A Tradition of Stewardship
A Commitment to Service

Planning, Building & Environmental Services

1195 Third Street, Suite 210
Napa, CA 94559
www.countyofnapa.org

Main: (707) 253-4417
Fax: (707) 253-4336

David Morrison
Director

To:	Planning Commission	From:	Sean Trippi
Date:	June 26, 2014	Re:	Yountville Hill Winery Mitigated Negative Declaration

Statutory Background

In accordance with Section 15073 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Napa County submitted the initial proposed IS/MND to the State Clearinghouse for a 30-day review period beginning on February 14, 2014. In addition, Napa County circulated a Notice of Intent to adopt the initial proposed IS/MND to interested agencies and individuals. During, and following the public review period, the County received a number of comment letters expressing concerns with the project. Subsequent to the preparation of the initial IS/MND, the applicant submitted additional information addressing the concerns raised in many of the comment letters.

Pursuant to Section 15073.5 of the CEQA Guidelines recirculation of the MND is not required unless a new, avoidable significant effect is identified and mitigation measures or project revisions must be added in order to reduce the effect to insignificance, or the lead agency determines that the proposed mitigation measures or project revisions will not reduce potential effects to less than significance and new measures or revisions must be required.

This memorandum further supports the environmental analysis and conclusions reached in the prior Mitigated Negative Declaration, and supports the finding that the proposed project does not raise any new issues and does not exceed the level of impacts identified in the previously prepared Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Applicable Reports in Circulation

This memo supplements the Yountville Hill Winery Mitigated Negative Declaration and includes summaries of and passages from the referenced reports. A copy of said documents are available for review at the offices of the Napa County Planning, Building & Environmental Services Department, 1195 Third Street, Suite 210, Napa, Calif.

Minor Technical Changes or Additions to the Yountville Hill Winery Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND)

Biological Resources

Protocol level botanical surveys were conducted in the spring and summer of 2009 by Pacific Biological & Consulting, as well as surveys for sensitive wildlife and wetlands. Additional surveys of the site were conducted in October 2013 by Wildlife Research Associates. The results of these surveys are contained in the two reports referenced in the IS/MND. The reports included analysis of the species found in the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Electronic Inventory and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB) for listed special-status species and targeted listed species that had the potential to exist within the project area based upon location and the presence of their general necessary habitat requirements. Although the 2013 report recommends additional seasonal plant surveys, the 2009 report conducted surveys during the targeted seasons and concluded that, other than the riparian area along the drainages, no sensitive or special plant species were found on the project site that would be impacted by the proposed development. The likelihood of federally or state listed plant species occurring on the site is low due to the low quality of habitat on the site.

A subsequent study entitled Special Status Plant Survey Report, dated June 2, 2014, was prepared to evaluate direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of the proposed project on existing site on special-status plant species. The plant surveys were conducted on October 13, 2013 and April 3, May 8, and June 1, 2014. The plant surveys conducted were floristic in accordance with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife guidelines which require that surveys be conducted during the time of year when special status plant species are most identifiable, generally when they are flowering. No special status plant species were observed during the appropriately timed protocol level seasonal survues and no impacts or mitigation measures are require for special status plants.

The existing driveway will be widened by about 10-feet to meet county standards and the existing culvert will be replaced by a three-sided box culvert in approximately the same location as the existing culvert. According to the Wildlife Research Associates, the ordinary high water mark of the creek at this location is approximately 5 feet wide, which is a small enough span to allow for design and installation of a 3-sided box culvert that begins and ends above the ordinary high water mark on either side of the channel.

A letter dated May 1, 2014, from Riechers Spence and Associates, the project Engineer, provides further clarification regarding the design of the box culvert, as well as the proposed design of the structure. The box culvert will span the creek with its support abutments outside the top of the creek bank resulting in no fill or construction within the creek banks.

Cultural Resources

A Cultural Resource Evaluation was prepared by Archaeological Resource Service dated August 25, 2009, to determine the presence or absence of pre-historic, historic, archaeological or paleontological resources, and potential impacts, if any, as a result of the proposed project. According to the study, the southern boundary of a potentially significant prehistoric site may extend into the northwest portion of the site. Surface scatter was generally found in the flatter portion of the site within the creek setback area and north of the existing driveway. This area had been previously disturbed by the cultivation of

vineyards. The proposal does not include any new construction in this area. There is another plotted sensitive site located just outside the project sites northern boundary, however, artifactual material may extend onto the project site and may be affected by the proposed project. Mitigation measure CULT-1 as well as project standard conditions of approval address potential impacts to cultural resources reducing impacts to a less than significant level.

CalTrans commented that the previous evaluation was out of date and that a new study should be prepared, specifically to address any potential work performed in the CalTrans right-of-way that may affect cultural resources. A subsequent evaluation was prepared by Archaeological Resource Service (ARG) dated May 30, 2014, to determine if the conclusions of the previous report are still valid. ARG conducted a literature search, contacted appropriate Native American Groups and conducted a field survey. No new observations of the presence or absence of cultural resources had been reported since the previous report and no new resources were observed in the field. The report concluded that the proposed project will not negatively impact known resources and that the mitigation measure and standard condition of approval addresses potential impacts to any unknown or newly discovered subsurface resources.

Hydrology and Water Quality

A Water System Feasibility Report prepared by Riechers Spence & Associates, dated October 24, 2013, the 10.89 acre indicates that the existing water usage on the parcel is approximately 1.8 af/yr, including 0.5 af/yr for the existing dwelling and 1.3 af/yr for the vineyard. The applicant proposes to demolish the existing residence and construct a new winery. The proposal also includes irrigating some of the existing vines with recycled or treated wastewater reducing the reliance on groundwater and resulting in an estimated water use of 4.87 af/yr, including 2.65 af/yr for the winery, 0.72 af/yr for the vineyards, and 1.5 af/yr for landscaping. 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. The project is located on the valley floor in an area that has an established acceptable water use criteria of 1.0 acre foot per acre per year or 10.89 af/yr for the project site.

Subsequent to preparation of the MND, the applicant commissioned Richard C. Slade & Associates LLC, Consulting Groundwater Geologists to assess groundwater conditions for the project site. The results of their assessment are included in a Memorandum dated May 31, 2014, and summarized below.

The site has two wells located in the lower, flatter portion of the site near the north and south property boundaries. The northerly well (Well No. 1) currently provides water to irrigate the existing vineyard and is approximately 23-feet deep. The other well (Well No. 2) was drilled to provide potable water and is approximately 300-feet deep. The wells were drilled in 1984 and 1974, respectively. Well No. 2 is proposed to be destroyed as part of this request. A third well was drilled in April 2014 in the eastern portion of the property near the top of the site is approximately 705-feet deep. This well would provide potable water for the winery.

Based on the annual water demand of 4.87 af/yr, average daily demand would be 4,350 gallons per day (gpd) and peak day demand would be 8,700 gpd (200% of daily demand). To meet these demands Well No. 3 would need to be pumped at a constant rate of 6.0 gallons per minute (gpm), 12 hours per day, every day or at a rate of 4.0 gpm 18 hours per day, every day to meet daily demand. To meet peak day

demand, the well would need to be pumped at a rate of 12.1 gpm for 12 hours or 8.1 gpm for 18 hours. These estimates assume no on site water storage. The proposed winery does include water storage tanks.

Well No. 1 will continue to be used to meet a very small portion (0.72 AF/yr) of the project demand to irrigate the vineyard, which will supplemented with treated wastewater. This equates to the well pumping at a rate of roughly 1.5 gpm , pumping 12 hours per day, every day during a typical 16-week irrigation season.

RCS performed a constant rate pumping test in Well No. 3 at a rate of 15 gpm, chosen for the pumping test because it is higher than the pumping rate at which onsite wells would need to pump in the future on to meet the peak day demand (12.1 gpm, assuming pumping 12 hrs/day every day) for the project. Further, this rate is much higher than the rate at which onsite wells would need to pump to meet the average daily demand for the project (6.0 gpm, assuming pumping 12 hrs/day, every day).

Water level drawdown in the pumping well at the end of the 24-hour pumping test was 11.2 ft when pumping at a rate of 15 gpm. Water levels became relatively stable after 6 hours of pumping, and thereafter remained stable throughout the pumping period. Within 24 hours of the cessation of the pumping test, the water levels in the well had fully recovered to the pre-test static water level.

While pumping Well No. 3 at a rate of 15 gpm for a period of 24 hours, very little to no water level drawdown was observed in onsite Well Nos. 1 and 2, which lie 900 ft. and 720 ft. from Well No. 3, respectively. The nearest known offsite well, as shown on Figure 5, is located roughly 1000 ft. west-northwest of Well No. 3. Because this distance is greater than are the distances from Well No. 3 (the pumping well) to Well Nos. 1 and 2 (the observation wells), and because essentially no water level drawdown was observed in Well No. 1 and 2 while pumping Well No. 3, then water level drawdown impacts while pumping Well No. 3 on that more distant offsite well would be considered to not be detectable. This would also be the same for all offsite wells that are at similar distances, or greater distances, from Well No. 3 than are Well Nos. 1 and 2.

RCS concluded that based on the data presented in their memorandum, Well No. 3 is capable of meeting the groundwater demands of the proposed project, including all potable water supplies. A small portion of the groundwater demand for vineyard irrigation will come from treated wastewater generated onsite and from Well No. 1. In addition, results of the water quality analyses for groundwater pumped from Well No. 3 meets the requirements for potable use for a public supply well. The report also concluded that potential impacts to neighboring offsite wells are considered to be less than significant, if any.

Transportation/Traffic

A traffic impact analysis was prepared for the project and was summarized in the MND. A Focused Collision History Analysis, dated May 14, 2014, was prepared by Omni-Means, to evaluate the accident rate on SR-29 in the vicinity of the project in comparison to the accident rate along a longer representative segment of SR-29 overall. The report also compares the accident rates to statewide rates and Napa County rates as identified by the California State Department of Transportation (Caltrans). A review of accidents near the project driveway is also included in the report.

The accident rate calculation is stated in terms of "accidents per million vehicle miles" and is based on the number of accidents occurring within the chosen segment, the segment length, and the average daily traffic volumes. The average number of accidents per year for the three year period was used in calculating the accident rate using data derived from the California Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS). The average daily traffic volumes were obtained from Caltrans volume databases and reflect average annual daily traffic (AADT) volumes.

The segment of SR-29 between the Washington Street and Oakville Grade intersections was evaluated to calculate the accident rate within the project vicinity. This segment encompasses the project driveway as well as the other nearby driveways and cross streets. An accident rate was also calculated for the "overall" SR-29 corridor between the towns of Yountville and St. Helena for comparison to the "project vicinity" accident rate. For the "overall" calculation, the SR-29 corridor between Washington Street (near Yountville) and Zinfandel Lane (near St. Helena) was evaluated. SR-29 north of Zinfandel Lane was not included in the analysis because vehicle queuing frequently influences traffic flows between Zinfandel Lane and Pope Street in St. Helena.

The study evaluated the collision history for the three year period from 2010-2012, being are the most recent three full calendar years for which SWITRS accident records are available. The accident totals excluded accidents occurring at or within 100 feet of a public cross street since these are considered "intersection" accidents for which the accident rate is calculated differently because they are influenced by side street traffic volumes and the intersection design characteristics (such as lane geometries and type of traffic controls).

There were 27 total accidents over the three year period (8 recorded accidents in 2008, 8 in 2009, and 11 in 2012) for an average of 9.0 accidents per year within the "project vicinity" segment (between Washington Street and Oakville Grade). The segment is 1.88 miles long and has an AADT volume of 23,433 trips (the average AADT for years 2010-2012). The "project vicinity" segment has a calculated accident rate of 0.56 accidents per million vehicle miles.

There was a total of 89 recorded accidents (24 in 2010, 29 in 2011, and 36 in 2012) representing an average of 29.67 accidents per year within the "overall" SR-29 segment (between Washington Street and Zinfandel Lane). The segment was measured to be 5.93 miles long and to have an AADT of 22,533 trips (the average of all Caltrans AADT volumes between Washington Street and Zinfandel Lane from 2010 to 2012). The "overall" SR-29 segment has a calculated accident rate of 0.61 accidents per million vehicle miles.

The calculated accident rates were also compared with statewide average rates compiled by Caltrans as published in their most recent document 2010 Collision Data on California State Highways. The statewide average accident rate for a conventional, flat, two-lane rural road with speed limit of 55 mph or less is 0.82 accidents per million vehicle miles. The calculated accident rates for SR-29 are lower than the statewide average rate, indicating the segment is experiencing fewer accidents than the statewide average for this type of roadway and volumes. In addition to the statewide rates, collision data are also provided by County. The accident rate in Napa County for two and three lane rural roads is 1.50 accidents per million vehicle miles (2010 data). Therefore, the accident rates on SR-29 near the project driveway as well as the overall segment between Washington Street and Zinfandel Lane are lower than the countywide rate for similar roadways.

The collision history in the immediate area of the project driveway, including the Mustard's Grill Restaurant driveway and the Cosentino Winery facility, was evaluated. Between 2010 and 2012 there was one recorded accident within 100 feet of the project driveway (vehicle hitting an object due to unsafe northbound turn 100 feet north at mile marker 21.35). As the nearby restaurant and winery driveway intersections have experienced a low number of recorded accidents over the surveyed time period, it is reasonable to expect the collision potential to be similar to these neighboring driveways.

The report concluded that calculated accident rate in the project vicinity is lower than the accident rate for the overall SR-29 corridor that was evaluated, and both SR-29 rates are lower than the statewide average and Napa County average rates, indicating the evaluated roadway segments of SR-29 are experiencing fewer accidents than average based on the volumes and roadway characteristics.

Noise

Noise from winery operations is generally limited; however, the proposed marketing plan and bottling activities could create additional noise impacts. The submitted marketing plan includes a number of monthly events, some of which would include up to 200 visitors. The area surrounding the subject property is very lightly developed, with only a scattering of homes located in the immediate vicinity with the nearest residences approximately 700 feet east and approximately 1,135 feet west, across S.R. 29, of the proposed winery building, and approximately 700 feet west of the lower cave portal/pad.

Section 8.16.070 of the Noise Ordinance states that, "No person shall operate, or cause to be operated, any source of sound at any location within the unincorporated area of the county, or allow the creation of any noise on property owned, leased, occupied or otherwise controlled by such person, which causes the noise level, when measured on any other property, either incorporated or unincorporated, to exceed:"

a. The noise standard for that land use as specified in Table 8.16.070 for a cumulative period of more than thirty minutes in any hour; or
b. The noise standard plus five dB for a cumulative period of more than fifteen minutes in any hour; or
c. The noise standard plus ten dB for a cumulative period of more than five minutes in any hour; or
d. The noise standard plus fifteen dB for a cumulative period of more than one minute in any hour;
e. The noise standard plus twenty dB or the maximum measured ambient level, for any period of time.

If the measured ambient noise level differs from that permissible within any of the first four noise limit categories above, the allowable noise exposure standard shall be the ambient noise level.

Table 8.16.070 - EXTERIOR NOISE LIMITS
(Levels not to be exceeded more than 30 minutes in any hour)

		Noise Level (dBA) Noise Zone Classification[1]		
Receiving Land Use Category	**Time Period**	**Rural**	**Suburban**	**Urban**
Residential single and double	10 p.m. — 7 a.m.	45	45	50
	7 a.m. — 10 p.m.	50	55	60
Residential multiple and country	10 p.m. — 7 a.m.	45	50	55
	7 a.m. — 10 p.m.	50	55	60
Commercial	10 p.m. — 7 a.m.		60	
	7 a.m. — 10 p.m.		65	
Industrial, including wineries	Anytime	75		

1. The classification of different areas of the county in terms of environmental noise zones shall be determined by the Noise Control Officer, based upon assessment of county noise survey data. Industrial noise limits are intended primarily for use at the boundary of industrial zones rather than for noise reduction within the zone.

The table below shows adjusted hourly noise levels in as described by Section 8.16.070(a-e).

Hourly Noise Metric	Residential Daytime Level	Residential Nighttime Level	Commercial Daytime Level	Commercial Nighttime Level
L_{50} - exceeded < 30 min/hour	50 dBA	45 dBA	65 dBA	60 dBA
L_{25} – exceeded < 15 min/hour	55 dBA	50 dBA	70 dBA	65 dBA
L_{08} – exceeded < 5 min/hour	60 dBA	55 dBA	75 dBA	70 dBA
L_{02} – exceeded < 1 min/hour	65 dBA	60 dBA	80 dBA	75 dBA
L_{max} – maximum per hour	70 dBA	65 dBA	85 dBA	80 dBA

The applicant has submitted three separate noise analysis assessing the potential impacts of bottling activities, dated March 14, 2014, that would occur during the daytime at the lower cave portal/pad and two reports concerning outdoor marketing events, dated March 21 and May 30, 2014, that would occur at the winery building. The analysis was conducted and the reports were prepared by Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc. (I&R).

I&R had previously conducted noise measurements as part of a study completed for the Cosentino Winery in 2013, which shares a property line with a residence, approximately 210 feet east of the centerline of Hwy 29 and 730 east of the lower cave portal/pad where bottling is proposed via a mobile bottling line.

Daytime and nighttime noise levels at the shared property line ranged from 52 to 57 dBA and 50 to 58 dBA, respectively. Average daytime noise levels were 56 dBA and average nighttime noise levels were 53 dBA, with a day-night average noise level of 60 dBA. Based in I&R's measurements, the daytime noise standards for rural residential use would be adjusted to match ambient levels pursuant to the County Noise Ordinance as follows:

Hourly Noise Metric	Residential Daytime Level
L_{50} - exceeded < 30 min/hour	**50 dBA**
L_{25} - exceeded < 15 min/hour	**55 dBA**
L_{08} - exceeded < 5 min/hour	60 dBA
L_{02} - exceeded < 1 min/hour	65 dBA
L_{max} – maximum per hour	70 dBA

Notes: **Bolded** entries have been increased to reflect ambient noise levels that exceed the base Noise Ordinance limits.

I&R conducted noise measurements at an operating mobile bottling line to determine noise levels produced by the bottling line. The measurements were taken 50 feet from the rear or open face of the truck and 30 feet from the end of the conveyer belt/case assembly area, note below.

Hourly Noise Metric	Bottling Line Noise Levels (50' from truck opening)
L_{50} - exceeded <3 0 min/hour	65 dBA
L_{25} - exceeded < 15 min/hour	67 dBA
L_{08} - exceeded < 5 min/hour	69 dBA
L_{02} - exceeded < 1 min/hour	71 dBA
L_{max} – maximum per hour	72 dBA

Sound from a fixed or point source drops off or spreads out as it travels away from the source. As noted above, the nearest residence is approximately 735 west of the proposed bottling area. Noise attenuation based on distance only would be approximately 23 dBA lower at the residential property line than 50 feet from the bottling line and 12 to 22 dBA below the adjusted noise levels pursuant to the County Noise Ordinance.

Hourly Noise Metric	Bottling Line Noise Levels at Residential Property Line	Adjusted Napa County Noise Standards
L_{50} - exceeded <3 0 min/hour	41 dBA	55 dBA
L_{25} - exceeded < 15 min/hour	44 dBA	56 dBA
L_{08} - exceeded < 5 min/hour	46 dBA	60 dBA
L_{02} - exceeded < 1 min/hour	47 dBA	65 dBA
L_{max} – maximum per hour	48 dBA	56 dBA

I&R also prepared two reports addressing noise from marketing events, including a noise simulation conducted on site. The reports assessed potential noise impacts at eight properties ranging from 1,135 to 5,680 feet west-southwest of the proposed winery building. This included four properties between S.R. 29 and the rail line, two properties in close proximity east of the rail line and two properties about a mile southwest of the project site.

In this case, the existing noise environment was not measured at the selected residences and businesses. However, the proximity of the receptors to S.R 29 and the rail line was taken into account and 5-10 dBA was either added or subtracted to the daytime and nighttime noise levels for the residential uses. The report also estimated the noise levels produced by marketing activities to be between approximately 64 to 67 dBA resulting from raised patron voices and non-amplified music,

respectively, measured 50 feet from the noise source. As noted above, sound from a fixed or point source drops off or spreads out as it travels away from the source.

Based on the distance between the proposed winery building and the selected residences and businesses (1,135 to 5,680 feet) sound attenuation based on distance only, would result in noise levels between 29 to 41 dBA lower than noise levels 50 feet from the source, which are below daytime and nighttime standards.

For the on-site noise simulation, I&R recorded two winery events with background music with 80 and 175 guests. The events were held at the same venue within a circular open air structure with a tent-like roof. Measurements were made at 50 and 100 feet from the edge and center of the event space, respectively. I&R was able to estimate the expected sound levels for the maximum 200 person events at the proposed winery given the only variable from the two recorded events being the number of guests, as shown in the table below.

Size of Event (number of Guests)	Sound Levels in terms of Napa County Noise Standards (dBA)				
	L_{max}	L_{02}	L_{08}	L_{25}	L_{50}
80 (measured)	63	61	59	58	57
175 (measured)	72	71	68	66	66
200 (estimated)	74	72	70	68	67

Due to the slope of the project site, the sound level for the on-site simulation could not be calibrated at 50 feet but was calibrated at 25 feet instead. As noted in the report, "considering the effect of hemispherical sound attenuation with distance where sound levels are reduced or increased with distance in accordance with the "inverse square law", which yields a six (6) dB sound level reduction or each doubling of the distance or a six (6) dB sound level increase for each halving of the distance, the sound level calibration at 25 feet was set at 6 dB above that of a 200 person event at 50 feet, or an median (L_{50}) level of 73 dBA."

In addition to the simulation of 200 guest event sound levels, a simulation was also conducted with the sound system output increased by 10 decibels to artificially increase the sound levels and allow for greater possible audibility of the event sound at test sites in the valley below. Based on the relationship between sound levels and event size determined during the event sound survey, this 10 decibel increase over the 200 guest event levels, would represent the sound levels produced by an event with 475 guests.

The average measured sound levels, in terms of the Napa County Noise Ordinance standards, at 25 feet during each of these simulation scenarios is shown below.

Simulation Scenario	Sound Levels in terms of Napa County Noise Standards (dBA)				
	L_{max}	L_{02}	L_{08}	L_{25}	L_{50}
Max. proposed 200 guest event	78	77	76	74	73
200 guest+10 dB	87	87	85	84	83

I&R then made sound level measurements and audibility determinations at three locations with a second sound level meter in valley floor areas below the future winery site at the winery property line near the access drive, approximately 770 feet to the west, in the Mustards parking lot, approximately 960 feet to the west, and at the driveway to the residence located at 7391 Hwy 29, approximately 1,850 feet west of the event simulation site.

Sound from the event simulations set for both the 200 person and the 200 person+10 dB event sound levels were not measurable and were inaudible above the background highway traffic and mechanical noise from commercial use noise levels at the two nearest locations. At the furthest location, which is significantly removed from highway traffic and commercial noise, sound from the event simulation set at the 200 person+10 dB event (estimated 475 guest) levels was audible and measureable, while sounds from the event simulation levels set for the proposed maximum 200 person event were occasionally audible though not measurable over ambient noise conditions as noted in the table below.

Measured Simulation Levels at the driveway to the residence located at 7391 Hwy 29

	Sound Levels in terms of Napa County Noise Standards (dBA)				
Simulation Scenario	L_{max}	L_{02}	L_{08}	L_{25}	L_{50}
Max. proposed 200 guest event	44	44	42	41	40
200 guest+10 dB (475 guest) event	45	45	43	42	41

Considering that the source level of this simulation were 10 decibels above, or twice as loud as, those for the 200 person event, and that only sound for the 200 person+10 dB event simulation was clearly measurable, much of the sound levels measured for the 200 person event simulation can be attributed to ambient, background noise at the measurement site. I&R also prepared acoustical calculations, based on the logarithmic relationship of sound levels, to determine the ambient sound levels at the measurement site and the actual sound level produced by the maximum (200 guest) event simulation at this measurement location in the absence of ambient noise which are provided in the table below. The table also shows the adjusted daytime and nighttime County Noise Ordinance Standards for the Rural Residential uses.

Calculated 200 guest event levels vs County standards

	Sound Levels in terms of Napa County Noise Standards (dBA)				
Sound Levels at location 3 (7391 Hwy 29 driveway)	L_{max}	L_{02}	L_{08}	L_{25}	L_{50}
Calculated ambient noise level during testing	44	43	42	41	40
Calculated 200 guest event level without ambient noise	**36**	**35**	**33**	**32**	**31**
Adjusted daytime County Noise Ordinance Standards	60	55	50	45	45
Adjusted nighttime County Noise Ordinance Standards	55	50	45	40	40

A review of the sound level produced by the maximum 200 guest event at the 7391 Hwy 29 driveway location indicates that event noise levels would be well below the daytime and nighttime County Noise Standards in this area. Based on the findings in the I&R noise simulation report dated May 30, 2014, compared to those in the March 21, 2014, report it is expected that sound levels produced by a

maximum size (200 guest) event to be well below the daytime and nighttime County Noise Standards at all residences and businesses in the project vicinity.

The conclusions of all three reports by I&R related to the noise generating activities under study is that noise from events and bottling at the proposed winery would not result in a significant noise impact at area residences and businesses.

SUMMARY AND FINDINGS

Review of the additional studies and reports has concluded that the environmental analysis and impacts identified in Mitigated Negative Declaration remain substantively unchanged and supports the finding that the additional studies and reports do not raise any new issues and do not exceed the level of impacts identified in the previously prepared Mitigated Negative Declaration.

The following findings are provided in accordance with CEQA §15073.5 (c) concerning the decision not to recirculate the Mitigated Negative Declaration pursuant to §15073.5(a)

Recirculation is not required under the following circumstances:
(1) Mitigation measures are replaced with equal or more effective measures pursuant to Section 15074.1.

(2) New project revisions are added in response to written or verbal comments on the project's effects identified in the proposed negative declaration which are not new avoidable significant effects.

(3) Measures or conditions of project approval are added after circulation of the negative declaration which are not required by CEQA, which do not create new significant environmental effects and are not necessary to mitigate an avoidable significant effect.

(4) New information is added to the negative declaration which merely clarifies, amplifies, or makes insignificant modifications to the negative declaration.

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, please see the Yountville Hill Winery Mitigated Negative Declaration dated February 11, 2014.

By: Sean Trippi, Project Planner

Signature

6/26/2014
Date