

“D”

**Initial Study/Negative Declaration
Staglin Family Vineyards Major
Modification
P18-00253-MOD**

**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:** Staglin Winery, Major Modification Use Permit #P18-00253-MOD
2. **Property Owner:** Staglin Family Vineyard; 1570 Bella Oaks Lane, Rutherford, CA 94574; (707) 927-4274
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Trevor Hawkes, Planner III; (707) 253-4388; trevor.hawkes@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):** The project is located on an approximately 63 acre site, north of Bella Oaks Lane and south of Manley Lane, approximately 0.9 miles east of State Route 29 (SR-29); 1570 Bella Oaks Lane, Rutherford, CA 94574; APN: 027-250-063, -064 and -065.
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Rob Anglin, Holman Teague Roche Anglin, LLP; 1455 First Street, Suite 217, Napa, CA 94559; (707) 927-4280; anglin@htrlaw.com
6. **General Plan description:** Agricultural Resource (AR)
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Preserve (AP)
8. **Background/Project History:** Staglin Winery's current entitlements were first established with the approval of Use Permit #98072-UP on June 2, 1999 by the County of Napa Planning Commission. The original Use Permit established a 36,000 gallon per year winery including 20,688 square feet of caves, the use of a 1,175 sq. ft. of an existing residence for winery offices, construction of a 420 sq. ft. building with an attached canopy for mechanical, office restrooms and work area, 1,200 sq. ft. of concrete work pads at the southern cave portal, tours and tastings by appointment only on weekdays with a maximum of 10 guests per day between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:30 p.m., a marketing program that allowed one (1) event per quarter with a maximum attendance of 30 guests and one annual release event with a maximum attendance of 100 guests, and various other improvements such as parking pads, landscaping, water and wastewater disposal systems, etc.

Use Permit #98072 was appealed to the Napa County Board of Supervisors by both the applicant, who appealed certain conditions of the approval, and 27 opponents ("Interested Parties") of the approval, who appealed on the grounds that the commission could not make certain findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. The Board of Supervisors eventually upheld the decision of the Planning Commission to approve the application when both parties presented a letter stating that they had resolved their conflict, except that conditions related to the project's marketing program were modified by the provisions of the letter. The modified marketing program allowed nine (9) events per year (eight (8) events with a maximum attendance of 45 persons and one (1) annual release event with a maximum attendance of 200 persons). Marketing events were required to be held inside or adjacent to the onsite residence, with four of the marketing events allowed inside the cave or in the outdoor area adjacent to the south cave portal. A requirement to contact a representative of the Interested Parties 48 hours in advance of a marketing event was also included in the conditions of approval.

In the intervening time between the initial Use Permit approval and the current proposed project, the applicant has received approval for three (3) modifications to their Use Permit.

- #99546-UP – Approved by the Napa County Planning Commission on January 17, 2001, and prior to completion of the initial use permit (#98072-UP). This modification increased the cave size to 22,756 sq. ft. and included the addition of a third cave portal. A prior approved exterior office building was relocated into the cave and a prior approved concrete work pad was change to a gravel staging area.
- #02044-MOD – Approved by the Napa County Planning Commission on May 15, 2002. This modification allowed the

production of red wine within the allocated 36,000 gallons of production capacity of permit #98072-UP.

- P08-00053-MOD – Approved by the Zoning Administrator on July 10, 2008. This minor modification converted and renovated two recently acquired buildings (Steckter house and Cabana on the submitted plans) into winery accessory use buildings, relocated offsite offices to the Steckter house, authorized no more than 4 marketing events per year and 3 days of tours and tastings per week in the Steckter house (to be conducted between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 4 p.m.), added eight (8) parking spaces, altered primary site access from Manley lane to Bella Oaks Drive via a new internal access driveway, recognized a lot line adjustment, increase full-time employment from five (5) to eight (8), and added a requirement for noticing of an adjacent property owner (APN 027-250-049) prior to marketing events held at the Steckter House.

The existing project site consists of 3 parcels (APN 027-250-063, -064, -065) totaling 63 acres with approximately 46 acres of vineyards, a 22,756 square foot cave, two (2) buildings totaling approximately 4,000 square feet for winery accessory uses such as tastings and offices, 320 square foot mechanical building, a single-family residence and 12 parking spaces. The site includes infrastructure improvements such as a well, a 15,750 sq. ft. ground mounted solar array, a combined process and sanitary wastewater system, six (6) storage tanks, and a looped internal access driveway. Existing winery access is provided via a driveway off Bella Oaks Lane.

9. **Description of Project:** Approval of a Use Permit Major Modification to an existing 36,000 gallon per year winery to allow the following:
- a) Modification to increase by appointment Daily Tours and Tastings Program from the current 10 persons per day (weekdays only) to 44 persons per day (Monday through Sunday); 308 persons maximum per week;
 - b) Modification of the locations of the Daily Tours and Tastings Program to take place in the Steckter House and the existing wine caves;
 - c) On-premises consumption of wines produced on-site located in the outdoor area immediately south of the Steckter House in accordance with Business and Professions Code Sections 23358, 23390 and 23396.5 (AB2004-Evans Bill);
 - d) Modification of the existing Marketing Program of nine (9) events per year (eight (8) events with a maximum attendance of 45 persons and one (1) event with a maximum attendance of 200 persons) to allow the following:
 - I. 32 events per year with 12 attendees maximum; between the hours of 11:00am and 10:00pm.
 - II. 16 events per year with 32 attendees maximum; between the hours of 11:00am and 10:00pm.
 - III. 3 events per year with 100 attendees maximum; between the hours of 6:00pm and 10:00pm.
 - IV. 1 event per year with 100 attendees maximum; between the hours of 10:00am and 4:00pm.
 - V. 1 event per year with 250 attendees maximum; between the hours of 1:00pm and 4:00pm.
 - VI. Catered food prepared by a licensed caterer. Minimal on-site preparation (heating and plating).
 - VII. Events of 32 attendees or less (items I and II) to occupy the building identified as the 'Steckter House'.
 - VIII. Events of 100 attendees or more (items III, IV, and V) to occupy the outdoor area north of the Steckter House.
 - e) Increase on-site employees from 8 full-time employees and 0 part-time employees to 11 full-time employees and 5 part-time employees;
 - f) Deletion of condition of Approval #3 from the original approved Use Permit (#98072-UP) which required the applicant to notify a representative of neighbors to the applicant 48 hours prior to an event; and
 - g) Width expansion for sections of the existing internal access driveway to 20' with a 22' horizontal clearance to comply with the Napa County Road and Street Standards.

No new buildings or other external changes to the winery's physical facility are proposed nor any production increase.

10. **Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses:** The 63 acre project site is located within the County of Napa's Agricultural Preserve (AP) zoning district and, approximately 0.9 miles east of SR-29. The project site is bounded by Manley Lane to the north, Bella Oaks Lane to the south, a blue line stream to the east and the foothills of the Mayacamas Mountains to the west. Primary access to the site is achieved via a looped private access road which connects to Bella Oaks Lane, a county road, along the southern boundary of the project area. The private access road transverses through vineyards in the southern portion of the project site, before heading north adjacent to the winery caves, passing along the winery offices, tasting room, and mechanical buildings that reside near the northern boundary of the project, before turning south again and reconnecting to the access road just north of its intersection with Bella Oaks Lane. The site is developed with vineyards, winery caves, winery offices, tasting room, mechanical building, solar array, a groundwater well, various water storage tanks, and a single-family residence. Multiple soil types traverse the project site, with Clear Lake Clay (drained, zero (0) to two (2) percent slopes) and Bale clay Loam (zero (0) to two (2) percent slopes) found in the eastern portion of the site, Bale Clay (two (2) to five (5) percent slopes) and Perkins Gravelly Loam (one (1) to 10 percent slopes) found closer to the offices/tasting rooms, and Lodo-Maymen-Felton association (30 to 75 percent slopes).

The project site is located on the eastern side of what is known as the Napa Valley Floor, and is surrounded by wineries, vineyards and rural residences to the north and east. To the south and west of the project site, the topography rises as you enter into the undeveloped open space of the Mayacamas mountain range that separates Napa and Sonoma counties. Site topography ranges from 0-5 percent slopes in the eastern portions of the project site, to 5-15% slopes for the portions of vineyards directly adjacent to the winery offices and

tasting rooms, and slopes exceeding 15% in the western portion of the project site where the winery cave system and single family residence are located. The majority of the property is disturbed and comprised of vineyards, the winery structures and the single family residence, however native oak woodlands are located within the slopes exceeding 15% in the western portion of the property.

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 meeting CalFire standards. Permits may also be required by the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, & Firearms.

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

None

Other Agencies Contacted

None

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.?

On March 18, 2020, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. The Middletown Rancheria responded on March 27, 2020, declining to comment as the project site is not located within their aboriginal territories. No other responses were received within 30-days of the tribe's receipt of the invitations.

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.



1/13/2021

Signature

Date

Name: Trevor Hawkes, Planner III

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

Discussion:

- a-c. Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms, geological features, water, trees and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of a beautiful or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken in. As generally described in the **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses** section, above, the area is defined by a mix of vineyards, wineries and rural residential structures. The requested modification is primarily operational in nature, with the access road expansion being the only physical improvements requested. No new structures or expansion of existing building footprints would occur as a result of the proposed project, and the project site is generally level in elevation with surrounding properties. No trees, rock outcroppings or designated historic buildings would be damaged as a result of the proposed project. State Route 29, which is approximately 0.9 miles from the project site, is identified as a Viewshed Road, however the County's Viewshed Protection Program is not applicable to the proposed project as none of the earthmoving associated with the project (additional paved width added to the access drive) is proposed on a slope in excess of 15% or on a minor/major ridgeline.
- d. The project as proposed would expand the number and hours of marketing events at the winery. This expansion of marketing events could result in an increase in the amount of time existing sources of light are functioning during nighttime hours, but this increase would be temporary in nature, only occurring during marketing events, and the sources of light would already adhere to Napa County Code regulations for outdoor lighting at wineries. The proposed project does not include any new structures or expansion of existing structures which would require new permanent sources light. In the event that additional permanent outdoor lighting is installed, pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approval for wineries, outdoor lighting would be required to be shielded and directed downwards, with only low level lighting allowed in parking areas. As subject to the standard conditions of approval, below, the project would not have a significant impact resulting from new sources of outside lighting.

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.*

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.*

Mitigation Measures: None are required

II.	AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. ¹ 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 majority of the project site is designated "Prime Farmland" with a small portion of the south-western fringe of the project site designated "Unique Farmland". No new winery structures or expansion of building footprints are proposed that would result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Important as shown on the Napa County Important Farmland Map of 2016 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. There is no existing agricultural contract on the property. The project site currently has approximately 45.55 acres of vineyards and no vineyards would be removed as part of the proposed project. There are no other changes included in this proposal that would result in the conversion of Farmland beyond the immediate project site. General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use policies AG/LU-2 and AG/LU-13 recognize wineries, and any use consistent with the Winery Definition Ordinance and clearly accessory to a winery, as agriculture. As a result, the proposed project would not result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use.
- c/d. According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps (based on the following GIS layers – Sensitive Biotic Oak Woodlands, Riparian Woodland Forest and Coniferous Forest) the project site contains no woodland or forested areas. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production, nor would it result in the loss or, or conversion of, forest land to a non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits. No impacts would occur.

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

Mitigation Measures: None are 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.

The screening criteria and thresholds are based on square footage of buildings and associated uses. As mentioned under the **Description of the Project** section of the project information page of this Initial Study, this modification does not propose any new structures or the expansion of existing building footprints. The existing winery facility includes approximately 6,800 sq. ft. of floor area dedicated to hospitality and administrative uses (tasting room, offices) and approximately 22,756 sq. ft. of floor area dedicated to production. When 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 existing winery contributes 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 increase in daily visitation and marketing programs could potentially result in an increase of vehicle emissions related to vehicle trips to and from the winery. In order to reduce new vehicle trips and emissions associated with the project, the winery will have a staff person appointed as a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) coordinator to facilitate employees reducing auto commuting and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). In addition, the TDM coordinator will promote use of shuttle buses to all marketing events.

The project falls well below the BAAQMD screening criteria as noted above, and will implement measures to reduce emissions associated with any increase in vehicle trips associated with the increase in daily visitation and marketing programs. Consequently the proposed project is not expected to significantly affect air quality individually or contribute considerably to any cumulative air quality impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c/d. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from earthmoving and construction activities required for project construction related to the access driveway 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 coatings. The Air District recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction impacts. If the proposed project adheres to these relevant best management practices identified by the Air District and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts

are considered less than significant:

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 or the PERP website <http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/portable.htm>.*

Furthermore, while earthmoving and construction on the site would 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 on-site 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 physical improvements and operational changes would not significantly increase odors associated with the winery. The closest residence is approximately 250 feet from a section of access road widening improvements. 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 are 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a/b. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps Vegetation layer, the majority of the project site is designated as agriculture (vineyards, access roads, production area adjacent to the caves), with urban or built-up land in the areas where the winery offices and tasting room are located, as well as the residence. The project site does contain native mixed oak woodlands in the western portion of the project site, surrounding the existing residence and adjacent to the western portion of the access roadway loop, and there is riparian forest along the eastern boundary of the project site, where there is an identified blue line stream. The entire project site is also contained within Spotted Owl habitat. The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any candidate, sensitive or special status species, nor would it have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities. The only physical improvements (access road widening) would occur within previously disturbed areas adjacent to the existing access road resulting in no vegetation or tree removal from the area identified as mixed oak woodland. Lack of tree removal would also prevent impacts to Spotted Owl Habitat. No physical changes are proposed near the riparian forest in the eastern portion of the project site. This project will have a less than significant impact on candidate, sensitive, or special status species as well as a less than significant impact on riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities.
- c/d. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps an unnamed USGS blue line stream is located along the eastern boundary of the project site. However, no development is proposed within approximately 900-feet of the identified stream. All proposed improvements would occur within a previously disturbed area that is not a wildlife corridor. Therefore, project activities would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with their corridors or nursery sites. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. No trees are proposed for removal as part of the project. Moreover, all physical improvements of the project are proposed within areas that has been previously disturbed. No impacts would occur.
- f. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans because there are no plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None are 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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/b. According to Napa County Environmental Resource, no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified within the project site. 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 would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval:

7.2 ARCHEOLOGICAL FINDING

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

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

- c. No human remains have been encountered on the property and no information has been encountered that would indicate that this project would encounter human remains. However, if resources are found during project grading, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard condition of approval noted above. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are 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 are 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 checked="" 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.

- i.) There are no known faults that run beneath the project site on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. The closest known fault is approximately 1,000 feet to the southwest of the western parcel boundaries. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing of a known fault.
- ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. The only construction associated with the proposed project is the expansion of pavement width for the internal access roadway. Code and standards related to the construction of paved roadways would reduce the potential impacts to a less than significant level in relation to seismic ground shaking.
- iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.

- iv.) According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) there are no known landslide areas within the subject site proposed for modification as a part of this project.
- b. The project proposes improvements (expansion of internal access driveway) on slopes that are between five (5) and 15 percent. The project would require incorporation of best management practices in the construction of the additional driveway and the construction would be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c/d. Based upon the Soil Survey of Napa County, prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the project site includes several different soils types including Clear Lake clay, drained, zero (0) to two (2) percent slopes, Bale clay loam, zero (0) to two (2) percent slopes, Perkins gravelly loam, one (1) to 10 percent slopes and Lodo-Maymen-Felton association, 30 to 75 percent slopes. According to the Napa County GIS Resource Maps (Surficial Deposits layer), the foundation materials consist of Quaternary deposits overlain by late Pleistocene Holocene alluvial fan deposits. Vegetative cover is primarily vineyard, domestic-introduced landscaping, wild grasses, and oak trees. Based upon the Napa County GIS Resource Maps (liquefaction layer) the property includes areas generally subject to a low tendencies to liquefy. All proposed construction will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction. Compliance with the latest editions of the California Building Code for seismic stability would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible, resulting in less than significant impacts.
- e. The proposed project does not include the need to expand the existing septic system and/or combined process and sanitary wastewater system. A soils evaluation was performed as function of the wastewater feasibility study and did not find the soils inadequate for septic or wastewater disposal systems. No impacts will occur.
- f. No paleontological resources or unique geological features have been identified on the property or were encountered on the property when the existing building were constructed or when the vines were planted. 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 Standard Condition of Approval 7.2 identified in **Section V** above. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are 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 (CO₂e)]. This threshold of significance is appropriate for evaluating projects in Napa County. During our ongoing planning effort, the County requires project applicants to consider methods to reduce GHG emissions consistent with Napa County General Plan Policy CON-65(e). (Note: Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, because this initial study assesses a project that is consistent with an adopted General Plan for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was prepared, it appropriately focuses on impacts which are "peculiar to the project," rather than the cumulative impacts previously assessed.) For the purposes of this analysis potential GHG emissions associated with winery 'construction' and 'development' and with 'ongoing' winery operations have been discussed.

GHGs are the atmospheric gases whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for the greenhouse effect, including carbon dioxide, methane, ozone, and the fluorocarbons, that contribute to climate change (a widely accepted theory/science explain human effects on the atmosphere). Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) gas, the principal greenhouse gas (GHG) being emitted by human activities, and whose concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity, also serves as the reference gas to compare other greenhouse gases. Agricultural sources of carbon emissions include forest clearing, land-use changes, biomass burning, and farm equipment and management activity emissions (http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/glossary/letter_c.html). Equivalent Carbon Dioxide (CO₂e) is the most commonly reported type of GHG emission and a way to get one number that approximates total emissions from all the different gasses that contribute to GHG (BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2017). In this case, carbon dioxide (CO₂) is used as the reference atom/compound to obtain atmospheric carbon CO₂ effects of GHG. Carbon stocks are converted to carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e) by multiplying the carbon total by 44/12 (or 3.67), which is the ratio of the atomic mass of a carbon dioxide molecule to the atomic mass of a carbon atom (<http://www.nciasi2.org/COLE/index.html>).

One time "Construction Emissions" associated with the project include: emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area, construction, and construction equipment and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as Equipment Emissions). These emissions also include underground carbon stocks (or Soil carbon) associated with any existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed. As previously stated, the only physical changes proposed in the project includes the widening of sections of the existing internal access road.

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

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. With the existing winery totaling approximately 22,756 sq. ft. of enclosed floor area, with 6,800 sq. ft. of enclosed space dedicated to tasting/hospitality uses, 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 CO₂e/yr GHG threshold of significance.

Furthermore, the applicant has already implemented the following GHG reduction methods at the winery: Generation of onsite renewable energy (the applicant states that 100% of the winery's energy is produced from their onsite ground mounted solar array), preservation

of open space in a conservation easement, habitat restoration (new oak trees have been planted within the conservation easement), exceeding Title 24 energy efficiency standards, solar hot water heating, energy conserving lighting, recycling of 75% of the winery's waste, certification as a Napa Green winery, using 70-80% cover crop, and retaining biomass from pruning and thinning rather than burning it. While the applicant already implements the GHG reduction measures listed above, as a function of this proposed project they will also implement a VMT reduction plan which will see a TDM coordinator assigned from their existing Staff members who will ensure that the winery utilizes bus transportation for large marketing events and encourages carpooling for guest and employees.

The proposed project has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds and determined that the project would not exceed the 1,100 MT/yr of CO₂e. GHG Emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the Cal Green Building Code, tightened vehicle fuel efficiency standards, and more project-specific on-site programs including those winery features noted above would combine to 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 are 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 would not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts utilized in typical winery operations. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. Hazardous materials such as diesel and maintenance fluids would be used onsite during construction of the additional pavement for the

improvement to the internal access roadway. Should they be stored onsite, these materials would be stored in secure locations to reduce the potential for upset or accident conditions. The proposed project consists of an existing winery that would not be expected to use any substantial quantities of hazardous materials. Therefore, it would not be reasonably foreseeable for the proposed project to create upset or accident conditions that involve the release of hazardous materials into the environments. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the existing winery buildings. According to Google Earth, the nearest school to the project site is St. Helena Primary, located approximately 4.1 miles to the north. No impacts would occur.
- 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. No impact would occur as the project site is not located within an airport land use plan.
- f. The proposed project's internal access driveway would meet Napa County Road and Street Standards as a requirement of a certificate of occupancy. Therefore, the proposed winery would not obstruct emergency vehicle access. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division and found acceptable, as conditioned.
- g. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. The project currently complies and would continue to comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river 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?

☐☐☒☐

Discussion:

On January 14, 2014, Governor Jerry Brown declared a drought emergency in the state of California. That declaration was followed up on April 1, 2015, when the Governor directed the State Water Resources Control Board to implement mandatory water reductions in cities and town across California to reduce water usage by 25 percent. These water restrictions do not apply to agricultural users. 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).

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

The project site consists of three parcels totaling 63 acres. All three parcels contain areas that would be categorized as "Napa Valley Floor" based upon current County Water Availability Analysis policies, with the entirety of APN 027-250-065 within the "Napa Valley Floor" and eastern portions of APN 027-250-064 and 027-250-063 within the "Napa Valley Floor". For purposes of analysis the remaining areas, which are categorized as "All other Areas" based upon current County Water Availability Analysis, were assumed to provide no additional water allotment to the project. Thus a Tier 1 Water Availability Analysis (WAA), dated June 12, 2018, was prepared by Summit Engineering for the project, to determine the estimated water use of the existing development, the proposed project, and water availability. The water source for the existing property is provided by one existing onsite well. The well serves the existing residence, winery, vineyard irrigation and landscape irrigation. According to the WAA-Guidance Document, properties located on the Napa Valley Floor area are subject to a Water Use Screening Criteria of 1.0 acre-feet of water per acre of land per year. Summit Engineering has approximated that the total land area of the combined three parcels that falls within the "Napa Valley Floor" totals 57.7 acres. Since all of the groundwater extraction is from the Napa Valley Floor area, the water use screening criteria is 57.7 acre-feet/year (af/yr).

- a. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. According to the Wastewater Feasibility Study prepared by Summit Engineering, June 2018, the wastewater flows associated with the proposed project can be accommodated with the existing combined process and sanitary wastewater system (a pressure distributed leach field). The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings.
- b. The findings of the Water Availability Analysis completed by Summit Engineering in June 2018, demonstrate that the project would not

substantially deplete local groundwater supplies and would not have a significant impact on groundwater resources. According to the water analysis, the existing groundwater use on the project site is 22.74 acre-feet/year. The proposed project would result in an anticipated water demand total of 22.95 acre-feet/year. The table below details each source of existing and proposed groundwater use:

Usage	Existing Water Demand (Acre-feet/Year)	Proposed Water Demand (Acre-feet/Year)
Winery Domestic	.15	.36
Domestic Residential	.75	.75
Landscape Irrigation	.18	.18
Vineyard Irrigation	21.0	21.0
Winery Process	.66	.66
Total Water Demand	22.74	22.95

The estimated project groundwater demand of 22.95 af/yr represents an increase of 0.21 af/yr over the existing condition. The increase results entirely from the increase in visitation, marketing events, and onsite employment. While the groundwater demand of the proposed project is significantly lower than the estimated groundwater availability of 57.7 af/yr the winery, as part of this entitlement would include the County's standard Condition of Approval requiring well monitoring, as well as, the potential to modify/alter permitted uses on site should groundwater resources become insufficient to supply the use.

4.9 GROUND WATER MANAGEMENT - WELLS

This condition is implemented jointly by the Public Works and PBES Departments:

The permittee shall be required (at the permittee's expense) to record well monitoring data (specifically, static water level no less than quarterly, and the volume of water no less than monthly). Such data will be provided to the County, if the PBES Director determines that substantial evidence¹ indicates that water usage at the winery is affecting, or would potentially affect, groundwater supplies or nearby wells. If data indicates the need for additional monitoring, and if the applicant is unable to secure monitoring access to neighboring wells, onsite monitoring wells may need to be established to gauge potential impacts on the groundwater resource utilized for the project. Water usage shall be minimized by use of best available control technology and best water management conservation practices.

In order to support the County's groundwater monitoring program, well monitoring data as discussed above will be provided to the County if the Director of Public Works determines that such data could be useful in supporting the County's groundwater monitoring program. The project well will be made available for inclusion in the groundwater monitoring network if the Director of Public Works determines that the well could be useful in supporting the program.

In the event that changed circumstances or significant new information provide substantial evidence¹ that the groundwater system referenced in the Use Permit would significantly affect the groundwater basin, the PBES Director shall be authorized to recommend additional reasonable conditions on the permittee, or revocation of this permit, as necessary to meet the requirements of the County Code and to protect public health, safety, and welfare.

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

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

The State has classified the Napa River Drainage Basin as a medium priority resource. Additionally, the legislation provides measurable objectives and milestones to reach sustainability and a State role of limited intervention when local agencies are unable or unwilling to

adopt sustainable management plans. Napa County supports this legislation and has begun the process of developing a local groundwater management agency which is anticipated to be in place and functioning within the timeline prescribed by the State.

The proposed project would result in a slight decrease of ground water supplies, and would remain far below the combined three parcel's water allotment, and therefore would not interfere with groundwater recharge or lowering of the local groundwater level. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Water Deficient Areas/Storage Areas*), the project site is not located within a water deficient area and the County is not aware of, nor has it received any reports of groundwater deficiencies in the area. The proposed groundwater uses would not result in a significant impact.

- c. The project would not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off the project site. Improvement plans prepared prior to the issuance of a building permit would ensure that the proposed project does not increase runoff flow rate or volume as a result of project implementation. General Plan Policy CON-50 c) requires discretionary projects, including this project, to meet performance standards designed to ensure peak runoff in 2-, 10-, 50-, and 100-year events following development is not greater than predevelopment conditions. The preliminary grading and drainage plan has been reviewed by the Engineering Division. The proposed project would implement standard stormwater quality treatment controls to treat runoff prior to discharge from the project site. The incorporation of these features into the project would ensure that the proposed project would not create substantial sources of polluted runoff. In addition, the proposed project does not have any unusual characteristics that create sources of pollution that would degrade water quality. Impacts would be less than significant.
- 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 are 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. The project would not occur within an established community, nor would it result in the division of an established community. The project complies with the Napa County Code and all other applicable regulations. 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.

Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-1 of the 2008 General Plan states that the County shall, "preserve existing agricultural land uses and plan for agriculture and related activities as the primary land uses in Napa County." The property's General Plan land use designation is AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space), which allows "agriculture, processing of agricultural products, and single-family dwellings." More specifically, General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-2 recognizes wineries and other agricultural processing facilities, and any use clearly accessory to those facilities, as agriculture. The project would allow for the continuation of agriculture as a dominant land use within the county and is fully consistent with the Napa County General Plan.

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

The General Plan includes two complimentary policies requiring wineries to be designed generally of a high architectural quality for the site and its surroundings. There are no applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the property.

Mitigation Measures: None are 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 are 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 would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during construction of the proposed driveway improvements. The nearest residence to sections of the private access drive proposed for widening is approximately 275 linear feet. Impacts due to a temporary increase in ambient noise generated from construction activities, or from groundborne vibration, would remain below a level of significance through compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). The County Noise Ordinance limits construction activities to daylight hours (7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.) using properly muffled vehicles. In addition to the county noise ordinance, the project applicant will be required to comply with project Conditions of Approval (outlined below) related to construction noise, which will limit activities further by requiring construction activities to be limited to daylight hours, vehicles to be muffled, and backup alarms adjusted to the lowest allowable levels. The proposed project would not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts and impacts would be less than significant.

8.3. **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 proposed project involves a marketing program including 53 events on an annual basis with the largest event permitting up to 250 guests. The proposed project requests the use of the tasting room for small marketing events (50 or less attendees). For the five larger events (50 or more attendees) the proposed project requests the use of outdoor space adjacent to the tasting room (which will be closed for tasting appointments during large events). Due to the location, outdoor marketing events would have the potential to generate higher noise levels, compared to existing conditions.

Additional regulations contained within County Code Chapter 8.16 establish exterior noise criteria for various land uses in the County. As described in the Project Setting, above, land uses in the area are dominated by open space uses, rural residential properties, wineries and vineyards; of these land uses, the residential land use is considered the most sensitive to noise. Based on the standards in County Code section 8.16.070, noise levels, measured at the exterior of a residential structure or residential use on a portion of a larger property, may not exceed 50 decibels for more than half of any hour in the window of daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) within which the applicant proposes to conduct events. Noise impacts of the proposed project would be considered bothersome and potentially significant if sound generated by it had the effect of exceeding the standards in County Code more than 50 percent of the time (i.e., more than 50 decibels for more than 30 minutes in an hour for a residential use).

The nearest off-site residence to the outdoor event space is approximately 500 feet to the north. Under the proposed project, the largest outdoor event that would occur on the parcel would have an attendance of no more than 250 people, and all events would end by 10:00 p.m., with clean-up conducted afterwards. Winery operations would occur between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday (excluding harvest). The potential for the creation of significant noise from increased visitation is significantly reduced, since the tasting areas are predominantly within the winery building itself. On-premise consumption would occur on the south side of the Steckter House, significantly reducing noise impacts to the closer residences to the north of the project by the building acting as a noise barrier. Continuing enforcement of Napa County's Noise Ordinance by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff, including the prohibition against amplified music, should further ensure that marketing events and other winery activities do not create a significant noise impact. Events and non-amplified music, excluding quiet clean-up, are required to finish by 10:00 p.m. Amplified music or sound systems would not be permitted for outdoor events as identified in standard Condition of Approval 4.10 below. Temporary events would be subject to County Code Chapter 5.36 which regulates proposed temporary events.

4.10 **AMPLIFIED MUSIC**

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

The proposed project would not result in long-term significant permanent noise impacts.

- c. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None are 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. 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 proposed staffing at the winery includes an increase in employees from eight (8) full-time and zero (0) part-time to 11 full-time employees and five (5) part-time. This increase could lead to minor population growth in Napa County. Relative to the County's projected low to moderate growth rate and overall adequate programmed housing supply that population growth does not rise to a level of environmental significance.

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. The proposed project would not displace a substantial number of existing people or housing and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None are 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. Public services are currently provided to the project area and the additional demand placed on existing services as a result of the proposed project would be minimal. Fire protection measures would be required as part of the development pursuant to Napa County Fire Marshall conditions and there would be no foreseeable impact to emergency response times with compliance with these conditions of approval. The Fire Department and Engineering Services Division have reviewed the application and recommend approval, as conditioned. School impact fees, which assist local school districts with capacity building measures, would not be levied due to the lack of any required building permits for the project, however as demonstrated in **Section XIV(a), Population and Housing**, the project is expected to create a minimal increase in the county's population and need for housing such that local schools would not be strained by the proposed project and it's increase in visitation, marketing events, and employment. The proposed project would have minimal impact on public parks as no residences are proposed, and as previously noted the increase in regional population from the proposed project is minimal. Impacts to public services would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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. The proposed project would not significantly increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. It is foreseeable that some of the new employees and patrons that would work or visit the winery would utilize some of the county's parks and recreational facilities, but not to a degree that would cause substantial physical deterioration of the parks and/or facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. No recreational facilities are proposed as part of the project. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

XVII.	TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	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"/>
b)	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"/>
c)	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"/>
d)	Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	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:

The updated CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 states that a project's potential environmental impacts should evaluate the generation of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and that a project's effect on automobile delay and Level of Service (LOS) shall no longer constitute a significant environmental impact. The applicant has submitted a traffic study titled *Traffic Impact Report for The Staglin Family Vineyard Use Permit Modification 2018*, prepared by Crane Transportation Group, dated July 28, 2020, which includes an analysis of both VMT and LOS to address potential environmental impacts and overall effects to the County roadway system.

- a. The *Traffic Impact Report for The Staglin Family Vineyard Use Permit Modification 2018*, prepared by Crane Transportation Group, dated July 28, 2020, addresses potential transportation impacts generated by the proposed project. The study reviewed LOS, sight distance, vehicle miles traveled, and the County left-turn lane warrant to identify potential impacts to the County roadway system. The scope of analysis included evaluation of SR 29 north and south of Bella Oaks Lane as well as the Bella Oaks Lane intersection with SR 29 and the vineyard driveway for harvest year 2019, year 2025, and cumulative (year 2030) horizons. Evaluations included conditions with and without project traffic.

Based upon the analysis in the Traffic Impact Report, the project as proposed would result in no significant off-site circulation system operational impacts for vehicle traffic to SR 29 at Bella Oaks Lane or the SR 29 and Bella Oaks Lane intersection. New traffic would only occur on weekdays – none on Saturday or Sunday. Sight lines at the project driveway connection to Bella Oaks Lane would remain acceptable and continue to meet Caltrans stopping sight distance criteria, and there would continue to be no left turn lane warranted on Bella Oaks Lane at the project driveway. In addition, the SR 29/Bella Oaks Lane intersection would not have Friday or Saturday PM peak hour volumes meeting rural peak hour signal Warrant #3 criteria for existing or future conditions. Two-way traffic volumes would increase on Bella Oaks Lane near SR 29, for example, during Harvest Friday existing PM peak hour volumes would increase due to the project from 45 vehicles to 52 vehicles, and during a Harvest Saturday existing PM peak hour volumes would increase due to the project from 17 to 27 vehicles.

There are no pedestrian walkways along Bella Oaks Lane and none are planned by the proposed project. Likewise, there are no existing or planned Class I to IV bicycle facilities along Bella Oaks Lane and none are planned by the proposed project. There are Class II bike lanes on SR 29, but they would not be impacted by impacts of the proposed project. There are no bus transportation facilities within walking distance of the project site. Impacts to programs, plans, ordinances or policies addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities would be less than significant.

- b. The transition to VMT is required of lead agencies beginning July 1, 2020. As a result, the 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 a 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.

Napa County is currently in the process of establishing a threshold for minimum vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for various land uses. The "winery" project category does not fall neatly into traditional land use categories and is a hybrid land use combining VMT characteristics of agriculture and office uses. Until minimum VMT thresholds are established by the County for winery projects, guidance may be taken from by the *California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA, December 2018*. The Advisory indicates that the VMT metric supports three statutory goals: "the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and diversity of land uses." The Advisory goes on to state that "achieving 15 percent lower per employee (office) VMT than existing development is both generally achievable and is supported by evidence that connects this level of reduction to the State's emissions goals." With regard to the proposed project, the Technical Advisory provides "screening thresholds" for small projects as follows:

"Many local agencies have developed screening thresholds to indicate when detailed analysis is needed. Absent substantial evidence indicating that a project would generate a potentially significant level of VMT, or inconsistency with a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) or general plan, projects that generate or attract fewer than 110 trips per day generally may be assumed to cause a less-than-significant transportation impact."

The applicant intends to create a TDM plan and appoint a TDM coordinator to demonstrate the winery's efforts to reduce vehicle miles traveled by a minimum of 15%. Measures identified in the project's Traffic Impact Study include measures such as telecommuting, ride share, and the use of high occupancy vehicles for marketing events. A project condition of approval will be included that requires submittal of the TDM program to the County for review. The condition of approval will also include a requirement to provide an annual report to the County regarding the effectiveness of the TDM measures. The project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b). Impacts would be less than significant.

- c/d. The project site includes an existing loop internal access driveway which connects with Bella Oaks Lane. Sections of the driveway are inadequate when compared to current Napa County Road and Street Standard (RSS) guidelines, and component of this project includes widening sections of the internal access driveway to meet the current RSS standards. Sight lines along Bella Oaks Lane from the project driveway are adequate. Engineering and CalFire have reviewed the proposed project for consistency with their standards and approve of the project as conditioned. The project will not result in any changes to levels of service or cause any new safety risks.
- e. There is currently parking for 12 vehicle parking spaces provided on site, with two (2) of those spaces designated for ADA access. Developers of new or expanded land uses are required to provide adequate parking or demonstrate that adequate parking exists to meet their anticipated parking demand. Excess parking that could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or commercial activity exceeding the site's capacity is discouraged. An onsite parking analysis was also provided in the submitted Traffic Impact Report by Crane Transportation Group. The analysis evaluated onsite parking dynamics during the larger proposed marketing event of 250 persons. The analysis assumed that 50% of the guests would arrive via shuttle, van or limousine at an average of eight (8) attendees per vehicle. The remaining 50% of the guests would arrive by personal vehicle at a rate of 2.6 persons per vehicle. Employees for these events were expected to take up an additional 10 to 20 parking spaces. Under these conditions a total of 84 parking spaces would be required, which when subtracted from the existing 12 parking spaces onsite leaves the project with a total of 72 overflow parking spaces required. Half of this 72 required overflow parking spaces could be accommodated in the outdoor production area adjacent to the win cave portal (referred to as the westernmost overflow parking area in the study). The other half of the required onsite parking would then need to be accommodated along 900 feet of internal access roadway shoulder. There is more than enough shoulder area along the project access road to accommodate 900 feet of overflow vehicle parking with the site and thus the proposed project would not be in conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-14.

Mitigation Measures: None are 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 On March 18, 2020, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. The Middletown Rancheria responded on March 27, 2020, declining to comment as the project site is not located within their aboriginal territories. No other responses were received within 30-days of the tribe's receipt of the invitations.

Mitigation Measures: None are 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The project does not require the construction of new or expanded wastewater, storm water drainage electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities. The project site's existing water system was permitted under a California Uniform Food Facilities Law exemption, and thus it will be a requirement that the applicant apply for a Public Water System Permit and upgrade the existing well so that the well head terminates 18 inches above the ground. However while the upgrade to the well head is a requirement of existing water system permitting, the existing water system has demonstrated sufficient capacity to meet both the existing and proposed water demands, so an expansion of the system would not be required here.
- b. As discussed in Section X. the findings of the Water Availability Analysis completed by Summit Engineering in June 2018, demonstrates that the project would not substantially deplete local groundwater supplies and would not have a significant impact on groundwater resources. According to the water analysis, the existing groundwater use on the project site is 22.74 acre-feet/year, and the proposed project would result in an increase of 0.21 acre-feet/year for an anticipated total of 22.95 acre-feet/year.
- c. The winery facility is serviced by a combined process and sanitary wastewater system. The project does not propose to increase wine production, and thus would not generate additional process waste. The proposed increase in employees, marketing events and visitation, would generate additional sanitary wastewater. A Wastewater Feasibility Study by Summit Engineering, June 2018, was provided to evaluate the proposed project on the existing wastewater system. The study demonstrates that all sanitary wastewater generated from the proposed project can feasibly be handled onsite within the current capacity of the combined Process and Sanitary wastewater system (a pressure distribution leach field located under the solar array onsite). The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d/e. According to the Napa County Baseline Data Report, all of the solid waste landfills where Napa County's waste is disposed have more than sufficient capacity related to the current waste generation. The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are 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. Portions of the western area of the project site contain areas that are designated as medium and very high fire hazard severity zones. The areas that are designated as very high fire hazard severity zones are completely contained within the state responsibility area, and all of the remaining project area falls within a local responsibility area for fire protection. There are no project features that would

substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The driveway expansion would improve emergency response capabilities on the site. The project application was reviewed and approved by the Napa County Fire Department, as conditioned. Impacts would be less than significant.

- b. A majority of the project site includes slopes of less than 5%, with an increase in grade as you move to the western boundary of the project site and begin to enter the Mayacamas Mountains. The project site includes a winery cave, tasting rooms, offices, maintenance buildings, and a residence on 63 acres, which will reduce the potential for exposure to pollutant concentrations. Internal access roads will be improved to existing Napa County Road and Street Standards, which will decrease the chances of project occupants to the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. The only physical improvements associated with the proposed project is the widening of the internal access roadway, to bring it into compliance with the current requirements of the Napa County Road and Streets Standards of private driveways. No other improvements, or maintenance of improvements, are proposed that would exacerbate fire risk. The proposed project has been reviewed and approved by Napa County Engineering Division, Fire Department, and Public Works Department, as conditioned.
- d. The only physical improvements of the proposed project includes widening sections of the existing internal access roadway. These sections of the winery access road are relatively flat and will require a minor amount of grading in an already developed area. The proposed physical improvements of the project do not change any drainage or runoff patterns or post-fire unstable slopes. The impacts to people or structures from flooding or landslides due to factors would remain less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

XXI.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project includes only minor physical improvements (internal access roadway widening) which are located on portions of the property that are already developed. As identified in Section IV. Biological Resources, due to the location of and limited scope of physical improvements, potential impacts to biological resources and wildlife species would be less than significant. As identified in Section V. Cultural Resources, according to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps no historical or archaeologic resources have been identified on the property. However, if resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance County standard condition of approval. The project would not result in significant impacts to rare or endangered plant or animal species or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology, and traffic are discussed in the respective sections above and were determined to have a less than significant impact. Potential impacts to air pollution and GHG emissions are being addressed through Greenhouse Gas Voluntary Best Management

Practices and VMT reduction strategies as discussed in Section VIII. Green House Gas and Section XVII. Transportation. The applicant already implements the following greenhouse gas reduction methods at the winery: Generation of onsite renewable energy (the applicant states that 100% of the winery's energy is produced from their onsite ground mounted solar array), preservation of open space in a conservation easement, habitat restoration (new oak trees have been planted within the conservation easement), exceeding Title 24 energy efficiency standards, solar hot water heating, energy conserving lighting, recycling of 75% of the winery's waste, certification as a Napa Green winery, using 70-80% cover crop, and retaining biomass from pruning and thinning rather than burning it. The winery will continue efforts to reduce VMT under the proposed project which includes the implementation of a TDM plan and appointment of a TDM coordinator to assist with scheduling bus transportation for large marketing events and encouraging carpooling for guest and employees. Section X. Hydrology includes detail on the Water Availability Analysis which demonstrates that the proposed project would result in a modest increase of 0.21 acre-feet/year over the existing condition, but would remain below the estimated groundwater recharge rate of 57.7 acre-feet/year, and consequently would not interfere with groundwater recharge or lowering of the local groundwater level. The Traffic Impact Report detailed in Section XVII. Transportation concluded that the proposed project would not have significant impacts on the County roadway system. The winery's implementation of a TDM plan will provide reductions in VMT. Potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

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

Mitigation Measures: None are required.
