

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

**Notice of Intent To Adopt a Negative Declaration**

1. **Project Title:** CaNani Winery (Use Permit # P09-00185-UP and Variance # P09-00492-VAR)
2. **Property Owner:** Yountville Vineyards, LLC
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Ronald Gee, Project Planner, (707) 253-4417, [ronald.gee@countyofnapa.org](mailto:ronald.gee@countyofnapa.org)
4. **Project location and APN:** The project site is located on two parcels, approximately 14.11 acres total size (12.52 and 1.59 acres), on the east side of St. Helena Highway (SR-29), at the southeast corner of the intersection at Yount Mill Road and St. Helena Highway, within the AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning district. (Assessor's Parcel #: 031-120-026 and 031-130-026) 7466 St. Helena Highway, Napa.
4. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Yountville Vineyards, LLC, P.O. Box 2692, Yountville, CA 94599
6. **General Plan description:** Agricultural Resource, *Napa County General Plan, June, 2008*
7. **Zoning:** AP (Agricultural Preserve) District
8. **Project Description:**

Approval of a Use Permit to establish a new, 48,000 gallon per year winery with: 1) a two-story, 16,243 sq. ft. winery building with 5,800 sq. ft. of offices, 1,670 sq. ft. of tasting/sales area; 2,281 sq. ft. of barrel storage, total 2,410 sq. ft. roof deck areas and 15,970 sq. ft. of cave area with four portals for a winery totaling 56,370 sq. ft.; 2) conversion of an existing 1,460 sq. ft., detached garage to a farm equipment storage building and a new 375 sq. ft. utility building; 3) 13 full-time and 2 part-time employees; 4) 49 on-site parking spaces; 5) new entrance monument and sign; 6) up to 75 visitors per day (Friday-Sunday) and 40 visitors per day (Monday-Thursday) by appointment only; 7) a marketing plan with 27 events per year with a maximum of 24 people (10 as evening events ending at 10:00 PM), two events per year with a maximum 49 people, one event per year with 100 people, and one event per year with 300 people; and 8) a new process wastewater septic system. A concurrent Variance application would reduce the minimum 600 foot winery setback from SR 29/St. Helena Highway to 235 feet.

**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: August 12, 2010

\_\_\_\_\_  
BY: Ronald Gee, Project Planner

**WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD:** August 13, 2010 to the conclusion of the public hearing before the Conservation, Development and Planning Commission scheduled on September 13, 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](mailto: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, September 1, 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:** Ca'Nani Winery (Use Permit # P09-00185-UP and Variance # P09-00492-VAR)
2. **Property Owner:** Yountville Vineyards, LLC, P.O. Box 2692, Yountville, CA 94558
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Ronald Gee, Project Planner, (707) 253-4417, [ronald.gee@countyofnapa.org](mailto:ronald.gee@countyofnapa.org)
4. **Project location and APN:** The project site is located on two parcels, approximately 14.11 acres total size, on the east side of St. Helena Highway (SR-29), at the southeast corner of the intersection at Yount Mill Road and St. Helena Highway, within the AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning district. (Assessor's Parcel #: 031-120-026 and 031-130-026) 7466 St. Helena Highway, Napa.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Yountville Vineyards, LLC, P. O. Box 2692, Yountville, CA 94599
6. **General Plan description:** Agricultural, Watershed & Opens Space, *Napa County General Plan, 2008*
7. **Zoning:** AP (Agricultural Preserve) District
8. **Project Description:**

Approval of a Use Permit to establish a new, 48,000 gallon per year winery with: 1) a two-story, 16,243 sq. ft. winery building with 5,800 sq. ft. of offices, 1,670 sq. ft. of tasting/sales area; 2,281 sq. ft. of barrel storage, total 2,410 sq. ft. roof deck areas and 15,970 sq. ft. of cave area with four portals for a winery totaling 56,370 sq. ft.; 2) conversion of an existing 1,460 sq. ft., detached garage to a farm equipment storage building and a new 375 sq. ft. utility building; 3) 13 full-time and 2 part-time employees; 4) 49 on-site parking spaces; 5) new entrance monument and sign; 6) up to 75 visitors per day (Friday-Sunday) and 40 visitors per day (Monday-Thursday) by appointment only; 7) a marketing plan with 27 events per year with a maximum of 24 people (10 as evening events ending at 10:00 PM), two events per year with a maximum 49 people, one event per year with 100 people, and one event per year with 300 people; and 8) a new process wastewater septic system. A concurrent Variance application would reduce the minimum 600 foot winery setback from SR 29/St. Helena Highway to 235 feet.

The new winery building will be built into the hillside with three of four cave portals entering the building. The winery building's first level will have 2,600 sq. ft. of production area, 2,281 sq. ft. of barrel storage and 1,670 sq. ft. of tasting/sales area. The second floor will have 5,800 sq. ft. of office space and two green roof decks with a total 2,410 sq. ft. area, not open to the public. The cave will contain the tasting/sales area, a commercial kitchen, laboratory, fermentation area, restrooms and barrel storage. Interior access to the second-story is via elevator only; exterior second-story access is provided by a stairway.

Two pre-existing, nonconforming residences would be replaced by a new, 1,000 sq. ft. guest house. The existing, 1,460 garage structure would remain and the new guest house will be attached to it, facing St. Helena Highway. The new 375 sq. ft. utility shed would be built on the hill above the new winery building to maintain off-site well connections. The new main residence, not a part of this project but subject to later Viewshed Review, will be built on the adjacent parcel to the southeast, APN 031-130-26, and will have separate access from SR-29/St. Helena Highway.

The existing driveway access to SR-29/St. Helena Highway will be widened to 20-ft. with a new monument (larger ewer) and sign located at the edge of the new curb cut. Due to the unusual location of the property line, with existing vineyards located in the SR-29 right-of-way, final driveway location and alignment will be determined in cooperation with Caltrans, the Public Works and Fire Departments; potential driveway relocation will align it with an existing driveway on the west side of SR 29, currently offset by 35-ft. to the north.

A 49-space parking lot with adequate emergency vehicle turnaround space is proposed west of the winery building; it includes four handicap and 13 designated employee parking spaces. During construction, cave spoils will be stored in the future parking area in front of the cave and building. The new septic and process wastewater system will be located on the perimeter of existing vineyards and outside the parking area. All developed areas will be screened with landscape improvements, during and post-construction, since the property has frontage along SR-29/St. Helena Highway.

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

The approximately 14.11-acre, irregularly-shaped lot is bounded to the north, east and south by rural residential, winery and vineyard uses; to the west, across SR-29/ St. Helena Highway, are winery, rural residential and commercial uses. The closest residence is 375 feet to the northeast, over a ridge top; other residences on the valley floor are 678 feet and 936 feet to the west and southwest, across SR 29, and 755 feet to the south. Located on the east side of the Mayacamas Mountains ridgeline on the Napa Valley floor, about nine acres of the site is on the valley floor; the balance of the site slopes up moderately to steeply east from SR-29/St. Helena Highway. The level portion of the site is developed with an existing vineyard, two residences, a garage and dilapidated storage buildings; all of these structures will be removed except for the garage. According to the United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Soil Survey of Napa County, California, about 75% of the site consists of Clear Lake clay (drained) and Bale clay loam (0 to 2 percent slopes) along SR 29/Yount Mill Road frontage; the east side of the property slopes up steeply with Hambright-Rock outcrop complex (2 to 30 percent slopes and 30 to 75 percent slopes). All, except the southeast corner of the site, is designated with Medium Liquefaction potential. The Napa River, a perennial stream, is located about 2,200 feet (0.42 mile) east of the site, on the other side of steep hills. Napa County Environmental Resource Maps indicate that the site is located outside any designated Biologically Sensitive, Floodplain, Dam/Levee Inundation or Alquist-Priolo Seismic Hazard Zones but within the designated SR 29/St. Helena Highway Viewshed zone. County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Archaeological Resources Overlay) indicate this site is a potential historically sensitive site, however, a subsequent cultural resources survey by Tom Origer & Associates (detailed in Section V. Cultural Resources below), determined that no cultural resources were found on the project site.

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

California Department of Transportation and Napa County Public Works Department – Encroachment Permit

**Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies**

**Other Agencies Contacted**

California Department of Transportation  
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

August 12, 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:** Ca'Nani Winery (Use Permit # P09-00185-UP and Variance # P09-00492-VAR)

**Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Yountville Vineyards, LLC, P.O. Box. 2692, Yountville, CA 94558

**Property Owner:** Yountville Vineyards, LLC

**Project location and APN:** The project site is located on two parcels, approximately 14.11 acres total size, on the east side of St. Helena Highway (SR-29), at the southeast corner of the intersection at Yount Mill Road and St. Helena Highway, within the AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning district. (Assessor's Parcel #: 031-120-026 and 031-130-026) 7466 St. Helena Highway, Napa.

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Approval of a Use Permit to establish a new, 48,000 gallon per year winery with: 1) a two-story, 16,243 sq. ft. winery building with 5,800 sq. ft. of offices, 1,670 sq. ft. of tasting/sales area; 2,281 sq. ft. of barrel storage, total 2,410 sq. ft. roof deck areas and 15,970 sq. ft. of cave area with four portals for a winery totaling 56,370 sq. ft.; 2) conversion of an existing 1,460 sq. ft., detached garage to a farm equipment storage building and a new 375 sq. ft. utility building; 3) 13 full-time and 2 part-time employees; 4) 49 on-site parking spaces; 5) new entrance monument and sign; 6) up to 75 visitors per day (Friday-Sunday) and 40 visitors per day (Monday-Thursday) by appointment only; 7) a marketing plan with 27 events per year with a maximum of 24 people (10 as evening events ending at 10:00 PM), two events per year with a maximum 49 people, one event per year with 100 people, and one event per year with 300 people; and 8) a new process wastewater septic system. A concurrent Variance application would reduce the minimum 600 foot winery setback from SR 29/St. Helena Highway to 235 feet.

**WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD:** August 13, 2010 through September 12, 2010

**HEARING DATE and LOCATION:** September 15, 2010, 9:00 a.m., Napa County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 1195 Third Street, Third Floor, Napa, CA 94559.

**DATE:** August 12, 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
<b>I. AESTHETICS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

- a-b) The proposed project will be located over 235 feet from SR 29/St. Helena Highway, a designated Viewshed Road in *the Napa County General Plan, 2008*. Due to the unusual front property line location, the project site is located an additional 160 feet from the edge of the SR 29 roadway for a total setback of 395 feet to the nearest building (guest house). The two-story winery building will be built into an existing hillside, another 200 feet back. No improvements are proposed that would damage the scenic vista; existing landscape improvements will be enhanced by providing additional berms and plant materials to screen staging areas during construction, the new parking lot, retaining walls and accessory buildings. A grove of olive trees will also be planted on the hillside above and in front of the winery building. 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 new 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 except for the reduced front yard setback, due to the unusual SR 29 right-of-way location. The project will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and surrounding area.
- d) The new winery 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. The proposed project will be located over 235 feet from SR 29/St. Helena Highway, a designated Viewshed Road in the Napa County General Plan. By complying with lighting requirements and the effective 395 feet setback from the edge of road, the project will not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. <b>AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.</b> 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a. – c. The project site is located in the designated Agricultural Resource area of the *Napa County General Plan 2008*, Land Use Element. The new winery use would take place on a site with existing cultivated vineyards. This site and surrounding properties are not under Williamson Act contract. There would be no conversion of existing farmland to non-agricultural use. 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. <b>AIR QUALITY.</b> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



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

**Discussion:** The proposed 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 26, 15-gallon, and 16, 80-year old specimen olive trees on the hill above the new winery building, 40 additional 80-year old specimen olive trees in front of the winery building and 25, 4" caliper, B&B oak trees in the new parking lot with an additional assortment of shrubs, other decorative trees and planters. There will also be two new "green roof" decks, on the second floor of the winery building with a total 2,140 sq. ft. area.

The project-specific increase in GHG emissions would be relatively modest, given the estimated number of new vehicle trips per day. According to the George Nickelson, *Traffic Analysis for a Proposed Ca'Nani Winery Project on SR 29, North of Yountville in Napa County, July 23, 2010*, the project will generate 59 added trips on weekdays, 82 on Saturdays with up to 71 added trips during the 6-week harvest season. Increasingly stringent Title 24 energy conservation requirements imposed as part of the building permit process will also minimize GHG emissions. Changes in sequestration would also be modest due to the less than 0.81 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)). The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has established a significant threshold and screening criteria related to GHG for new development. While the District's screening table (BAAQD Air Quality Guidelines, Table 3.1) does not specifically address wineries, it suggests that "quality restaurants" less than 9,000 sq. ft. in size and "manufacturing" uses less than 64,000 sq. ft. in size would not generate green house gas emissions in excess of the significance criteria (1,100 metric tons of CO2 annually). The proposed project for the winery includes a 1,000 sq. ft. tasting room and 22,747 sq. ft. additional square footage related to wine production. Since these square footages are far below the screening levels sites referred to in the District's Guidelines, it's clear that the proposed winery would not generate GHG above the significance thresholds established by the District; further analysis and quantification of GHG emissions is not warranted.

Overall increases in 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 by including use of eco-friendly building materials and a future solar energy system.

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
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, and expanded road access, all improvements would take place on previously disturbed areas.

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, a perennial stream, is located about 2,200 feet (0.42 mile) east of the site, on the other side of steep hills. No new improvements will be constructed in a 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 SR 29/St. Helena Highway 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:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 this site is a potential historically sensitive site or has sensitive structures located within the project site. After contacting the State of California Native American Heritage Commission, the Mishewal-Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley, reviewing prehistoric and archaeological archival research at the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University and conducting an on-site field survey, Tom Origer & Associates prepared, *Cultural Resources Survey for the Ca’Nani Winery Project, Napa, California, July 6, 2010* and concluded that no cultural resources were found during the course of their survey on the project site. No substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 will occur as a result of the project.
- b. There are no known archaeological resources in the development area. According to the Tom Origer & Associates Cultural Resources Survey, three cultural resources studies have examined corridors of land along SR 29 adjacent to the proposed place of use which identified eight cultural resources and five isolated archaeological specimens within a one-mile radius of the place of use (project site). A survey conducted to the east, in the nearby Yountville Hills, found no cultural resources. The nearest reported ethnographic village site is, *ka’imus*, located within the town of Yountville. In the event archaeological artifacts are encountered during construction of the project, as a standard permit condition of approval, all work would cease to allow a qualified archaeologist to record and evaluate the resources. This is considered a less-than-significant impact because the project site has been previously graded and planted in vineyards.
- 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:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

- a. According to Napa County Environmental Resource Maps , the proposed project is not located within any Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zone but has medium liquefaction potential. The site has level topography with gentle to steeply-sloped portions of the site. While seismic activity is endemic to the Bay Area, all cave and 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 outside of a high liquefaction area, people or structures will not be exposed to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death.
- b. According to the United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Soil Survey of Napa County, California, about about 75% of the site consists of Clear Lake clay (drained) and Bale clay loam (0 to 2 percent slopes) along SR 29/Yount Mill Road frontage; the east side of the property slopes up steeply with Hambright-Rock outcrop complex (2 to 30 percent slopes and 30 to 75 percent slopes). Along SR 29/St. Helena Highway parcel frontage are existing vineyards; where a parking/circulation area, access road and the winery are proposed, no substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil will result from the project.
- c. The project will occur on gentle- to steeply- sloping parts of the parcel. The soils on site are characterized by medium runoff with moderate erosion potential. The project is required to submit a site development plan, including implementation of storm water and erosion control Best Management Practices under the standards developed in the County's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Phase II Stormwater Permit, 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. According to the Napa County Department of Environmental Management (DEM), a combined sanitary and process wastewater system is required to accommodate the winery and residential use. With DEM permit issuance and installation of an 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
<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:</b>				
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 winery 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 new winery use would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.
- g. The access driveway that serves the project will be improved to comply with County and Caltrans road standards. Therefore, the design of the project will not negatively impact or hinder emergency vehicle access. The project has been reviewed by Caltrans, the County Fire Department and Public Works Department and will be subject to a new Encroachment Permit application.
- 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 in comments dated April 13, 2010.

**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. Therefore, the project does not have the potential to significantly impact water quality and discharge standards.
- b. There is an existing groundwater well on this and adjacent properties for which the applicant has deeded easement rights for use. As stated in the Phase 1 Water Availability Analysis submitted with the permit application, Due to the size of the 14.11 acre project site, it has a 14.112 acre feet per year (af/yr) allocation, based upon Napa County allotments for 1.0 af/yr on Valley Floor parcels. The existing water demand is 7.65 af/yr (based upon 0.6 af/yr for residential, 0.25 af/yr for farm labor dwelling, 2.55 af/yr for vineyard and fire protection use); with the proposed winery use, this would increase to 9.12 af/yr (i.e., 0.6 af/yr residential, 0.25 farm labor dwelling, 1.46 af/yr winery, 2.55 vineyard, 4.25 af/yr fire protection uses), well below the allowed 14.11 af/yr allocation. Therefore, the projected water



use for this project should not have a significant impact on the static water levels of neighboring wells. 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 an aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.

- c-d. The proposed project will not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off site. The project will incorporate erosion control measures appropriate to its maximum slope to manage onsite surface drainage and erosion of onsite soils during construction and winter months (October to April) for the proposed wine cave. By incorporating erosion control measures, this project would have a less than a significant impact. No substantial alteration of existing drainage is anticipated to occur. There will be an increase in the overall impervious surface resulting from the new building, pavement and sidewalks. However, given the size of the drainage basin, the increase in impervious surfaces will not discernibly change the amount of groundwater filtration or discernibly increase surface runoff from that which currently existing on site. This project would therefore result in a less than significant impact.
- e. The project is required to submit a site development plan, including implementation of storm water and erosion control Best Management Practices under the standards developed in the County's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Phase II Stormwater Permit, which is required by County Code and is a standard practice on all County development projects. Since there will be 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 either a 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 could impede or direct flood flows that occur in designated floodplain areas.
- i. - j. The project site is located on gently-sloping land approximately 146 ft. above mean average sea level (MSL). Potential for tsunami is considered less-than-significant. The project is located many miles from San Francisco Bay, and in the unlikely event that a tsunami enters the bay, any surge would dissipate well before reaching Napa.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> 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
<b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> 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
<b>XI. NOISE.</b> 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"/>
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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 wine cave facility. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant with the implementation of County standard practices.

- a. There are few residential uses within close proximity to the project. Temporary construction noise will be in compliance with both County and City 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, the potential for impact is less-than-significant.
- c. - d. The anticipated noise levels following the completion of construction would be minimal for the agricultural and rural residential use. No outdoor music for winery marketing activities are proposed. For these reasons, anticipated noise levels are considered less-than-significant.
- e. The project site is no located within an airport land use plan of a public airport
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

**Mitigation Measure(s):** None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b> 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 includes removal of two, pre-existing nonconforming dilapidated residences (cottage units). A new, 1,000 sq. ft. cottage will be built near the winery exceeding the combined square footage of the existing units. A permanent residence will be built, though not as part of this project, in the southeast corner of the project site. The project will not displace any housing or divide any established communities. The project will result in 13 new full-time and two 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
<b>XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> 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. The proposed project would not result in potentially significant adverse impacts on public services. 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 *April 13, 2010 Use*

*Permit Comments*, stated that if specific fire protection measures addressing building and cave 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. County revenue resulting from building permit fees, property tax increases and taxes from the sale of wine will help meet the costs of providing public services to the property.

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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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. The project site has an unusual property frontage location in relation to the SR 29/St. Helena Highway right-of-way. The property line is located approximately 160-feet east of the edge of roadway and existing, planted vineyard is located within the right-of-way. SR 29 has a center left-turn lane in the two-lane roadway. Typical along the length of SR 29, there are off-set driveways on either side of the road. Napa Cellars, located on the west side of SR 29 has a driveway off-set 35 feet north of the proposed Ca'Nani access/existing property driveway. A second emergency access driveway is proposed on Yount Mill Road frontage.

As stated in the George Nickelson, *Traffic Analysis for a Proposed Ca'Nani Winery Project on State Route 29, North of Yountville in Napa County, July 23, 2010*, "... approximately 59 maximum daily trips on a weekday, 82 maximum daily trips on a Saturday and 71 maximum daily trips during the 6-week harvest season will be generated over the course of a year by the 20,000 gallons per year winery. The project's trips would add minimally (about 0.4%-0.5%) to peak hour traffic flows on SR 29. Sight distance would be satisfactory at the project driveway. Although no significant conflicts are expected between traffic volumes in/out of the proposed winery and in/out of the nearby Napa Cellars driveway (off-set by 35-feet across SR 29), it appears the project driveway could be shifted to align with the Napa Cellars driveway." The applicant has agreed to relocate the existing project site driveway to align with the Napa Cellars driveway.

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 1% 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 in traffic generated by the project is considered a less-than-significant impact.

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

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> 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"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

- a. The project will occur in a rural area and requires its own wastewater treatment system subject to Napa County Environmental Management Department approval consistent with Regional Water Quality District standards.
- b. The project will not require construction of any new water or wastewater treatment facilities that will result in a significant impact to the environment.
- 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 hills. 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 would require 9.12 af/year for the combined residential, vineyard and winery use, well below the 14.11 af/year allotted to the site for the "valley area" of the County. Sufficient water supplies will be available for the proposed use.
- e. See response "a." above.
- f.-g. The project will be served by a Upper Valley Waste Management Authority with sufficient capacity to meet the projects 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
<b>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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.