

COUNTY OF NAPA
CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND PLANNING DEPARTMENT
1195 3rd Street, Suite 210
Napa, Calif. 94559
(707) 253-4417

Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration

1. **Project Title:** Sandpoint Winery Use Permit Application № P09-00516-UP and Variance Application № P09-00535-VAR
2. **Property Owner:** Scott Young, Sandpoint Wines LLC, 1919 Inglewood Avenue, St. Helena, Calif., 94574
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Christopher M. Cahill, Project Planner, 707.253.4847, ccahill@co.napa.ca.us
4. **Project location and APN:** The project is located on a 16 acre parcel located on the south side of Inglewood Avenue, approximately ½ mile west of its intersection with CA-29 (the St. Helena Highway) and within the AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning district. APN: 027-120-056. 1919 Inglewood Avenue, St. Helena, Calif., 94574
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Donna Oldford, Plans4Wine, 2620 Pinot Way, St. Helena, Calif., 94574, 707.963.5832, dboldford@aol.com
6. **Hazardous Waste Sites:** This project site is not on any of the lists of hazardous waste sites enumerated under Government Code §65962.5.
7. **Project Description:**

Variance to allow construction of a new winery within required road setbacks (300 feet required, 82 feet proposed).

Use Permit to establish a new 30,000 gallon per year winery with:

- a 10,691 sq. ft. two story winery building with a below-grade wine storage cellar and a second-story winery deck;
- a 250 sq. ft. winery storage shed;
- at-grade courtyard improvements;
- three full-time and three part-time employees;
- six parking spaces;
- by-appointment tours and tastings with a maximum of 16 visitors per day and 42 per week;
- an annual marketing plan with 24 20-person catered food and wine pairing events, three 60-person open house/wine club events, a non-Auction Napa Valley 125-person auction event, and participation in Auction Napa Valley;
- new winery domestic and process wastewater treatment systems;
- two new 15 foot tall fire-flow water tanks totaling approximately 40,000 gallons; and
- two new 15 foot tall recycled water landscape irrigation tanks totaling approximately 40,000 gallons.


NOTE TO REVIEWERS: This document is also reviewing future ministerial actions under §15022 & §15268 of the State CEQA Guidelines as foreseeable projects, including all work associated with the construction of the proposed improvements and the ongoing operation of the winery facility as limited by the terms of any adopted use permit. Building permit application(s) for work associated with this project have not been submitted as of the date of this document.

PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION:

The Director of Conservation, Development, and Planning has tentatively determined that the following project would not have a significant effect on the environment and Napa 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., Suite 210, Napa, California 94559 between the hours of 8:00 AM and 4:45 PM Monday through Friday (except holidays).

June 8, 2010
DATE:


BY: Christopher M. Cahill

WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD: June 16, 2010 through July 6, 2010

Please send written comments to the attention of Chris Cahill at 1195 Third St., Suite 210, Napa, Calif. 94559, or via e-mail to ccahill@co.napa.ca.us. A public hearing on this project is tentatively scheduled for the Napa County Conservation, Development, and Planning Commission at 9:00 AM or later on Wednesday, July 7, 2010. You may confirm the date and time of this hearing by calling (707) 253.4417.

COUNTY OF NAPA
CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND PLANNING DEPARTMENT
1195 3rd Street, Suite 210
Napa, Calif. 94559
(707) 253-4417

Initial Study Checklist

1. **Project Title**
Sandpoint Winery Use Permit Application № P09-00516-UP and Variance Application № P09-00535-VAR
2. **Property Owner**
Scott Young, Sandpoint Wines LLC, 1919 Inglewood Avenue, St. Helena, Calif., 94574
3. **Contact person and phone number**
Christopher M. Cahill, Project Planner, 707.253.4847, ccahill@co.napa.ca.us
4. **Project location and APN**
The project is located on a 16 acre parcel located on the south side of Inglewood Avenue, approximately ½ mile west of its intersection with CA-29 (the St. Helena Highway) and within the AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning district. APN: 027-120-056. 1919 Inglewood Avenue, St. Helena, Calif., 94574
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address**
Donna Oldford, Plans4Wine, 2620 Pinot Way, St. Helena, Calif., 94574, 707.963.5832, dboldford@aol.com
6. **General Plan Land Use Designation**
AR (Agricultural Resource)
7. **Current Zoning**
AP (Agricultural Preserve)
8. **Project Description**
Variance to allow construction of a new winery within required road setbacks (300 feet required, 82 feet proposed).

Use Permit to establish a new 30,000 gallon per year winery with:
 - a 10,691 sq. ft. two story winery building with a below-grade wine storage cellar and a second-story winery deck;
 - a 250 sq. ft. winery storage shed;
 - at-grade courtyard improvements;
 - three full-time and three part-time employees;
 - six parking spaces;
 - by-appointment tours and tastings with a maximum of 16 visitors per day and 42 per week;
 - an annual marketing plan with 24 20-person catered food and wine pairing events, three 60-person open house/wine club events, a non-Auction Napa Valley 125-person auction event, and participation in Auction Napa Valley;
 - new winery domestic and process wastewater treatment systems;
 - two new 15 foot tall fire-flow water tanks totaling approximately 40,000 gallons; and
 - two new 15 foot tall recycled water landscape irrigation tanks totaling approximately 40,000 gallons.

9. Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses:

The project is proposed on a 16 acre parcel located on the south side of Inglewood Avenue, approximately ½ mile west of Inglewood's intersection with State Highway 29 (or the St. Helena Highway) and more or less directly adjacent to the intersection of Inglewood Avenue and Stanton Drive. As the crow flies, it is also about 1/3 mile south of the City of St. Helena. The property formerly included a residence, barn, and vineyard and is currently being redeveloped with a "residential enclave" including a new single family residence, guest house, pool, pool house, and garages. Slightly less than 14 acres of existing, producing, vineyard would also remain.

Based on Napa County environmental resource mapping and the *Soil Survey of Napa County, California* (G. Lambert and J. Kashiwagi, Soil Conservation Service), the entirety of the project area, and indeed the whole of the subject parcel, is comprised of soils classified as Pleasanton Loam (0 to 2 percent slopes). The Pleasanton soil series is characterized by well drained soils on alluvial fans and in flood plains. Pleasanton soils are formed in alluvium derived from sedimentary rock and the Pleasanton soils of Napa County are generally more acidic than those located elsewhere in Northern California. Permeability is moderately slow, with an effective rooting depth of 60 inches or more and a water capacity of eight to nine inches. Runoff is slow and the risk of erosion is slight. Native vegetation types in the project vicinity would have included annual grasses and scattered oaks. The subject property has a long history of agricultural use, with 1940 aerial photos showing much of the parcel planted to vineyard.

As noted above, the subject property is bounded to the north by Inglewood Avenue. It is located directly to the south of the Stanton Lane/Lydia Lane residential subdivision in an area of mixed agricultural and residential uses. Access to Inglewood, which is a dead end public road running generally east to west, is from State Highway 29 to the east. CA-29 is a major local and sub-regional transportation route which runs as an undivided two lane highway in the vicinity of Inglewood Avenue with a two way center left turn lane which begins some 200 feet south of the Inglewood/CA-29 intersection and runs much of the way to the St. Helena city limit, to the north. There are no blue line streams, known wetlands, or floodplains located on, or directly adjacent to, the project area. However, an unnamed tributary to Bale Slough, and therefrom to the Napa River, is located approximately 300 yards to the west of the subject property, at the foot of the Mayacamas.

Land uses in the vicinity of the project are an interesting mix of large and smaller lot residential uses, active vineyard operations on lots ranging (generally) from ten to twenty acres, wineries with production ranging from 6,000 to 1.2 million gallons annually, commercial operations including a gas station, professional offices, a gourmet market, a combined winery/deli, and a sit-down restaurant, and the largely undeveloped and heavily wooded hills of the Mayacamas Range to the west. Individual wineries located within ½ mile of the project area include the Hall Winery (401 S. St Helena Highway, 1,260,000 gallons/year, public tours and tasting), Villa Helena Winery (1455 Inglewood Avenue, 6,000 gallons/year, tours and tasting by appointment), Corison Winery (987 S. St. Helena Highway, 20,000 gallons per year, tours and tasting by appointment), Milat Winery (1091 S. St. Helena Highway, 20,000 gallons per year, public tours and tasting), Flora Springs Wine Company (1978 West Zinfandel Lane, 120,000 gallons per year, tours and tasting by appointment with public tours and tasting at 677 S. St. Helena Highway), and Jaeger Family Vineyards (2125 Inglewood Avenue, 13,200 gallons per year, tours and tasting by appointment).

Pockets of RS:B-1 single-family residential zoning exist to the north, east, and south of the subject parcel and the South St. Helena commercial node, including both CL (Commercial Limited) and CN (Neighborhood Commercial) zoned parcels is located to the east- surrounding the Inglewood/CA-29 intersection. The PL (Public Lands) zoned Pestoni pomace facility is located approximately one mile to the south of the Sandpoint property and the PD (Planned Development) zoned Vineland Mobile Home Park is located at 341 St. Helena Highway, ½ mile to the northeast. Residential uses in the project area are (by the standards of unincorporated Napa County) comparatively extensive, with a number of residential lots sized at ½ acre or smaller.

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

N/A

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies:

N/A

Other Agencies Contacted:

Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, Federal Taxation Trade Bureau

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

The conclusions and recommendations contained herein are professional opinions developed in accordance with current standards of professional practice. They are based on a review of the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps, the Napa County Baseline Data Report, specific documents referenced herein, other sources of information included or referenced in the record file, comments received, conversations with knowledgeable individuals, the preparer's personal knowledge of the area, and visits to the site and surrounding areas. For further information, please see the permanent record file on this project, available for review at the offices of the Napa County Department of Conservation, Development, and Planning, 1195 Third Street, Napa, Calif.

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 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.



BY: Christopher M. Cahill
Project Planner
Napa County Conservation, Development, & Planning

June 8, 2010

Date

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a.-c. Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms, geological features, water, trees and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of a beautiful or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken-in. As generally described in the **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses** section, above, the Inglewood Avenue area is defined by a mix of vineyard and residential uses set against a background of undeveloped hills to the west. The new winery proposed here will be visible from the street, however the area between the proposed winery and the street will be landscaped and the scale and materials of the winery itself will be generally in keeping with the residential character of the area. Vegetation removal associated with this project would be limited to the removal of approximately ½ acre of existing vines. No tree removal is proposed, nor is any foreseeable given the lack of trees in the vicinity of the project. Seen as a whole, nothing in this project would substantially alter a scenic vista or substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site or its immediate surroundings. The project is not in, nor is it near, any state scenic highway. Impacts related to scenic resources will be less than significant.

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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. Based on a review of Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Department of Conservation Farmlands, 2008* layer), the entirety of the project area is located on prime farmland. This application proposes the permanent removal of approximately 1/2 acre of vines, however, the entirety of the proposed development will either be dedicated to active wine production or winery-accessory uses. General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use policies Ag/LU-2 and Ag/LU-13 recognize wineries, and any use consistent with the Winery Definition Ordinance and clearly accessory to a winery, as agriculture. As a result, this application will not result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use.
- b. As discussed at "a.," above, the proposed winery is consistent with the parcel's AP agricultural zoning. The parcel is not subject to a Williamson Act contract.
- c. As discussed at items "a." and "b.," above, the winery and winery accessory uses proposed in this application are defined as agricultural by the Napa County General Plan and are allowed under the parcel's AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning. Neither this project, nor any foreseeable consequence thereof, would result in changes to the existing environment which would result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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

Discussion:

A Note on Greenhouse Gasses

Construction and operation of the project analyzed in this initial study would contribute to overall increases in Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions by generating emissions associated with transportation to and from the site, emissions from energy used within buildings, and emissions from the use of equipment. In addition, the project would marginally decrease baseline carbon sequestration through the removal of approximately 1/2 acre of existing vineyard. The project-specific increase in GHG emissions would be relatively modest, given the estimated average of 16 new vehicle trips per day, and increasingly stringent Title 24 energy conservation requirements imposed as part of the building permit process.

Neither the State nor Napa County has adopted explicit thresholds of significance for GHG emissions, although the State has recently adopted changes to the State CEQA Guidelines which suggest that agencies may consider (among other factors) the extent to which a project complies with requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(b) (3)). Also, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has proposed compliance with a "qualified climate action plan" as a threshold of significance, along with a quantitative threshold of 1,100 MTCO₂e/yr (metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents per year) for land use projects.

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

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

currently serving as the basis for development of a refined inventory and emission reduction plan for unincorporated Napa County.

During our ongoing planning effort, the County requires project applicants to consider methods to reduce GHG emissions consistent with Napa County General Plan Policy CON-65(e). The applicants here have incorporated GHG reduction methods including: secured bicycle parking facilities, permeable paving, solar panels providing as much as 50% of the facility's energy supply, zero potable water irrigation, low VOC construction materials, and employee carpool/bike/pedestrian incentives into their project

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

- a. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plan. Wineries as proposed here are not producers of air pollution in volumes substantial enough to result in an air quality plan conflict. The project site lies within the Napa Valley, which forms one of the climatologically distinct sub-regions (Napa County Sub region) within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The topographical and meteorological features of the Valley create a relatively high potential for air pollution. Over the long term, emissions resulting from the proposed project would consist primarily of mobile sources, including production-related deliveries and visitor and employee vehicles traveling to and from the winery. The *Bay Area Air Quality Management Plan* states that projects that do not exceed a threshold of 2,000 vehicle trips per day will not impact air quality and do not require further study (*BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines*, p. 24). The use permit proposed here includes 3 full-time employees, 3 part-time employees, 16 busiest-day tours and tasting visitors, and potentially 3 busiest-day production pickups/deliveries; meaning that this project should account for 16 maximum daily trips on a day with no marketing events (this assumes 1 occupant per car for employees and 2.6 occupants per car for visitors). The subject application also proposes occasional marketing events, with up to 60 people at the largest event; at 2.6 persons per car that would add up to 23 additional trips on the day of a large marketing event. The resulting busiest day plus marketing total of 39 project-related trips is well below the established threshold of significance. (It's worth noting here that this analysis assumes a condition of approval, standard in cases like this, that two marketing events may not occur on the same day.)
- b. Please see "a.", above. There are no projected or existing air quality violations in the area to which this proposal would contribute. The project would not result in any violations of applicable air quality standards.
- c. Please see "a.," above and "d.-e.," below. The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. Standard conditions of approval for any Napa County construction project require dust control measures.
- d.-e. Earthmoving and construction activities required for project construction may cause odors and a temporary degradation in air quality from dust and heavy equipment air emissions during the construction phase. While construction on the site will generate dust particulates in the short-term, the impact would be less than significant with dust control measures as specified in Napa County's standard condition of approval relating to dust;

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

Wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. Construction-phase pollutants will be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. The project will not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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.-d. Napa County Environmental Resource Mapping (*Biological Critical Habitat Areas - California Red-legged Frog, Contra Costa Goldfields, and Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp; Vernal Pools; CNDDDB; Plant Surveys; and CNPS layers*) do not

indicate the presence of candidate, sensitive, or special status species on or near the project site. The proposed improvements will occur in areas which are already disturbed by longstanding viticultural use. There is no riparian area on or adjacent to the subject parcel; the nearest blue-line stream is located approximately 300 feet to the west of the parcel and 800 feet to the west of the winery site itself. The project will not have an adverse impact on any special status species, will not impact riparian habitat or federally protected wetlands, and will not impact migratory species, wildlife corridors, or wildlife nursery sites.

- e. This project does not include, and would not foreseeably necessitate, the removal of any trees. Excepting impacts to oak woodlands, Napa County does not have any local policies or ordinances addressing tree preservation. The project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.
- f. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans applicable to the subject parcel.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. According to Napa County Environmental Resource Mapping (*historic sites* layer), no historic resources are known to be located on or in the direct vicinity of the project site. Neither this project nor any foreseeable resulting ministerial activity will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource.
- b. According to Napa County Environmental Resource Mapping (*archaeology surveys, archeology sites, archeologically sensitive areas, and archeology flags* layers), portions of the subject property are located in a mapped archeologically sensitive area. In order to develop a more detailed and site-specific picture of this known archeological sensitivity, the Planning Division requested that the applicant submit a professional archeological analysis. The applicant contracted with Archaeological Services, Inc. of Kelseyville, who submitted a brief archeological report (Flaherty, Jay, *Archaeological Survey Young Property, NCAPN 027-120-056, 1919 Inglerwood Avenue, Saint Helena, CA, April 18, 2007*). The Flaherty report does not identify any significant archeological resources in the project area. According to Mr. Flaherty;

The first step in conducting the Cultural Resources study of your project area was to conduct a records search at CHRIS, located in Rohnert Park, CA. As a result of records search (#06-1546) it has been documented that your project area has already been surveyed for cultural resources as part of a larger project area in 2000 by Tom Origer and Associates. As a result of the study by Origer ("A Cultural Resources Survey for the Florn Springs-Komes Project South of St. Helena, Napa County, CA," CHRIS file S#22843) no cultural resources were discovered within your project boundaries. ASI recommends no further study at this time...

As analyzed in the project cultural resources survey, this project is unlikely to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of any known archeological resource. Standard County conditions of approval, including the requirement that;

...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 Conservation, Development, and Planning 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;

will result in a less than significant potential for impacts to archeological resources.

- c. No unique paleontological or geological features are known to be located on or in the vicinity of the project site. As a result, neither this project nor any foreseeable resulting ministerial activity will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a paleontological or geological resource.
- d. No formal cemeteries are known to exist within the project area and, as noted above, no significant evidence of historic and/or prehistoric Native American settlement was found in the project area. Public Resources Code §5097.98, Health and Safety Code §7050.5, and CEQA §15064.5(e) detail the procedures to follow in case of the accidental discovery of human remains, including requirements that work be stopped in the area, that the County Coroner be notified, and that the most likely descendants be identified and notified via the Native American Heritage Commission. Foreseeable project-specific impacts to human remains are less than significant.

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

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- ai. There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault map. As such, the proposed facility would result in a less than significant impact with regard to rupturing a known fault.
 - aii. All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. The proposed improvements must comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction, including the California Building Code, which will function to reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
 - aiii. No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that would indicate a high susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Napa County Environmental Resource Mapping (*liquefaction* layer) indicates that the project area is generally subject to a "low" tendency to liquefy. The proposed winery must comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction, including the California Building Code, which would reduce any potential impacts related to liquefaction to a less than significant level.
 - aiv. Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (*landslide line, landslide polygon, and landslide geology* layers) do not indicate the presence of landslides or slope instability on the flat subject property.
- b. Based on Napa County environmental resource mapping and the *Soil Survey of Napa County, California* (G. Lambert and J. Kashiwagi, Soil Conservation Service), the entirety of the project area, and indeed the whole of the subject parcel, is comprised of soils classified as Pleasanton Loam (0 to 2 percent slopes). The Pleasanton soil series is characterized by well drained soils on alluvial fans and in flood plains. Pleasanton soils are formed in alluvium derived from sedimentary rock and the Pleasanton soils of Napa County are generally more acidic than those located elsewhere in Northern California. Permeability is moderately slow, with an effective rooting depth of 60 inches or more and a water capacity of eight to nine inches. Runoff is slow and the risk of erosion is slight. The proposed project will require incorporation of best management practices and will be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance, which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable, to ensure that development does not impact adjoining properties, drainages, and roadways.

- c.-d. Late Pleistocene-Holocene fan deposits underlay the surficial soils in the project area. Based on Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Mapping (*liquefaction* layer) the project site has a "low" liquefaction predilection. Construction of the facility must comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction, including the California Building Code, which will function to reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- e. The Napa County Department of Environmental Management has reviewed this application and recommends approval based on the submitted wastewater feasibility report and septic improvement plans. Soils on the property have been determined to be adequate to support the proposed septic improvements. Please see the **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY** section, below, for a discussion of proposed wastewater treatment improvements.

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

	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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.-b. A Hazardous Materials Management Plan will be required by the Department of Environmental Management prior to occupancy of the new winery facility. Such plans provide information on the type and amount of hazardous materials stored on the project site. The proposed project will not result in a significant risk of release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- c. There are no schools located within ¼ mile of the project site; the closest school is the St. Helena Primary School, which is located approximately one mile to the northwest.
- d.-f. Napa County environmental resource mapping (*hazardous facilities* layer) indicates that the subject property is not on any known list of hazardous material sites. The project site is not located within two miles of any airport, be it public or private.
- g. The project has been designed to comply with emergency access and response requirements and has been reviewed by the Napa County departments responsible for emergency services; it will not have a negative impact on emergency response planning.
- h. The project is located in an area dominated by intensive irrigated agriculture. Risks associated with wildland fire in the direct vicinity are quite low; and to the extent they exist they are primarily associated with smoke related damage to wine grapes (smoke taint) and not with risks to life or structures. The Napa County Fire Marshal has reviewed this application and believes there is adequate fire service in the area. This project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires.

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

	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The applicant has submitted a project Septic Feasibility Report (Andrew Simpson for Delta Consulting and Engineering, *Septic Feasibility Report for the Sandpoint Winery Use Permit Application*, Rev 3, March 17, 2010) which proposes two possible wastewater treatment and disposal options. In the first case, the existing 600 gallon per day residential domestic waste septic system would be expanded to accommodate an additional combined winery process waste/ domestic waste flow of 1,138 gallons per day. Under this scenario, the existing 4,000 gallon dosing tank would remain, but the approximately 438 linear feet of existing pressure distribution subsurface disposal lines would be expanded by some 760 linear feet, for a total of 1,198 linear feet of pressure distribution system. Existing

and proposed septic fields would be located between the existing residential enclave and the proposed winery, with a 100% reserve area located just south of the existing residence. As an alternative, Delta is also proposing a system in which winery process waste is treated using an Orenco AdvanTex AX-100 unit with additional aerobic treatment in the recirculation tank. A 20,000 storage tank would be needed for wet-weather storage and the treated process waste would be used to irrigate proposed decorative landscaping and the approximately 14 acres of existing on-site vineyards that are to remain. Under this second scenario, both winery and residential domestic waste would be dealt with as described at option one, above. The Napa County Department of Environmental Management has reviewed the proposed domestic and process wastewater systems and recommends approval as conditioned. Additionally, the applicant will be required to obtain all necessary permits from the Napa County Department of Public Works, including a Stormwater Pollution Management Permit. The permit will provide for adequate on-site containment of runoff during storm events through placement of siltation measures around the development area.

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

Based on the submitted *Phase One* water availability analysis, the 16 acre subject valley-area parcel has a water availability calculation of 16 acre feet per year (af/yr), which is arrived at by multiplying its 16 acre size by a one af/yr/acre fair share water use factor. According to the applicant, existing water usage on the parcel is approximately 11.2 af/yr, including .75 af/yr for residential use and 10.5 af/yr for established vineyards. This application proposes an additional 0.2 af/yr of residential use, 1.12 af/yr of agricultural use for a small (slightly more than ¼ acre) orchard area, 0.69 af/yr of winery water use, and a decrease in vineyard water use of 0.78 af/yr. As a result of the foregoing, annual water demand for this parcel would increase to 12.6 af/yr. Based on these figures, the project would be below the established threshold for groundwater use on the property. The project will not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater level.

- c.-e. There are no existing or planned stormwater systems that would be affected by this project. The project will likely disturb slightly less than one acre of land, however, if it ultimately does result in more than an acre of disturbance, the permittee will be required to comply with the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board addressing stormwater pollution during construction activities. The area surrounding the project is pervious ground that is planted to vineyards and has the capacity to absorb runoff.
- f. There is nothing included in this proposal that would otherwise substantially degrade water quality. As discussed in greater detail at, "a.," above, the Department of Environmental Management has reviewed the sanitary wastewater proposal and has found the proposed system adequate, as conditioned, to meet the facility's septic needs. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality.
- g.-i. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Floodplain, Flood Zones, and Dam Levee Inundation* layers), the project site is not located within a mapped floodplain or dam levee inundation area. This project will not expose people or structures to significant risks associated with flooding.
- j. In coming years, higher global temperatures are expected to raise sea level by expanding ocean water, melting mountain glaciers and small ice caps, and causing portions of Greenland and the Antarctic ice sheets to melt. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change estimates that the global average sea level will rise between 0.6 and 2 feet over the next century (IPCC, 2007). However, the project area is located at approximately 225 feet in

elevation and there is no known history of mud flow in the vicinity. The project will not subject people or structures to a significant risk of inundation from tsunami, seiche, or mudflow.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

	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. The proposed project is located in an area dominated by agricultural, residential, and open space uses and the improvements proposed here are in support of ongoing agricultural uses county-wide, as they provide a market for grapes grown within Napa County. This project will not divide an established community
- b. The subject parcel is located in the AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning district, which allows wineries and uses accessory to wineries subject to use permit approval. With the winery road setback variances requested here, the project would be fully 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 AR (Agricultural Resource), 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 that new wineries, "...be designed to convey their permanence and attractiveness." (General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-10 and General Plan Community Character Policy CC-2). The buildings proposed here are generally of a high architectural quality and are fully in keeping with the design of the existing winery structure. The proposed winery additions will convey the required permanence and attractiveness.

- c. There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the property.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

		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:

- 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. The nearest known resource is the former Smith Gravel streambed gravel removal operation, which was located in Sulphur Creek, to the north.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

		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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a.-d. The proposed project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during the project construction phase. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles; and, as a result, noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. The proposed project would not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts. Construction activities would generally occur during the period between 7 am and 7 pm on weekdays- normal waking hours. All construction activities will be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (N.C.C. Chapter 8.16).

Noise from winery operations is generally limited; however, the proposed marketing plan could create additional noise impacts. The submitted marketing plan includes a number of annual events, several of which would include up to 60 visitors. The Napa County Exterior Noise Ordinance, which was adopted in 1984, sets the maximum permissible received sound level for a rural residence as 45 db between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. While the 45 db limitation is strict (45 db is roughly equivalent to the sound generated by a quiet conversation), the area around the proposed winery is relatively lightly developed and standard winery conditions of approval are designed to minimize noise impacts on neighboring properties associated with outdoor amplified music by requiring;

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

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

e.-f. The project site is not subject to an airport land use plan nor is it located within two miles of a public airport or private airstrip.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

	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. The Association of Bay Area Governments' *Projections 2009* figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase some 7.2% by the year 2035, while county-wide employment is projected to increase by 29% in the same period (Metropolitan Transportation Commission, *Superdistrict and County Summaries of ABAG's Projections 2009 - 2000-2035 Data Summary*, September 2009). The new employee positions which are part of this project may lead to some population growth within Napa County. However, relative to the county's projected low to moderate growth rate and overall adequate programmed housing supply, that population growth does not rise to a level of environmental significance.

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 environmental 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. In addition, the project will be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs.

b.-c. This application will not displace any persons or any existing housing units and will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

	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:

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

	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"/>
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. The project site is located near the end of Inglewood Avenue, a two lane public roadway with an approximate 20 foot pavement width extending from a point 450 feet to the west of the subject parcel (where the public roadway

ends) to State Highway 29, approximately ½ mile to the east. State Highway 29 is the major north-south route through the Napa Valley and has two travel lanes with paved shoulders and an existing two-way left turn lane which runs from White Lane to the north to a point approximately 250 feet to the south of the Inglewood Avenue intersection. Consistent with Napa County Use Permit Modification approval № P05-0184-MOD, V. Sattui Winery, which is located on the eastern frontage of Highway 29, between White Lane and Inglewood Avenue, is required to construct Approximately 1,300 feet of additional continuous center two-way left turn lane running from Inglewood Avenue south to Stice Lane. Those improvements are yet-to-be completed, however Caltrans encroachment permits have been filed and engineering specifications have been developed for the project.

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

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

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

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

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

LOS E- Operating conditions at or near capacity. Speeds are reduced to a low but relatively uniform value. Freedom to maneuver is difficult with users experiencing frustration and poor comfort and convenience.

Unstable operation is frequent, and minor disturbances in traffic flow can cause breakdown conditions.

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

Traffic loads are extremely light and vehicle travel is generally unimpeded by traffic congestion along the length of Inglewood Avenue. However, State Highway 29 between Chaix Lane (to the north) and Zinfandel Lane (to the south) has been identified as an impacted traffic segment. According to the 2008 Napa County General Plan Update EIR, the segment of Highway 29 between Chaix Lane and Zinfandel Lane, a zone which includes the Inglewood Avenue intersection, has an existing LOS of "F." Projected 2030 traffic volumes along the Chaix Lane-Zinfandel Lane segment would remain at LOS "F" under all of the cumulative scenarios analyzed in the General Plan EIR, including a no-roadway-improvements scenario. (Dowling Associates, *Technical Memorandum Supporting the Findings and Recommendations for: The Napa County General Plan Update EIR*, September 2006.)

Traffic Peak hours at the intersection of State Highway 29 and White Lane, just 250 feet to the north of Inglewood Avenue, have been determined to be 4:15 p.m. to 5:15 p.m. on weekdays and 2:15 p.m. to 3:15 p.m. on weekends. During the weekday peak, a traffic volume of 2,159 vehicles moves through the intersection of State Highway 29 and White Lane. During the weekend peak, 2,296 vehicles move through the intersection (w-trans, V. Sattui *Traffic Study*, June 9, 2006). Caltrans traffic volume records indicate that volumes on State Highway 29 and State Highway 12, important feeder routes into, out of, and through Napa County have been constant or have actually decreased slightly over the 2006-2009 period (George Nickelson for Omni-Means Engineering, *Responses to Comments by Tom Brohard and Associates Related to the Napa Commerce Center Traffic Impact Analysis*, May 21, 2010). As a result, the w-trans 2006 traffic volume figures should be representative, or may even overstate current flows along Highway 29 in the vicinity of Inglewood Avenue.

As analyzed at Air Quality, above, the use permit proposed here includes 3 full-time employees, 3 part-time employees, 16 busiest-day tours and tasting visitors, and potentially 3 busiest-day production pickups/deliveries; meaning that this project should account for 16 maximum daily trips on a day with no marketing events (this assumes 1 occupant per car for employees and 2.6 occupants per car for visitors). The application also proposes occasional marketing events, with up to 60 people at the largest event; at 2.6 persons per car that would add up to 23 additional trips on the day of a large marketing event. The resulting busiest day plus marketing trip generation total would be 39 trips. Because a percentage of the winery's proposed production would be from grapes grown off-site, somewhere between 10 and 20 grape truck trips would also be generated annually (with an average of less than 1 per day during the harvest season).

On an average day, then, this project would result in less than 16 daily vehicle trips and on the busiest day annually it would result in perhaps 39 daily trips. Peak hour project traffic volumes, even in the worst case scenario, are unlikely to exceed 10 trips. As noted above, week day and weekend peak hour traffic loads at Highway 29 in the vicinity of the Inglewood intersection range from 2,100 to 2,300 vehicles. 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 worse than LOS E, or at intersections or two-lane highway where base case (without project) is at LOS F, a significant impact is considered to occur where a project increases the base volumes by more than 1%. This 1% significance factor has been used consistently as the significance determination for all recent EIRs and other CEQA documents. Traffic generated by this project will contribute less than 1% to peak hour traffic levels on local roadways and to any resulting deterioration in relevant levels of service. This less-than-1% increase is considered a less-than-significant traffic impact and as a result, this project will not result in a significant increase in traffic or a decrease in the existing roadway level of service either individually or cumulatively.

- c. This proposed project would not result in any change to air traffic patterns.
- d.-e. Access to the proposed winery would be from a new 20 foot wide driveway located some 180 feet to the east of the property's existing residential access drive. The Department of Public Works has reviewed project access and recommends approval with standard conditions related to driveway improvements. The Napa County Fire Marshall has reviewed this application and has identified no significant impacts related to emergency vehicle access provided that standard conditions of approval are incorporated. Project impacts related to traffic hazards and emergency access are expected to be less than significant.
- f. This application proposes 6 parking spaces, including 1 disabled-accessible space. The winery would have 3 full time and 3 part time winery employees (it is important to note that those numbers are inclusive of family members who will both live and work on the property) along with 16 busiest by-appointment tours and tasting visitors. Given those figures, the 6 proposed parking spaces should be adequate. Standard conditions of approval disallowing parking in the right-of-way and requiring the shuttling of special event visitors from off-site where special marketing event visitation exceeds parking capacity should guarantee adequate parking during the largest 60 person special marketing event. Impacts to parking capacity will be less than significant.
- g. There is no aspect of this proposed project that would conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation. The project proposes secured bike parking.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required

	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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 not exceed wastewater treatment requirements as established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and will not result in a significant impact on the environment relative to wastewater discharge. Wastewater disposal will be accommodated on-site and in compliance with State and County regulations.
- b. This application proposes new domestic and process wastewater systems as described at **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**, above. The Napa County Department of Environmental Management has reviewed the proposed domestic and process wastewater systems and recommends approval as conditioned. Required wellhead setbacks and ongoing monitoring of the facility's wastewater systems by the Department of Environmental Management should reduce any impacts on water quality to less than significant levels. The new wastewater treatment system will not result in significant environmental impacts over permitted baseline levels.
- c. The project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or an expansion of existing facilities which would cause a significant impact to the environment.
- d. As discussed at the **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY** section, above, groundwater usage will remain below the property's fair share volume. No new or expanded entitlements are necessary.

- e. Domestic wastewater will be treated on-site and will not require a wastewater treatment provider. Process wastewater will likewise be treated and disposed of on-site consistent with the requirements of the Napa County Department of Environmental Management.
- f. The project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the project's demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the project.
- g. The project will comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

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

	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 would have a less than significant impact on wildlife resources. No sensitive resources or biologic areas will be converted or affected by this project. Also as analyzed above, the project would not result in a significant loss of native trees, native vegetation, or important examples of California's history or pre-history.
- b. As discussed above, and in particular under **Air Quality, Transportation/Traffic, and Population and Housing** the proposed project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

- c. There are no environmental effects caused by this project that would result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, whether directly or indirectly. No hazardous conditions resulting from this project have been identified. The project would not have any environmental effects that would result in significant impacts.

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