# **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

- Project Title: Gateway Winery, Use Permit (P06-01532-UP).
- 2. Property Owner: Gateway Winery, LLC
- 3. Contact person and phone number: Sean Trippi, Principal Planner, 253-4417, strippi@co.napa.ca.us.
- 4. **Project location and APN:** Located on a 11.1 acre parcel on the southwest corner of Technology Way and Morris Court within an Industrial Park: Airport Compatibility (IP:AC) zoning district. APN: 057-250-029. Napa.
- 5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Dickenson, Peatman & Fogarty, 809 Coombs Street, Napa CA, 94559 (Kevin Teague)
- 6. **Hazardous Waste Sites:** The project is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.
- 7. Project Description: The project consists of a request to establish a new winery and/or distilled spirits facility with a maximum production capacity of 600,000 gallons per year and/or speculative warehousing/manufacturing/office uses. The proposal includes the construction of three buildings totaling 261,000 square feet, (Building 1 49,000 square feet, Building 2 73,621 square feet, and Building 3 138,379 square feet), on-site parking for 227 vehicles and 65 employees in two shifts. The facility would operate 24 hours per day, seven days a week. The project will connect to municipal water and sewer services provided by the City of American Canyon and the Napa Sanitation District, respectively. Process waste would be hauled off-site.

Exterior building materials for all three buildings include ribbed concrete wall panels at the first floor level, corrugated insulated metal wall panels at the second floor level with aluminum and glass window walls, and corrugated insulated metal roof panels with clerestory windows above that run nearly the entire length of the buildings. The second floor on all of the buildings is cantilevered over the first floor creating second floor balconies with clear railings. The height to the peak of the main roof is 37-feet above grade; the height to the peak of the 20-foot wide clerestory element is 42-feet above grade. The peak of the roof element over the second and third floor window curtain walls is also approximately 42-feet above grade.

Three new driveways are proposed; two on Morris Court and one on Technology Way. A total of 227 parking spaces are provided on site. Perimeter landscaping and landscaping interior to the site is also proposed. The portion of the site west of Building 3 will be left in its natural state.

The proposal also includes tours and tastings by appointment only with an average of 70 persons per week (an estimated 30 persons on the busiest day) and a marketing plan with three activities per month with a maximum of 250 persons. The events would occur in the evenings and on the weekends and may include live music.

### 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 **mitigated 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: February 7, 2008

By: Sean Imppr

WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD: 2/14/2008 to 3/5/2008

Please send written comments to the attention of Sean Trippi at 1195 Third St., Room 210, Napa, California 94559, or via e-mail to <a href="mailto:strippi@co.napa.ca.us">strippi@co.napa.ca.us</a>. A public hearing on this project is tentatively scheduled for the Napa County Planning Commission on Wednesday, March 5, 2008. You may confirm the date and time of this hearing by calling (707) 253-4416.

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

Initial Study Checklist (reference CEQA, Appendix G)

- Project Title: Gateway Winery, Use Permit (P06-01532-UP).
- 2. Property Owner: Gateway Winery, LLC
- 3. Contact person and phone number: Sean Trippi, Principal Planner, 253-4417, strippi@co.napa.ca.us
- 4. **Project location and APN:** Located on a 11.1 acre parcel on the southwest corner of Technology Way and Morris Court within an Industrial Park: Airport Compatibility (IP:AC) zoning district. APN: 057-250-029. Napa.
- 5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address**: Dickenson, Peatman & Fogarty, 809 Coombs Street, Napa CA, 94559 (Kevin Teague)
- 6. General Plan description: Industrial
- 7. Zoning: Industrial Park: Airport Compatibility (IP:AC) and Industrial: Airport Compatibility (I:AC)
- 8. **Project Description**: The project consists of a request to establish a new winery and/or distilled spirits facility with a maximum production capacity of 600,000 gallons per year and/or speculative warehousing/manufacturing/office uses. The proposal includes the construction of three buildings totaling 261,000 square feet, (Building 1 49,000 square feet, Building 2 73,621 square feet, and Building 3 138,379 square feet), on-site parking for 227 vehicles and 65 employees in two shifts. The facility would operate 24 hours per day, seven days a week. The project will connect to municipal water and sewer services provided by the City of American Canyon and the Napa Sanitation District, respectively. Process waste would be hauled off-site.

Exterior building materials for all three buildings include ribbed concrete wall panels at the first floor level, corrugated insulated metal wall panels at the second floor level with aluminum and glass window walls, and corrugated insulated metal roof panels with clerestory windows above that run nearly the entire length of the buildings. The second floor on all of the buildings is cantilevered over the first floor creating second floor balconies with clear railings. The height to the peak of the main roof is 37-feet above grade; the height to the peak of the 20-foot wide clerestory element is 42-feet above grade. The peak of the roof element over the second and third floor window curtain walls is also approximately 42-feet above grade.

Three new driveways are proposed; two on Morris Court and one on Technology Way. A total of 227 parking spaces are provided on site. Perimeter landscaping and landscaping interior to the site is also proposed. The portion of the site west of Building 3 will be left in its natural state.

The proposal also includes tours and tastings by appointment only with an average of 70 persons per week (an estimated 30 persons on the busiest day) and a marketing plan with three activities per month with a maximum of 250 persons. The events would occur in the evenings and on the weekends and may include live music.

- 9. Environmental setting and surrounding land uses: The site is vacant and flat with non-native grasses. The site has been previously graded and is located within a partially developed industrial park. The project site is in close proximity to the Napa County Airport. Properties to the north, east and southwest are vacant, properties to the southeast of this site are developed with warehouse and light industrial uses.
- 10. Other agencies whose approval is required: Discretionary approval required by Napa County consists of a use permit. The proposed project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County including, but not limited to building permits and grading permits.

# Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board City of American Canyon Napa Sanitation District Other Agencies Contacted
City of Napa

# **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 he prepared.	nave a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be
I find that although the proposed project could ha	ave a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will
	icant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
environment, but at least one effect 1) has been a has been addressed by mitigation measures base REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the I find that although the proposed project could have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NE	potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT effects that remain to be addressed. We a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have EGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or VE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the
Signature Signature	2/7/08 Date
Sean Trippi, Principal Planner	Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department

# **ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
l.	AE	STHETICS. Would the project:				
	a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				$\boxtimes$
	b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees,				
	- \	rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				$\boxtimes$
	c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			$\boxtimes$	
	d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			$\boxtimes$	
Discu	ssion:					
a/b.	rock c	proposed project would not be located within an area which would damage butcroppings, or historic buildings. The proposed project site has been prest. The site is not visible from a scenic highway or any scenic routes.	any known scenic viously graded, con	vista, or damage s tains no native veç	scenic resource getation and is	es, trees, currently
C.	develo loadin overal minim	roject is located within a fairly developed portion of the Napa County Airpo comments. Building 1 would face both Technology Way and Morris Court, the gareas for all three buildings would be partially visible from Morris Court, the latest of the second industrial projects approved and court design requirements for the specific plan's industrial park area. The character or quality of the site and surrounding area.	e other two building out would generally nstructed within the	s would generally not be visible from specific plan bou	face Morris Co Technology V ndaries, and n	ourt. The Vay. The neets the
d. <u>Mitiga</u>	minim deflec being As des	ew facility will result in a minor increase in the nighttime lighting. In according mecessary for operational and security needs. Light fixtures will be to the light down. Avoidance of highly reflective surfaces will be required, cast skyward. This is an area routinely overflown by low flying aircraft which signed, and as subject to standard conditions of approval, the project will neasures:	ept as low to the g as well as standar ch necessitates stro	round as possible d County condition ng controls on sky	and include s ns to prevent l ward nighttime	hields to ight from
			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II.	Calit	RICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining impacts to agricultural resources a fornia Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared bessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:	re significant environi y the California Dept.	mental effects, lead	agencies may	refer to the del to use in
	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?				$\boxtimes$
	b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				
	c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location				$\boxtimes$
	,	or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				$\boxtimes$
Discus	sion:					
_ =		A				

- a. The project site is located within a developing industrial park. The project would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Important as shown on the Napa County Important Farmland Map 2002 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency.
- The project site is not subject to a Williamson Act contract, and is zoned for industrial development.
- c. The project site is surrounded by developing industrial park land. Although farming activities occurred on these lands in the past, the area has been designated for industrial development for over 20 years. The project will not result in the conversion of existing farmland.

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impa
III.		R QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the application to make the following determinations. Would the project:	le air quality managei	ment or air pollution	control district n	nay be relie
	a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			$\boxtimes$	
	b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			$\boxtimes$	
	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)?				
				ᆜ	$\boxtimes$	ᆜ
	d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			$\boxtimes$	
	e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			$\boxtimes$	
Discus	sion:	The following analysis is based on the "RAAOMD CEOA Guidelines - Ass	essing the Air Quali	ty Impacts of Proje	ote and Plane'	

Discussion: The following analysis is based on the "BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines – Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans" (December 1999).

- a. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plans. The project site lies at the southern end of the Napa Valley, which forms one of the climatologically sub regions (Napa County Sub region) within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The topographical and meteorological features of the valley create a relatively high potential for air pollution. Potential air quality impacts could result from construction activities. Construction emissions would have a temporary effect consisting mainly of dust generated during grading and other construction activities, exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles, and relatively minor emissions from paints and other architectural coatings. BAAQMD recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing such impacts. These measures are set forth at Table 2 of the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines. If the proposed project adheres to these measures, then BAAQMD recommends concluding that construction-related impacts will be insignificant. These measures will be incorporated into the proposed project as conditions of approval. In accordance with BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, these impacts are considered less than significant.
- b.-e. See (a) above. There are no projected or existing air quality violations in this area that this proposal would contribute to. Nor would it result in any violations of any applicable air quality standards.

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 pollution-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 Measures: None required.

IV. B	IOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	_	_	_	_
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?			⊠ ⊠	
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?				
ď	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?	П	П	×	П
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				
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?				$\boxtimes$

# Discussion:

a/b. Two previous surveys of plant species, entitled Botanical Survey of Napa Valley Gateway, prepared by Jake Ruygt, dated August 25, 1988, and Napa Valley Gateway, Botanical Survey for a Tentative Subdivision Map, prepared by ESA, dated December 5, 1991, were conducted in the airport industrial park area and included the project site. Neither survey found any rare, threatened, or endangered species on the project site. The Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers - plants CNPS points & polygons, red legged frog core area and critical habitat, streams, vernal pools & vernal pool species, known fish presence, '03 Spotted Owls, and Spotted Owl habitat) do not indicate the presence of any special status plant or animal species, wetlands, streams or riparian areas on the subject property. However, there have been purported sightings of Swainson's hawk within 2 miles of the project site during the last 2 years by local bird watching enthusiasts. Consequently, the California Department of Fish and Game has commented on other projects in the vicinity that the potential occurrence of Swainson's hawk should be addressed in local environmental documents. Therefore, it is reasonable for the County to find that Swainson's hawk may exist in the area and the site has been evaluated to determine whether the species is present.

The project site contains no trees and is not in a native state. There is no suitable nesting habitat on the project site or within at least a quarter mile given the absence of mature trees. Industrial development has been progressing in the general vicinity since 1989. Prior to industrial development, the area was used for grazing. There are several existing developments on adjoining and neighboring properties. The site is part of the Gateway Business Park Industrial Subdivision approved for industrial development in 1989. The site has been previously graded and site improvements such as curb, gutter, sidewalk, sewer and water laterals, street lights, etc. were installed in the mid-1990's. The site does not appear to meet DFG's criteria as suitable foraging habitat given its urbanized characteristics. It should also be noted that prior to commencing this construction, the Gateway Business Park developer was required to obtain all necessary permits from DFG, the Army Corps of Engineers, and United States Fish and Wildlife Service. Mitigation for Swainson's hawk was not required by DFG during that permitting process. Given the fact that this site has been highly altered from its original native state as part of ongoing industrial development, and given that the purported sighting of Swainson's hawk in the general vicinity did not surface until approximately 14 years after industrial development commenced on the site, the County has reasonably concluded that the project site does not constitute foraging habitat and the project therefore does not have a significant potential to impact the special-status species that may occur within the general vicinity.

- c. The Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers vernal pools, vernal pool species, and known fish presence), do not indicate the presence of any wetlands, riparian areas on the subject property or potential wetlands within the project boundary. The project would result in no substantial impacts to federally protected or potentially sensitive wetlands.
- d. As there are no streams or creeks on the site or fencing/barriers proposed, the project does not have the potential to 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.
- e. The project would not conflict with any local policies protecting biological species, such a tree preservation or the County's Conservation Regulations. The site is an improved industrial lot with no native vegetation. In accordance with the requirements of the specific plan, new landscaping will be provided on the site. 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.

V.	cu	LTURAL 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?			$\boxtimes$	
	b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines§15064.5?			$\boxtimes$	
	c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?			$\boxtimes$	
	d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			$\boxtimes$	

# Discussion:

- a-c. The project site is vacant and does not contain any structures. Research into past uses has not identified historic resources that may be present at the site. Two previous archaeological surveys, entitled A Cultural Resource Inventory of the Napa Airport Master Environmental Assessment Area, prepared by Archaeological Resource Service (ARS), dated September 1983, and A Cultural Resources Evaluation of the "Napa 218" Parcel in the Napa County Airport Area, prepared by ARS, dated May 20, 1999, were conducted in the airport industrial park area and included the project site. Neither study indicated the presence of historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources. In addition, the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers –Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology sites, sensitive areas, and flags) do not identify any historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features on the project site. There is no information in the County's files that would indicate that there is a potential for occurrence of these resources. The site has been previously graded when public improvements were installed. It is therefore not anticipated that any cultural resources are present on the site, and the potential for impact is considered less-than-significant. However, if resources are found during grading of the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard conditions of approval.
- d. No human remains have been encountered on the property during past grading activities when the public improvements were constructed and no information has been encountered that would indicate that this project would encounter human remains. However, if resources are found during grading of the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard conditions of approval.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.	GE	OLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
	a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
		<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>Strong seismic ground shaking?</li> </ul>			$\boxtimes$	
		iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			$\boxtimes$	
		iv) Landslides?			$\boxtimes$	
	b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			$\boxtimes$	
	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?			$\boxtimes$	
	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?	П	П	_ ⊠	
	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?				
Discussio a. i.		here are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recer	nt Alquist-Priolo Ear	thquake Fault Zor	ing Map. As	such, the

- proposed facility would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.
- All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the facility must comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction, including the California Building Code which would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction.
- The Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) did not indicate the presence of landslides on the property.
- b. Based upon the Soil Survey of Napa County, prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the soils in the area of development are Haire Loam, 2 to 9% slopes, which have slow to medium runoff and a slight erosion hazard. This soil type is found mainly on old terraces and alluvial fans. Given that the site is essentially flat, development on the site will be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance related to erosion control measures which would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Surficial Deposits layer) early or mid Pleistocene or terrace deposits, late Pleistocene-Holocene fan deposits, and undifferentiated Holocene alluvium underlie the surficial soils on the project site. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Liquefaction layer) the project site has very low to high susceptibility for liquefaction. Development will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level. In addition, a soils report, prepared by a qualified Engineer will be required as part of the building permit submittal. The report will address the soil stability, potential for liquefaction and will be used to design specific foundation systems and grading methods.
- The project will connect to municipal water service provided by the City of American Canyon and sewer service by Napa Sanitation District. e. "Will serve" letters have been submitted by the affected jurisdictions indicating that they have sufficient capacity to accommodate the water and wasterwater demand of this project.

VII.	НА	ZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			$\boxtimes$	
	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?			$\boxtimes$	
	c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				$\boxtimes$
	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?				$\boxtimes$
	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?			$\boxtimes$	
	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?				
	g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			$\boxtimes$	
	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?				

Less Than

# Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts normally used in winery and distillery operations. A Business Plan will be filed with the Environmental Health Division should the amount of these materials reach reportable levels. However, in the event that a future use involves the use, storage or transportation of greater the 55 gallons or 500 pounds of hazardous materials, a use permit and subsequent environmental assessment would be required in accordance with the Napa County Zoning Ordinance prior to the establishment of the use. During construction of the project some hazardous materials, such as building coatings/ adhesives/ etc., will be utilized. However, given the quantities of hazardous materials and the limited duration, they will result is a less-than-significant impact.
- b. The project would not result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site.
- d. The proposed site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.
- e. The project site is located within two miles of the Napa County Airport, and is therefore subject to the requirements of the County's Airport Compatibility Combination zoning district and the requirements of the Napa County Airport Land Use Commission. The project is located with Zones B and D of the compatibility plan. No construction is being proposed on the portion of the site that falls within Zone B. The portion of the site that falls within Zone D is an area of common overflight and moderate risk. The proposed use of the buildings is highly compatibility with the risk and noise impacts associated with properties within Zone D. The buildings have also been designed to comply with specific requirements regarding light and glare to ensure airport land use compatibility.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.

- g. The proposed driveways that serve the project will be improved to comply with County 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 is located within an urbanized area.

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII.	HY	DROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:		moorporation	impact	
	a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			$\boxtimes$	
	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)?				
						$\boxtimes$
	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?			<b>N</b>	
	d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including		Ш	$\boxtimes$	
	-,	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?			$\boxtimes$	
	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?			$\boxtimes$	
	f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			$\boxtimes$	
	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?				$\boxtimes$
	h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				$\boxtimes$
	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?				$\boxtimes$
	j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			П	$\bowtie$
	17	The state of the s			Ц	

# Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not violate any known water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project will discharge into an existing storm drainage system designed to accommodate the drainage from this site. The applicant is required to obtain a stormwater permit from the 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. The project will connect to municipal water provided by the City of American Canyon. No groundwater wells are associated with this property.

- c-d. The proposed project will not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off site. The project will incorporate erosion control measures appropriate to its maximum slope to manage onsite surface drainage and erosion of onsite soils during construction and winter months (October to April). By incorporating erosion control measures, this project would have a less than significant impact. No substantial alteration of existing drainage is anticipated to occur. There will be an increase in the overall imperious surface resulting from the new buildings, 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 existing storm drainage system is designed to County standards and is sized to accommodate all drainage from this site.
- f. There are no other factors in this project that would otherwise degrade water quality.
- g-i. The project site is not located within a flood hazard area, nor would it impede or redirect flood flows or expose structures or people to flooding. The project site is not located within a dam or levee failure inundation zone.

j.	The p	parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, se	iches, or mudflows.			
Mitig	ation M	leasures: None required				
			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX.	LA	ND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
	a) b)	Physically divide an established community?  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?			$\boxtimes$	
	c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				$\boxtimes$
Discu	ssion:					
Mitig	other prope	sed project complies with the Napa County General Plan, the Napa Cou applicable regulations. There are no applicable habitat conservation plan rty.  easures: None required.	ns or natural commi	unity conservation	plans applical	ole to the
X.	МІМ	IERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				
	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?				$\boxtimes$
Discu	ssion:					
a/b.		Conservation and Open Space Element of the General Plan do not indires on the project site. The proposed project would not result in a loss of			cally importan	t mineral
Mitiga	ation M	easures: None required.				

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No impac
XI.	NO	ISE. Would the project result in:		incorporation	mpact	
	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?			$\boxtimes$	
	b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				
	c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			$\boxtimes$	
	d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			$\boxtimes$	
	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?			$\boxtimes$	
	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?				$\boxtimes$
Discus	ssion:					
c/d. e) f)	opera hours  The a and d resulti to the  The p area of most v sensiti	nticipated to be significant. The proposed project would not result in lotional impacts. Furthermore, construction activities would generally occur of human activity. All construction activities will be conducted in compliant inticipated level of noise to occur following the completion of construction in istillery uses in an existing industrial park. The project is located within any from additional industrial development will impact sensitive receptors. County Noise Ordinance, would ensure the proposed project would not reportion of the project site where development is proposed is located within of common aircraft overflight. As such, persons on the project site will be visitor activity would occur within the proposed buildings limiting exposure to increased noise levels from aircraft, and is considered compatible with roject is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.	r during the period of ce with the Napa Concluding the operation industrial park and The design of the posult in adverse noise compatibility Zone I exposed to noise for aircra	of 7am-7pm on we unty Noise Ordina on of the facility wo dis not in an area roposed project, to impacts.  O of the Napa Couron regular aircraft. The nature of	eekdays, during ance (Chapter ance (Chapter and be typical and where noise is ogether with a anty Airport, whaft overflight.	g normal 8.16) of winery ncreases dherence nich is an However,
maga				Less Than		
VII	DOL	NIII ATION AND HOUGING Would the accident	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII.		PULATION 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)?		$\boxtimes$		
	b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				$\boxtimes$
	c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				$\boxtimes$

# Discussion:

- a. The project site is currently vacant and located in an industrial area. The facility is anticipated to employ a maximum of 65 full and part time employees primarily in two shifts. The project will increase the number of jobs within the industrial park. Given the size of the project, the number of jobs is expected to be relatively small compared to the overall business park and nearby communities; therefore this increase in jobs will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable increase in the demand for housing units within Napa County and the general vicinity. Furthermore, the County has adopted a Housing Element (certified by the State Housing and Community Development Agency) which identifies locations for new affordable housing, and adopted a development impact fee, included as mitigation measure #1, below, to provide funds for constructing affordable housing to off-set the cumulative existing affordable housing shortage in the County. The fee is paid at the time building permits are issued. This fee is charged to all new non-residential developments based on the gross square footage of nonresidential space multiplied by the applicable fee by type of use as listed in Chapter 15.60.100, Table 1, and is considered to reduce housing inducement impacts to a less than significant level.
- There are no existing homes on, or adjacent to, the project site. The project will not result in the displacement of any housing units or people. b/c.

# Mitigation Measures:

Prior to County authorization of a Building Permit the applicant shall pay the Napa County Affordable Housing Mitigation Fee in accordance with No. 1243, or as may be amended, for any additional building square footage constructed.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII.	PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in:		moorporation	impaot	
	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?			$\boxtimes$	
	Police protection?			$\boxtimes$	
	Schools?			$\boxtimes$	
	Parks?			$\boxtimes$	
	Other public facilities?			$\boxtimes$	
Discu	ussion:				
a.	The proposed project will have a less than significant impact on public service proposed project would not increase the demand on those public services. Fire and there would be no expected impact to response time as the property has g levied with the building permit application. Those fees assist local school district have little impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from building percosts of providing public services to the property.	protection measure ood public road acc ts with capacity buil	es are required as pless. School impacting measures. The	part of the dev at mitigation fe the proposed p	elopment es will be roject will
Mitig	ation Measures: None required.				
XIV.	RECREATION. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	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?				

	D)	expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				
Discu	ussion:					
a/b. Mitio	recre	proposed project would not significantly increase the use of existing relational facilities that may have a significant adverse effect on the environmeters: None required.		, nor does the p	roposed projec	et include
			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV.	TR	ANSPORTATION/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)?			$\boxtimes$	
	b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?		$\boxtimes$		
	c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?			$\boxtimes$	
	d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	_		$\boxtimes$	П
	e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?			$\boxtimes$	Ī
	f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?			$\boxtimes$	
	g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			$\boxtimes$	
Discu	ssion:					
a-b.	traffic the re conge of imp	day traffic volumes within the project vicinity consist primarily of commercial, tourist, and industrial park traffic occurring throughout the day. So patterns: a Napa to Bay Area commute, and a smaller Solano County to sult of regional growth impacts. Major improvements to both Highway 2 estion. As mandated by Napa County, projects within the industrial park altrovements to impacted roadways within the industrial park.  1990, the County has imposed and collected traffic mitigation fees on a	uthern Napa County o Napa commute. '9 and Highway 12 re responsible for pa	is characterized the existing traffic are necessary to aying "fair share" of	by two distinct of congestion is address region costs to the cor	commute primarily nal traffic estruction
	develorelieve traffic by the	oper's "fair share" fee goes toward funding roadway improvements within traffic on State Highways. The traffic mitigation fee is further described i mitigation fee based on PM peak hour vehicle trips will be imposed and or Director of Public Works and is included as mitigation measure #2, below.	n the specific plan a n Board of Supervis collected prior to iss	area including imp or's Resolution 02 uance of a buildin	orovements des 2-39. For this p ag permit as de	signed to project, a termined
	The C	ounty has established that a significant traffic impact would occur if increa	ses in traffic from a	project would cau	se intersection	s or two-

Less Than

Significant

With Mitigation

Incorporation

Less Than

Significant

Impact

No Impact

Potentially

Significant Impact

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 directed by the Napa County Transportation Planning Agency. This factor has been used consistently as the significance determination for

all recent EIR and CEQA documents within the Airport Industrial Area.

According to the project's traffic analysis, prepared by George W. Nickelson, P.E., dated August 23, 2007, the project is anticipated to generate approximately 41 trips within the p.m. peak hour from employees, visitors and truck deliveries. P.M peak traffic generated from the project is anticipated to contribute less than 1% to the 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 with the payment of the "fair share" development impact fee.

- c. The project does not have any impact on air traffic patterns.
- d/e. The project includes construction of a new driveway on Technology Way and two new driveways on Morris Court. Morris Court is a cul-desac off Technology Way which is a looped road intended to provide access to other streets, cul-de-sacs and industrial lots. The new driveways have been designed to comply with all County standards. The project will not result in any changes to levels of service or cause any new safety risks.
- f. The project has been designed with 227 parking spaces to comply with Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan standards. The project will not result in inadequate parking.
- The proposed project does not conflict with any known policies or plans supporting alternative transportation.

### **Mitigation Measures:**

2. Prior to County authorization of a Building Permit, the applicant shall submit payment of the Napa County's traffic Mitigation fee in accordance with Board resolution 02-029, as may be amended, of the equivalent of the vehicle trips generated by the project in the PM peak traffic period.

			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?				$\boxtimes$
	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?			$\boxtimes$	
	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?			$\boxtimes$	
	d) e)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?  Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves			$\boxtimes$	
	,	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?			$\boxtimes$	
	f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			$\boxtimes$	
	g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				$\boxtimes$

# Discussion:

- a. The project will occur within an urbanized area and connect to a publicly maintained wastewater treatment system. The wastewater provider, Napa Sanitation District, has provided a will serve letter and has found that project to be in compliance with district master plans.
- 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. The project site is located in an area planned for industrial development and existing water and wastewater treatment facilities have been sized to accommodate the proposed project.

- c. The proposed project includes the construction of new drainage facilities. The new drainage system will be designed by a qualified engineer and is subject to review and approval by the Department of Public Works. The Department of Public Works has included conditions of approval requiring that the drainage system be designed to avoid diversion or concentration of storm water runoff onto adjacent properties.
- d. The project will receive water from the City of American Canyon which has sufficient water supplies to serve projected needs. The project is located within an area designated for urban development by the City. The City has acquired water rights to provide adequate water for all areas within their service area, and has issued a will serve letter for the proposal.
- e. See response "a." above.
- f. The proposed project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the projects demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the proposed project.
- g. The proposed project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XVII.	MA	NDATORY 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?			⋈	
	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)?			$\boxtimes$	
	c)	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			$\boxtimes$	
Discuss	sion:					

- a. The project site has previously been disturbed and does not contain any known listed planted or animal species. There is purported recent sightings of a special status species within two miles of the project site, but the project site does not appear to qualify as suitable foraging habitat for that species and therefore the impact is considered less-than-significant. 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 as mitigated. 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 numan beings, either directly or indirect			

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION  NAPA COUNTY CONSERVATION DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPT 1195 THIRD STREET, SUITE 210 NAPA CA 94559				
(Filed in compliance with Section 21108 or 21152 of the Public Resources Code)				
To: ☐ Office of Planning and Research 1400 Tenth Street, Room 121 Sacramento, CA 95814 Napa CA 94559				
PROJECT TITLE: Gateway Winery				
PERMIT(s): File #P06-01532-UP (Use Permit) SCH NUMBER: N/A				
LEAD AGENCY: Napa County Conservation Development & Planning Departs CONTACT PERSON: Sean Trippi, Project Planner	ment <b>PHONE:</b> 707-253-4417			
PROJECT LOCATION: The project is located on a 11.1 acre parcel on the southwest corner of Technology Way and Morris Court within an IP:AC (Industrial Park, Airport Compatibility) zoning district. (Assessor's Parcel #: 057-250-029), Napa.				
NEAREST CITY: Napa County: Napa				
GENERAL PROJECT DESCRIPTION: : Approval of a Use Permit to establish a new winery/distillery with a combined maximum production capacity of 600,000 gallon per year, and/or speculative warehousing/manufacturing/office uses consisting of (1) the construction of three buildings totaling 261,000 square feet, (Building 1 - 49,000 square feet, Building 2 - 73,621 square feet, and Building 3 - 138,379 square feet); (2) on-site parking for 227 vehicles; (3) 65 employees in two shifts; (4) the facility would operate 24 hours per day, seven days a week; (5) three new driveways are proposed; two on Morris Court and one on Technology Way; (6) new on-site landscaping; (7) tours and tastings by appointment only with a maximum of 200 persons per week (30 persons on the busiest day); (8) a marketing plan with three activities per month with a maximum of 250 persons, that would occur in the evenings and on the weekends and may include live music; and, (9) connection to municipal water and sewer services provided by the City of American Canyon and the Napa Sanitation District, respectively, with process waste hauled off-site.				
COUNTY PERMIT(s): Use Permit, File #P06-0152-UP				
APPLICANT NAME: Gateway Winery, LLC, c/o Dickenson, Peatman & Fogarty (Kevin Teague) ADDRESS: 809 Coombs Street, Napa, CA 94558				
This is to advise that Napa County as ∑Lead Agency ☐Responsible Age on March 5, 2008 and made the following determinations:  (Date)	ency approved the above-described project			
<ol> <li>The project</li></ol>	ot pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.  Int to the provisions of CEQA.  The approval of this project.  The opted for this project.			
TITLE: John McDowell, Deputy Director, Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department				

Date sent to OPR: