

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

Initial Study Checklist
 (form updated September 2010)

1. **Project Title:** Kent Rasmussen Carneros Winery, Use Permit # P11-00043-UP
2. **Property Owner:** Kent A. Rasmussen
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Ronald Gee, Project Planner, 707.253.4417, ronald.gee@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and APN:** 2125 Cuttings Wharf Road, on the southwest side of Cuttings Wharf Road, approximately 0.5 mile (2,747 feet) north of the intersection with Las Amigas Road, Assessor's Parcel Number 047-240-006, Napa.
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Kent A. Rasmussen, P.O. Box 312, St. Helena, CA 94574, krwine@gmail.com
6. **General Plan description:** Agricultural Resource, Open Space, *Napa County General Plan, 2008*
7. **Zoning:** AW:AC (Agricultural Watershed : Airport Compatibility Combination) District
8. **Description of Project.**

Request to allow conversion of a 1986 Small Winery Certificate in two phases to 1) increase production from 20,000 gallons/year to 100,000 gallons/year; 2) convert the existing residence to a 2,471 square foot administrative office/tasting room space with exterior 1,386 and 493 square feet deck additions; 3) replace an existing barn and carport with a new 14,691 square foot winery production facility including a 2,350 square foot covered crush pad, laboratory and employee break kitchen (no commercial kitchen); 4) upgrade the existing sanitary and wastewater treatment system; 5) add mechanical equipment, water pump and water storage tank pads and an enclosed disposal receptacle; 6) install a new 12-space parking lot and improved access/circulation area; 7) allow 8 full-time and 4 part-time employees; 8) allow catered food with wine tastings and outdoor picnicking; 9) expand hours of operation from 5 days/week, 9:00 AM-5:00 PM to 7 days/week, 6:00 AM-6:00 PM; and 10) expand the winery marketing plan from 5 visitors per week to allow 4 daily private tours and tastings with 6 people, 4 monthly food and wine pairings with 24 people, 4 annual wine club/wine release events with 50 people, one annual winery auction-related event with 125 people and one annual Napa Valley Wine Auction event with 125 people with all evening events concluding by 10:00 PM. Phase One converts the residence to a winery tasting room/administrative office space with deck additions, constructs an outdoor covered crush pad and storage shed; Phase Two constructs the new winery structure, associated improvement pads and other winery infrastructure.

9. **Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses.**

The 11.55 acre site slopes up gently to the southwest; it is developed with approximately 9.5 acres of existing vineyard, a single-family residence, barn, carport, winery and other agricultural accessory structures. The subject parcel is bordered to the northwest, southwest, southeast and northeast, across Cuttings Wharf Road, by similar vineyard and agricultural uses. The closest off-site residence is located approximately 285 feet southeast from the existing winery facility.

The small winery was established in 1986 at an existing single-family residence, initially producing 1,200 gallons/year, expanding to its current 20,000 gallons/year capacity. Based on the information contained in Napa County Environmental Resource Maps, the site has Cole silt loam (0-2% slopes) soil on the northeast 75% of the site with Haire loam (2%-9% slopes) on the rear southwest quarter. The majority of the site, including the existing home and proposed winery facilities, has very low liquefaction potential; the southwest 20%, including the existing reservoir, has high liquefaction potential. The site is considered a potentially sensitive Archeological site with Landslides and Moderate Fire Safety Hazard Severity. According to the California State Department of Fish & Game Natural Diversity Database, the site potentially has *Marin knotweed* located on the site.

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

Napa County Building, Public Works and Department of Environmental Management
California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control
U.S. Treasury Department, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax & Trade Bureau (TTB)

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

June 10, 2011

Date

Name: Ronald Gee

Napa County Conservation, Development & Planning Department

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

Discussion:

- The proposed project is not located within an area visible from any known scenic vista.
- The proposed project is not located along a state scenic highway; SR 12/SR 121 is located approximately 1.27 miles north of the project site. The proposed project is located on Cuttings Wharf Road, a County road not listed as a candidate for scenic highway designation in the Scenic Highways Element of the Napa County General Plan. Although over 45 years old, the existing residence has been determined not to be a historic building; it is visible from the public road. The proposed winery expansion will be visible from the public road. Removal of two wisteria and two fruit trees will be required; removal of these trees will not diminish the existing views from any designated scenic highways; a standard permit condition of approval requires submittal of a landscape plan to replace those trees lost, to restore and increase existing landscape screening. The proposed project will not result in damage to scenic resources and is consistent with the goals and policies of the Scenic Highways Element in the Napa County General Plan.
- Existing and proposed structures on the project site are located in the front quarter of the lot and are visible from Cuttings Wharf Road. The closest neighboring residence is located approximately 285 feet southeast from the project site. The design of the new buildings will generally match the styles of nearby properties. Modifications to the existing character are considered negligible and would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.
- Pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approval for wineries, outdoor lighting will be required to be shielded and directed downwards, with only low level lighting allowed in parking areas. The standard winery condition of approval relating to lighting states that;

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

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

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. ¹ Would the project:				

¹ "Forest land" is defined by the State as "land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits." (Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) The Napa County General Plan anticipates and does not preclude conversion of some "forest land" to agricultural use, and the program-level EIR for the 2008 General Plan Update analyzed the impacts of up to 12,500 acres of vineyard development between 2005 and 2030, with the assumption that some of this development would occur on "forest land." In that analysis specifically, and in the County's view generally, the conversion of forest land to agricultural use would constitute a potentially significant impact only if there were resulting significant impacts to sensitive species,

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) 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. Based on a review of Napa County environmental resource mapping, the entirety of the project area, and the vast majority of the subject parcel, is located on Prime Farmland (*Department of Conservation Farmlands, 2008* layer). This project development site will occur on an area developed with an existing single-family residence, barn, winery, carport and accessory agricultural equipment storage structures. The application will reduce the approximately 9.5 acre of existing vineyard to approximately 8.37 acres, however, the entirety of the proposed development will either be dedicated to active wine production or winery-accessory uses. General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use policies **Ag/LU-2** and **Ag/LU-13** recognize wineries, and any use consistent with the Winery Definition Ordinance and accessory to a winery, as agriculture. As a result, this application will not result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use.
- b. The subject parcel is not subject to Williamson Act contract. The property's AW:AC (Agricultural Watershed : Airport Compatibility Combination) District zoning allows wineries and related accessory uses upon grant of a use permit. The proposed project poses no conflict with agricultural zoning or with a Williamson Act contract.
- c.-d. The subject parcel includes neither forestland nor timberland and is not subject to timberland zoning. There will be no impact to forest resources.
- e. As discussed at items "a." and "b.", above, the winery and winery accessory uses proposed in this application are defined as agricultural by the Napa County General Plan and are allowed under the parcel's AW:AC (Agricultural Watershed : Airport Compatibility Combination) District zoning. Neither this project, nor any foreseeable consequence thereof, would result in changes to the existing environment which would result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use.

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

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

biodiversity, wildlife movement, sensitive biotic communities listed by the California Department of Fish and Game, water quality, or other environmental resources addressed in this checklist.

	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 odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable Air Quality Plan. Winery expansions, as proposed here, are not producers of air pollution in volumes substantial enough to result in an air quality plan conflict. The project site lies within the Napa Valley, which forms one of the climatologically distinct sub-regions (Napa County Sub region) within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The topographical and meteorological features of the Valley create a relatively high potential for air pollution. Over the long term, emissions resulting from the proposed project would consist primarily of mobile sources, including production-related deliveries and visitor and employee vehicles traveling to and from the winery. The *Bay Area Air Quality Management Plan* states that projects that do not exceed a threshold of 2,000 vehicle trips per day will not impact air quality and do not require further study (*BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines*, p. 24). The use permit includes 8 full-time and 4 part-time employees and up to 4 daily tours with a maximum of 6 people for a total of 43 maximum daily trips (this assumes 1.05 occupants per car for employees, 3.2 trips per day per full-time employee, 2 trips per day per part-time employee, and 2.6 occupants per car for visitors- all per *Napa County Winery Traffic Generation Characteristics*). In addition, 4 monthly food and wine pairings with 24 people, 4 annual wine club/wine release events with 50 people, and one annual Winery Auction event with 125 people and one annual Napa Valley Wine Auction event with 125 people and 10 event staff are proposed. The resulting trip generation is well below the established 2,000 trip threshold of significance. Impacts related to conformance with the relevant air quality plan will be less than significant.
- b. Please see "a.", above. There are no projected or existing air quality violations in the area to which this proposal would contribute. The project would not result in any violations of applicable air quality standards.
- c. Please see "a.," above and "d.-e.," below. The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. Standard conditions of approval for any Napa County construction project require dust control measures.
- d.-e. Earthmoving and construction activities required for project construction may cause odors and a temporary degradation in air quality from dust and heavy equipment air emissions during the construction phase. While construction on the site will generate dust particulates in the short-term, the impact would be less than significant with dust control measures as specified in Napa County's standard condition of approval relating to dust:

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

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

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- Napa County Resource Maps (Department of Fish & Game, Natural Diversity Database) identify the site as a potential *Marin knotweed* habitat. The MUSCI Natural Resource Assessment report, *Rasmussen Vineyards Winery Focused Biological Review, April 12, 2010*, surveyed the site for biological resources of concern in the area, including *Marin knotweed*, *Showy Indian Clover*, *Pallid Bat*, *Golden Eagle* and *American Badger*. The report concluded that, "There are no sensitive biological resources associated with the evaluated parcel. There are no resource-at-risk issues identified as a consequence of implementing the winery project. Therefore, there are no recommendations for mitigation." Due to the lack of presence of any candidate, sensitive or special status species or any recognized biologically critical habitats, this project will not have significant impacts on any special-status species.
- The nearest stream, Carneros Creek, is located approximately 1,000 feet off-site, to the southwest. Napa County Resource Maps (Wetlands & Vernal Ponds, Biological Critical Habitat Areas) show there are no riparian habitats, critical habitat areas or other sensitive natural communities identified within the project site; there is an existing on-site reservoir. As stated in "a." above, the MUSCI Natural Resource Assessment report, *Rasmussen Vineyards Winery Focused Biological Review, April 12, 2010*, surveyed the site for biological resources of concern and determined that this project will not result in any substantial adverse impacts on riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities.
- No wetlands or potential wetlands were identified within the project boundary. This project will not result in any impacts to federally protected or potentially sensitive wetlands.
- 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. The remainder of the property will remain in existing vineyard and natural state. This project will not have a significant impact on wildlife movement.
- The proposed project is not subject to any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including tree preservation policies or ordinances. The applicant has submitted a biological survey, discussed above, which identified no raptor nest sites and no protected species.
- The proposed project will 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): No mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				

	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. Based upon the Archeological Resource Service survey, *A Cultural Resources Evaluation of the Proposed Rasmussen Winery, 2125 Cuttings Wharf Road, Napa County California, March 26, 2010*, the project will not cause a substantial change in the significance of a historical resource. As stated in the report, two pre-historic artifacts and three structures greater than 45 years of age were identified within the project area. The two pre-historic artifacts are not considered a potentially significant cultural resource. Found on different parts of the property, they are considered isolated artifacts indicative of Native American use of the area. The residence, detached garage and shed appear to be greater than 45 years of age but none of the buildings are associated with any historic event (CRHR, Criterion 1); associated with a person important in history (CRHR, Criterion 2); are architecturally significant (CRHR, Criterion 3); or can yield further information about the past (CRHR, Criterion 4). For these reasons, "no specific recommendations were warranted since there are no historic properties or significant cultural resources within or adjacent to the project area."
- b. There are no known archaeological resources in the development area. In the event archaeological artifacts are encountered during construction of the project, all work would cease to allow a qualified archaeologist to record and evaluate the resources.
- 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.
- e. No formal cemeteries are known to exist within the project area and, as noted above, no significant evidence of historic and/or prehistoric Native American settlement was found in the project area. Public Resources Code §5097.98, Health and Safety Code §7050.5, and CEQA §15064.5(e) detail the procedures to follow in case of the accidental discovery of human remains, including requirements that work be stopped in the area, that the County Coroner be notified, and that the most likely descendants be identified and notified via the Native American Heritage Commission. Foreseeable project-specific impacts to human remains are less than significant.

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

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

Discussion:

- According to Napa County Resource Maps (Alquist-Priolo Fault and Landslides) the proposed project is not known to be located within any Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zone. Although there are soils with High Liquefaction potential on the southwest 25% of the property, the project site area has Very Low Liquefaction potential. There are no landslides or soil creep in the vicinity of the project site. While seismic activity is endemic to the Bay Area, this low profile structure will be constructed to California/International Building Code requirements and possesses a less than significant risk.
- The project will occur on slopes ranging from 0% to 9%, average slopes of 4%. The soils on site are Cole silt loam (0-2% slopes) soil on the northeast 75% of the site with Haire loam (2%-9% slopes) on the rear southwest quarter, which are characterized by rapid runoff with moderate to high erosion potential. The project is required to submit a site development plan, including implementation of Best Management Practices under the standards developed in the County's NPDES Phase II Stormwater Permit, which will lessen to less than significant any impacts associated with soil erosion or loss of topsoil.
- As stated above, less than three acres of the property is located within a High Liquefaction potential on area about feet west of the project site. 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-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.
- The Cole silt loam and Haire loam soil types are not considered to be expansive, as defined in table 19.1B of the UBC creating substantial risks to life or property.
- The Department of Environmental Management and Public Works Department (on behalf of the RWQOB), have reviewed the project and determined that there are no major limitations of the property's ability to support the use of the proposed sewage disposal system on existing soils. Environmental Management has recommended approval of the project subject to conditions of approval. Public Works Department permit conditions include RWQOB requirements as a standard condition of approval. This project would result in a less than significant impact.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a) Generate a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions in excess of applicable thresholds adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District or the California Air Resources Board which may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with a county-adopted climate action plan or another applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Discussion:

- a. Construction and operation of the project analyzed in this initial study would contribute to overall increases in Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions by generating emissions associated with transportation to and from the site, emissions from energy used within buildings, and emissions from the use of equipment. In addition, the project would marginally decrease baseline carbon sequestration through the removal of two trees. The project-specific increase in GHG emissions would be relatively modest, given the estimated 39 maximum new vehicle trips per day for employees and visitors, with 15 trips during P.M. peak periods (with up to 89 additional trips during the largest marketing events), and increasingly stringent Title 24 energy conservation requirements imposed as part of the building permit process.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has established a significance threshold of 1,100 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents per year and screening criteria related to greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) for new development. While the District's screening table does not specifically address wineries, it suggests that "quality restaurants" less than 9,000 square feet in size and "warehousing" uses less than 64,000 square feet in size would not generate GHG in excess of the significance criterion (BAAQD Air Quality Guidelines, Table 3.1). The proposed winery includes an approximately 2,471 square foot hospitality building, with storage, and approximately 14,691 additional square feet of floor area related to wine production for a total of 17,569 square feet. Since the proposed floor area is far below the screening levels for similar uses in the District's Guidelines, the proposed winery would not generate GHG above the significance threshold established by the District, and further analysis (and quantification) of GHG emissions is not warranted. In addition, winery hospitality functions generate less intensive traffic than that of "Quality Restaurants" as described by Institute of Traffic Engineers, *Traffic Generation Rates, 2008*, which range from 7.5 to 10 vehicle trips per 1,000 square feet of restaurant floor area; in this case, the typical restaurant generates a maximum of about 25 trips during peak periods (10 x 2.471) compared with the 15 trips by the proposed winery.

- b. 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 in that document, despite the adoption of mitigation measures incorporating specific policies and action items into the General Plan.

Consistent with these General Plan action items, Napa County participated in the development of a community-wide GHG emissions inventory and "emission reduction framework" for all local jurisdictions in the County in 2008-2009. This planning effort was completed by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency in December 2009, and is currently serving as the basis for development of a refined inventory and emission reduction plan for unincorporated Napa County. The County's draft Climate Action Plan is currently available for public review and is anticipated to be heard by the Planning Commission in mid-2011, with Board action following shortly thereafter.

During our ongoing planning effort, the County requires project applicants to consider methods to reduce GHG emissions consistent with Napa County General Plan Policy **CON-65(e)**. The applicants have incorporated GHG reduction methods where feasible including: high-efficiency landscaping, ample natural ventilation, and recycled and/or low VOC construction materials.

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 efforts to reduce emissions described above. For these reasons, project impacts related to GHG emissions are considered less than significant.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts of propane that is required as a heating fuel source. A Business Plan will be filed with the Environmental Health Department should the amount of other hazardous materials used at the winery reaches reportable levels.
- b. The project will 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 approximately 2.5 miles from the Napa County Airport within the designated Compatibility Zone E, Other Airport Environs, where risk of accident is considered very low. No safety hazards will be created by the proposed winery expansion or occur within this Airport Influence Zone of the Napa County Airport.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airstrips of airports that would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area..
- g. The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- h. The access driveway that serves the project is being improved to comply with County Road standards. Therefore, the design of the project will not negatively impact or hinder emergency vehicle access. Napa County Fire/CDF has reviewed the project and found that it does present any unique problems in emergency response.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. 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"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The applicant has submitted the Paul N. Bartelt, P.E., Bartelt Engineering, "Onsite Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study for the Rasmussen Winery, February, 2011" which evaluates the feasibility of providing onsite wastewater disposal for a 100,000 gallons per year winery facility. Bartelt Engineering proposes to combine and dispose of process wastewater and sanitary wastewater through a subsurface drip dispersal system with effluent pretreatment. Both the domestic and process waste would be treated separately before being combined for discharge. Domestic wastewater would be treated in a standard 1,500 gallon septic tank with a peak flow of 625 gallons per day (GPD) and two-days retention time. Process wastewater will initially pass through a 5,000 gallon tank with 2,500 gpd peak flow, with 1.5-days retention time. By gravity flow, both systems will be combined into a 5,000 gallon recirculation/blend tank for pretreatment and storage for 1.5 days before being stored in a 5,000 gallon dosing tank for another 1.5 days. Treated effluent in the dosing tank will then be pumped to the subsurface drip dispersal field by a duplex pumping system. The subsurface drip dispersal field will consist of 60 lines that are 100 feet long for a total 6,000 lineal feet of drip line with 3,000 emitters; the leach field will have a 200% reserve area. The Napa County Department of Environmental Management has reviewed the proposed domestic and process wastewater systems and recommends approval as conditioned. Additionally, the applicant will be required to obtain all necessary permits from the Napa County Department of Public Works, including a Stormwater Pollution Management Permit.
- b. Minimum thresholds for water use have been established by the Department of Public Works using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS). These reports are the result of water resources investigations performed by the USGS in cooperation with the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. Any project which reduces water usage or any water usage which is at or below the established threshold, is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels.

Based on the submitted *Phase One* water availability analysis, the 11.55 acre subject valley-area parcel has a water availability calculation of 11.55 acre-feet per year (af/yr), which is arrived at by multiplying its 11.5 acre size by a one af/yr/acre fair share water use factor. According to the applicant, existing water usage on the parcel is approximately 5.50 af/yr, including 0.75 af/yr for residential use (1 primary residence at .75 af/yr) and 4.75 af/yr for irrigation of 9.5 acres of established vineyards with no heat or fire protection. This application proposes an additional 1.33 af/yr of winery water use with removal of the single-family residence, 2.65 af/yr for the 100,000 gallon winery and 4.18 af/yr for 8.35 acres of vineyard with no heat or frost protection. As a result of the foregoing, annual water demand for this parcel would increase to 6.83 af/yr. Based on these figures, the project would be below the established threshold for groundwater use on the property. The County is not aware of, nor has it received any reports of, groundwater shortages near the project area. The project will not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater level.

- c.-e. There are no existing or planned stormwater systems that would be affected by this project. As the project will likely result in disturbance to more than one acre of land, the permittee will be required to comply with the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board addressing stormwater pollution during construction. The area surrounding the project is pervious ground that is planted to vineyards and has the capacity to absorb runoff.
- f. There is nothing included in this proposal that would otherwise substantially degrade water quality. As discussed in greater detail at "a.," above, the Department of Environmental Management has reviewed the proposed wastewater improvements and has found the proposed system adequate, as conditioned, to meet the facility's septic and process wastewater treatment and disposal needs. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality.
- g. This project proposes no housing development and results in conversion of the existing residence to a winery facility. No housing will be placed within a mapped flood zone.
- h.-i. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Floodplain, Flood Zones, and Dam Levee Inundation* layers), the project site is not located within a mapped floodplain or dam levee inundation area. This project will not expose people or structures to significant risks associated with flooding. j. In coming years, higher global temperatures are expected to raise sea level by expanding ocean water, melting mountain glaciers and small ice caps, and causing portions of Greenland and the Antarctic ice sheets to melt. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change estimates that the global average sea level will rise between 0.6 and 2 feet over the next century (IPCC, 2007). However, the project area is located at approximately 85 feet in elevation and there is no known history of mud flow in the vicinity. The project will not subject people or structures to a significant risk of inundation from tsunami, seiche, or mudflow.

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

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

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project is located in an area dominated by agricultural, residential and open space uses and the improvements proposed here are in support of ongoing agricultural uses county-wide, as they provide a market for grapes grown within Napa County. This project will not divide an established community.
- b. The subject parcel is located in the AW:AC (Agricultural Watershed : Airport Compatibility Combination) zoning district, which allows wineries and winery-accessory uses subject to use permit approval. The project is fully compliant with the physical limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance. The County has adopted the Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO) to protect agriculture and open space and to regulate winery development and expansion in a manner that avoids potential negative environmental effects.

Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy **AG/LU 1** of the 2008 General Plan states that the County shall, “preserve existing agricultural land uses and plan for agriculture and related activities as the primary land uses in Napa County.” The property’s General Plan land use designation is AR (Agricultural Resource), which allows “agriculture, processing of agricultural products, and single-family dwellings.” More specifically, General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy **AG/LU-2** recognizes wineries and other agricultural processing facilities, and any use clearly accessory to those facilities, as agriculture. The project would allow for the continuation of agriculture as a dominant land use within the county and is fully consistent with the Napa County General Plan.

The proposed use of the property for the “fermenting and processing of grape juice into wine” (NCC §18.08.640) supports the economic viability of agriculture within the county consistent with General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy **AG/LU-4** (“The County will reserve agricultural lands for agricultural use including lands used for grazing and watershed/ open space...”) and General Plan Economic Development Policy **E-1** (“The County’s economic development will focus on ensuring the continued viability of agriculture...”).

The General Plan includes two complimentary policies requiring that new wineries, “...be designed to convey their permanence and attractiveness.” (General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy **AG/LU-10** and General Plan Community Character Policy **CC-2**). The buildings proposed here are generally of a high architectural quality and are in keeping with the primary agricultural character of the site and its surroundings. The proposed winery structures will convey the required permanence and attractiveness.

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

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

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

Discussion:

a.-b. Historically, the two most valuable mineral commodities in Napa County in economic terms have been mercury and mineral water. More recently, building stone and aggregate have become economically valuable. Mines and Mineral Deposits mapping included in the Napa County Baseline Data Report indicates that there are no known mineral resources nor any locally important mineral resource recovery sites located on the project site (*Mines and Mineral Deposits*, Napa County Baseline Data Report, Figure 2-2). The nearest known resource is the Sayer Sand and Gravel operation, located across the Napa River, approximately 3.0 miles to the northeast.

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

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII.	NOISE. Would the project result in:				
	a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during the project construction phase. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles; and, as a result, noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. The proposed project would not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts. Construction activities would generally occur during the period between 7:00 am and 7:00 pm on weekdays- normal waking hours. All construction activities will be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (N.C.C. Chapter 8.16).

Noise from winery operations is generally limited; however, the proposed tours and tastings program and marketing plan could create additional noise impacts. The submitted marketing plan includes expansion of hours of operation from 5 days/week, 9:00 AM-5:00 PM to 7 days/week, 6:00 AM-6:00 PM. Winery marketing plans will increase from 5 visitors per week to allow 4 daily private tours and tastings with 6 people, 4 monthly food and wine pairings with 24 people, 4 annual wine club/wine release events with 50 people, one annual winery auction-related event with 125 people and one annual Napa Valley Wine Auction event with 125 people with all evening events concluding by 10:00 PM. Noise generated during these times is not anticipated to be significant. The project would not result in significant permanent construction noise impacts or operating impacts.

- b. Given the relatively sparse population in the agricultural and rural residential setting and the project's distance from neighboring residences (within a radius of ±285 feet), there is a relatively low potential for impacts related to construction noise to result in a significant impact. Furthermore, construction activities would generally occur during the period of 7:00 AM-7:00 PM on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity.

- c.-d. The anticipated level of noise to occur following the completion of construction including the operation of the facility would be minimal and typical of an agricultural setting within a sparsely populated rural setting. To ensure noise impacts are reduced to a less than significant level, the applicant will be required to contain all mechanical equipment within the proposed buildings and/or within an acoustic enclosure.

- e. The project site is located approximately 2.25 miles from the Napa County Airport in designated Airport Compatibility Zone E, Other Airport Environs. Aircraft overflights can occur anywhere in this area when aircraft are departing or approaching the airport. Overflight annoyance is the primary impact element in this area. The risk of accident is very low. Standard conditions of approval, consistent with adopted the *Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*, require that an Avigation Easement or Deed Notice shall be recorded to recognize the project site's location within Napa County Airport Compatibility Zone E, Other Airport Environs and overflight noise impacts. The Avigation Easement provides for the right of aircraft operation, overflight and related noises, and for the regulation of light emissions, electrical emissions, or the release of substances such as steam or smoke which could interfere with aircraft operations. Prior to recordation the Avigation Easement is subject to County Counsel and Airport Land Use Commission staff review and approval prior to recordation.

- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

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

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

Discussion:

- a. – c. Due to the small increase in number of employees involved, the project would not result in a significant adverse impact on population and housing.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. 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:

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

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. 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 and/or conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-16, which seeks to maintain an adequate Level of Service (LOS) at signalized and unsignalized intersections, or reduce the effectiveness of existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-23, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a.-b. The project site will be accessed via Cuttings Wharf Road, a public road maintained by Napa County. According to the George W. Nickelson, "Initial Traffic Evaluation for a Proposed Winery Expansion at 2125 Cuttings Wharf Road in Napa County, April 13, 2011", traffic counts on Cuttings Wharf Road have an average weekday traffic volume of 2,105 vehicles and a Saturday volume of 2,059 vehicles south of State Route 121 (SR 121) based upon February–March, 2011 Napa County Department of Public Works traffic

counts. The weekday peak period (4:00-6:00 PM) and Saturday peak period (1:00-3:00 PM) volumes are 9% of the daily volumes. Traffic counts at the winery indicate the weekday and Saturday two-way peak hour volumes on Cuttings Wharf Road are 146 and 148 vehicles respectively.

The current level of service (LOS) for the subject area is LOS A during peak hours; the average daily traffic volume along Cuttings Wharf Road at the project site is estimated to be 1,640 vehicles based upon traffic counts conducted from February-March, 2011. The use permit includes 8 full-time and 4 part-time employees and up to 4 daily tours with a maximum of 6 people for a total volume of 43 maximum daily trips (this assumes 1.05 occupants per car for employees, 3.2 trips per day per full-time employee, 2 trips per day per part-time employee, and 2.6 occupants per car for visitors). Winery operations create 5 additional trips per day for "grapes, materials/supplies and case goods" (all figures per *Napa County Winery Traffic Generation Characteristics*). The total volume increase of 48 maximum daily trips, combined with the series of planned marketing events (including 4 monthly food and wine pairings with 24 people, 4 annual wine club/wine release events with 50 people, and one annual Winery Auction event with 125 people and one annual Napa Valley Wine Auction event with 125 people and 10 event staff), will not increase the existing LOS A. According to Public Works, Traffic Engineering staff, any potential line-of-sight issues due to the location of the existing driveway on Cutting's Wharf Road will be addressed with recommended and standard conditions of approval. The project does not conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency for designated roads or highways.

- c. The project is located in the Napa County Airport Compatibility Zone E, Other Airport Environs, the outer ring of the runway flight path at its highest altitude, and would not result in a change in air traffic patterns for the Napa County Airport. Aircraft overflights can occur anywhere in these areas when aircraft are departing or approaching the airport. Overflight annoyance is the primary effect in these areas. The risk of accident is very low. The project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns for the Napa County Airport. According to the *Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP)*, dedication of an aviation or overflight easement is required as a condition of new development within all airport influence area zones, a standard project condition of approval.
- d. As stated above in the George Nickelson traffic evaluation for the project, there is adequate line-of-sight and no left-turn lane is required for the project. Ongoing landscape maintenance along perimeter fencing will ensure clear line-of-site. According to Napa County traffic standards, daily traffic volumes in/out of the proposed winery would need to create 90 daily vehicle trips before a left-turn lane would be warranted; as proposed, a maximum of 39-48 daily vehicle trips would be generated. The existing and proposed access driveway complies with County Road standards.
- e. According to Public Works Department and Fire Marshal comments, as proposed, adequate emergency access and circulation will be provided on the project site and will be required prior to issuance of Building Permits. The project will not result in inadequate emergency access.
- f. The 8 proposed guest parking spaces in front, additional employee parking in the rear and temporary guest spaces along vineyard avenues during special marketing events will be adequate to accommodate maximum occupancy, employees and any related activities. No parking will be accommodated on public roadways or emergency through lanes as a standard condition of approval.
- g. The proposed project does not conflict with any known policies or plans supporting alternative transportation.

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

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI.	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Discussion:

- a. The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements as established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and will not result in a significant impact on the environment relative to wastewater discharge. Wastewater disposal will be accommodated on-site and in compliance with State and County regulations.
- b. This application proposes new domestic and process wastewater systems as described at **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**, above. The Napa County Department of Environmental Management has reviewed the proposed domestic and process wastewater systems and recommends approval as conditioned. Required wellhead setbacks and ongoing monitoring of the facility's wastewater systems by the Department of Environmental Management should reduce any impacts on water quality to less than significant levels. The new wastewater treatment system will not result in significant environmental impacts over permitted baseline levels.
- c. The project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or an expansion of existing facilities which would cause a significant impact to the environment.
- d. As discussed at the **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY** section, above, groundwater usage will remain below the property's fair share volume. No new or expanded entitlements are necessary.
- e. Domestic wastewater will be treated on-site and will not require a wastewater treatment provider. Process wastewater will likewise be treated and disposed of on-site consistent with the requirements of the Napa County Department of Environmental Management.
- f. The project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the project's demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the project.
- g. The project will comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 would have no impact on wildlife resources. No sensitive resources or biologic areas will be converted or affected by this project. Also as analyzed above, the project would not result in a significant loss of native trees, native vegetation, or important examples of California's history or pre-history.
- b. As discussed above, particularly under **Air Quality, Transportation/Traffic** and **Population and Housing**, the proposed project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- c. There are no environmental effects caused by this project that would result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, whether directly or indirectly. No hazardous conditions resulting from this project have been identified. The project would not have any environmental effects that would result in significant impacts.

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