**CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPARTMENT**  
1195 THIRD ST., SUITE 210  
NAPA, CA 94559  
(707) 253-4417

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

1. **Project Title:** Cairdean Winery Use Permit #P11-00298 and Variance #P11-00299
2. **Property Owner:** Edwin and Stacia Williams
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Charlene Gallina, Supervising Planner 707-299-1355, [charlene.gallina@countyofnapa.org](mailto:charlene.gallina@countyofnapa.org)
4. **Project Location and APN:** 3125 St Helena Highway (SR29/128), St Helena, CA; APN 022-070-028
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** JuanCarlos Fernandez, 1104 Adams St Suite 203b, St. Helena, CA 94574
6. **General Plan description:** AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space)
7. **Zoning:** AW (Agricultural Watershed)
8. **Description of Project:**
  - 1) Two Variances (P11-00299) to allow the construction of a new winery 259 feet from the centerline of State Route 29/128 (St. Helena Highway) road setback where 600 feet is required for a setback and 100 feet from the centerline of a private road (used by the public) where 300 feet is required for a setback.
  - 2) A Use Permit to establish a new 50,000 gallon per year winery with:
    - Winery building with total coverage of 61,221sf
      - +/- 19,390sf production area (single story), and
      - +/- 2,500sf admin area including +/- 250sf tasting room, +/- 230sf employee break room;
    - A +/-13,000sf of caves to include:
      - +/- 340sf wine library,
      - +/- 450 case good storage,
      - +/- 12,210 barrel storage;
    - A +/- 3,700sf of covered work area;
    - A +/- 2,000sf of covered crush pad;
    - A +/- 22,300sf of new access paving (including one-way loop driveway, parking spaces, walkways, loading area);
    - A gated access;
    - 14 parking spaces (including 1 ADA-accessible space);
    - 1-acre of vineyard;
    - A new winery domestic and process wastewater treatment and disposal system (including a 10,500 gallon domestic water tank, a 10,500 gallon irrigation tank and a 65,000 gallon recycled water holding tank and other various smaller tanks as needed);
    - A 40,000 gallon fire water tank;
    - A landscaping program that includes a green roof, vineyard plantings, native & drought tolerant plants;
    - +/- 14,000 cubic yards of cave spoil to be disposed on-site or hauled off-site to Clover Flats or another location;
    - Fourteen (14) employees (four (4) Full-Time, six (6) Part-Time, and four (4) Harvest);
    - Tasting Hours: 9:30-6:30 p.m.; seven days per week
    - Tours & Tasting with catered food @ 25 person maximum per day and 25 person average;
    - Marketing plan with catered food:
      - 2-25 person events per month
      - 2-50 person events per month
      - 2-100 person events per year

NOTE: Wine Auction with 25 persons;

  - On-premise wine consumption pursuant to AB 2004; and

- Demolition of four existing structures (a single-family residence, a agricultural barn, a garage and a pool house)

**9. Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses.**

The project is proposed on a 50.31 acre parcel located on the south side of Napa County on St. Helena Highway (State Route 29/128) approximately 1,300 feet north of its intersection with Lodi Lane. The property is an irregularly shaped parcel with elevations that range from 300 to 700-ft on the east facing slopes. The property is presently developed with a single family residence with associated infrastructure, some residential landscaping, three accessory structures (an agricultural barn, pool house, and garage), a reservoir, fallow agricultural grassland, an access road to the west edge of the parcel and natural habitat of oak woodland, douglas fir forest and a small area of chaparral.

Surrounding land uses consists of vineyards, a commercial business complex, rural residential oak woodlands and conifer woodlands. The northerly parcel boundary is SR 29/128 (St Helena Highway) and vineyards located in the Agricultural Preserve (AP) Zoning District. The easterly parcel boundary is the former St. Helena Outlets/Marketplace, rural residential and douglas fir/oak woodland forest. The Zoning designation is Commercial Limited (CL) and Agricultural Watershed (AW), respectively. The westerly parcel boundary is vineyards and douglas fir forest located in the Agricultural Watershed (AW) Zoning District. The southerly parcel boundary is rural residential and douglas fir/oak woodland forest located in the Agricultural Watershed (AW) Zoning District.

The St. Helena Outlet/Marketplace is currently undergoing renovations and a rearrangement of previously approved uses. Permits on file are for re-roof of all 5 buildings, and remodel of Building 3 for a 100-seat restaurant. These renovations are within the existing structures. There are no anticipated changes in previously approved uses, intensification of uses, or any expansion of the wastewater system and/or in the parking area or circulation pattern.

(References: General Plan, BDR, GIS, Project/Parcel Files, Applications #P11-00298 UP & #P11-00299 VAR materials dated August 17, 2011, Revisions: October 2011, December 2011, February 2012, April 2012 including: Concept Design, Viewshed by Signum Architects; Landscape Concept by Blasen Landscape; Water Feasibility Study & Phase 1 Water Study by RSA dated October 2011, Rev December 2011; Preliminary Stormwater Runoff Management Plans (SRMP) by RSA dated July 2011; Prehistoric Archaeological Resource Report & Historic Structure Evaluation by Archaeological Resources Service dated August 2011; Excavation Truck Trip Generation & Stockpile Location by RSA dated April 2012; and Biological Resource Survey by Kjeldsen Biological Consulting dated March 2012)

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

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

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

California Department of Fish & Game  
California Department of Water Resources

**Other Agencies Contacted**

Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control  
Federal Taxation Trade Bureau

**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 Conservation, Development & Planning Department

May 7, 2012  
Date

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

Discussion:

a-c. The project site is located on the south side of State Route 29/128 (St. Helena Highway) approximately 1,300 feet north of its intersection with Lodi Lane with the direct access onto southbound SR 29/128. SR 29/128 is considered a scenic highway. The existing residence and other structures are not visible from SR29/128. These structures are up gradient, set back from SR29/128 approximately 120 feet and screened by the existing mature trees along the parcel boundary on SR 29/128. The existing residence and other structures will be demolished, and the area would become winery, parking area, and vineyard. The existing mature trees along the SR 29/128 will remain. There would be no changes anticipated to the existing entrance. The existing entrance on SR 29/128 provides access to the proposed winery parcel and the adjacent parcel. The winery parcel on the west side and a commercial parcel on the east side of the entrance. The existing entrance is approximately 50 feet in width and 170 feet in length. The winery facilities would be set back approximately 259 feet from parcel boundary on SR 29/128 and would not be viewed by the traveling public on SR 29/128 as the project site is up gradient from its entrance on SR 29/128, and would not be seen due the intervening terrain. The traveling public southbound on SR 29/128 could have a brief fleeting of the project site. They would see the proposed vineyard, and a low profile single story winery structure. Material of construction are anticipated to be metal siding, formed concrete, plaster and stone veneer, a green & metal roof. The northbound traveling public would view the existing matures trees along SR 29/128, and the existing entrance driveway. Viewshed analysis was prepared illustrating the winery upon completion would not likely be seen by the majority traveling public. Seen as a whole, nothing in this project would substantially alter a scenic vista or substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site or its immediate surroundings. Impacts related to scenic resources will be less than significant.

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

*"All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward, shall be located as low to the ground as possible, shall be the minimum necessary for security, safety, or operations, and shall incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. No flood-lighting or sodium lighting of the building is permitted. Architectural highlighting and/or spotting are not allowed. Low-level lighting shall be utilized in parking areas as opposed to elevated high-intensity light standards. All lighting shall comply with the California Building Code."*

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

(References: General Plan, BDR, GIS-Viewshed roads/Historic sites, project/parcel files)

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. <b>AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.</b> <sup>1</sup> Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 proposed project will not convert any Farmland to a non-agriculture use. There are no Williamson Act contracts associated with the parcel. The project includes installation of approximately an acre of vineyard. The project site is zoned Agriculture Watershed (AW), a winery is an allowed use with a use permit. The winery would use the grapes in their future production. In addition, the project as proposed will disturb approximately 8 acres or 5 acres of grassland and 3 acres of douglas fir and oak woodland of existing habitat, with approximately 42 acres of the douglas fir forest and oak woodland to be undisturbed. The proposed number and species of trees of note to be removed are as follows: three Redwoods (landscape plantings), two Live Oak, three Valley Oak, one douglas fir and one walnut. The applicant has proposed to replace these removed trees throughout the winery portion of the site. Please refer to the Biological Resources Section for more detailed discussion and proposed mitigation measures. The existing douglas fir forest will not be disturbed by the proposed winery and no conversion of timber land would occur. There are no other changes anticipated that could convert Farmland to non-agricultural use. Impacts related to agriculture and forest resources will be less than significant.

References: Zoning Code Chapter 18.16, BDR/GIS layer: Viticultural areas, agriculture layer, potential productive soils, project/parcel files)

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. <b>AIR QUALITY.</b> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
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. The thresholds were designed to establish the level at which the District believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA and were posted on the Air District's website and included in the Air District's May 2011 updated CEQA Guidelines.

On March 5, 2012 the Alameda County Superior Court issued a judgment finding that the Air District had failed to comply with CEQA when it adopted the thresholds. The court did not determine whether the 2011 thresholds were valid on the merits, but found that their adoption was a project under CEQA. The court issued a writ of mandate ordering the District to set aside the thresholds and cease dissemination of them until the Air District had complied with CEQA.

In view of the court's order, the Air District is no longer recommending that the 2011 thresholds be used as a generally applicable measure of a project's significant air quality impacts (see <http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planning-and-Research/CEQA-GUIDELINES/Updated-CEQA-Guidelines.aspx>), instead the Air District recommends that lead agencies rely on project-specific evidence and the Air District's 1999 thresholds of significance (*CEQA Guidelines – Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans*, BAAQMD, December 1999). The following analysis is based upon and consistent with the Air District's 1999 *CEQA Guidelines*.

The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plan. Wineries as proposed here are not producers of air pollution in volumes substantial enough to result in an air quality plan conflict. The project site lies within the Napa Valley, which forms one of the climatologically distinct sub-regions (Napa County Sub region) within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The topographical and meteorological features of the Valley create a relatively high potential for air pollution. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from construction activities. Construction emissions would have a temporary effect, consisting mainly of dust generated during grading and other construction activities, exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles, and relatively minor emissions from paints and other architectural coatings. The Air District recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction impacts in their 1999 *CEQA Guidelines*. If the proposed project adheres to these measures, the Air District recommends concluding that construction-related impacts will be less than significant. Relevant best practices are set forth at Table 2 of the 1999 *Guidelines* and are incorporated into the County's standard conditions of project approval.

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 *Bay Area Air Quality Management Plan* 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 (1999 *Guidelines*, p. 24). The use permit proposed here includes up to 4 full-time employees, 6 part-time employees, 25 busiest-day tours and tasting visitors, and 50,000 gallons of production; meaning that this project should account for 39 maximum daily trips on a typical weekday, and 148 trips on harvest-season day with no marketing events. The subject application also proposes occasional marketing events, with up to 100 people at the largest event; at 2.8 persons per car that would add up to 95 additional trips on the day of a large marketing event. The resulting busiest day plus marketing total is well below the established 2,000 vehicle trip threshold of significance. The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

d/e. Earthmoving and construction activities required for project construction may cause odors and a temporary degradation in air quality from dust and heavy equipment air emissions during the construction phase. While construction on the site will generate dust particulates in the short-term, the impact would be less than significant with dust control measures as specified in Napa County's standard condition of approval relating to dust;

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

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

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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-d. A biological constraints analysis was prepared evaluating the project's potential to impact biological resources. The report, titled "Biological Resource Survey, Cairdean Vineyards", was prepared by Kjeldsen Biological Consulting, a firm that has conducted numerous surveys and evaluations in Napa County. The report, which is attached and incorporated herein by reference, concludes that the project will not result in significant impacts to biological resources, however, mitigation is required in order to ensure that species that may potentially occur are not affected. Mitigation measures are included herein which reduced potential impacts to biological resources to a less-than-significant level. A summary of potential impacts detailed in the biological survey is as follows:

Tree removal and oak woodlands – The project includes placement of a subsurface drip irrigation treated wastewater dispersal field within existing oak woodlands. The report concludes that installation of the dispersal lines and periodic disposal of treated water in the dispersal field will not impact the health of the oaks within the woodland. A mitigation measure has been include requiring monitoring of the health of the trees for a period of five years after installation and use of the dispersal field, and planting of replacement trees in an alternate location the event that the dispersal field results in loss of the oak woodland. Also, a mitigation measure has been included requiring 20 replacement trees for the 10 native trees being removed in the vicinity of the proposed winery and vineyard generally surrounding the area where the existing home and out



buildings are located. These 10 mature native trees are located within a developed landscape, and their removal will not constitute loss of a significant number of trees or a definable woodland area.

Special-status animal species – No special-status animal species were observed during the site reconnaissance, but the existing buildings on site, scheduled for demolition, have potential to serve as roosting habitat for Pallid and Townsend's Big-eared bat. Trees in the vicinity of the project also have potential as nesting habitat for birds including protected species, although the project biologist did not observe the presence of any protected bird species. Lastly, a small, surface feed man made reservoir is located up the hill from the winery site and was found to have habitat suitable for Western Pond Turtle, although no evidence of turtles was present during the site reconnaissance. The applicant has indicated that removal of the pond for use as potential location for cave spoils is possible. Although no special status animal species are believed to presently occur on the site, mitigation measures have been included requiring subsequent site surveys and avoidance if special status species occupy the site prior to commencing construction. Given that the protected animal species are not believed to presently occur within the project area, the potential for impact could be considered less than significant. However, in an abundance of caution and in recognition that portions of the project site contain suitable habitat, this potential for the presence of special status animal species has been treated as a potentially significant impact. The proposed mitigation measure (below) will reduce the potential impact to less-than-significant.

Special-status plant species – Two special status plant species were observed on the subject project well outside of the areas of proposed earth disturbing activities. There are no special status plant species within the project development boundaries. Significant plant community resources on the property have been avoided including Forest Woodland Alliance, Chaparral Shrub Alliance, and Seasonal Drainages. Further seasonal biological studies are unwarranted.

Critical habitat – Based on the biologist's evaluation of the subject project and the County's environmental sensitivity maps, including referencing the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), there is no critical habitat for special status species as defined by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service present on the study site.

Seasonal drainages – The proposed project does not impact any of the seasonal drainages located on the property. However, there is a small seasonally fed pond located on the project site that is being considered as a possible location for the disposal of cave spoils. This is a man-made feature, but filling of the pond would result in changes to a water feature on a seasonal drainage. It is likely that all cave spoils will be disposed of at the winery project site and the proposed vineyard, or hauled off site. In the event that the permittee wishes to convert the pond to a cave spoil disposal site, permitting from the Department of Fish and Game, Regional Water Quality Control Board and possibly the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will be necessary, in addition to a grading permit from Napa County. As noted above, the pond is potential habitat for Western Pond Turtle although no presence of turtles was observed. A mitigation measure has been included requiring the pond to be avoided unless the permittee secured permits for its conversion from all agencies with jurisdiction.

- e. The project would not conflict with any local policies protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation or the County's Conservation Regulations. Grading will occur on slopes averaging less than 30% (as calculated in accordance with the Conservation Regulations), and replacement trees will be planted for all trees removed. The project does not conflict with any County ordinance or requirement to preserve existing trees, and therefore is considered as not having potential for a significant impact thereto.
- 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. A mitigation measure addressing loss of oaks has been included due to a portion of the project occurring within oak woodlands.

(References: General Plan, BDR/GIS layers: sensitive biotic groups, vegetation, streams, project/parcel files)

- a. **Mitigation Measures/Method of Monitoring:** (revised 10.6.11 consistent with State CEQA Guidelines §15073.5(c){4}).
  - 1. Prior to commencing construction, the permittee shall submit a tree protection and monitoring plan for the Blue Oak woodland area where the septic system dispersal field will be located. The plan shall be prepared by a qualified biologist and shall include the following elements: 1) an inventory of trees; 2) construction measures that will minimize root disturbance; 3) a schedule for maximum rates of treated water dispersal; and 4) a schedule for inspections of tree health by the biologist for a period of 5 years from the grant of occupancy for the winery (and commencing use of the dispersal field). In the event that tree health declines or results in loss of trees, replacement trees shall be planted on-site outside of the dispersal field as recommended by the project biologist and subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.

**Method of Monitoring:** This Mitigation Measure requires submission of a tree protection and monitoring plan with the landscape plan.  
**RESPONSIBLE AGENCY(IES)** – Planning Division.

- Prior to commencing construction, a tree preservation and replacement plan shall be prepared in concert with the project landscape plan subject to review and approval by the Planning Division, which indicates the location, size and species of all trees within the limits of grading and earth disturbance of proposed construction. The plan shall indicate which trees will be removed and which trees will be preserved. A minimum of 3 native replacement shall be planted for each native tree removed. Protective fencing shall be placed around the dripline of trees to be preserved.

**Method of Monitoring:** This Mitigation Measure requires submission of a tree protection and monitoring plan with the landscape plan.  
**RESPONSIBLE AGENCY(IES) – Planning Division.**

- Prior to commencing construction, the permittee shall conduct a pre-construction bat survey to reaffirm that no bat species roost or otherwise occupy areas affected by project construction. The survey shall be prepared by a qualified biologist (or other qualified professional) with expertise in bat habitat. The survey shall meet the protocols of State Department of Fish and Game, and consultation with the Department of Fish and Game shall occur as prescribed by the agency. In the event that the study confirms the results of the original reconnaissance finding that no bat species occupy the project area, then no further mitigation will be required subject to review and approval by the State Department of Fish and Game. In the event that bat species are present within the project area, project construction shall not commence until authorized by the State Department of Fish and Game, and the permittee shall follow all protocols for avoidance and relocation of protected species.

**Method of Monitoring:** This Mitigation Measure requires submission of a pre-construction bat survey prior to commencing construction.  
**RESPONSIBLE AGENCY(IES) – Planning Division & State Department of Fish and Game.**

- A qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey of all potential nesting habitat for birds within 500 ft. of earthmoving activities. Surveys shall be conducted within 14 days prior to tree removal or ground-breaking activities on the project site. If active nests are found, the project biologist shall consult and obtain approval for appropriate buffers with the California Department of Fish and Game prior to tree removal or ground-breaking activities, or until it is determined that all young have fledged.

**Method of Monitoring:** This Mitigation Measure requires submission of a pre-construction survey of all potential nesting habitat for birds within 500 ft. of earthmoving activities prior to commencing construction. **RESPONSIBLE AGENCY(IES) – Planning Division & State Department of Fish and Game.**

- In the event that the existing pond located outside of the project area will be used as a cave tailing disposal location, the permittee shall secure all required permits from California Department of Fish and Game, Regional Water Quality Control Board, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, and any other potential State or Federal agency with jurisdiction by law. A pre-construction survey for the presence of Western Pond Turtle shall be conducted prior to issuance of a grading permit to fill the pond. The pre-construction survey may also require reconnaissance for other protected species as determined by agencies with jurisdiction by law. In the event that Western Pond Turtle or any other protected species is present at the pond, the permittee shall either avoid placing cave spoils within the pond area, or shall follow the protocols for mitigation of protected species, including like-in-kind replacement of lost habitat, as prescribed by those agencies with jurisdiction over the pond.

**Method of Monitoring:** This Mitigation Measure requires submission of a pre-construction survey for the presence of Western Pond Turtle prior to issuance of a grading permit to fill the pond. **RESPONSIBLE AGENCY(IES) – Planning Division & State Department of Fish and Game.**

- ~~Grading permit plans submitted for construction shall include a landscape plan indicating the location of all native bunch grass being remove Department of Fish and Game.~~

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V.	<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

There are no known cultural resources in the area of the proposed project as noted in the report Prehistoric Archaeological Resource Report & Historic Structure Evaluation by Archaeological Resources Service dated August 2011.

a-d. There are no known historically sensitive sites and archaeological resources, sensitive sites, in the vicinity of the project site. A standard condition of approval for archaeology requires that an archaeologist monitor the construction site during any earthmoving activities. No unique paleontological or geological features are known to be located on or in the vicinity of the project site. While not anticipated, should a discovery of unknown cultural resources occur; during construction, in the event that cultural resources or prehistoric artifacts are discovered, uncovered, or otherwise detected during soil-disturbing activities, work on the immediately affected portion of the site shall cease immediately and Napa County be notified, and a qualified archaeologist shall be brought to the site to assess whether the resources at issue are either "historical resources" or "unique archaeological resources." The archaeologist shall recommend appropriate mitigation to Napa County, which shall determine what measures are appropriate and feasible. Such measures may include avoidance, removal and preservation, and/or recordation in accordance with accepted professional archaeological practice. California law recognizes the need to protect Native American human burials, skeletal remains, and items associated with Native American burials from vandalism and inadvertent destruction. The procedures for the treatment of Native American human remains are contained in California Health and Safety Code §7050.5 and §7052 and California Public Resources Code §5097. The California Health and Safety Code requires that if human remains are found in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, work is to be halted in the immediate area, and the county coroner is to be notified to determine the nature of the remains. The coroner is required to examine all discoveries of human remains within 48 hours of receiving notice of a discovery on private or state lands (Health and Safety Code §7050.5(b)). If the coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American interment, then the Native American Heritage Commission shall be consulted to identify the most likely descendants and the appropriate disposition of the remains. Therefore, less than significant effects are anticipated with respect to (a-d).

(Reference: General Plan, BDR/GIS layer: historic sites, project/parcel files)

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<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
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:

The parcel is located in the seismically active San Francisco Bay Area. The terrain is sloped from less than 10% at the entrance on SR 29/128 and then rises steeply going west to the rear of the parcel. Construction activities will occur in areas of minimal slope, general less than 5% but in sloped as much as 30% in the vicinity of the cave portals. Caves will be drilled into volcanic bedrock west of the main winery building. There are no known faults that traverse the project site and no slide areas are indicated on geology layer of the County Geographic Information Layer. Soil types are Perkins gravelly loam on the eastern portion of the parcel where the vineyard is proposed, Boomer gravelly loam slope where the winery and caves are to be located, and Boomer-Forward Felta complex where the proposed winery wastewater drip system is proposed. The proposed winery wastewater and domestic waste systems have been reviewed and considered appropriate for the project by Department of Environmental Management. A Preliminary Stormwater Runoff Management Plans (SRMP) was prepared by the project's civil engineer, and reviewed by the Public Works Department and found compliant with standards.

- a. The proposed project is not located within any Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zone. The portion of the site where the winery will be constructed is lightly sloped, generally 5% to 15% average slopes. According to Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Alquist-Priolo Fault, Soil Types and Liquefaction layers), soil types located on the project site have low liquefaction potential. While seismic activity is endemic to the Bay Area, the project is required to conform with the International Building Code, which contains minimum building design standards for property with any liquefaction potential.
- b. No substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil will result from the project because the project will be subject to County and State sediment retention requirements and stormwater pollution prevention requirement (see discussion under Section viii, Hydrology and Water Quality). A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan is required for storm water and erosion control and Best Management Practices under the standards developed in the County's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Phase II Stormwater Permit. Therefore, the potential for impacts is considered less than significant.
- c. The project site is not known to be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence or collapse.
- d. The soil type is not considered to be expansive, as defined in table 19.1B of the International Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property.
- e. The project will include construction a new subsurface drip irrigation septic system, designed by a licensed civil engineer with expertise in septic system design. The system has been found by County Environmental Management to be sufficient to accommodate the proposed project. The soil on the property is capable of supporting the designed system, and will result in a less than significant impact.

(Reference: General Plan, County Code Chapters 8, 13, 16 & 18, BDR/ GIS layers: geology, soils, landslides, streams, water bodies, slope; project/parcel files)

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. <b>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Generate a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions in excess of applicable thresholds adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality 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?

**Discussion:**

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

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

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)**. The applicants intend to have incorporated GHG reduction methods including: solar panels, use of a cave, recycled-water irrigation with zero-potable water use, on-site winery waste treatment and disposal system, roof top landscaping, landscaping with native plants, and high efficiency HVAC systems.

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, because this initial study assesses a project that is consistent with an adopted General Plan for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was prepared, it appropriately focuses on impacts which are "peculiar to the project," rather than the cumulative impacts previously assessed. The increase in emissions expected as a result of the project will be relatively modest and the project is in compliance with the County's efforts to reduce emissions as described in "b.", below. For these reasons, project impacts related to GHG emissions are considered less than significant.

b. The County's Draft Climate Action Plan would require discretionary projects to reduce their GHG emissions to 38% below "business as usual" volumes as of 2020 through the application of a combination of State, local, and project-specific programs and policies. Because the Draft Climate Action Plan has not yet been formally adopted: it cannot be considered a formal threshold of significance for CEQA purposes. Nonetheless, the project was analyzed for consistency with the Draft Climate Action Plan. Given the proposed reduction measures incorporated into the project, the applicant would be able to reduce emissions by 38%. The project's "business as usual" emissions were calculated by Planning staff using CalEEMod GHG modeling software, resulting in modeled annual emissions of 297 metric tons of carbon dioxide and carbon dioxide equivalents (MT C02e). GHG Emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the CalGreen Building Code, tightened vehicle fuel efficiency standards, and more project-specific on-site programs including those winery features noted above in "a" would combine to reduce emissions below the "business as usual" level, and make it feasible to meet the proposed 38% requirement.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

*(Reference: General Plan, project/parcel files)*

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

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII.	<b>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> Would the project:				
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

The proposed winery project would use some hazardous materials in the course of routine winery operational activities. A limited amount of hazardous material would also be used during construction. The winery has been reviewed and conditioned by the Department of Environmental Management and prior to commencing operation a Business Activities Form, and/or a Hazardous Material Business Plan will be required to monitor quantities of hazardous materials. The project has been designed by a licensed engineer to meet County standards for emergency vehicle access to all the facilities. The proposed improvements have been reviewed by the County Fire Marshall and County Public Works civil engineers and found to comply with County standards.

a-f. The proposed project will not involve the handling of substantial amounts of any hazardous materials during the course of routine business. No hazardous material will result from the wine making process. The proposed project includes fire suppression systems with water tanks, sprinkler systems, multiple entrances/exits, the construction material is to be fire resistance and emergency vehicles will have access to the entire perimeter of all structures. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site. The proposed site is not a known hazardous materials site. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any public or private airports. Therefore, no effects are anticipated with respect to (a-f).

g/h. The proposed project would not interfere with emergency response or evacuation plans. As designed, the proposed project would improve emergency vehicle access to the site in the event of wild land fire. The current entrance off of State Route 29/128 access will continue to serve as the main entrance for the 2 parcels (APN 022-070-025 and APN 022-070-028). There is a left turn lane on northbound SR 29/128 at the entrance and there are acceleration/deceleration lanes at the entrance on to south bound SR 29/128. The proposed winery driveway is a one-way loop beginning approximately 50 feet from entrance off of SR 29/128, and has been designed to accommodate FIRE & emergency vehicles access. Therefore, the project will not result in significant impacts with respect to (g-h).

(Reference: California Health and Safety Code Chapters 6.5 & 6.95, General Plan, County Code Chapters 8, 13, 16 & 18, BDR/GIS layers: hazardous facilities, Napa Airport, roads, Fire & fire hazard zones-CDF; project/parcel file)

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. <b>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b> Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	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 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- b. The proposed project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The Napa County Department of Environmental Management has reviewed the existing domestic and process wastewater systems, and recommends approval as conditioned. Additionally, the applicant will be required to obtain all necessary permits from the Napa County Department of Public Works, including a Stormwater Pollution Management Permit. The permit will provide for adequate on-site containment of runoff during storm events through placement of siltation measures around the development area.
- b. Minimum thresholds for water use have been established by the Department of Public Works using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS). These reports are the result of water resources investigations performed by the USGS in cooperation with the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. Any project which reduces water usage or any water usage which is at or below the established threshold is, for purposes of the application of the County's Groundwater Conservation Ordinance, assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels.

Based on the submitted *Phase One* water availability analysis, the 50.3 acre subject valley-area parcel has a water availability calculation of 50.3 acre feet per year (af/yr), which is arrived at by multiplying its approximately 50.3 acre size by a one acre feet per year per acre fair share water use factor. The proposed winery's production and the Water Demand Calculations submitted placed water demand for the winery, tasting room, and wine production at 3.88 af/yr. The Department of Public Works has reviewed this analysis and recommends approval of this project on the basis that the project would be below the established threshold for groundwater use on the property. The County is not aware of, nor has it received any reports of, groundwater shortages near the project area. The project will not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater level.

- c-e. There are no existing or planned stormwater systems that would be affected by this project. The area surrounding the project is pervious ground that is forested with douglas firs and oak woodlands, and planted in vineyards (1 acre) and has the capacity to absorb runoff. Any drainage alterations would be included in the grading and improvement plans that are required for project construction. The applicant is required to submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) for a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan permit (SWPPP) from the Regional Water Quality Control Board for pre & post construction activities, as well as, a Napa County Public Works grading permit to ensure that no excessive run-off occurs during pre/post construction. Review and approval by the Department of Public Works of the grading and improvement plans will ensure that there is no potential for significant on- or off-site erosion, impact to the two blue-line streams, siltation, or flooding.
- f. There is nothing included in this proposal that would otherwise substantially degrade water quality. As discussed in greater detail in, "a.," above, the Department of Environmental Management has reviewed the proposed wastewater system and has found the system adequately sized, as conditioned, to meet the facility's septic and process wastewater treatment and disposal needs. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality.
- g. This project proposes no housing development. No housing would be placed within a mapped flood zone.
- h/i. The project site is not located within a flood hazard area, nor would it impede or redirect flood flows or expose structures or people to flooding. The project site is not located within a dam or levee failure inundation zone.
- j. In coming years, higher global temperatures are expected to raise sea level by expanding ocean water, melting mountain glaciers and small ice caps, and causing portions of Greenland and the Antarctic ice sheets to melt. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change estimates that the global average sea level will rise between 0.6 and 2 feet over the next century (IPCC, 2007). However, the project area is located at approximately 300 to 700 feet in elevation and is located outside the tsunami inundation area pursuant to the Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning. There is also no known history of mud flow in the vicinity. The project will not subject people or structures to a significant risk of inundation from tsunami, seiche, or mudflow.

*(References: General Plan, BDR/GIS layers: flood zones, water bodies, dam levee inundation, groundwater deficient areas, streams, geology, domestic water supply drainages, contours & slope, County Code Chapters 13, 16 & 18, project/parcel files)*

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

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

**Discussion:**

- a-c. The proposed project is located in an area dominated by agricultural, commercial, residential, and open space uses and the improvements proposed here in support of ongoing agricultural uses county-wide, as they provide a market for grapes grown within Napa County. The project will not divide an establish community. Furthermore, the proposed project is in compliance with the Napa County General Plan, the Napa County Zoning Ordinance and related applicable County Code sections, and all other applicable regulations. There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the property.

*(Reference: General Plan, County Code, project/parcel files).*

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



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

Discussion:

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

(*Reference*: General Plan, BDR/GIS, project/parcel files)

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

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

Discussion:

a/b. The proposed project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during the project construction phase. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly-muffled vehicles. No ground borne vibration or ground borne noise is anticipated. Noise generated during this period is not anticipated to be significant. Furthermore, construction activities will generally occur during the period of 7am-7pm on weekdays- normal waking hours. All construction activities will be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). The proposed project will not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts.

c/d. Noise from winery operations is generally limited; however, the proposed visitation and marketing plan could create additional noise impacts. The submitted visitation plan limits tours and tastings to 25 persons per day on the weekends only, and the submitted marketing plan includes two-25 person events per month, two-50 person events per month, two-100 events per year, and wine auction with 25

persons. The Napa County Exterior Noise Ordinance, which was adopted in 1984, sets the maximum permissible received sound level for a rural residence as 45 db between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. While the 45 db limitation is strict (45 db is roughly equivalent to the sound generated by a quiet conversation), much of the area around the proposed winery is given over to agricultural uses and standards winery conditions of approval are designed to minimize noise impacts on neighboring properties associated with outdoor amplified music by requiring:

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

In addition, continuing enforcement of Napa County's Exterior Noise Ordinance by the Department of Environmental Management and the Napa County Sheriff, including a separate and reinforcing prohibition against outdoor amplified music, will ensure that marketing events and other winery activities do not create a significant noise impact.

e/f. The project is not within the vicinity of a private or public airstrip that would create noise pollution.

(Reference: General Plan, County Code Chapters 8 & 18, BDR/GIS layers: Napa Airport compatibility zones, city boundaries, project/parcel files)

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

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

Discussion:

a/b. The proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in population growth, either directly or indirectly. The winery will have 14 employees (four (4) Full-Time, six (6) Part-Time, and four (4) Harvest Employees). Neither of which are not anticipated to induce a substantial growth in population requiring any new infrastructure. As proposed by the applicant, the project site will be able to accommodate additional parking for these new employees. Furthermore, the applicant, as a condition of approval for the project, will be required to pay an affordable housing fee (Napa County Zoning Ordinance – Section 18.107, Affordable Housing and Incentives) for the proposed winery to address the demand for additional housing either directly or indirectly.

b/c. This application will remove one unit of housing though not necessitating the construction of a replacement housing elsewhere.

(Reference: General Plan, BDR/GIS, County Code, project/parcel files)

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

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

(Reference: General Plan, County Code Chapters 8, 13 & 18, project/parcel files)

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. <b>RECREATION.</b> Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. This application proposes a new winery, including construction of new winery facilities and systems, new on-site employment, tours and tastings by appointment, and a number of marketing events. No portion of this project, nor any foreseeable result thereof, would significantly increase the use of existing recreational facilities.
- b. This project does not include new recreational facilities of any description.

(Reference: General Plan, BDR/GIS, project/parcel files)

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</b> Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system 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. SR 29/128 currently operates at a Level of Service (LOS) D. The applicant has submitted traffic data which identifies that the proposed winery hours (9:30 am to 6:30 pm), days of operation (seven days per week), the number of employees (14), the winery's Tours/Tastings Plan (25 persons maximum per day with catered food) and the Marketing Plan with catered food (2-25 person events per month, 2-50 person events per month, 2-100 person events per year, and a wine action with 25 persons) will contribute to 39 daily trips in SR 29/128's overall traffic. Furthermore, the cave and portal construction will generate approximately +/- 14,000 cubic yards. The applicant proposes to dispose of the spoils either on-site or hauled off-site to Clover Flats or another location, or a combination of the two methods. Based on the excavation truck trip generation data submitted by the applicant, the total number of trips generated by this construction effort is 60 trips over a period of 10 months (cave and portal construction – 32 trips over 20 days; drilling of the winery caves over nine months – 28 trips).

The General Plan EIRs anticipates a cumulative traffic increase and service level changes to SR 29/128 as existing wineries expand and/or new wineries are added over the next 20 years. The Department of Public Works has reviewed this data and recommends approval of the project on the basis that the traffic volumes are below the threshold that would impact SR 29/128, and since a left turn storage lane has already been constructed on SR 29/128 from Lodi Lane to the entrance of the winery parcel (APN 022-070-028) and the St. Helena Outlet/Marketplace parcel (APN 022-070-025), as well as, an acceleration and a deceleration lane to facilitate west-bound and east-bound traffic turning into both properties. There will be no residual individually or cumulatively significant traffic impacts associated with this project as regards traffic congestion and levels of service.

c. The proposed project would not result in any change to air traffic patterns.

d/e. The proposed winery access will remain at the current residential access entrance on SR 29/128. The existing residential access will be improved by road design/alignment, appropriately surfaced to support winery vehicles and emergency vehicles. Furthermore, the proposed gated access will be located approximately 55 feet from the eastern property line bordering the St. Helena Outlets/Marketplace, and will not interfere with traffic circulation from SR29/121 when the winery is closed for business. The Department of Public Works has reviewed this request and recommends approval of the proposed project with standard conditions based on existing environmental and

physical constraints. The Napa County Fire Marshall has also reviewed this application and has likewise identified no significant impacts related to emergency vehicle access provided that standard conditions of approval are incorporated. Project impacts related to traffic hazards and emergency access are expected to be less than significant.

- f. The proposed project proposes 14 parking spaces and one loading area sufficient for proposed winery hours of operation, number of employees and visitors, routine operations and maintenance of the winery and vineyard. Valet service will be utilized to accommodate marketing events. The Department of Public Works has reviewed the winery's existing parking layout and recommends approval with standard conditions. Through implementation of these conditions, the project will have adequate parking and will not conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-23, so as to cause potentially significant environmental impacts.
- g. There is no aspect of this proposed project that would conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.

(References: General Plan, BDR/GIS layers: roads, County Road & Streets Standards, project/parcel files.)

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

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

Discussion:

a-g. The proposed project includes construction of on-site, project serving water, wastewater and storm drainage facilities. Existing ground water wells will be the source of water, and the project has been designed and conditioned to meet public drinking water standards. A subsurface drip irrigation septic system will be installed to accommodate domestic and winery wastewater, which was designed by a license septic engineer and evaluated by registered health specialist with the County's Environmental Management Department. The proposed system is properly sized to serve the development, and project site conditions can adequately accommodate the improvements. Minor changes to the existing, generally natural site drainage will occur with the new improvements. In the vicinity of the winery structure and parking areas, storm water drainage facilities have been proposed which have been designed by a licensed civil engineer and evaluated by County Public Work's civil engineers, and found to comply with County standards. The project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the project's demands. The project will comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, less than significant effects are anticipated with respect to (a-g).

(Reference: General Plan, County Code Chapters 8 & 13, project/parcel files)

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. With the mitigation measures included in **Biological Resources**, the project would have a less than significant impact on wildlife resources. The majority of the property will remain in the generally undeveloped, forested state as currently exists. The proposed project will occur on the lower eastern portion of the site in the vicinity where of existing improvements. Existing vegetation, including several native oaks, will be removed where the winery and new vineyard are being placed, but with the mitigation measures included, the project will not result in a significant impact, either individually or cumulatively. The project would not result in a significant loss of native trees, native vegetation, or important examples of California's history or pre-history.
- b. As discussed above and in particular under **Air Quality, Biological Resources, Transportation/Traffic, and Population and Housing** the proposed project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. The project will result in additional traffic entering and existing SR 29/128, but these trips will occur at an existing improved intersection that contains a protected left turn lane. This left turn pocket was sized to accommodate traffic for the adjoining commercial center that shares this driveway intersection with SR 29/128. Under the Napa County General Plan, traffic volumes are projected to increase on SR 29/128, as with all other arterial roadways within Napa County. The increase in vehicle volumes on the local roadway network will be caused by a combination of locally generated traffic from new development as well as general regional growth. Much of the forecasted increases in traffic will result of traffic generated outside of unincorporated Napa County from sources in adjoining counties and from within the cities within Napa County. The proposed project will contribute a small amount toward this general overall increase. Given the visitation and production levels proposed for the facility are rather minor when compared to other forms of growth (subdivisions and shopping centers), the increase in traffic resulting from the project is consequently considered to not contribute significantly to known, anticipated future significant traffic impacts. In addition, unlike most other forms of development that are contributing to cumulative traffic impacts, this winery (as is the case with all other post Winery Definition Ordinance wineries), is subject to conducting visitation and marketing on a pre-arranged appointment basis only, which allows such activities to occur outside of peak traffic congestion periods. The project's contribution to air pollution is primarily caused by new vehicle trips. The proposed additional traffic is quite minimal and will not result in a discernible change to air quality, nor contribute significantly to potential cumulative air quality impacts. Likewise, increases in employment resulting from the project are also quite minimal and will not contribute discernibly to the need for additional housing. As discussed in item 'a.' above and in the Biological Resources section, mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project which will result in no significant impacts occurring to resources.
- c. There are no environmental effects caused by this project that would result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, whether directly or indirectly. No hazardous conditions resulting from this project have been identified. The project would not have any environmental effects that would result in significant impacts.

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required. See mitigation measures for Biological Resources.