

“D”

Initial Study/Negative Declaration

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

Initial Study Checklist  
(form updated January 2019)

1. **Project Title:** Caldwell Vineyards Major Modification #P17-00074
2. **Property Owner/Applicant:** Caldwell Vineyards, LLC, 1558 Silverado Trail, Napa, CA 94558
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Wynntress Balcher, (707) 299-1351, [wynntress.balcher@countyofnapa.org](mailto:wynntress.balcher@countyofnapa.org)
4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):** A ±42.96 acre parcel at the terminus of Kreuzer Lane; 270 Kreuzer Lane, Napa; APN: 045-310-056 and 045-310-055
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Thomas Adams, Esq, 1455 First Street Ste 301, Napa, CA 94559, (707) 252-7122  
TADAMS@dpf-law.com
6. **General Plan description:** AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space)
7. **Zoning:** AW (Agricultural Watershed)
8. **Background/Project History:**

The Planning Commission (Commission) approved Use Permit #03318-UP on December 15, 2004 to establish a 25,000 gallon/year winery. The approval included a requirement that a minimum of 50% of the total production capacity (12,500) gallons must be processed from grapes grown on the property or in the immediate vicinity of the winery parcel. Immediate vicinity was identified as vineyards accessed by driving along Kreuzer Lane and that would otherwise have their grapes removed from this area along the existing private roadway and Kreuzer Lane located in the vicinity of the winery parcel. Custom crush activities were also approved for a maximum 10,000 gallons, but at least 5,000 gallons of the custom crush wine was required to be processed from grapes grown on vineyards in the immediate vicinity of the winery parcel. All winery activities were approved to occur within a 16,970 ft<sup>2</sup> cave; no outdoor winery activities were approved. No tasks were authorized outside the caves. By appointment retail sales and tours and tastings were approved, with a maximum visitor total of eight (8) persons per day, not to exceed 40 per week. A marketing plan was approved for 10 promotional tours, tastings and meal events per year with a maximum of 10 people at each event; two (2) release events per year with a maximum of 60 people at each event; and one (1) wine auction event with a maximum of 50 people. The conditions of approval included a notification requirement of 60 days prior notice to the owners of parcels 045-310-045 and -047 for the two (2) release events and one wine auction event, and prior notification within a reasonable time after the events are scheduled. The conditions limit reoccurring and scheduled vehicle trips to and from the site for employees, deliveries and visitors to occur during PM peak traffic hours (4:00–6:00 pm) to the maximum extent possible.

Use Permit # P07-00039-VMM was approved by the Director on July 3, 2007 to expand the existing winery cave by 1,468 ft<sup>2</sup> to accommodate winery offices and bathrooms, for a total square feet of ±18,438 ft<sup>2</sup>. The offices are for use exclusively by winery staff and bathrooms for use by both winery staff and visitors.

Subject Use Permit P17-00074-MOD was originally submitted for consideration on February 24, 2017, requesting an increase in production to 35,000 gallons/year; increase in cave area; increase of nine employees; an increase of 52 daily visitors (increase 380 visitors/week); increase of 6 marketing events; extend visitation and retail sales until 6:00 pm; remove custom crush conditions; and construct an outdoor shade trellis for tastings. The project was heard by the Commission on January, 18, 2018, March 7, 2018, and October 17, 2018. At the third hearing for the project on October 17, 2018, another modification to the project was presented by the applicant to the Commission. Because the project representative requested that the hearing not be continued, which would have allowed staff time to review the new modifications to the project, the Commission denied the project.

An appeal of the Commission's action was heard by the Board of Supervisors on March 12, 2019. The Board remanded the project back

to the Commission, with direction to 1) consider a revised application that uses a seasonality approach to add a weekly maximum to visitation numbers, 2) consider a traffic monitoring program to work in conjunction with a visitor log monitoring program, 3) consider a phased-in approach to the requested volumes and the appropriateness of the scope of events during high fire season, and, 4) consider greater notification to neighbors and surrounding parcels for events.

9. **Description of Project:**

Approval of a Use Permit Modification for an existing winery to allow the following:

- a) increase the winery production capacity **from** 25,000 to 35,000 gallons per year;
- b) remove the condition of approval limiting the number of custom producers and activities;
- c) increase the number of employees **from** three (two full time and one part time) **to** 12 employees (six full time and 6 part time);
- d) increase the number of daily by-appointment visitation from a maximum 40/week (maximum 8/day) to varied seasonal weekly levels as follows:
  - 84 visitors/week during the **Low Season**-January, February, March and December;
  - 106 visitors/week during the **Mid Season**- May, June, July, and August;
  - 190 visitors/week during the **High Season**-April, September, October, November;
  - daily visitation shall not exceed 25 in the **Low Season**, or exceed **35** in the **Mid and High Seasons**;
  - The tasting room shall be **closed** on any days when Marketing Events are scheduled; and,
  - the maximum annual visitation shall be 6,250.
- e) modify the hours of by-appointment tasting hours **from** completion by 4:30 PM **to**:
  - 10:00 AM to 6:00 PM, six days a week during the **Low season** (January, February, March, December); and
  - 10:00 AM to 6:00 PM, seven days per week during the **Mid-season** (May, June, July, and August) and the **High season** (April, September, October, and, November).
- f) modify the Marketing Plan to increase events **from** 13 annual events **to**:
  - a Maximum 12 Very Small Events (up to 28 people each), 10:00 AM to 10:00 PM;
  - a Maximum 3 Small Events (up to 68 people each), 10:00 AM to 10:00 PM; and,
  - events may occur inside the tasting room; in the paved area in front of the cave; under the trellis shade area east of the cave, and in the gravel area below the cave.
- g) allow for on-site consumption of wines produced at the winery (AB 2004) within the tasting room, the paved areas in front of the cave, under the shade trellis on the paved area east of the cave entrance, and on the gravel area below the cave, in accordance with Business and Professions Code Section Sections 23358, 23390 and 2339.5;
- h) construct a 584 ft<sup>2</sup> trellis shade structure/outdoor picnic area for employees, tour drivers waiting for clients, and Marketing Events, east of the cave entrance;
- i) install traffic calming devices (such as "mumble" strips) on the private portion of Kreuzer Lane;
- i) increase the width of portions of the existing roadway;
- j) an exception to the Napa County Road and Street Standards (RSS) for the 680 foot section of the common access drive to allow a varied roadway width between 14 to 20 feet; and,
- k) construct a ±2,000 ft<sup>2</sup> permanent cover over the crush pad located in front of the cave.

The project does not include any expansion beyond the existing ±18,438 ft<sup>2</sup> winery cave nor any increase in the winery development area. The proposed trellis shade structure/outdoor picnic area is located on improved surface east of the cave currently used for bin storage.

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

The project property is located on the Mt. George USGS Quad at ±440 ft. MSL, about 1.5 miles east of the City of Napa, at the terminus of Kreuzer Lane. The land is moderately sloping, ranging from 15% to over 30%. An intermittent blue-line stream (Kreuse Creek) flows within a deeply incised west flowing drainage canyon located below the project site and access road. The project winery site is located within existing caves on the southeastern face of a hillside. Native vegetation includes oak woodland and riparian woodland vegetation, Valley Oak, Cottonwood, Coast Live Oak, Madrone, California Bay, Blue Oak, Black Oak, and Big Leaf Maple. Adjacent land uses are agriculture, large lot residential, and unimproved open space.

The geology consists of Pre-Quaternary deposits and bedrock overlain by Pliocene-Miocene Sonoma volcanics. A soil creep zone flows southwesterly near the east side of the access driveway for the lower parking area. Soil types include Sobrante loam 30%-50% slopes; Hambright rock-outcrop complex, 30 to 75 % slopes, rock outcrop. There is a very low hazard for liquefaction.

The Napa County Environmental Sensitivity maps indicate this parcel not is located within an environmentally sensitive area for plants, fish, geology, or biology. The parcel is developed with ± 30.32 acres of vineyards and a winery located within existing caves, an access driveway, and improved parking lot. The surrounding land uses include: agriculture (vineyards) and large lot residential uses to the north and west; the land is predominantly vacant forested open space to the east; and forested open space and large lot residential use on the property to the south. The closest residences are located ±1000 feet to the southwest and ±900 feet to the northwest of the existing winery cave. There is an automated gate at the terminus of Kreuzer Lane, beyond which the private access road is shared by the winery and ±5 residences beyond the gate to the winery. Four residence front the private road and the winery and two other residences take access to the road via paved driveways.

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

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

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

Other Agencies Contacted

Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control

Federal Trade and Taxation Bureau

12. **Tribal Cultural Resources.** Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resource, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

Notifications of Proposed Project Pursuant to PRC Code Section 210803.2 were forwarded to the three tribes who have requested notification on October 17, 2017. The Middletown Rancheria responded on October 27, 2017 with no comments but requested they be contacted if any evidence of human habitation is found as the project progresses. The Yoche Dehe Wintun tribe responded on December 5, 2017 requesting a site visit to the project area to evaluate their cultural concerns. A reply was sent to the tribe regarding the close of the consultation period (November 16, 2017), a copy of the project application materials were included for their information. The tribe is on the public notification list and a copy of the draft negative declaration for the project will be sent when posted. The applicant has been notified of the request for the site visit.

**Note:** Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:**

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature Wynne Anton Beck Date January 2, 2020

Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Napa County  
Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department

I.	AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	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) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

- a-c The project site is not located within view of a scenic vista or designated Viewshed road listed in the Scenic Highway Element of the Napa County General Plan. The project sits below a minor ridgeline, and, the cave portal and the proposed crush pad cover cannot be seen from any "designated scenic highway" listed in the Scenic Highway Element of the Napa County General Plan. The project site is located approximately .7 miles from the nearest public road (Kreuzer Lane ). The proposed crush pad cover is designed to complement the curves of the existing cave portals and will cover the existing apron of the fourth portal. There are no new structures proposed as part of this project that could have the potential to significantly affect the aesthetics of the site. The existing water tank will supply water protection water storage; no new tanks are proposed.
- d. The proposed project does not include outdoor improvements that would introduce additional source of lights that could significantly impact daytime or nighttime views of the area. The proposed expanded visiting hours are 10:00 am to 6:00 pm. The increase in visitors and events will not create substantial glare during the day. The project proposes that events will occur outdoors using a 580 ft² trellis shade structure east of the cave portals, the paved areas in front of the cave and the gravel area below the cave, where events will end at 10:00 pm, introducing additional light sources above what currently exists. The winery was permitted for only in-cave winery activities. The lighting for outdoor events would be minimal since the project is not proposing the installation of outdoor lighting and the potential for a significant light impact would be reduced with the standard Napa County conditions of approval for wineries, where outdoor lighting is required to be shielded and directed downwards, with only low-level lighting allowed in parking areas. As designed, and as subject to the standard condition of approval, below, the project will not have a significant impact resulting from new sources of outside lighting. In addition, the closest off-site residence is ±900 feet from the winery. Native oaks and oak tree plantings are located along the top of the bench in front of the cave portals. The tree that died in front of the receiving portal was replaced with another cork oak tree for screening.

**4.16 GENERAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE – LIGHTING, LANDSCAPING, PAINTING, OUTDOOR EQUIPMENT STORAGE, AND TRASH ENCLOSURE AREAS**

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

**6.3 LIGHTING – PLAN SUBMITTAL**

- a. Two (2) copies of a detailed lighting plan showing the location and specifications for all lighting fixtures to be installed on the property shall be submitted for Planning Division review and approval. All lighting shall comply with the CBC.
- b. All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward, shall be located as low to the ground as possible, shall be the minimum necessary for security, safety, or operations; on timers; and shall incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. All lighting shall be shielded or placed such that it does not shine directly on adjacent properties or impact vehicles on adjacent streets. No flood-lighting or sodium lighting of the building is permitted, including architectural highlighting and spotting. Low-level lighting shall be utilized in parking areas as opposed to elevated high intensity light standards. Lighting utilized during harvest activities is exempt from this requirement.

**Mitigation Measures:** None

II.	AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. <sup>1</sup> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	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/b/e. The project would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Important as shown on the Napa County Important Farmland Map 2002 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. There is no Williamson Act contract associated with the parcel. There are no other changes included in this proposal that would result in the conversion of Farmland beyond the immediate project site. General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policies AG/LU-2 and AG/LU-13 recognize wineries, and any use consistent with the Winery Definition Ordinance and clearly accessory to a winery, as agriculture. As a result, this application would not result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use.
- c/d. The project site is zoned Agricultural Watershed (AW), which allows wineries and expansions upon grant of a use permit, and is not located within an area zoned for timberland production. According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps (based on the following layers – Sensitive Biotic Oak Woodlands, Sensitive Biotic Riparian Woodland Forest and Coniferous Forest) the southwestern portion of the project property contains a designated Sensitive Biotic Oak Woodland. The project site, existing winery caves, parking areas, and access driveway, are located to the north of this sensitive area and no land disturbing activities will occur within the areas designated Sensitive Biotic Oak Woodland. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to no-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality or other public benefits. The proposed project will not have an impact on forest resources, have conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland.

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

**Mitigation Measures:** None Required

III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) Board of Directors unanimously adopted thresholds of significance to assist in the review of projects under the California Environmental Quality Act. These Thresholds are designed to establish the level at which BAAQMD believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA and were posted on BAAQMD's website and included in BAAQMD's updated CEQA Guidelines (updated May 2012). The Thresholds are advisory and may be followed by local agencies at their own discretion.

The Thresholds were challenged in court. Following litigation in the trial court, the court of appeal, and the California Supreme Court, all of the Thresholds were upheld. However, in an opinion issued on December 17, 2015, the California Supreme Court held that CEQA does not generally require an analysis of the impacts of locating development in areas subject to environmental hazards unless the project would exacerbate existing environmental hazards. The Supreme Court also found that CEQA requires the analysis of exposing people to environmental hazards in specific circumstances, including the location of development near airports, schools near sources of toxic contamination, and certain exemptions for infill and workforce housing. The Supreme Court also held that public agencies remain free to conduct this analysis regardless of whether it is required by CEQA.

In view of the Supreme Court's opinion, local agencies may rely on Thresholds designed to reflect the impact of locating development near areas of toxic air contamination where such an analysis is required by CEQA or where the agency has determined that such an analysis would assist in making a decision about the project. However, the Thresholds are not mandatory and agencies should apply them only after determining that they reflect an appropriate measure of a project's impacts. These Guidelines may inform environmental review for development projects in the Bay Area, but do not commit local governments or BAAQMD to any specific course of regulatory action.

BAAQMD published a new version of the Guidelines dated May 2017, which includes revisions made to address the Supreme Court's opinion. The May 2017 Guidelines update does not address outdated references, links, analytical methodologies or other technical information that may be in the Guidelines or Thresholds Justification Report. The Air District is currently working to revise any outdated information in the Guidelines as part of its update to the CEQA Guidelines and thresholds of significance.

a-b. The mountains bordering Napa Valley block much of the prevailing northwesterly winds throughout the year. Sunshine is plentiful in Napa County, and summertime can be very warm in the valley, particularly in the northern end. Winters are usually mild, with cool temperatures overnight and mild-to-moderate temperatures during the day. Wintertime temperatures tend to be slightly cooler in the northern end of the valley. Winds are generally calm throughout the county. Annual precipitation averages range from about 24 inches in low elevations to more than 40 inches in the mountains.

Ozone and fine particle pollution, or PM2.5, are the major regional air pollutants of concern in the San Francisco Bay Area. Ozone is primarily a problem in the summer, and fine particle pollution in the winter. In Napa County, ozone rarely exceeds health standards, but PM2.5 occasionally does reach unhealthy concentrations. There are multiple reasons for PM2.5 exceedances in Napa County. First, much of the county is wind-sheltered, which tends to trap PM2.5 within the Napa Valley. Second, much of the area is well north of the moderating temperatures of San Pablo Bay and, as a result, Napa County experiences some of the coldest nights in the Bay Area. This

leads to greater fireplace use and, in turn, higher PM2.5 levels. Finally, in the winter easterly winds often move fine-particle-laden air from the Central Valley to the Carquinez Strait and then into western Solano and southern Napa County (BAAQMD, In Your Community: Napa County, April 2016)

The impacts associated with implementation of the project were evaluated consistent with guidance provided by BAAQMD. Ambient air quality standards have been established by state and federal environmental agencies for specific air pollutants most pervasive in urban environments. These pollutants are referred to as criteria air pollutants because the standards established for them were developed to meet specific health and welfare criteria set forth in the enabling legislation. The criteria air pollutants emitted by development, traffic and other activities anticipated under the proposed development include ozone, ozone precursors oxides of nitrogen and reactive organic gases (NOx and ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO2), and suspended particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5). Other criteria pollutants, such as lead and sulfur dioxide (SO2), would not be substantially emitted by the proposed development or traffic, and air quality standards for them are being met throughout the Bay Area.

BAAQMD has not officially recommended the use of its thresholds in CEQA analyses and CEQA ultimately allows lead agencies the discretion to determine whether a particular environmental impact would be considered significant, as evidenced by scientific or other factual data. BAAQMD also states that lead agencies need to determine appropriate air quality thresholds to use for each project they review based on substantial evidence that they include in the administrative record of the CEQA document. One resource BAAQMD provides as a reference for determining appropriate thresholds is the *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines* developed by its staff in 2010 and as updated through May 2017. These guidelines outline substantial evidence supporting a variety of thresholds of significance.

As mentioned above, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Operational-Related Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursors Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. Given the size of the entire winery project, the construction of a ±2,000 ft<sup>2</sup> cover over the existing paved area of the grape receiving/crush area before a portal of the existing ±18,438ft<sup>2</sup> winery cave, the proposed physical improvements to the winery compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47,000 square feet (high quality restaurant) and 541,000 square feet (general light industry) for NOX (oxides of nitrogen), the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. (Please note: a high quality restaurant is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, but grossly overstates emissions associated with other portions of a winery, such as office, barrel storage and production, which generate fewer vehicle trips. Therefore, a general light industry comparison has also been used for other such uses.)

The project falls well below the screening criteria as noted above, and consequently will not significantly affect air quality individually or contribute considerably to any cumulative air quality impacts.

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

#### 7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

##### c. AIR QUALITY

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

1. *Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. The BAAQMD's phone number shall also be visible.*
2. *Water all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) two times per day.*
3. *Cover all haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site.*
4. *Remove all visible mud or dirt traced onto adjacent public roads by using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.*
5. *All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.*
6. *All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.*

7. *Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting off equipment when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five (5) minutes (as required by State Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.*
8. *All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator. Any portable engines greater than 50 horsepower or associated equipment operated within the BAAQMD's jurisdiction shall have either a California Air Resources Board (ARB) registration Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) or a BAAQMD permit. For general information regarding the certified visible emissions evaluator or the registration program, visit the ARB FAQ [http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/perp/perpfact\\_04-16-15.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/perp/perpfact_04-16-15.pdf) or the PERP website <http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/portable.htm>."*

Furthermore, while earthmoving and construction on the site will generate dust particulates in the short-term, the impact would be less than significant with dust control measures as specified in Napa County's standard condition of approval relating to dust:

7.1 **SITE IMPROVEMENTS**

b. **DUST CONTROL**

*Water and/or dust palliatives shall be applied in sufficient quantities during grading and other ground disturbing activities onsite to minimize the amount of dust produced. Outdoor construction activities shall not occur when average wind speeds exceed 20 mph.*

While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. The closest residences are located ±1000 feet to the southwest and ±900 feet to the northwest of the existing winery cave. Construction-phase pollutants would be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. The project would not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

IV.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
- 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?

**Discussion:**

- a/b. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers - plants CNPS points & polygons, plant surveys, red legged frog core area and critical habitat, vernal pools & vernal pool species, Spotted Owl Habitat – 1.5 mile buffer and known fish presence) no known candidate, sensitive, or special status species have been identified as occurring within the project boundaries. The intermittent blue-line stream traversing the property has not been identified for a known fish presence as it is noted on the maps as artificially blocked. Therefore, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any special status species, or species of particular concern. As discussed in Section I above, the proposal and associated construction are minimal with no significant grading or tree removal required. Furthermore, there were no species or site conditions which would be considered essential for the support of a species with limited distribution or be considered to be a sensitive natural plant community. The potential for this project to have a significant impact on special status species is not very probable.
- c/d. There are no wetlands on the property or on the neighboring properties that would be affected by this project; no construction of walls or fences are proposed and no activities are proposed in or near Kreuse Creek. Therefore, project activities will not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with their corridors or nursery sites, because no sensitive natural communities have been identified on the property. The project as proposed would have no impact to biological resources.
- e/f. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans or other similar plans in effect for this area that would be affected by this project. The project would require minimal improvements adjacent to the existing road and driveway, and the activities would have a less than significant impact.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

V.	CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to 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)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

- a-c. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology surveys, sites, sensitive areas, and flags) no historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified on the property. Based on the location of the winery activities within an existing cave and minimal road widening improvements proposed, there would be no impact to cultural resources. However, if resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval:

**7.2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL FINDING**

*"In the event that archeological artifacts or human remains are discovered during construction, work shall cease in a 50-foot radius surrounding the area of discovery. The permittee shall contact the PBES Department for further guidance, which will likely include the requirement for the permittee to hire a qualified professional to analyze the artifacts encountered and to determine if additional measures*

are required. If human remains are encountered during project development, all work in the vicinity must be halted, and the Napa County Coroner informed, so that the Coroner can determine if an investigation of the cause of death is required, and if the remains are of Native American origin. If the remains are of Native American origin, the permittee shall comply with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 5097.98."

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

VI.	ENERGY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would comply with Title 24 energy use requirements and would not result in significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency because there are no plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

VII.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Discussion:**

- a. The project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
- i) Known faults: There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.
  - ii) Strong seismic ground shaking: All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
  - iii) Seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction: No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Compliance with the latest editions of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.
  - iv) Landslides: According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) there is a landslide creep located on a slope southeast of the existing cave portal and parking lots, however no improvements are proposed near this slide area and the road improvement activities would not have any impact on existing unstable lands.
- b. The proposed development will involve minimal grading improvements to the existing roadbed to increase the width of the existing access roads in compliance with the Napa County Road and Street Standards (NCRSS). Winery improvements will occur within the caves. The proposed crush pad cover and the trellis require very minimal improvements. Based upon the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (soils) the project access road is located on Hambright rock-outcrop complex; Sobrante loam, and rock outcrop soils, which have medium to very rapid runoff and slight to high erosion hazard. The project will require incorporation of best management practices and will be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment, erosion control measures and dust control, reducing potential soil loss concern to a level of insignificance.
- c. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the project site has low risk for liquefaction. The area of the caves is relatively flat, although the access to the cave is down a gently sloping roadway. Besides the small trellis and the permanent crush pad cover, there are no proposed structures with this project and no expansion of the winery within the existing cave.
- d. The Hambright Rock outcrop complex and the Sobrante loam soils are not considered expansive and would not create substantial risks to life or property.
- e. No expansion of the waste disposal system is proposed and the Wastewater Analysis Study submitted with the project does not indicate any failure of the soils supporting the existing system. The existing system can accommodate the increase in visitation, employees and marketing activities.
- f. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology surveys, sites, sensitive areas, and flags) no historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified on the property. Based on the location of the winery activities within an existing cave and minimal road widening improvements proposed, there would be no impact to cultural resources.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

VIII.	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Generate a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions in excess of applicable thresholds adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District or the California Air Resources Board which may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Conflict with a county-adopted climate action plan or another applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

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

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

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

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

In 2011, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) released California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Project Screening Criteria and Significance of Thresholds [1,100 metric tons per year (MT) of carbon dioxide and carbon dioxide equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e)]. This threshold of significance is appropriate for evaluating projects in Napa County.

During our ongoing planning effort, the County requires project applicants to consider methods to reduce GHG emissions consistent with Napa County General Plan Policy CON-65(e). (Note: Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, because this initial study assesses a project that is consistent with an adopted General Plan for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was prepared, it appropriately focuses on impacts which are "peculiar to the project," rather than the cumulative impacts previously assessed.) For the purposes of this analysis potential GHG emissions associated with winery 'construction' and 'development' and with 'ongoing' winery operations have been discussed.

GHGs are the atmospheric gases whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for the greenhouse effect, including carbon dioxide, methane, ozone, and the fluorocarbons, that contribute to climate change (a widely accepted theory/science explain human effects on the atmosphere). Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) gas, the principal greenhouse gas (GHG) being emitted by human activities, and whose concentration

in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity, also serves as the reference gas to compare other greenhouse gases. Agricultural sources of carbon emissions include forest clearing, land-use changes, biomass burning, and farm equipment and management activity emissions ([http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/glossary/letter\\_c.html](http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/glossary/letter_c.html)). Equivalent Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>e) is the most commonly reported type of GHG emission and a way to get one number that approximates total emissions from all the different gasses that contribute to GHG (BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2017). In this case, carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) is used as the reference atom/compound to obtain atmospheric carbon CO<sub>2</sub> effects of GHG. Carbon stocks are converted to carbon dioxide equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e) by multiplying the carbon total by 44/12 (or 3.67), which is the ratio of the atomic mass of a carbon dioxide molecule to the atomic mass of a carbon atom (<http://www.nciasi2.org/COLE/index.html>).

One time "Construction Emissions" associated with the project include: i) emissions associated with the energy used to install and develop and prepare support post holes for the crush pad cover; and, ii) emission associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the areas for widening the existing road, construction, construction equipment and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as Equipment Emissions). As previously stated, this project includes only the installation of an overhead cover over an existing concrete slab for crush and deliveries and the construction of road widening improvements to the existing access driveway. No other construction is proposed.

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

As discussed in the Air Quality section of this Initial Study, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors & GHG Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, including GHG emissions, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. However, the existing winery is located solely within a cave, with no increase in floor area proposed as part of this project, and compared to the BAAQMD's GHG screening criteria of 121,000 square feet for general industrial, and compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 9,000 square feet for high quality restaurant, the project was determined not to exceed the 1,100 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr GHG threshold of significance.

Furthermore, the applicant has indicated that the project incorporates the following voluntary best management practices: intend to use energy conserving lighting and connect to recycled water and already do: energy star roof/living roof/cool roof; connection to recycled water; install water efficient fixtures; low impact development; water efficient landscape; recycle 75% of all waste; compost 75% food and garden material; implement a sustainable purchasing and shipping programs; site design that is oriented and designed to optimize conditions for natural heating, cooling, and day lighting of interior spaces, and to maximize winter sun exposure, such as a cave; limit the amount of grading and tree removal during construction of the required access road improvements; local food production; education to staff and visitors on sustainable practices; use 70-80% cover crop; and retain biomass removed via pruning and thinning by chipping the material and reusing it rather than burning on-site. All winery activities are conducted within an existing cave which has been oriented to the south where the four portal entries are shaded by trees.

The proposed project has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds and determined that the project would not exceed the 1,100 MT/yr of CO<sub>2</sub>e. GHG Emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the Cal Green Building Code, tightened vehicle fuel efficiency standards, and more project-specific on-site programs including those winery features noted above would combine to further reduce emissions below BAAQMD thresholds. As indicated above, the County is currently preparing a CAP and as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP has released Final Technical Memorandum #1 (2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016). Table 1 of the Technical Memorandum indicates that 2% of the County's GHG emissions in 2014 were a result of land use change.

The increase in emissions expected as a result of the project would be relatively modest and the project is in compliance with the County's efforts to reduce emissions as described above. For these reasons, project impacts related to GHG emissions are considered less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required

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

**Discussion:**

- a. The proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts normally used in winery operations. A Business Plan will be filed with the Environmental Health Division should the amount of hazardous materials reach reportable levels. However, in the event that the proposed use or a future use involves the use, storage or transportation of greater than 55 gallons or 500 pounds of hazardous materials, a use permit and subsequent environmental assessment would be required in accordance with the Napa County Zoning Ordinance prior to the establishment of the use. During construction of the project some hazardous materials, such as building coatings/ adhesives/ etc., will be utilized. However, given the quantities of hazardous materials and the limited duration, they will result in a less-than-significant impact.
- b. As noted above, the project will not involve the transportation of hazardous materials in quantities that would not result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site.
- d. Based on a search of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control database, the project site does not contain any known EPA, National Priority List sites, State response sites, voluntary cleanup sites, or any school cleanup sites. No impact would occur as the project site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.
- e. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan, or where a plan has been adopted, and is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.
- f. The proposed project will not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. The project will include improvements to the sight distances for the neighbor with a blind driveway on Kreuzer Lane, with the installation of traffic calming devices which will improve road safety, and the increase in width will improve emergency access and evacuation routes.

- g. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Fire Hazard Severity), the project is located within the State Responsibility Area (Napa County SRA) and designated a moderate fire hazard area, and the project could expose people directly or indirectly increase exposure of people to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. The project includes an evacuation plan in the event of wildland fires. The project has been reviewed by the Napa County Fire Marshall who recommended approval of the project subject to applicable conditions related to fire sprinklers; maximum occupancy limitations; water storage with sufficient fire flow, fire pumps, fire service mains, fire hydrants, adequate access and access road, and defensible space (10' along roads and 100' around structures). Application of the conditions of approval required by the Fire Marshal will serve to reduce potential significant adverse fire impacts to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

X.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 or through the addition of impervious surfaces which would:				
i)	result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii)	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"/>
iii)	create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv)	impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

- a. The project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements nor substantially deplete local groundwater supplies. The project's development plans indicate the existing system is adequate and able to accommodate the increase in waste disposal from the increase in production, employees and visitation. The Napa County Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the proposed domestic and process wastewater systems and recommends approval as conditioned. If the system is found to

be inadequate the system would be expanded into the existing reserve area and thus no significant adverse impact would result. Additionally, any earth disturbing activities would be subject to the County's Stormwater Ordinance which would include measures to prevent erosion, sediment, and waste materials from entering waterways both during and after any construction activities. Given the County's Best Management Practices, which comply with RWQCB requirements, the project does not have the potential to significantly impact or violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality.

On January 14, 2014, Governor Jerry Brown declared a drought emergency in the state of California. That declaration was followed up on April 1, 2015, when the Governor directed the State Water Resources Control Board to implement mandatory water reductions in cities and town across California to reduce water usage by 25 percent. These water restrictions do not apply to agricultural users. However, on April 7, 2017, Governor Jerry Brown signed an executive order lifting California's drought emergency in all but four counties (Fresno, Kings, Tulare and Tuolumne). The County of Napa had not adopted or implemented any additional mandatory water use restrictions. The County requires all discretionary permit applicants to complete necessary water analyses in order to document that sufficient water supplies are available for the proposed project and to implement water saving measures to prepare for periods of limited water supply and to conserve limited groundwater resources.

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

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

The subject properties are located within in both the Napa Valley Floor MST subarea and within the Eastern Mountain subarea of Napa County according to the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2013. The County has no record of problems or complaints of diminished groundwater supplies at the project site well, but there are reports in the general vicinity, within the MST designated area wells.

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

The well serving the project is located on the winery parcel, APN: 045-310-056, a ±42.96 acre parcel, but the well also serves parcel APN: 045-310-055, a ±40.11, planted in vineyards supplying the winery. Based upon the current County Water Availability Analysis (WAA) Screening Criteria Applicability, the project water source is located in an area categorized as "all other areas", and therefore water use criteria is parcel specific based upon a Tier 2 analysis. A Tier 2 analysis was completed by CMP Civil Engineering & Land Surveying, dated January 20, 2017, which included a parcel specific recharge evaluation. According to the recharge evaluation, groundwater recharge at the subject parcel is estimated to be 24.92 af/yr.

Although the winery and vineyards are physically located in the mapped MST, the project water source well is located outside the mapped MST. According to the County's WAA, determining the total water demand based on multiple contiguous parcels is acceptable, however, to protect future property owners, certain safeguards must be in place to ensure that the water allotment and transfer between parcels is clearly documented and recorded. The Environmental Health Division has included a condition that the existing well located on parcel APN: 045-310-055 cannot be used as a back-up source for the winery, since the construction standards do not meet the requirements for a well serving a small public water system required for the winery, and since such well is located within the MST deficient groundwater basin.

- b. An existing well was constructed at the site (APN: 045-310-056) in 2004 and serves the winery and the vineyard property (APN:045-310-055). According to the WAA report, the well produces 91 GPM, and calculates that the total water available for the 83.07 acres is **24.92 AF/YR**. The analysis indicates that the existing total water demand is **17.14 AF/YR**, specifically:

<i>EXISTING PARCEL WATER DEMAND</i>	
	<i>Acre feet per year</i>
<i>Winery Processing – 25,000 gallons</i>	<i>0.38</i>
<i>Domestic and Landscaping:</i>	<i>--</i>
<i>Employees (2 full-time/1 part-time )</i>	<i>0.04</i>
<i>Visitors (8 per day)</i>	<i>0.03</i>
<i>Marketing visitors (270/yr)</i>	<i>0.002</i>
<i>Landscaping</i>	<i>0.08</i>
<i>Vineyard (±30.32 ac) Irrigation</i>	<i>9.10</i>
<i>Vineyard (±30.32 ac) Heat protection</i>	<i>7.58</i>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>17.14</b>

The analysis concluded that the projected water demand for the project is **17.47 AF/YR**, specifically:

<i>PROPOSED PARCEL WATER DEMAND</i>	
	<i>Acre feet per year</i>
<i>Winery Processing – 35,000 gallons</i>	<i>0.54</i>
<i>Employees (6 full-time/6 Part-time)</i>	<i>0.17</i>
<i>Visitors (35 daily)*</i>	<i>0.07</i>
<i>Marketing Visitors (1040/yr)</i>	<i>0.01</i>
<i>Vineyard (±30.32 ac) Irrigation</i>	<i>9.10</i>
<i>Vineyard (±30.32 ac) Heat protection</i>	<i>7.58</i>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>17.47</b>

It should be noted that the project description regarding the number of visitors has been changed from a prior project description of 60 to a maximum 35 per day, and that the tasting room would be closed for visitation during any marketing events,. Thus there would be a less water usage for the project. However, the applicant will be limited to the amount specified in the WAA prepared for the project.

As a result of the foregoing, annual water demand for this parcel would increase 0.33 af/yr, from 17.14 af/yr. to 17.47 af/yr. Based on the figures shown in the WAA engineer's report, the project would remain below the rate of recharge use on the parcel of 24.92 af/yr. Based upon the County's Water Availability Guidelines, a Tier 2 Well and Spring Evaluation is required to determine whether a potential impact may occur. The Tier 2 well and spring interference criterion are presumptively met if there are no non-project wells within 500 feet of the existing well and no natural springs in use for domestic or agricultural use located within 1500 feet of the existing well. The WAA included the Tier 2 analysis and found that there are no wells located within 500 feet of the existing well utilized by the project winery and vineyards and no springs are located in within 1500 feet. Based on the Tier 2 well and spring interference criteria being satisfied, the project will have a less than significant effect on groundwater sources.

- c. The proposed project will not substantially alter the drainage pattern on the site nor cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off site. The installation of the proposed crush pad cover will serve to implement the County stormwater protection regulations, reducing any impact in the release of potential polluted stormwater runoff to a level of insignificance. There are no existing or planned stormwater systems that would be affected by this project. If the project disturbs more than one acre of land, the permittee will be required to comply with the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board addressing stormwater pollution during construction activities. The project site includes vineyards, landscaping and other pervious areas that have the capacity to absorb runoff.
- d. The site lies outside the boundaries of the 100 and 500 year flood hazard boundaries. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. No impacts would occur.
- e. The proposed project would not conflict with a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan because there are no such plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required

XI.	LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

a. The proposed project is located in an area dominated by agricultural, open space and rural residences. The proposed use and the improvements proposed here are in support of the ongoing agricultural use on the property, and this project will not divide an established community.

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

The 2008 Napa County General Plan ensures that every important land use decision will be scrutinized and assessed for its potential to affect the quality of life, the environment we live in, the ability to farm, process agricultural products, and get those products to market. The Agricultural Land Use Goal AG/LU-1 is to preserve existing agricultural land uses and plan for agriculture and related activities as the primary land use; and Land Use Goal AG/LU-3 is to support the economic viability of agriculture, including grape growing, winemaking, other types of agriculture, and supporting industries to ensure the preservation of agricultural lands. The project would allow for the continuation of agriculture as a dominant land use within the county and is fully consistent with the Napa County General Plan.

Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU 1 of the 2008 General Plan states "agriculture and related activities are the primary land uses in Napa County" and Land Use Policy AG-LU-2 states that: "agriculture" is defined as the raising of crops, trees, and livestock; the production and processing of agricultural products; and the related marketing, sales, and other accessory uses..." The property's General Plan land use designation is AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space), which allows "agriculture, processing of agricultural products, and single-family dwellings." The proposed use of the property to expand an existing winery for the "fermenting and processing of grape juice into wine" (NCC §18.08.640) utilizing the existing grapes grown on the project parcel and other Napa County grapes owned by the applicant supports the continuation of agriculture as a dominant land use within the County. Further, the project supports the economic viability of agriculture consistent with the General Plan Economic Development Policy E-1, "The County's economic development will focus on ensuring the continued viability of agriculture in Napa County."

**Mitigation Measures:** None Required.

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

**Discussion:**

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

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

XIII.	NOISE. Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project 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)	Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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"/>

**Discussion:**

a/b. The project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during the grading activities associated with construction of the access driveway improvements and the installation of the crush pad cover. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours, occurring during the period of 7 am-7 pm on weekdays, normal hours of human activity, and will use properly muffled vehicles. All construction activities shall be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). All construction activities shall be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16), reducing the potential adverse impact to a less than significant level. The standard noise condition of approval applied to use permits to address the construction noise is as follows:

**"7.3 CONSTRUCTION NOISE**

*Construction noise shall be minimized to the greatest extent practical and feasible under State and local safety laws, consistent with construction noise levels permitted by the General Plan Community Character Element and the County Noise Ordinance. Construction equipment muffling and hours of operation shall be in compliance with the County Code. Equipment shall be shut down when not in use. Construction equipment shall normally be staged, loaded, and unloaded on the project site, if at all practicable. If project terrain or access road conditions require construction equipment to be staged, loaded, or unloaded off the project site (such as on a neighboring road or at the base of a hill), such activities shall only occur daily between the hours of 8 am to 5 pm."*

The standard condition also addresses noisy winery equipment which requires such machinery be enclosed or muffled and maintained so as not to create a noise disturbance and must comply with the County Code Noise Ordinance (Chapter 8.16). The project does not propose any changes to the existing equipment. Since the project proposes that some visitation and marketing events will occur outside of the caves, potential noise from loud music is addressed by the condition which prohibits the use of amplified sound systems or amplified music outdoors. The closest residences are located ±900 feet from the cave and outdoor areas. Any outdoor activities by tours and tasting visitors would be limited to business hours and the marketing events (maximum 68 guests) which may generate an increase in the ambient noise levels from voices and unamplified music are limited in number (15 events) and will end by 10:00 pm.

**"4.10 AMPLIFIED MUSIC**

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

The proposed construction grading would not result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibrations or ground born noise levels greater than those created by general farm plowing activities. By addressing the potential adverse impacts indicated above, the proposed project will not result in a significant adverse noise impact.

c. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

XIV.	POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Induce substantial unplanned 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 people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

a. There are modest increases in overall employment by the winery by four full time and five part time employees. The Association of Bay Area Governments' *Projections 2003* figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase some 23% by the year 2030 (*Napa County Baseline Data Report*, November 30, 2005). Additionally, the County's *Baseline Data Report* indicates that total housing units currently programmed in county and municipal housing elements exceed ABAG growth projections by approximately 15%. The additional four full-time and five part-time employee positions which are part of this project will most likely lead to some population growth in Napa County. However, relative to the County's projected low to moderate growth rate and overall adequate programmed housing supply, that population growth does not rise to a level of environmental significance. In addition, the project will be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs.

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

b. This project will not require the removal of housing or displacement of existing people, and will therefore not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

XV.	PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	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:				
	i) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- iii) Schools?
- iv) Parks?
- v) Other public facilities?

**Discussion:**

- a. Public services are currently provided to the project area, and as the winery has been in full operation, the additional demand placed on existing services would be marginal. Fire protection measures are required as part of the development pursuant to Napa County Fire Marshall conditions and there will be no foreseeable impact to emergency response times with the adoption of standard conditions of approval. The Fire Department and the Engineering Services Division have reviewed the application and recommend approval as conditioned. School impact mitigation fees, which assist local school districts with capacity building measures, will be levied pursuant to building permit submittal. The proposed project will have little to no impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from any building permit fees, property tax increases, and taxes from the sale of wine will help meet the costs of providing public services to the property. The proposed project will have a less than significant impact on public services.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

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

**Discussion:**

- a/b. The project would not significantly increase the use of recreational facilities, nor does the project include recreational facilities that may have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

**Mitigation Measures:** None Required

XVII. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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-38, 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 a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric 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-14, 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"/> |

**Discussion:**

a/b. Access to the winery is from Kreuzer Lane, located off Fourth Avenue, a collector county road. The project site is located at the terminus of Kreuzer Lane, located east of its intersection with Fourth Avenue. Kreuzer Lane is classified as a local road. Northbound traffic on Fourth Avenue and westbound traffic on Kreuzer Lane have traffic control signs at the intersection, but Fourth Avenue southbound traffic is not controlled. There is a gate at the terminus of Kreuzer Lane, beyond which the road is shared by the winery and ±5 residences. Four residences front the private road, and the winery and two other residences take access to the private road via private driveways. The winery driveway from the private road is ±1000 feet.

The applicant has submitted traffic data identifying a change to the winery hours: seven days per week, 10:00 am to 6:00 pm, Sunday through Saturday for visitation; 6 days per week in the low season (January, February, March, December); no changes to the current 7:00 am – 5:00 pm, 4 days/week non-harvest production hours; an increase in the number of employees (from two (2) full time/ one (1) part time to six (6) full time/ six (6) part time); a proposed increase in the number of tours and tasting by appointment only visitors from eight (8) daily (average 40 per week) to a varied 25-35/day (seasonally-based), a weekly maximum of 84-190 (seasonally-based); and a change to the Marketing Plan from 13 to 15 events, all to occur within the hours of 10:00 am and 10:00 pm. The winery will be closed for tours/tastings on the days when events are to occur and the conditions of approval for the existing use permit requires that prior written notification of the marketing events must be provided to two of the adjacent neighbors. The project proposes a maximum annual visitation of 6,250. The traffic generation numbers indicated are non-harvest estimates.

The traffic flow calculations presented in the application state that the project is expected to produce up to 50 daily trips on weekdays (additional 35 trips), 16 trips during peak hour (additional 11 trips); and 28 daily trips on weekends (additional 14 trips), with 33 weekend peak hour trips. The 35 new trips would be the equivalent of trips resulting from three residences (one and ½ residences during peak hour). The project includes an increase in production capacity and an increase in on-haul delivery which is projected to result in one (1) additional trip during harvest. The winery utilizes on-site and adjacent grapes; off-site grapes are used by the custom crush producers approved in the original use permit (up to 10,000 gallons). Construction will be limited to road improvements to the private driveway and the installation of the crush pad cover which would be a minimal and temporary in nature, subject to standard conditions of approval from the Engineering and Conservation Division as part of the grading permit process. Impacts would be less than significant.

A traffic study was prepared to analyze potential traffic impacts associated with the project (Focused Traffic Analysis for the Caldwell Vineyards Project, March 1, 2018, W-Trans). Based on counts collected in February 2018, the average weekday traffic (ADT) on Kreuzer Lane east of Fourth Avenue is approximately 400 vehicles per day; the ADT on Fourth Avenue west of Kreuzer Lane is approximately 1,900 daily vehicles; and the ADT on Fourth Avenue north of Kreuzer Lane is about 1,800 daily vehicles.

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

- LOS A- Free-flowing travel with an excellent level of comfort and convenience and freedom to maneuver.
- LOS B- Stable operating conditions, but the presence of other road users causes a noticeable, though slight, reduction in comfort, convenience, and maneuvering freedom.
- LOS C- Stable operating conditions, but the operation of individual users is substantially affected by the interaction with others in the traffic stream.
- LOS D- High-density, but stable flow. Users experience severe restrictions in speed and freedom to maneuver, with poor levels of comfort and convenience.
- LOS E- Operating conditions at or near capacity. Speeds are reduced to a low but relatively uniform value. Freedom to maneuver is difficult with users experiencing frustration and poor comfort and convenience. Unstable operation is frequent, and minor disturbances in traffic flow can cause breakdown conditions.
- LOS F- Forced or breakdown conditions. This condition exists wherever the volume of traffic exceeds the capacity of the roadway. Long queues

can form behind these bottleneck points with queued traffic traveling in a stop-and-go fashion. (2000 Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board)

Based on counts collected in February 2018 for the focused study, the average weekday daily traffic (ADT) on Kreuzer Lane east to Fourth Avenue is about 400 vehicles per day, the ADT on Fourth Avenue west of Kreuzer Lane is  $\pm 1,900$  vehicles per day and the ADT on Fourth Avenue north of Kreuzer lane is about 1,800 daily vehicles. Existing volumes from counts taken on Kreuzer Lane between Fourth Avenue and the project driveway indicate an increase of 61 cars daily, with an increase of 23 car during the weekday PM peak hour. The study concluded that Under Existing plus Project, the study segments of Fourth Avenue and Kreuzer Lane are expected to operate at LOS C or better. The proposed project presents significantly lower visitation numbers, and the potential impact on the level of service would be significantly lower.

Based on the most current five year period available for collision history (2010-2015) on Imola Avenue and Fourth Avenue, collision rates are similar to or lower than statewide averages for similar facilities. Further, there are no collision trends or patterns that may indicate a safety issue. The project will be accessed from a private driveway off Kreuzer Lane just west of a private gate. Since there will not be any left turn movements from a public road, a left turn lane is not necessary.

Visitation to the winery is by appointment only, which allows the applicant to precisely control visitation arrivals and departures and schedule appointments to occur at regular intervals during the day and to avoid the peak travel hours (4:00 PM – 6:00 PM weekdays; 2:00 PM 4:00 PM weekends). The standard Condition of Approval (COA) #4.2, addresses tours and tasting, stating that to the maximum extent feasible, scheduling of visitors shall not occur during peak travel times (4:00 PM - 6:00 PM weekdays, 2:00 PM to 4:00 PM weekend), which serves to reduce the traffic impacts during peak travel times. The proposed marketing events will mostly occur during the evening hours; however, the project proposes that if an event is scheduled, the winery will be closed for tours and tasting, reducing potential traffic impacts.

- c. The transition to VMT is not required of lead agencies until July 1, 2020. However, in anticipation of the transition, the General Plan Circulation Element includes new policies that reflect this new regulatory framework for transportation impact assessment, along with a draft threshold of significance that is based on reduction of VMT compared to the unmitigated project rather than the regional average VMT (Policies CIR-7 through CIR-9). Staff believes this alternative approach to determining the significance of a project's transportation impacts would be better suited to Napa County's rural context, while still supporting the efforts of the County to achieve the greenhouse gas emissions goals of its pending Climate Action Plan. The reduction in VMT and, correspondingly, GHG emissions from the transportation sector, is also necessary for Napa County, the region, and the state to achieve long-term, statewide mandates targeted toward reducing GHG emissions. Such mandates include, but are not limited to Executive Orders S-3-05 and B-16-12, which respectively, set general statewide GHG emissions reduction target of 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050, and an 80 percent GHG emissions reduction below 1990 levels (also by 2050) specifically for the transportation sector.
- d/e. Access to the site is by way of a public road, Kreuzer Lane which turns into a private road beyond an automatic gate serving several other residences and agricultural activities. Residents on the road report that the slope commencing at the terminus of the private portion of Kreuzer Lane causes vehicles to speed by their residences, causing a safety issue when exiting their properties. The project has incorporated traffic calming measures, acceptable to the Fire Marshal, such as "mumble" strips, aiding in the reduction of traffic safety impacts. The required increases to the width of the existing road (County Road and Street Standards) will serve to ensure that the road does not include any other design features that will impact traffic and traffic safety. The County's Engineering Services and the Napa County Fire Marshall have reviewed this application and identified no significant impacts related to emergency vehicle access. An exception to the County Road and Street Standards (RSS) for a 680 foot portion of the access driveway was requested to allow for the 680 foot section of the common access drive to allow a varied roadway width between 14 to 20 feet. The Engineering Services Division and Fire Marshall were able to make the findings to support the Exception Request and that the improvements proposed achieve the same overall practical effect of the RSS by providing defensible space and consideration toward life, safety and public welfare. The end of the driveway fronting the winery includes an existing turnaround. The project identifies the preparation of a fire evacuation plan with primary and secondary emergency exit routes, where a map will be sent to event guests and kept on site, which will include an alternate emergency exit route to Green Valley Road. Project impacts related to traffic hazards and emergency access are expected to be less than significant.
- f. The project will not 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. There are currently 5 improved existing on-site parking spaces, with an unimproved overflow area located on a bench below the winery. The unimproved area is delineated as being able to provide 38 delineated parking spaces. During events, the use of valets would be necessary to organize the guest parking in the lower gravel area parking area, which could accommodate more parking than the designated parking spaces. No parking will be permitted within the right-of-way of Kreuzer Lane due topographical constraints. Therefore, the parking for the project would have a less than significant impact.
- g. **Mitigation Measures:** None required.

**XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.** Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k); or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

a/b According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology surveys, sites, sensitive areas, and flags) no historic sites or tribal resources have been identified on the property. Invitation for tribal consultation was completed pursuant to AB 52.

As discussed in Section V of this initial study, there are no existing structures on the parcel that are listed in a local, state or federal register of historic resources. Consultation with representatives of local Native American tribes who have a cultural interest in the area in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 was not requested. After the 30 day consultation invitation ended, a request for a site visit was made by the Yoche Dehe Wintun tribe. The request was forwarded to the applicant and advised to contact the tribe. Copies of the application package was forwarded to the Tribe and they were advised that when the environmental document is release for public review, the document can be sent to them for their review. As discussed in Section V of this initial study, if any resources not previously uncovered during this prior disturbance are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the proposed project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist must be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the standard county conditions of approval.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required

**XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.** Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of a new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- c) 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?
- d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?
- e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

**Discussion:**

- a. The project will not require or result in the relocation or construction of a new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities. Water on the site is currently provided by a well, located outside of the identified MST water deficit area on the south side of the property, currently serving the existing winery and vineyards. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact.
- b. The project has sufficient water supplies to serve projected needs. The projected water use for the project is 17.47 AF/YR, which is a .33 AF/year increase. Napa County has established a threshold 24.92 AF/YR for the two parcels being served by the project well which reflects the annual rate of recharge as identified in the WAA. The WAA included the Tier 2 analysis and found that there are no wells located within 500 feet of the existing well utilized by the project winery and vineyards and no springs are located in within 1,500 feet. With the Tier 2 well and spring interference criteria satisfied, the determination that the project will have a less than significant effect on groundwater sources.
- c. Wastewater will be treated on-site and will not require a wastewater treatment provider. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d. The project will be served by the local landfills which have sufficient capacity to meet the projects demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the project.
- e. The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, therefore, impact would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

XX.	WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Due to slope, prevailing winds and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

a/b. The proposed project is located within the state responsibility area and is classified as a moderate fire hazard severity zone. The project

would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan because the proposed driveway improvements would provide adequate access to the public portions of Kreuzer Road and Fourth Avenue, the primary roads providing major access to the roads leaving the Coombsville area. The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. The project application was reviewed and approved by the Napa County Fire Department, as conditioned. Impacts would be less than significant.

c/b Implementation of the project would include the improvement of the existing access driveway to County standards except for a request in the reduction in the width for a commercial driveway on one portion of the existing driveway, based upon existing topographical features. The improvements proposed achieves the same overall practical effect of the Napa County Road and Street Standards (RSS) by providing defensible space and consideration toward life, safety and public welfare. The request was reviewed and accepted by the Engineering Division and the Fire Marshal's office. As part of the plan the applicant would implement horizontal and vertical vegetation management plan consistent with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection requirements along the entire length of the private lane and around any existing and proposed structures to create defensible space.

**Mitigation Measures:**

XXI.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<p>a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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?</p> <p>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)?</p> <p>c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>

**Discussion:**

- a. The project as proposed will not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps project is not located within any identified environmentally sensitive environmental resource areas.
- b. The project would increase the demands for public services to a limited extent, increase traffic and air pollution, all of which contribute to cumulative effects when future development in Napa Valley is considered. Cumulative impacts of these issues are discussed in previous sections of this Initial Study, wherein the impact from an increase in air pollution is being addressed as discussed in the project's Greenhouse Gas Voluntary Best Management Practices including but not limited to the use energy conserving lighting and to connect to recycled water and has an existing energy star roof/living roof/cool roof; install water efficient fixtures; low impact development; water efficient landscape; recycle 75% of all waste; compost 75% food and garden material; implement a sustainable purchasing and shipping programs; site design that is oriented and designed to optimize conditions for natural heating, cooling, and day lighting of interior spaces, and to maximize winter sun exposure, such as a cave; limit the amount of grading and tree removal during construction of the required access road improvements; local food production; education to staff and visitors on sustainable practices; use 70-80% cover

crop; and retain biomass removed via pruning and thinning by chipping the material and reusing it rather than burning on-site, and the existing cave is oriented to the south where the existing four portal entries are shaded by trees. The proposed project's near-term and cumulative contribution to those unacceptable levels of service would be less than one percent and would fall below County thresholds of significance.

- c. This project would not have any environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. All environmental effects from this project have been mitigated to a level of insignificance. No other environmental effects have been identified that would cause, either directly or indirectly, adverse effects on human beings.

**Mitigation Measures:** None Required.

DRAFT