

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

Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration

1. **Project Title:** El Retiro Winery Use Permit Major Modification (P07-00782 UP)
2. **Property Owner:** EAC partners LLC (dba Screaming Eagle Winery)
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Kirsty Shelton, Planner III, (707) 253-4417, kshelton@co.napa.ca.us
4. **Project location and APN:** Located on the west side of Silverado Trail, approximately 0.5 miles south of its intersection with Oakville Cross Road and 1.75 miles north of its intersection with Yountville Cross Road, on a \pm 73.13 acre site within an Agricultural Preserve Zoning District. The winery is accessed via a 1,280 foot driveway, 7557 Silverado Trail, Yountville; designated Assessor's Parcel Number: 031-070-009.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Charles Banks, 110 El Paseo, Santa Barbara, CA 93101
6. **General Plan description:** Split designation of Agriculture Resource (AR) and Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space (AWOS), *Napa County General Plan, March, 2002*
7. **Zoning:** AP (Agricultural Preserve) District
8. **Project Description:** Use Permit Modification (P07-00782- UP) to modify a prior Use Permit (#03533-MOD) that although never constructed is considered "used" within the meaning of the County Code Section 18.124.080. This prior Use Permit authorized the construction of a 7,850 sq. ft. winery structure and 3,500 sq. ft. of caves. This proposal requests construction of a total of 22,333 sq. ft. of building area and a total of 16,000 sq. ft. of cave area. The cave spoils will be exported to the Stony Point Rock Quarry located in Sonoma. The buildings will be accessed by the reconfiguration of the existing entrance and the improvement of 3,160 linear foot one-way loop access road and six parking spaces. The winery currently operates under a Small Winery permit (SW-48889), which authorizes a maximum production capacity of 20,000 gallons of wine per year, a maximum of 15 visitors per week, and no other marketing. Water serves the operations via an existing well and the wastewater is processed via an existing processing pond. There are no other changes to the operations besides the request to establish 4 full time employees.

PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION:

The Conservation, Development and Planning Director of Napa County have tentatively determined that the following project would not have a significant effect on the environment and the County intends to adopt a **Negative Declaration**. Documentation supporting this determination is contained in the attached Initial Study Checklist and is available for inspection at the Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department Office, 1195 Third St., Room 210, Napa, California 94559 between the hours of 8:00 AM and 4:45 PM Monday through Friday (except holidays).

DATE: March 25, 2008

BY: Kirsty Shelton, Planner III

WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD: March 28, 2008 to the conclusion of the public hearing before the Conservation, Development, and Planning Commission scheduled on April 16, 2008.

Please send written comments to the attention of Kirsty Shelton at 1195 Third St., Room 210, Napa, California 94559, or via e-mail to kshelton@co.napa.ca.us. A public hearing on this project is tentatively scheduled for the Napa County Planning Commission at 9:00 AM or later on Wednesday, April 16, 2008. You may confirm the date and time of this hearing by calling (707) 253-4416.

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

Initial Study Checklist
(reference CEQA, Appendix G)

1. **Project Title:** El Retiro Winery Use Permit Major Modification
2. **Property Owner:** EAC partners LLC
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Kirsty Shelton Planner III, (707) 253-4417, kshelton@co.napa.ca.us
4. **Project location and APN:** Located on the west side of Silverado Trail, approximately 0.5 miles south of it's intersection with Oakville Cross Road and 0.9 miles north of it's intersection with Yountville Cross Road, on a ± 73.13 acre site within a Agricultural Preserve Zoning District . The winery is accessed via a 1,280 foot driveway, 7557 Silverado Trail; designated Assessor's Parcel Number: 031-070-009.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Charles Banks, 110 El Paseo, Santa Barbara, CA 93101
6. **General Plan description:** Split designation of Agriculture Resource (AR) and Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space (AWOS), *Napa County General Plan, March, 2002*
7. **Zoning:** AP (Agricultural Preserve) District
8. **Project Description:** Use Permit Modification (P07-00782- UP) to modify a prior Use Permit (#03533-MOD) that although never constructed is considered "used" within the meaning of the County Code Section 18.124.080. This prior Use Permit authorized the construction of a 7,850 sq. ft. winery structure and 3,500 sq. ft. of caves. This proposal requests construction of a total of 22,333 sq. ft. of building area and a total of 16,000 sq. ft. of cave area. The cave spoils will be exported to the Stony Point Rock Quarry located in Sonoma. The buildings will be accessed by the reconfiguration of the existing entrance and the improvement of 3,160 linear foot one-way loop access road and six parking spaces. The winery currently operates under a Small Winery permit (SW-48889), which authorizes a maximum production capacity of 20,000 gallons of wine per year, a maximum of 15 visitors per week, and no other marketing. Water serves the operations via an existing well and the wastewater is processed via an existing processing pond. There are no other changes to the operations besides the request to establish 4 full time employees.
9. **Environmental setting and surrounding land uses:** The majority of the 73.13 acre site includes less than a 5% slope; the southern property line dissects the toe of a small hill and includes a gradual slope of approximately 15% slope. An unnamed watercourse runs through the northwest corner of the site and drains into the Napa River. The site is currently developed with approximately 70 acres of vineyards, two agricultural barns, two residences constructed circa 1954(1,917 sq. ft. and 1,608 sq ft.), a 1,500 sq. ft. winery, approximately 1,000 sq. ft. of caves, a wastewater storage pond, a septic tank and related leach fields, and access roads. There are no changes to the existing conditions besides the demolition of the 1,917 sq. ft. primary residence as it interferes with the proposed winery footprint. According to the United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Soil Survey of Napa County, California, about three-fourths of the property consists of Bale Clay Loam with 0-5% slopes, the remanding southeastern portion of the property lines within the Perkins Gravel Loam also with 2-5% slopes; the base of the hill at the southern property line includes Hambright-Rock outcrop complex with 2-30% slopes. Adjacent parcels include vineyard to the north and west and undeveloped land to the east and south. There are no homes nearby.
10. **Other agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).
Napa County Environmental Management Department Alcoholic Beverage Control
Napa County Public Works Department

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature

March 21, 2008
Date

Kirsty Shelton, Planner

Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

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

Discussion:

- The proposed project is located on the valley floor of the Napa Valley. Although this project is visible from a viewshed road as defined in the Napa County Zoning Ordinance, the project site is relatively flat and is situated 1,280 feet from Silverado Trail. Further, the architecture and layout have been designed to primarily be subterranean and the exterior appearance is that similar of an agricultural barn.
- This site is relatively flat and has already been graded for the installation of vineyards. Although the site borders native trees, there are no existing or scenic resources, historic structures or rock outcroppings; and therefore no impact.
- See a and b above.
- The new facility will result in a minor increase in the nighttime lighting. In accordance with County standards, all exterior lighting will be the minimum necessary for the operational and security needs. Light fixtures will be kept as low to the ground as possible and include shields to deflect the light down. Avoidance of highly reflective surfaces will be required, as well as standard county conditions to prevent light from being cast skyward. As designed, and as subject to standard conditions of approval, the project will not have a significant impact from light or glare.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The project site is located in both the designated Agricultural Resource and Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space area of the Napa County General Plan Land Use Element. There would be no conversion of existing farmland to non-agricultural use. The proposed uses are considered agricultural. The land is currently developed with vineyards except for the project development area; at project build-out the project will not require removal of vineyards.
- b. This site and surrounding properties are all under Williamson Act contracts, also known as agricultural contracts. These contracts are intended to preserve agriculture and provide a tax benefit for those exclusive uses. The project would have a less than significant impact on agricultural resources as protected by state law or Williamson contracts because the land used for the winery and caves is located on a hill that is currently undeveloped with vines and further is considered integral to agriculture.
- c. The new use would take place on a site with existing producing vineyards. Winery uses are considered as accessory and integral to agricultural use and therefore it is a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable dust or odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed facilities and associated earthwork would not result in significant adverse impacts to air quality.

a-c. The project site is located in Napa County, which forms one of the climatological sub-regions (Napa County Subregion) within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin, and is consequently subject to the requirements of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The project would not be in conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Ozone Maintenance Plan, Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan or the Bay Area 1991 Clean Air Plan, under the Federal Clean Air Act. BAAQMD regard emissions of PM-10 and other pollutants from construction activity to be less than significant if dust and particulate control measures are implemented, which are included in this project.

The BAAQMD has determined that land uses that generate fewer than 2,000 trips per day do not generally require detailed air quality analysis, since these land uses would not generally be expected to have potentially significant air quality impacts (specifically, they would not be expected to generate over 80 pounds per day of Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)). Although the building and expansion areas have a relatively large amount of overall floor area, the project is designated for both bottling and warehouse uses which typically have very low traffic generation rates per square foot under roof. Given the relatively small amount of traffic generation, including temporary construction and routine operations, the consequent auto/truck emission when compared to the size of the affected air basin, the incremental increase in vehicles emissions from this project will not effectively change existing conditions. Therefore, the project's potential to impact air quality is considered less-than-significant.

d-e. The BAAQMD defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact. The project site is not located in close proximity to any odor-sensitive receptors. During project construction, the project has the potential to generate substantial amounts of dust or other construction-related air quality disturbances. As a standard practice for County development projects, application of water and/or dust palliatives are required in sufficient quantities during grading and other ground disturbing activities on-site to minimize the amount of dust produced. These Best Management Practices will reduce potential temporary changes in air quality to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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. A review of the CNPS and special biological species layers in the County GIS maps resulted in no records of special status animal or plant species and there were no special status animal or plant species observed on or near the project sites. This site has been previously disturbed by vineyard installation activities. Further, there are no sensitive plant communities listed by DFG on the project sites; therefore the project would result in less than significant impact.
- b. The project as proposed is more than 1,200 feet from the unnamed watercourse and is considered less than a significant impact.
- c. County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Watershed Overlay) do not indicate the presence of any wetlands or potential wetlands within the project boundary. The project would result in no substantial impacts to federally protected or potentially sensitive wetlands and therefore no impact is expected.
- d. The project does not lie within any established migration patterns and would not 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 and therefore is a less than significant impact.

- e. As proposed the project is not proposed within the setback of the unnamed watercourse, however if the development does encroach, Section 18.108 of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance requires further protection by installing construction staking of the stream setbacks; there are no trees proposed for removal.
- f. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans. There are no plans applicable to the subject parcel.

Mitigation Measure(s):

None.

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

Discussion:

- a. County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Archaeological Resources Overlay) indicated that there are no archaeological sites in the project vicinity and therefore no impact.
- b. There are no known archaeological resources in the development area. As per the standard Conditions of Project Approval, in the event archaeological artifacts are encountered during construction of the project, all work would cease to allow a qualified archaeologist to record and evaluate the resources. This is considered a less-than-significant impact because the project site has been previously graded.
- c. The subject site does not contain any known paleontological resources or unique geologic features and therefore is not anticipated to result in any significant adverse impacts to such resources.
- d. The presence of any formal cemeteries is not known to occur within the project area and therefore the proposed project is not anticipated to result in any significant adverse impacts on any such resources.

Mitigation Measure(s): None

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project is not located within any Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zone. While seismic activity is endemic to the Bay Area, all structures must be constructed to current California building code requirements; therefore a less than significant impact is anticipated.
- b. According to the United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Soil Survey of Napa County, California, about three-fourths of the project will occur on the soil designation of Bale clay loam on relatively flat land, with a slope of 2-5%. The remainder of the soils on the southeast portion of the site is designated as Perkins Gravelly Loam soils and also has a 2-5% slope. The soils on site are characterized by medium runoff with moderate erosion potential. The project is required to submit a site development plan, including implementation of storm water and erosion control Best Management Practices under the standards developed in the County's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Phase II Stormwater Permit will be prepared. Since there will be more than one acre of disturbed area for the project, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is required and will be a condition of project approval. Therefore, the potential for impacts is considered less than significant.

- c. The project site is located on soil that is designated as having a very low and low liquefaction potential and it is not known that it would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially results in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence or collapse and therefore is considered a less than significant impact.
- d. The soil type is not considered to be expansive, as defined in table 19.1B of the UBC creating substantial risks to life or property. However, the soil types consist of a high level of clay, as conditioned the applicant will provide the requirements for building permit submittal which includes structurally engineered plans according to the soils type.
- e. Because the amount of production remains the same, the wastewater system is not proposed to be expanded; the process waste water can be accommodated via irrigation of the on-site vineyard after pretreatment in the aerated lagoon system.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

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

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than typical amounts used for normal winery operations. A Business Plan will be filed with the Department of Environmental Management should the amount of these materials reach reportable levels. In the event a future use involved the use, storage or transportation of greater than 55 gallons or 500 pounds of hazardous materials, a Use Permit and subsequent environmental assessment would be required in accordance with the County Zoning Ordinance prior to establishment of the use. During construction of the project some hazardous materials, such as building coatings, adhesives, paints, etc. will be utilized. However, given the quantities of hazardous material and the limited duration they would result in a less than significant impact.
- b. The project would not result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site.
- d. The proposed site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.
- e. The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The new winery use would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.
- g. The access loop road that serves the project will be improved to comply with County road standards. The design of this project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Public Works Department and found acceptable as conditioned and determined that the design of the road will not impair emergency access or egress.
- h. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires because the project will incorporate fire safety equipment and measures as required by the California Department of Forestry/County Fire Marshal memorandum and required as conditions of approval.

Mitigation Measure(s):

None.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not violate any known water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The applicant is required to obtain a pre- and post-construction Stormwater Permit from the California State Regional Water Quality Control Board because the project disturbance will exceed one acre. Therefore as required, the project does not have the potential to significantly impact water quality and discharge standards.
- b. The total projected water use for all uses within this parcel is approximately 43.58 acre-feet per year, which includes 1.05 acre-feet for the residential portion, 0.43 acre-feet for the winery portions, 42.0 acre-feet for vineyard irrigation, and 0.10 for landscape irrigation. The acceptable water use for valley floor areas is 1.0 acre feet per year which for the acre site yields a parcel threshold of 73 acre-feet of water. The project as proposed is in compliant with our groundwater threshold. Therefore, the project as proposed will not deplete the ground water supplies and therefore will be a less than significant impact.

- c-d. The proposed project will not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off site. The project will incorporate erosion control measures appropriate to its maximum slope to manage onsite surface drainage and erosion of onsite soils during construction and winter months (October to April). By incorporating erosion control measures, this project would have a less than a significant impact. No substantial alteration of existing drainage is anticipated to occur. There will be an increase in the overall impervious surface resulting from the new building, pavement and sidewalks. However, given the size of the drainage basin, the increase in impervious surfaces will not discernibly change the amount of groundwater filtration or discernibly increase surface runoff from that which currently existing on site. This project would therefore result in a less than significant impact.
- e. The project is required to submit a site development plan, including implementation of storm water and erosion control Best Management Practices under the standards developed in the County's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Phase II Stormwater Permit, which is required by County Code and is a standard practice on all County development projects. Since there will be more than one acre of disturbed area for the project, the County requires a pre and post construction Storm Water Pollutant Elimination Permit (SWPP). Project storm drainage will be directed toward the existing drainage system and stored within the existing pond. With the implementation of Best Management Practices the impact will be a less than significant impact.
- f. There are no other factors in this project that would otherwise degrade water quality.
- g. - h. The project site is not located within a designated 100-year floodplain.
- i. - j. The project site is located on the valley floor and the potential for tsunami is considered less-than-significant. The project is located many miles from San Francisco bay, and in the unlikely event that a tsunami enters the bay, any surge would dissipate well before reaching Napa.

Mitigation Measure(s):

None.

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

Discussion:

- a. - c. The project would not result in adverse land use impacts. There are no habitat or conservation plans adopted by the County. The County has designated the site for agricultural development and, as proposed, the project is consistent with both the AR and AWOS general plan designation and AP zoning.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

Discussion:

The proposed project would not result in impacts to mineral resources per the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity maps (Soil Type, Surficial Deposits Overlays).

- a. The project site does not contain any known mineral resources.
- b. The project site is not designated as a locally important mineral resources recovery site.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during the construction of the facility. Current (under a separate permit) and future construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant with the implementation of County standard practices and given the remote, rural nature of the site.

- a. There is only one residential use within close proximity to the project and it is currently occupied by an on-site worker. The other neighboring property will not be affected; regardless temporary construction noise will be in compliance with County noise standards.
- b. Construction activities may result in ground borne vibrations and short-term noise levels. However, given the lack of proximity of the construction site to neighboring properties; the potential for impact is less-than-significant.
- c. - d. The anticipated noise levels following the completion of construction would be minimal, typical of winery and agricultural processing and rural uses, and are considered less-than-significant.
- e. The project site is no located within an airport land use plan of a public airport
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Mitigation Measure(s):

NONE

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

Discussion:

- a. – c. The project will involve construction of 22,333 square feet. The project is located adjacent to agricultural land and will not displace any housing or divide any established communities. The project will result in four new full-time employees. This increase in jobs will not contribute significantly to a cumulatively considerable increase in the demand for housing units within the communities of Napa County and the general vicinity. The County has adopted a housing impact fee to provide funds for constructing affordable housing. This fee is charged to all new non-residential development based on the gross square footage of building area multiplied by the applicable fee by type of use listed in Chapter 15.60.100 Table A and it is required it to be paid prior to release of building permit and is considered to reduce housing inducement impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure(s):

None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in:				
a) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The proposed project would not result in potentially significant adverse impacts on public services.

- a. According to Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Resource Maps (Fire Hazard Zones –CDF overlay), the site is not located within the California Department of Forestry designated “High” Fire Hazard Zone. The Napa County Fire Marshal stated that if specific fire protection measures addressing building construction, minimum water flow, on-site fire safety equipment, fire apparatus access roads, barricades and fire safety plans are incorporated into the project, fire safety concerns could be mitigated. No substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services would result, therefore, potential project impacts would be less than significant. School impact mitigation fees will be levied and collected with the building permit application. Those fees assist schools with capacity building measures. The project will have little impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from building permit fees, property tax revenue and taxes from the sale of wine, cheese, and olive oil will help meet the costs of providing public services to the property.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. RECREATION. Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-b. The project would not significantly increase the use nor result in significant adverse impacts on existing recreational facilities; therefore the impact is less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-b. According to traffic information provided by the applicant, the maximum anticipated number of visitors and employees to the site would be 15 invited guests per day plus four full time employees resulting in 38 trips per day.

The County has established that a significant traffic impact would occur if increases in traffic from a project would cause intersections or two-lane highway capacity to deteriorate to be worse than LOS E, or at intersections or two-lane highway where base case (without project) is LOS F, a significant impact is considered to occur if a project increases the base volumes by more than one percent. Napa County utilizes a one percent significance threshold for the identification of significant adverse traffic impact during peak hours to travel. This threshold was determined the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency and has been used consistently as the significance determination for all recent EIR and CEQA documents.

There is only three additional employees that will contribute to peak period traffic generated from the project will contribute less than 1% to traffic levels on local roadways and intersections. This less than 1% increase is considered a less-than-significant level.

- c. The project does not have any impact on air traffic patterns.
- d -e. The project will not result in any changes to levels of service or cause any new safety risks.
- f. The project as conditioned for the parking standards will not result in inadequate parking.
- g. The proposed project does not conflict with any known policies or plans supporting alternative transportation.

Mitigation Measure(s):

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Discussion:

- a. The project will occur in an isolated rural area and requires connections to the existing wastewater treatment system subject to Napa County Environmental Management Department (NCEMD) approval consistent with Regional Water Quality District standards.
- b. The project will require construction of winery and related facilities on land that includes less than a 15% slope and will require minimal grading and therefore will result in a less than significant impact to the environment.
- c. The proposed structures are well beyond the County setbacks and comply with the County's Conservation regulations. Best Management Practices for erosion control would be required as part of the project by the Public Works Department. No new construction of storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities would result from the project which could cause any significant environmental effects.
- d. According to the information sheet provided by the applicant, the proposed facilities would require 43.58 acre feet of water, well below the 73 acre foot threshold for this property.
- e. See response "a." above.
- f.-g. The project will be served by the Upper Valley Waste Management Authority. The project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

Discussion:

- a. The project site does not contain any known listed plant or animal species. The project as conditioned will not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, traffic and housing impacts are discussed in their respective sections above.
- c. The project as proposed does not pose any substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.