

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

Notice of Intent to Adopt a **Revised** Negative Declaration¹

1. **Project Title:** Robert Sinskey Winery (Use Permit Major Modification # P09-00480-MOD)
2. **Property Owner:** Sinskey Vineyards, Inc.
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Ronald Gee, Project Planner, (707) 253-4417, ronald.gee@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project location and APN:** The project site is located on one parcel, approximately 11.82 acres in size, on the east side of Silverado Trail, approximately 0.21 mile (1,100 feet) southeast of the intersection with Yountville Cross Road, within the AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district. (Assessor's Parcel Number: 031-230-017) 6320 Silverado Trail, Napa.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Sinskey Vineyards, Inc. dba Robert Sinskey Winery, 6320 Silverado Trail, Napa, CA 94558
6. **General Plan description:** Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space, *Napa County General Plan, June, 2008*
7. **Zoning:** AW (Agricultural Watershed) District
8. **Project Description:**

Major Modification to Use Permit # 94099-MOD to: 1) expand winery production capacity from 65,000 gallons/year to 143,000 gallons/year; 2) expand and relocate the demonstration kitchen with 662 square feet of new kitchen area and 1,261 square feet of new seating area; 3) expand the existing winery facility with a 2,937 square feet second-floor winery office wing and first-floor 801 square feet office addition; 4) expand the existing west-side, outdoor terrace by 1,500 square feet; 5) increase parking from 30 to 62 spaces with a new parking lot; 6) increase the number of full-time employees from six to ten and part-time employees from three to five; 7) construct a new wastewater disposal system; 8) modify the existing marketing plan to increase the average number of food and wine seminar attendees from 30 to 36, allow up to 75 visitors/day (55 average) for private tours and tastings and modest food service, add a new once-monthly evening marketing event for up to 80 people and new twice-yearly marketing events with food service for up to 150 visitors, all evening events would be held between the hours of 6:00 pm and 11:30 pm with clean-up permitted until 12:00 am; 9) modify four 1994 Use Permit conditions of approval and four mitigation measures which restricted winery operations to accommodate a former neighbor; and 10) allow retail sales of produce and animal products grown, raised or produced on the winery property and adjacent parcel, also owned by the applicant's family.

PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION:

The Conservation, Development and Planning Director of Napa County has 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: June 15, 2010

BY: Ronald Gee, Project Planner

¹ Revisions are shown by redline/strikeout and do not alter the analysis or conclusions presented, but provide additional information about waste water treatment that became available after July 7, 2010.

WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD: June 17, 2010 to the conclusion of the public hearing before the Conservation, Development and Planning Commission scheduled on July 7, 2010.

Please send written comments to the attention of Ronald Gee at 1195 Third St., Room 210, Napa, California 94559, or via e-mail to Ronald.gee@countyofnapa.org

A public hearing on this project is tentatively scheduled for the Napa County 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) 253-4416.

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:** Robert Sinskey Winery (Use Permit Major Modification # P09-00480-MOD)
2. **Property Owner:** Sinskey Vineyards, Inc.
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Ronald Gee, Project Planner, (707) 253-4417, ronald.gee@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project location and APN:** The project site is located on one parcel, approximately 11.82 acres in size, on the east side of Silverado Trail, approximately 0.21 mile (1,100 feet) southeast of the intersection with Yountville Cross Road, within the AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district. (Assessor's Parcel Number 031-230-017) 6320 Silverado Trail, Napa.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Sinskey Vineyards, Inc. dba Robert Sinskey Winery, 6320 Silverado Trail, Napa, CA 94558
6. **General Plan description:** Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space, *Napa County General Plan, 2008*
7. **Zoning:** AW (Agricultural Watershed) District
8. **Project Description:**

Major Modification to Use Permit # 94099-MOD to: 1) expand winery production capacity from 65,000 gallons/year to 143,000 gallons/year; 2) expand and relocate the demonstration kitchen with 662 square feet of new kitchen area and 1,261 square feet of new seating area; 3) expand the existing winery facility with a 2,937 square feet second-floor winery office wing and first-floor 801 square feet office addition; 4) expand the existing west-side, outdoor terrace by 1,500 square feet; 5) increase parking from 30 to 62 spaces with a new parking lot; 6) increase the number of full-time employees from six to ten and part-time employees from three to five; 7) construct a new wastewater disposal system; 8) modify the existing marketing plan to increase the average number of food and wine seminar attendees from 30 to 36, allow up to 75 visitors/day (55 average) for private tours and tastings and modest food service, add a new once-monthly evening marketing event for up to 80 people and new twice-yearly marketing events with food service for up to 150 visitors, all evening events would be held between the hours of 6:00 pm and 11:30 pm with clean-up permitted until 12:00 am; 9) modify four 1994 Use Permit conditions of approval and four mitigation measures which restricted winery operations to accommodate a former neighbor; and 10) allow retail sales of produce and animal products grown, raised or produced on the winery property and adjacent parcel, also owned by the applicant's family.

In the main winery building, the demonstration kitchen will be expanded and relocated; it will increase in area by 662 feet with an additional 1,261 seating area. A new, second-floor winery office wing of 2,937 square feet and 801 square feet expansion of existing first-floor office space will be included. The outdoor terrace area will be expanded by 1,500 square feet on the west side.

An existing 24-foot wide, driveway from Silverado Trail provides shared access to the winery and adjacent rural residential site. An existing two-level parking lot contains 30 parking spaces (including four handicap spaces). A new 32-space parking lot is proposed west of this lot with an additional, designated limousine parking pocket on the southeast corner of the driveway.

The new constructed wetland process wastewater treatment system, existing septic system and reserve leach fields will be located in the front yard area, in the vineyard and lavender field, between Silverado Trail and the parking lots. The sub-surface flow constructed wetland will increase system capacity and retention time; it will treat winery process waste water only.

9. **Environmental setting and surrounding land uses:**

The approximately 12-acre, irregularly-shaped lot is bounded to the north, east and south by rural residential, winery and vineyard uses; to the west, across Silverado Trail, are existing vineyards and rural residential uses. The hillside property slopes up gently to steeply (5% to 40%) to the northeast from Silverado Trail at a base elevation of 171 feet to 400 feet MSL. The site is developed with an existing two-story winery building with a vineyard, water storage pond, access road and parking area. According to the United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Soil Survey of Napa County, California, there is Bale Clay Loam (2 to 5% slopes) along Silverado Trail frontage, Kidd Loam (15-30% slopes) and Bressa-Dibble outcrop complex (30-50% slopes) in the middle 70% of the site and Hambricht Rock-Outcrop Complex (30-75% slopes) in the north corner; the southern half of the site is subject to Low Liquefaction and the balance of the site has Very Low Liquefaction potential. There is identified soil creep on the site that was subject to a geotechnical investigation detailed below. The site is located outside any designated Floodplain, Dam/Levee Inundation or Alquist-Priolo Seismic Hazard Zones. Silverado Trail is a designated Viewshed roadway. All proposed winery structure and parking lot additions and activities will be located outside identified landslide areas. Silverado Trail is a two-lane roadway with a center, left-turn lane along parcel frontage.

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

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

San Francisco Bay Regional water Quality Control Board

Other Agencies Contacted

Napa County Public Works Department

Napa County Environmental Management 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

Ronald Gee, Project Planner

June 15, 2010

Date

Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department

PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

The Conservation, Development and Planning Director of Napa County has tentatively determined that the following project would not have a significant effect on the environment. Documentation supporting this determination is on file for public inspection at the Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department Office, 1195 Third St., Suite 210, Napa, California 94559. For further information call (707) 253-4416.

Project Title: Robert Sinskey Winery (Use Permit # P09-00480-MOD)

Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Robert Sinskey Vineyards, Inc. dba Robert Sinskey Winery, 6320 Silverado Trail, Napa, CA 94558

Property Owner: Sinskey Vineyards, Inc. dba Robert Sinskey Winery

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Major Modification to Use Permit # 94099-MOD to: 1) expand winery production capacity from 65,000 gallons/year to 143,000 gallons/year; 2) expand and relocate the demonstration kitchen with 662 square feet of new kitchen area and 1,261 square feet of new seating area; 3) expand the existing winery facility with a 2,937 square feet second-floor winery office wing and first-floor 801 square feet office addition; 4) expand the existing west-side, outdoor terrace by 1,500 square feet; 5) increase parking from 30 to 62 spaces with a new parking lot; 6) increase the number of full-time employees from six to ten and part-time employees from three to five; 7) construct a new wastewater disposal system; 8) modify the existing marketing plan to increase the average number of food and wine seminar attendees from 30 to 36, allow up to 75 visitors/day (55 average) for private tours and tastings and modest food service, add a new once-monthly evening marketing event for up to 80 people and new twice-yearly marketing events with food service for up to 150 visitors, all evening events would be held between the hours of 6:00 pm and 11:30 pm with clean-up permitted until 12:00 am; 9) modify four 1994 Use Permit conditions of approval and four mitigation measures which restricted winery operations to accommodate a former neighbor; and 10) allow retail sales of produce and animal products grown, raised or produced on the winery property and adjacent parcel, also owned by the applicant's family.

WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD: June 17, 2010 through July 7, 2010

HEARING DATE and LOCATION: July 7, 2010, 9:00 a.m., Napa County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 1195 Third Street, Third Floor, Napa, CA 94559.

DATE: June 15, 2010

BY THE ORDER OF

Hillary Gitelman
Director
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 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-b) The proposed project will be located over 600 feet from Silverado Trail, a designated Viewshed Road in *the Napa County General Plan, 2008*. The new parking lot and building additions will be to an existing winery structure built in 1987. No changes to the building exterior are proposed that would damage the scenic vista; existing landscape improvements will be enhanced by providing additional plant materials to screen the new parking lot, retaining walls and building additions. The project will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or substantially damage scenic resources; no rock outcroppings or historic resources are located on-site that would be affected by the project.
- c) Except for the new parking lot and remodeled winery building façade, the open area along parcel frontage is planted in vineyard and existing landscape screening. The project meets all building and landscape setbacks from roadways. The project will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and surrounding area.
- d) The expanded 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. Standard conditions of approval require, "All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward, shall be located as low to the ground as possible, and 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, including architectural highlighting and spotting. Low-level lighting shall be utilized in parking areas as opposed to elevated high-intensity light standards. Prior to issuance of any building permit for construction of the winery, two (2) copies of a separate detailed lighting plan showing the location and specifications for all lighting fixtures to be installed on the property shall be submitted for Department review and approval." Therefore, 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 t 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: | | | | |
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 conversation of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

a. – c. The project site is located in the designated Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space area of the Napa County General Plan Land Use Element. The existing winery use takes place on a site with existing cultivated vineyards and allows for expanded production capacity. The property across Silverado Trail from the project is under Williamson Act contract, not the project site. There would be minor conversion of existing vineyard to accommodate the new expanded parking area. The project would have a less-than-significant impact on agricultural resources.

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"/> |
| 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"/> |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 facility and associated earthwork would not result in significant adverse impacts to air quality.

a.-c. Construction and operation of the proposed project analyzed in this Initial Study would contribute to the 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 affect carbon sequestration by modifying vegetation on the site by planting 46 15-gallon, 15 5-gallon and 6 1-gallon fruit trees and shrubs in landscaped islands around the winery and new parking lot with an additional assortment of shrubs, other decorative trees and planters. There will also be a new "living roof" added to the southwest corner of the building.

The project-specific increase in GHG emissions would be relatively modest, given the estimated number of new vehicle trips per day 64-68 added trips on weekdays and Saturdays with up to 76 added trips during the 6-week harvest season, and increasingly stringent Title 24 energy conservation requirements imposed as part of the building permit process. Changes in sequestration would also be modest due to the less than 0.5 acre of newly disturbed construction area required for the project.

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 despite adoption of mitigation measures that incorporated specific policies and action items into the General Plan.

Consistent with these General Plan action items, Napa County participated in 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 (NCTPA) 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 the 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 current project applicant has incorporated the following reduction methods into their project: 1) use of eco-friendly building materials; 2) a future solar energy system; 3) installation of a sub-surface flow constructed wetland process wastewater treatment system that increases system capacity and retention time while improving treatment efficacy through contact with an extensive microbiological community.

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

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 sensitive noise-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, 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <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. According to County Environmental Sensitivity Maps, the project site is not located within any area with 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. Except for minor conversion of vineyards rows to accommodate a new parking lot, all improvements would take place on an existing winery site built in 1987.

The proposed subsurface treatment constructed wetland (SFCW) process waste water (PWW) treatment system will create an 80-foot long, 20-foot wide and 3-foot deep wetland area consisting of three beds. According to the Report of Waste Discharge application submitted to the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), the SFCW beds will have a low-permeability liner and filled with pea gravel or river rock such that PWW does not spill over the gravel. The bed will be planted with hydrophytic plants, including but not limited to, Bulrush (*Scirpus*, spp.), Cattail (*Typha*, spp.), Reeds (*Juncus*, spp.), Papyrus, irises, calla lilies, canna lilies, etc. to provide root systems for the attachment of micro-organisms that provide wastewater treatment. These plants will provide nesting opportunities for birds such as avocets, red-winged blackbirds and other species. Other organisms, such as frogs, insects and lizards, may inhabit the wetland beds. The sub-surface nature of these beds, however, will not make them rich for habitat for aquatic life. Ongoing operation and maintenance procedures will be established to monitor and maintain the wetland, including annual trimming of plants to a 6-inch height. Similar systems have been approved by the RWQCB and operate throughout Northern California, including Sonoma County; these new SFCW systems have not been detrimental to species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species.

The new SFCW system will treat winery PWW only; domestic PWW will be handled by the existing septic system. The new SFCW is subject to both RWQCB and Napa County Department of Environmental Management permit review and approval, including operation and maintenance monitoring. For these reasons, no substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, is expected to occur 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

- b. The Napa River is located across Silverado Trail, about 3,416 feet (0.65 mile) west of the site. No new improvements will be constructed in the creek or within the vicinity of the river. The project would not result in substantial adverse impacts on riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities nor will it result in any changes from what now exists.
- 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.
- d. The project 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 because all improvements would take place on an existing winery site that has been developed since 1987. See response to Section IV.a above.
- e. Near Silverado Trail, the habitat is largely grassland but is surrounded by existing vineyards. The project does not conflict with any County ordinance or requirement to preserve existing trees, and therefore is considered as not having potential for significant impact.
- 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"/> |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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) indicate there are no known historically-sensitive sites or structures located within the project site.
- b. There are no known archaeological resources in the development area. Standard use permit conditions of approval require 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 Department will be contacted for further guidance, which will likely include the requirement for the applicant to hire a qualified professional to analyze the artifacts encountered and to determine if additional measures are required. If human remains are encountered during the development, all work in the vicinity must be, by law, halted, and the Napa County Coroner informed, so that he can determine if an investigation of the cause of death is required, and if the remains are of Native American origin. If the remains are of Native American origin, the nearest tribal relatives as determined by the State Native American Heritage Commission would be contacted to obtain recommendations for treating or removal of such remains, including grave goods, with appropriate dignity, as required under Public Resources Code Section 5097.98." 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: | | | | |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 designated Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zone. According to the PJC & Associates, Inc., *Geotechnical Investigation (for) Proposed Addition and Parking Lot, Robert Sinskey Vineyards, September 18, 2008*, the closest known fault is the West Napa Fault, located 2.3 miles west of the project. The property slopes up to the southeast with gentle- to steeply-sloped topography. While seismic activity is endemic to the Bay Area, all structures will be constructed to UBC requirements and result in a less than significant risk. Since the winery and winery-related activities will take place in a low liquefaction area, people or structures will not be exposed to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death. In addition, the applicant has included all recommendations of the PJC & Associates, Inc. geotechnical investigation as part of final project design to address any potential geological hazards, including landslides and soil creep.
- b. According to the United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Soil Survey of Napa County, California, there is Bale Clay Loam (2 to 5% slopes) along Silverado Trail frontage, Kidd Loam (15-30% slopes) and Bressa-Dibble outcrop complex (30-50% slopes) in the middle 70% of the site and Hambright Rock-Outcrop Complex (30-75% slopes) in the north corner; the southern half of the site is subject to Low Liquefaction and the balance of the site has Very Low Liquefaction potential. No substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil will result from the project.
- c. The project will occur on gently sloping parts of the parcel. The soils on site are characterized by medium runoff with low 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, which is required by County Code and is a standard practice on all County development projects.

Since there will be less than one acre of disturbed area for the project, no Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPP) is required. Therefore, the potential for impacts is considered less than significant.

- d. The project site is not known to be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence or collapse.
- e. 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.
- f. An existing process wastewater (PWW) system and leach field has been operating since 1988 (upgraded in 1998) with a current capacity of 17,500 gallons for domestic wastewater. An upgraded, sub-surface flow constructed wetland will increase capacity to 30,000 gallons with a biological treatment system is proposed. With Sanitary Permit issuance and installation of the new approved system, no impact to soils relative to septic tanks or waste water disposal systems will occur.

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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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. Any future operator that uses substantial amounts of hazardous materials will be subject to review and approval by the County, including the Environmental Management Department that regulates all hazardous material uses. A Business Plan will be filed with the Environmental Management Department should hazardous materials reach reportable levels.
- 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 expanded winery use would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working on the project or the project area.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.
- g. The access driveway that serves the project has been improved to comply with County road standards. Therefore, the design of the project will not negatively impact or hinder emergency vehicle access. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Public Works Department and found acceptable as conditioned.
- 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 would incorporate fire safety equipment and measures as required by the California Department of Forestry/County Fire Marshal.

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

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not violate any known water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The applicant is required to obtain a Stormwater Permit from the California State Regional Water Quality Control Board because the project disturbance exceeds one acre; this permit will address seasonal erosion control and drainage both during and post-construction. Therefore, the project does not have the potential to significantly impact water quality and discharge standards.
- b. There are four existing groundwater wells on this property drilled between 1983-1995. On-site storage is provided by four tanks with a capacity of 32,500 gallons. With the 11.82 acre parcel size and parcel location factor of 0.5, the site's allowable water allotment is 5.91 acre feet/year. The site's current level of use for winery, vineyard, landscaping and commercial operations is approximately 3.18 acre feet/year. With the proposed expansion, the water use total increases to approximately 3.76 acre feet/year, still below the maximum

5.91 acre/feet maximum threshold. The project would not result in substantial depletion of 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.

- c-d. The proposed building addition and new parking lot will alter the drainage pattern on site but will not 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 are existing retention facilities located along parcel frontage. 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 less than one acre of disturbed area for the project, no Storm Water Pollutant Elimination Permit (SWPP) is required. Project storm drainage will be directed either towards the existing vineyard or will flow in its natural drainage path eventually towards Nash Creek, an intermittent stream that flows into the Napa River to the east, located approximately 550 feet down-slope from the project site.
- f. There are no other factors in this project that would otherwise degrade water quality.
- g. - h. The project site is not located within any designated 100-year and 500-year floodplain; all winery structures and activities will be located outside of these designated areas. No housing or other structures that could impede or direct flood flows will occur in designated floodplain areas
- i. - j. In coming years, higher global temperatures are expected to raise sea levels 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 (IPCC) estimates that the global average sea level will rise between 0.6 and 2 feet over the next century (IPCC, 2007). Elevations on the property range from approximately 171 feet above mean sea level down to approximately 400 feet. The potential for tsunami is considered less-than-significant. The project is located many miles from San Francisco Bay; in the unlikely event that a tsunami enters the bay, any surge would dissipate well before reaching the subject property.

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. The County has designated the site for agricultural development and, as proposed, the project is consistent with both the general plan designation and 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 groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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

The project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during remodeling and construction of the winery addition. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant with implementation of County Noise Ordinance requirements and enforcement by the Department of Environment Management.

Earlier Negative Declarations for the project, Use Permits # 94099-MOD and # U-90-7, included specific mitigation measures to address a former neighboring resident's concerns about winery hours of operation, traffic and noise impacts. These mitigation measures restricted equipment use, exterior lighting, on-site advertising and the number of parking spaces. The current proposal includes a request to remove these former mitigation measures since the applicant has since purchased the neighboring property and, therefore, they are no longer necessary.

- a. There is a neighboring residence south of the project site now owned by the applicant. Temporary construction noise will be in compliance with both County noise standards.
- b. Construction activities may result in groundborne vibrations and noise levels. However, given the lack of proximity of the construction site to existing residences (other than the one applicant-owned property about 250-feet southeast of the winery), the potential for impact is less-than-significant. The closest additional residences are located 425 feet west and 720 feet northwest, both across Silverado Trail, and 670 feet south of the winery.
- c. - d. The anticipated noise levels following the completion of construction would be minimal, typical of agricultural winery uses, and are considered less-than-significant.
- e. The project site is not located within an area subject to the *Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan* nor located within two miles of a public airport with potential exposure to excessive noise levels.
- 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 addition to a portion of an existing winery facility. The project will not displace any housing or divide any established communities. The project will result in three new full-time and six part-time jobs. 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 development 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 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"/> |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 located within the California Department of Forestry designated Fire Hazard Zone. The Napa County Fire Marshal, in December 29, 2009 *Use Permit Comments*, 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.

The proposed project is not expected to change any existing level of public services or require any new facilities. The capacities of Fire and Police services are adequate to service the proposed project, though emergency response time is expected to remain lengthy. Water is available from existing wells on the property. School impact mitigation fees levied will be 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 fee, property tax revenue and taxes from the sale of wine will help meet the cost of providing public services to the property. Therefore, less than significant effects are anticipated with respect to (a).

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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts on recreation facilities.

- a-b. The project would not significantly increase the use of existing recreational facilities.

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 results in substantial safety risks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) 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. As stated in the George Nickelson, *Traffic Analysis for Production and Visitor Increases at the Robert Sinskey Vineyards Winery on Silverado Trail, October 27, 2009*, based on new radar surveys, the "critical" vehicle speeds (i.e., 85% of all surveyed vehicle travel at or below the critical speed of 51 mph) along Silverado Trail, vehicles require a stopping sight distance of 450 feet to the property access driveway. There is over 1,000 feet visibility to the north and 650-700 feet to the south, both in excess of the 450 feet minimum Caltrans design standard.

Proposed winery expansion traffic generation will result in 64-68 added trips on weekdays and Saturdays; during the six-week harvest season, the traffic increase would be 76 daily trips. The additional daily trips the project would generate represent an approximately 0.3%-0.4% increase to the existing 10,486 average daily traffic volume along Silverado Trail, south of Yountville Cross Road. 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 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 Planning Agency and has been used consistently as the significance determination for all recent EIR and CEQA documents. Peak period traffic generated from the project will contribute less than 1% to traffic levels on local roadways and intersections and to deterioration in their level of service. This less than 1% increase is considered a less-than-significant level.

December 14, 2009 Department of Public Works Department project comments state that restriping of the existing left-turn lane along Silverado Trail property frontage will be required. Sufficient road width exists; the proximity of two opposing left turns requires restriping for a continuous left-turn lane in place of the two existing, individually-dedicated turn lanes (for the project and a neighboring residential driveway). The applicant has agreed to the restriping requirement and has incorporated the continuous center, left-turn lane restriping along Silverado parcel frontage as part of the project.

- c. The project does not have any impact on air traffic patterns.
- d -e. The project will not result in any significant changes to levels of service or cause any new safety risks. Access driveway line-of-sight along Silverado Trail exceeds Caltrans design standards and the existing project access 24-foot road width exceeds the minimum 18-foot with two-foot shoulder standard. There is an existing southbound, left-turn lane along parcel frontage.
- f. The project will increase on-site parking from 30 to 62 spaces with the addition of a new parking lot. The project will not result in inadequate parking capacity.
- g. The proposed project does not conflict with any known policies or plans supporting alternative transportation.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

| | | 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"/> |
| | 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"/> |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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. As detailed in Section IV.a above, a new subsurface treatment constructed wetland (SFCW) process waste water (PWW) treatment system is proposed for winery expansion. The new SFCW system will treat winery PWW only; domestic PWW will be handled by the existing septic system. Similar systems have been approved by the RWQCB and operate throughout Northern California, including Sonoma County. The new SFCW is subject to both RWQCB and Napa County Department of Environmental Management permit review and approval, including operation and maintenance monitoring. The new, combined system will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
- b. The project includes a proposal to upgrade the existing septic system and leach field with a new SFCW biological treatment system, as detailed above, to increase system capacity and retention time. Compliance with Napa County and RWQCB permit requirements, the new water and wastewater treatment facilities will not result in significant environmental effects.
- c. The existing residence/future winery structure is located about 2,200 feet (0.42 mile) west of the Napa River and is further separated by SR 29. 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 Water Availability Analysis, Phase I Study, the proposed winery expansion would require 3.76 acre feet/year for the combined winery, vineyard, landscaping and other operational uses, well below the approximately 5.91 acre feet/year allotted to the 11.82 acre site for the "valley area" of the County. Sufficient water supplies will be available for the proposed use from the four existing wells drilled between 1983-1995. In addition, there are four existing water storage tanks with a total 32,500 gallons capacity.
- e. See response "a." above.
- f.-g. The project will be served by the Upper Valley Waste Management Authority which has sufficient capacity to meet the project's demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the project. 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 | | | | |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 has previously been disturbed and does not contain any known listed planted or animal species. The project 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 does not pose any substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.