

# APPENDIX C

COUNTY OF NAPA  
PLANNING, BUILDING AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT  
1195 THIRD STREET, SUITE 210  
NAPA, CA 94559  
(707) 253-4416

## Initial Study Checklist (form updated February 2015)

1. **Project Title:** Reverie on Diamond Mountain Use Permit Modification #P13-00027-MOD, Use Permit Exception to the Conservation Regulations #P15-00141, and an Exception to the Napa County Road & Street Standards. (RSS).
2. **Property Owner:** Norman Kiken; 1520 Diamond Mountain Road, Calistoga, CA 94515; (707) 942-6800.
3. **Project sponsor's Name and Address:** Norman Kiken; 1520 Diamond Mountain Road, Calistoga, CA 94515; (707) 942-6800.
4. **Representative:** Scott Greenwood-Meinert; 1455 First Street, Ste 301, Napa, CA 94559; (707) 252-7122; scottGM@dpf-law.com.
5. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and Email:** Charlene Gallina, (707) 299-1355; [charlene.gallina@countyofnapa.org](mailto:charlene.gallina@countyofnapa.org)
6. **Project Location and APN:** The project is located on a 39.83 acre parcel approximately 1,000 feet west of Diamond Mountain Road and approximately 4,000 feet from its intersection with State Highway 29/128, within the AW (Agricultural Watershed) Zoning District; 1530 Diamond Mountain Road, Calistoga, CA, APN: 020-440-005.
7. **General Plan description:** Agriculture Watershed & Open Space (AWOS) Designation.
8. **Zoning:** Agricultural Watershed (AW) District.
9. **Background:**

**The use permit entitlement request evaluated in this Initial Study pertains to an existing winery that has previously expanded beyond the limits of its use permit without required County approvals. The subject property is presently in violation of County Code, although it is noted that the subject use permit modification request was submitted voluntarily by the applicant prior to the County initiating a code enforcement case. Property owners with code violations have the right to request retroactive approval of developments/uses implemented without required permits. This Initial Study/Negative Declaration evaluates the potential for new environmental impacts resulting from the applicant's request. This document is not an endorsement by County staff of the applicant's proposal. It is intended solely as a public disclosure document to inform all interested parties in advance of a decision being rendered by the Napa County Planning Commission.**

**Approximately seven days prior to the Planning Commission's scheduled June 3, 2015 hearing, Planning Division staff will issue a Staff Report analyzing project components and outlining decision making options for the Commission, including making a recommendation on one of the options. The Staff Report for the June 3, 2015 hearing will be issued no later than Friday, May 29, 2015.**

### Project History:

The property was purchased by Norman Kiken in 1993. The existing parcel is 39.83 acres in area and includes an existing 2,951 sq.ft. winery building, a 4,710<sup>±</sup> sq.ft. winery cave, associated outdoor work areas, crush and tank pads, and a single family residence located on the same parcel approximately 1,300 feet to the northwest of the winery. The property also has an existing approximately 27 acre vineyard. The winery was first established in 1995 within a 2,237 sq. ft. portion of the 2,951 sq.ft. existing barn/guest quarters. The existing single family residence was authorized and constructed in 1994. The cave was excavated in the mid 1990's.

Erosion Control Plan #93391-ECPS was administratively approved by the Conservation, Development & Planning Department on August 9, 1994 authorizing the construction of a 2,000<sup>±</sup> ft. access drive, an approximately 5,000 sq.ft. single residence, pool and on-site septic waste water system on slopes averaging 20%. Building Permit #55073 was issued for this residence on August 11, 1994 and finalized on July 14, 1995.

Use Permit #94254-UP was approved by the Planning Commission on June 21, 1995 authorizing the establishment of a 5,000 gallon per

year estate winery through the conversion of 2,237 sq.ft. of an existing 2,951 sq.ft. barn, and the addition of a 3,000 sq.ft. crush and tank pad. By appointment visitation and retail sales were set at 20 visitors per day with an average of 20 visitors per week. The marketing plan was authorized as follows: 1) tours and tastings for wine trade personnel at 10 persons per year with 5 to 10 (average 6) persons per event; 2) private promotional dinners at 4 per year with 6 to 18 (average 12) persons per event; and 3) wine auction related events such as barrel tastings and auctions at 2 per year with an average attendance of 25 persons. Hours of operation was set at 8 am-5 pm, daily. The number of employees was set at 2 full-time plus 1 temporary employee during harvest. Parking was limited to five (5) spaces. The guest cottage within the winery was deemed accessory to the residence and was prohibited from having any connection to the winery or used for marketing or other winery activities. A Variance (#94255-VAR) to allow the winery to be within the 300 foot setback from a minor private road was also submitted; however, the Planning Commission found the road to not serve the public because it was a secondary access and, therefore, the variance request was officially withdrawn at the public hearing. Building permits for such approval was obtained from the County of Napa.

Over time, the entire second floor was converted for winery purposes without obtaining a use permit modification, building permit and/or grading permit. Presently, no residential use remains within the former barn/guest cottage. In the mid 1990's, a 4,710+/- cave was excavated in the hillside immediately adjacent to the winery/barn without obtaining a use permit modification, building permit and/or grading permit. According to Rick Stone of Nordby Wine Cave, the cave excavator, the cave was constructed in accordance with accepted industry standards at the time, and the cave spoils were disposed on site and used to improve vineyard roads.

On February 4, 2013, Use Permit Major Modification P13-00027 was voluntarily submitted by the property owner, as well as, in response to being selected to participate in the Winery Audit process. The request seeks approval of the cave and other existing winery-related site improvements improved without benefit of permit as well as authorization of wine production and visitation/marketing exceeding levels contemplated in the original use permit entitlement.

Demolition Permit B14-01281 was administratively approved by the Planning Building & Environmental Services Department on August 20, 2014 authorizing the demolition of a 540 sq.ft. winery material storage and 400 sq.ft. vineyard equipment shop buildings located within the stream setback of a small tributary flowing into Teale Creek. It should be noted that such buildings existed before adoption of the Conservation Regulations in 1991 and the establishment of stream setbacks, however, these structures had been modified/expanded and/or replaced at some point after 1991 and prior to submittal of Major Modification P13-0027. As indicated, the applicant expanded and partially enclosed one of the buildings that spanned the stream and constructed another. Demolition of the buildings resolved the code violation pertaining to these structures.

## 10. Description of Project:

Request for approval of a modification to Use Permit #94254-UP, a Use Permit Exception to the Conservation Regulations (P15-00141) and an Exception to the Napa County Roads & Street Standards to allow the following:

- A. Recognize and authorize an increase the approved production capacity from 5,000 to 9,200 gallons per year;
- B. Recognize and authorize the 1,460 sq.ft. (Second Floor) of the winery building allocated to accessory use;
- C. Recognize and authorize the use of the 4,710 +/-sq.ft. cave for wine production, case storage and wine barrel storage and once fire sprinklers are installed use of the cave for tours , tastings and some events (Cave spoils were kept on the property and used to improve the vineyard roads);
- D. Recognize and authorize an increase in the approved "by appointment visitation" of 20 persons per day with an average of 20 per week **to** a maximum of 40 persons per day with an average of 200 persons per week;
- E. Recognize and authorize expansion of the existing marketing plan **from** the following: 1) tours and tastings for wine trade personnel at 10 persons per year with 5 to 10 (average 6) persons per event; 2) private promotional dinners at 4 per year with 6 to 18 (average 12) persons per event; and 3) wine auction related events such as barrel tastings and auctions at 2 per year with an average attendance of 25 persons **to** allow 1) 4 events per year with up to 60 persons; 2) 2 events per year with up to 40 persons; 3) 12 events per year with up to 10 guests; and 4) participation in the wine auction;
- F. Recognize and authorize an increase in the approved number of employees **from** 2 employees plus 1 temporary employee during harvest **to** a maximum of 5 employees;
- G. Recognize and authorize on-premise consumption of the wines produced on-site, consistent with Business and Professions Code §§23356, 23390, and 23396.5 (also known as AB 2004 (Evans 2008 or the Picnic Bill) within the winery building and improved lawn areas, and under the mature redwood grove;
- H. Recognize and authorize catered food pairings;
- I. Abandonment of an existing septic system and the installation of a new code compliant domestic and winery waste system. Both hold and haul and rapid aerobic treatment with storage are proposed;
- J. Installation of a new well;
- K. Installation of a new automatic storm water diversion valve and a temporary crush pad cover; and
- L. Installation of a new ADA compliant parking space.

The proposal also includes a Use Permit Exception (#P15-00141) to the Conservation Regulations with regards to retention of the following 1) the portal for the existing wine cave encroaches into the setback for the small tributary creek on the property; and 2) the minor landscaping improvements along a portion of Teal Creek that are within the required setback of that creek. The proposal also includes an Exception to the Napa County Road & Street Standards (RSS) to allow for a reduction in the required 20 foot roadway width to preserve unique features of the natural environment. Access to the project site is from an approximately 1,000 ft. long paved private drive crossing several properties which outlets onto Diamond Mountain Road, a County maintained public right of way. Minor widening will occur on portions of this road on the adjoining property where no mature trees are located and outside of creek setbacks. The RSS exception would apply only to areas where natural features are to be preserved (see RSS exception drawing for details).

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

The project site is situated approximately 1,000 feet west of Diamond Mountain Road and approximately 4,000 feet from its intersection with State Highway 29/128. The site consists of a hillside that ranges in elevation from 784 feet above sea level at the northern boundary south of Kortum Canyon Road to 510 feet above sea level at the southern boundary of site at Diamond Mountain Road. The property is comprised of 39.83 acres of land which is accessed via a shared driveway that serves the following parcels: APN 020-400-012 Lands of Von Strasser, APN 020-400-013 Lands of

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

Discretionary approvals required by the County consist of a use permit modification request. The project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County, including but not limited to building permits, grading permits, and waste disposal permits. Permits may also be required by the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, & Firearms.

**Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies**  
California Department of Fish & Wildlife

**Other Agencies Contacted**  
Federal Trade and Taxation Bureau  
Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control  
City of Calistoga

**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  
Name: Charlene Gallina, Supervising Planner

Date

# ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

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

**Discussion:**

- a-c. The recognition of existing winery operations and the propose abandonment of the existing the septic system and the installation of a new system, as well as, installation of a new well would not be located within an area which would damage any known scenic vista, or damage scenic resources, trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings. The proposed project site is located at the bottom of a secluded canyon and previously developed with exception to these required system improvements for the winery. Therefore, no impacts to scenic vistas will occur.
- d. The proposed project does not result in any changes to the exterior of the existing winery including the cave or continued use of outdoor areas for events and visitation activities will not result in any changes to nighttime lighting then already existing. In accordance with County standards, all exterior lighting will be the minimum necessary for operational and security needs. Any upgrades in light fixtures will be kept as low to the ground as possible and include shields to deflect the light downward. Avoidance of highly reflective surfaces will be required, as well as standard County conditions to prevent light from being cast skyward. As designed, and as subject to standard conditions of approval, below, the project will not create a significant impact from light or glare.

*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, including architectural highlighting and spotting. Low-level lighting shall be utilized in parking areas as opposed to elevated high-intensity light standards. Lighting utilized during harvest activities is not subject to this requirement. Prior to issuance of any building permit pursuant to this approval, two copies of a detailed lighting plan showing the location and specifications for all lighting fixtures to be installed on the property shall be submitted for Planning Division review and approval. All lighting shall comply with the California Building Code.*

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.<sup>1</sup> Would the project:</b>				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

a/b. The project site is already developed and would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important as shown on the Napa County GIS map (*Department of Conservation Farmlands 2012 Napa County Farmlands* layer). According to Napa County GIS the property is categorized as Unique Farmland (U). Although the site is classified as locally important, the site has been developed since the mid-90s. The project site is not subject to a Williamson Act contract.

c/d. The project site is zoned Agricultural Watershed (AW), which allows wineries upon grant of a use permit. The project site does not contain woodland or forested areas, and thus would not result in the loss of or conversion of forest lands to a non-forest use. Portions of the subject property and areas adjoining the property contain woodlands and forested areas, but no changes to these features are proposed as part of this project.

According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Sensitive Biotic Oak woodlands, Riparian Woodland forest, and Coniferous forest) the project site does not contain woodland or forested areas. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

e. As discussed in item “a.”, above, the winery and winery accessory uses are defined as agricultural by the Napa County General Plan and are allowed under the parcels’ AW (Agricultural Watershed) 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):** None required.

<sup>1</sup> “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, biodiversity, wildlife movement, sensitive biotic communities listed by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, 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
III. <b>AIR QUALITY.</b> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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-c. 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. On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Board of Directors unanimously adopted thresholds of significance to assist in the review of projects under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The thresholds were designed to establish the level at which the District believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA and were posted on the Air District's website and included in the Air District's May 2011 updated CEQA Guidelines.

On March 5, 2012 the Alameda County Superior Court issued a judgment finding that the Air District had failed to comply with CEQA when it adopted the thresholds. However, on August 31, 2013, the Court of Appeals reinstated the Air District's thresholds of significance provided in Table 3-1 (Criteria Air Pollutants & Precursors Screening Levels Sizes) which are applicable for evaluating projects in Napa County. Furthermore, Air District's 1999 CEQA Guidelines (p.24) 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.

Over the long term, emission sources for the project would consist primarily of mobile sources including employee vehicles and shuttle vans traveling to and from the site and deliveries. The proposed business will employ 5 or fewer people and an average of 200 visitors per week generating vehicle trips per day significantly below BAAQMD's recommended threshold of 2,000 vehicle trips/day for purposes of performing a detailed air quality analysis.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management Plan has determined that light industrial projects or manufacturing facilities that do not exceed a threshold of 541,000 sq. ft. or 992,000 sq. ft., respectively, will not significantly impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2010, page 3-1.). Given the size of the project being approximately 9,700 sq. ft. compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 541,000 sq. ft. for light industrial or 992,000 sq. ft. for manufacturing uses, the project would contribute a less-than-insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan.

The Air District's threshold of significance provided in Table 3-1 has determined that light industrial projects or manufacturing facilities that do not exceed a threshold of 541,000 sq. ft. or 992,000 sq. ft., respectively, will not significantly impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2011 Pages 3-2 & 3-3). Given that the size of the project is approximately 9,700 square feet compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 541,000 sq. ft. or 992,000 sq. ft., for NO<sub>x</sub> (oxides of nitrogen) for light industrial or for manufacturing uses, respectively, the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan.

There are no projected or existing air quality violations in this area to which this project would contribute. Nor would it result in any violations of any applicable air quality standards. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plan. Light industrial, manufacturing (bakery) and ancillary office uses, as proposed, are not producers of air pollution in volumes substantial enough to result in an air quality plan conflict. Over the long term, emissions resulting from the proposed project would consist primarily of mobile sources, including employee vehicles and shuttle vans traveling to and from the site and deliveries.

As discussed above, the project is well below the thresholds of significance. 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. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plan.

- d. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from earthmoving and construction activities required for project construction which consist solely of minor amounts private road widening and installation of a new septic system. Earthmoving and construction emissions would have a temporary effect; consisting mainly of dust generated during grading and other construction activities, exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles, and relatively minor emissions from paints and other architectural coatings. The Air District recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction impacts. With adherence to these relevant best management practices identified by the Air District and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts are considered less than significant:

*"The permittee shall comply during all construction activities with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Basic Construction Mitigation Measures (Table 8-1, May 2011 Updated CEQA Guidelines) as provided below:*

- All exposed surfaces (e.g. parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads shall be watered two times per day.
- All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
- All visible mud or dirt tracked out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
- All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.
- Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible.

Furthermore, while earthmoving and 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".*

- e. While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, light industrial or manufacturing uses 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):** None required

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. <b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 Wildlife or U.S. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b/c. The project site has previously been developed and used as a wine production facility with indoor and outdoor visitation areas. Physical changes to the existing environment consist of minor widening to private access road and installation of a replacement septic system within a previously disturbed garden area. The proposed improvements will not require the removal of any native vegetation and will occur in areas previously disturbed by past uses. The potential for this project to have a significant impact on special status species is less than significant.

Attached to and incorporated into this Initial Study is a biological resource evaluation performed by a qualified environmental consultant as follows: *Biological Resources Baseline Conditions Report, Reverie Winery, Napa County, California* First Carbon Solutions, October 2014. The report confirms that the minor changes to the existing environment proposed at this time do not have the potential to significantly impact any sensitive biological resources. The project would result in no substantial impacts to federally protected or potentially sensitive wetlands.

d. The project site contains two streams which run adjacent to and through existing site improvements. As discussed in depth in the incorporate biological resource evaluation, the stream channels and related top of bank stream corridors have been highly altered both prior to approval of the original winery and as a result of the winery development and other improvements in recent years. Many of these manmade improvements within the stream and top of bank existed likely for decades prior to the construction of the winery. When the winery was built, the County authorized installation of landscaping and paths within the stream setback.

This project seeks recognition of the cave portal and associated access road installed within the creek setbacks without benefit of permit. No changes to the existing conditions within the streams channels and associated stream corridors are proposed as part of this project. Since this improvements already exist, the currently proposed project does not have the potential to result in new changes that would substantially interfere 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. It is unknown what effects, if any, occurred to the stream course as a result of the unpermitted construction in the mid to late 1990's. Photographs of the site prior to the cave's construction provide little clarity on the pre-violation condition. Given the close proximity of the cave to previously approved winery building and outdoor work area, it is likely much or all of the area where the cave portal and access road were installed within the creek setback were already previous altered and no longer in a native state. However, it is noted that had a Conservation Regulation Use Permit Exception been requested prior to installing the cave portal and access road, to County would have had an opportunity to evaluate the state of stream corridor to determine if the improvements had any potential to interfere substantially with wildlife movement. Since the change to the environment occurred approximately 15 to 20 years ago, and it is speculative to attempt to gauge the extent of impact, if any, it cannot now be considered a potentially significant impact because no change to the physical environment would presently result should the Planning Commission approve the project retroactively.

e. The project seeks recognition of a previously constructed cave portal and associated access road installed within County required stream setbacks. The existing developed environment is in conflict with the County's local ordinance protecting biological and hydrological resources. The County's Conservation Regulations allow the Planning Commission to grant encroachments into creek setbacks with the issuance of a use permit subject to the Commission determining that the project meets certain required findings. The findings are geared toward limiting the extent of encroachments into creek setbacks and preserving and/or enhancing environmental resources elsewhere on the project site in

response to allowed encroachment. Those improvements installed within the creek setback without permit occurred in the mid to late 1990's. As such, it is unknown to what extent, if any, biological and hydrological resources were impacted by the unauthorized construction activities. If the County grants the requested use permit exception after-the-fact, that action has no potential to change the environmental setting from how it now sits and thus, the project does not have the potential to result in new impacts. Conversely, the County is under no obligation to authorize these improvements and denial of the use permit exception may occur. In the event the County denied the request, the unauthorized improvements would need to be removed and restored to a natural state. Denial of the permit request and restoration of stream setback areas would be exempt from CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Categorical Exemption 15321, Enforcement Actions by Regulatory Agencies, and as such this Initial Study/Negative Declaration would not apply.

- f. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans. There are no plans applicable to the subject parcel.

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

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V.	<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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-c. The project site had previously been highly altered over the last several decades. Prior to the construction of the winery in the mid 1990's, the project site contained a barn/guest house, road, vineyards and gardens. Since the mid 1990's the project site has been further improved with the cave, additional roads, several agricultural building (of which two unauthorized buildings have recently been removed) and expansion of the creek side gardens/landscaping. The County Geographic Information System Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology sites and flags) indicate that a pre-historic site is or was located in the general vicinity, likely south of the subject project, but is not precisely mapped (University of California researchers extensively studied Native American sites throughout Napa County during the mid-part of the twentieth century but the location of many of the sites were not well defined or precisely mapped). Since the project site has been highly altered, and because only minimal amounts of new earth disturbing activities will occur in areas that have been previously disturbed, it is unlikely that any archaeological resources will be encountered. The potential for impact is therefore considered less-than-significant. However, if resources are found during grading of the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval that will be imposed on the project:

*“In the event that archeological artifacts or human remains are discovered during any subsequent construction in the project area, work shall cease in a 50-foot radius surrounding the area of discovery. The permittee shall contact the CDPD for further guidance, which will likely include the requirement for the permittee to hire a qualified professional to analyze the artifacts encountered and to determine if additional measures are required. If human remains are encountered during the development, all work in the vicinity must be, by law, halted, and the Napa County Coroner informed so that the Coroner can determine if an investigation of the cause of death is required, and if the remains are of Native American origin. If the remains are of Native American origin, the nearest tribal relatives as determined by the State Native American Heritage Commission would be contacted to obtain recommendations for treating or removal of such remains, including grave goods, with appropriate dignity, as required under Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.”*

- d. No human remains have been encountered on the property during past grading activities when improvements were constructed and no information has been encountered that would indicate that this project would encounter human remains. However, if resources are found during grading of the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard condition of approval noted above.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. <b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> 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"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829.	<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:

A

- i.) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed facility would result in a less than significant impact with regards to the rupturing of a known fault.
  - ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the facility will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible.
  - iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code for seismic stability would reduce any impacts to a less than significant level.
  - iv.) The Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) did not indicate the presence of landslides on the property.
- b. Based upon the Soil Survey of Napa County, prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the site is comprised of soils of the Bloomer-Forward-Felta complex which are characterized by low potential for liquefaction or other ground failure. This level soil type is found mainly on five (5)% to ten (10)% slope areas. For the minimal amount of earth disturbance no requested, project approval will require incorporation of best management practices and will be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable, to ensure that development does not impact adjoining properties, drainages, and roadways.
- c/d. Early or mid-Pleistocene deposits underlay the site according to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Surficial Deposits layer). Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Liquefaction layer) the project site has low susceptibility for liquefaction. Development will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level. In addition, a soils report, prepared by a qualified Engineer will be required as part of the building permit submittal. The report will address the soil stability, potential for liquefaction, and will be used to design specific foundation systems and grading methods which will reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

- e. The Napa County Division of Environmental Health has reviewed this application and recommends approval based on the submitted wastewater feasibility report and septic improvement plans. Soils on the property have been determined to be adequate to support the proposed new septic improvements including the winery's process waste as well as the proposed number of visitors to the winery.

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

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII.	<b>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.</b> 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 reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. Overall increases in Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions in Napa County were assessed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the Napa County General Plan Update and certified in June 2008. GHG emissions were found to be significant and unavoidable 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 served as the basis for development of a refined inventory and emission reduction plan for unincorporated Napa County.

In 2011, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) released California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Project Screening Criteria and Significance of Thresholds [1,100 metric tons per year (MT) of carbon dioxide and carbon dioxide equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e)]. This threshold of significance is appropriate for evaluating projects in Napa County.

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). (Note: 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 proposed project has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds and determined that the project would not exceed the 1,100 MT/yr of CO<sub>2</sub>e. The increase in emissions expected as a result of the project will be derived almost exclusively from new vehicle trips associated with proposed levels of visitation and recognition of the proposed amount of production. At 9,200 gallons of wine per year and an average of 200 visitors per week, the project is well below the BAAQMD threshold for GHG emissions. With the exception of a minor amounts of new construction to improve the access road and replace the septic system, the project improvements were installed in the mid 1990's. Therefore, project impacts related to GHG emissions are considered less than significant.

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

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII.	<b>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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/b. The proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts normally used in construction of the building. A Business Plan will be filed with the Environmental Health Division should the amount of hazardous materials reach reportable levels. However, in the event that the proposed use or a future use involves the use, storage or transportation of greater than 55 gallons or 500 pounds of hazardous materials, a use permit and subsequent environmental assessment would be required in accordance with the Napa County Zoning Ordinance prior to the establishment of the use. During construction of the project some hazardous materials, such as building coatings/adhesives/ etc., will be utilized. However, given the quantities of hazardous materials and the limited duration of construction activity, they will result in a less-than-significant impact.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site.
- d. The proposed site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.
- e. The project site is not located within two miles of any public airport.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.
- g. The proposed project will not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. The Napa County Fire Marshall has reviewed this application and recommends approval of the project subject to conditions of approval which requires a minimum of 10 feet of defensible space along each side of any existing and or proposed private driveway and other conditions ensuring access to the subject parcel at all times. The Fire Marshal has reviewed the proposed exception to the width of the private access road, and finds that the proposed design provides sufficient emergency access as designed.
- h. The proposed site is located within a State Fire Hazard Severity Zone and will increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. The Napa County Fire Marshall has reviewed this application and recommends approval of the project subject to conditions of approval which requires a minimum of 100 feet of defensible space out from all portions of the structure and other conditions to ensure that fire apparatus will have access to all buildings. Unpermitted cave and building work requires permitting under current Building and Fire Code standards. As-built plans submitting for permit will need to indicate how the structures either comply with current life and safety standards, and/or how they will be retrofit. The Fire Marshal and Building Official have reviewed the proposed use permit request

and believe the unpermitted improvements can be brought up to standards. The cave design features two portals that comply with current spacing requirements for life and safety access. Therefore, the potential for impact is considered less-than-significant.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b> 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

On January 14, 2014 Governor Jerry Brown declared a drought emergency in the state of California. That declaration was followed up on April 1, 2015 when the Governor directed the State Water Resources Control Board to implement mandatory water reductions in cities and towns across California to reduce water usage by 25 percent. These water restrictions do not apply to agricultural users. At this time the County of Napa has not adopted or implemented mandatory water use restrictions. The County requires all Use Permit applicants to complete necessary water analyses in order to document that sufficient water supplies are available for the proposed project. On June 28, 2011 the Board of Supervisors approved creation of a Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee (GRAC). The GRAC's purpose was to assist County staff and technical consultants with recommendations regarding groundwater, including data collection, monitoring, well pump test protocols, management objectives, and community support. The County completed a county-wide assessment of groundwater resources (Napa County Groundwater Conditions and Groundwater Monitoring Recommendations Report (Feb. 2011)) and developed a groundwater monitoring program (Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2013 (Jan. 2013)). The County also completed a 2013 Updated Hydrogeologic Conceptualization and Characterization of Groundwater Conditions (Jan. 2013).

In general, recent studies have found that groundwater levels in the Napa Valley Floor exhibit stable long-term trends with a shallow depth to water. Historical trends in the Milliken-Sarco-Tulucay (MST) area, however, have shown increasing depths to groundwater, but recent stabilization in many locations. Groundwater availability, recharge, storage and yield is not consistent across the County. More is known about the resource where

historical data have been collected. Less is known in areas with limited data or unknown geology. In order to fill existing data gaps and to provide a better understand of groundwater resources in the County, the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan recommended 18 Areas of Interest (AOIs) for additional groundwater level and water quality monitoring. Through the well owner and public outreach efforts of the Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee (GRAC), approximately 40 new wells have been added to the monitoring program within these areas.

- a. The proposed project will not violate any known water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. A new on-site domestic and process wastewater systems is proposed to accommodate the increase in visitation. The Napa County Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the proposed domestic and process wastewater systems and recommends approval as conditioned. Additionally, any earth disturbing activities would be subject to the County's Stormwater Ordinance which would include measures to prevent erosion, sediment, and waste materials from entering waterways both during and after any construction activities. CAB Consulting Engineers submitted a Water System Technical Managerial and Finance Report (dated January 23, 2015) for the proposed Transient Non-Community Water system to support the proposed visitation. The report indicates that water quality data for the existing well was available to the engineer and all constituents evaluated met current water quality requirements. Given the County's Best Management Practices, which comply with RWQCB requirements, the project does not have the potential to significantly impact water quality and discharge standards.
- b. A water availability analysis was prepared for the project CAB Consulting Engineers, attached, which details existing, previous approved, and proposed ground water use rates. The analysis is attached and incorporated into the Initial Study/Negative Declaration. The analysis indicates that the originally approved winery with all other existing uses on the site would have a typical annual water demand of 10.15 acre feet per year. Winery related water use under the originally approved use permit would account for .18 acre/feet of the overall water use. Existing vineyards account for the vast majority of water use equating to 8.59 acre/feet. Current water use, accounting for visitation occurring beyond the scope of the use permit, raise overall winery water use to .24 acre/feet per year and raising overall property water use to 10.21 acre/feet per year. Under the proposed use, which accounts for wine production at 9,200 gallons per year raises winery water use to .36 acre/feet per year and 10.33 acre/feet for all uses on the property. Proposed water use compared to the original use permit entitlement would increase by .21 acre/feet per year, or roughly 70,000 gallons annually. However, in the event the Commission approves the requested use permit at the levels of visitation, marketing and production requested, the actual overall increase in groundwater demand above existing conditions would be relatively nominal given that the project is already operating above the levels of use previously entitled. As such, any increase in water use would be considered a less than significant change over the existing conditions. No well to well interference evaluation was performed, and no site specific groundwater recharge rate analysis was performed, because the project will result in no greater than a 1.5% increase from what is originally approved, and likely a less than 1% increase from what is presently occurring.
- c-e. The proposed project will not substantially alter the drainage pattern on the site nor cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off site. The project will incorporate erosion control measures appropriate to its maximum slope to manage onsite surface drainage and erosion of onsite soils during construction and winter months (October to April). As noted above, the project is required to comply with County Engineering Services Division requirements which are consistent with RWQCB standards. There are no existing or planned stormwater systems that would be affected by this project. If the project disturbs 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 activities. The project site includes vineyards, landscaping and other pervious areas that have the capacity to absorb runoff.

No changes to drainage courses adjoining and running through the project are proposed at this time. As noted in the biological resources section, these drainages have been highly altered over decades both prior to approval the winery and in subsequent years. In the mid to late 1990's a cave portal with access road were constructed within the County designated stream setback zone adjacent to the existing winery, for which approval is now sought. In the event the Commission grants retroactive approval of these features, no changes to the existing environment will result. Consequently, the propose project has no potential to result in a new alteration of drainage courses.
- f. There is nothing included in this proposal that would otherwise substantially degrade water quality. As discussed in greater detail at, "a.," above, the Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the sanitary wastewater proposal and has found the required abandonment of the existing system and proposed system adequate to meet the facility's septic needs as conditioned. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality.
- g.-i. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Floodplain and Dam Levee Inundation* layers), the project site is not located within a flood hazard area, nor would it impede or redirect flood flows or expose structures or people to flooding. The project site is not located within a dam or levee failure inundation zone.
- j. 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 510 feet above mean sea level. 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):** None required

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. <b>LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, open space and rural residences. The proposed use and the improvements proposed here are in support of the ongoing agricultural use in the area. This project will not divide an established community.
- b. The subject parcel is located in the AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district, which allows wineries and uses accessory to wineries subject to use permit approval. The proposed project has been requested in order to bring the project into compliance with the County's Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO), which was adopted to protect agriculture and open space and to regulate winery development and expansion in a manner that avoids potential negative environmental effects.

Although this use permit request is not in conflict with adopted policies, regulations and standards (property owner with code violations have the right to seek retroactive approval of unpermitted work), the prior unauthorized lands uses that have occurred on the site are in conflict with adopted policies, regulations and standards. This conflict is not considered a significant environmental impact because the outcome of this use permit decision and associated code enforcement case will dictate how the conflict will be resolved and return the property to compliance with adopted policies, regulations and standards. In the event the Commission finds that this improvements merit grant of an exception, then like on projects where approval is sought before implementation, the project would be considered not to conflict with adopted standards and thus have no impact to land use policies. In the event the Commission finds that exceptions cannot be granted, then the project would be subject to denial, or a modified project would be approved conditions the project to remove any and all items that the Commission finds is in conflict with land use policies.

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 AWOS (Agriculture Watershed & Open Space), 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 recognition on expansion of production capacity will not change the use of the property for the "fermenting and processing of grape juice into wine" (NCC §18.08.640) and 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...).

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

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. <b>MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<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 (*Mines and Mineral Deposits*, BDR Figure 2-2) indicates that there are no known mineral resources nor any locally important mineral resource recovery sites located on or near the project site.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XII. NOISE.</b> Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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/b. The proposed project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during limited project construction of septic system and driveway improvements, as well as any upgrades necessary to meet California Building Code requirements for the winery and cave. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. The proposed project would not result in long-term significant permanent construction noise impacts or operational impacts. Furthermore, construction activities would generally occur during the period of 7am-7pm on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity. All construction activities will be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (N.C.C. Chapter 8.16).

c/d. Noise from winery operations is generally limited; however, the proposed new marketing plan could create additional noise impacts. The submitted marketing plan includes a total of 18 marketing events annually ranging from 10 visitors to 60 visitors, occurring between the hours of 10:00AM and 10:00PM. The Napa County Noise Ordinance, which was adopted in 1984, sets the maximum permissible received sound level for a rural residence as 45db between the hours of 10 PM. and 7 AM. While the 45 db limitation is strict (45 db is roughly equivalent to the sound generated by a quiet conversation), the area surrounding the subject property features primarily large hillside properties containing vineyards, rural residences and forests. The nearest residence is approximately 190 feet from the south side of the winery building. The applicant has indicated that outdoor marketing activities will occur on the north side of the building and will cease prior to 10:00 PM in the same

manner as past marketing events. A condition of approval will be placed on the project requiring events to be conducted indoors or in the outdoor area north of the building. Expansion of outdoor events into the garden or grassy area across the creek is not requested as part of this permit and would be subject to review and approval of a subsequent use permit modification is desired by the permittee. Operation of the project in compliance the project conditions of approval would comply with the Napa County Noise Ordinance and thus reduce potential substantial noise impacts to a non-significant level.

- e. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area nor is it within two miles of a public airport or private airstrip.
- f. The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. The proposed staffing for the winery is indicated as 5 or fewer employees. The water and waste disposal analysis reports prepared its analysis based on 5 employees at the facility. The Association of Bay Area Governments' Projections 2003 figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase some 23% by the year 2030 (Napa County Baseline Data Report, November 30, 2005). Additionally, the County's Baseline Data Report indicates that total housing units currently programmed in county and municipal housing elements exceed ABAG growth projections by approximately 15%. Recognition of the additional employee position increase will lead to some minor population growth in Napa County, but will not rise to a level of environmental significance. In addition, the project will be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs.

Cumulative impacts related to population and housing balance were identified in the 2008 General Plan EIR. As set forth in Government Code §65580, the County of Napa must facilitate the improvement and development of housing to make adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community. Similarly, CEQA recognizes the importance of balancing the prevention of environment damage with the provision of a "decent home and satisfying living environment for every Californian." (See Public Resources Code §21000(g).) The 2008 General Plan sets forth the County's long-range plan for meeting regional housing needs, during the present and future housing cycles, while balancing environmental, economic, and fiscal factors and community goals. The policies and programs identified in the General Plan Housing Element function, in combination with the County's housing impact mitigation fee, to ensure adequate cumulative volume and diversity of housing. Cumulative impacts on the local and regional population and housing balance will be less than significant.

- b/c. The existing residence is currently vacant and may be used for residential purposes only, and is not proposed for winery use. The existing guest cottage on the second floor was converted for winery purposes office, thereby, elimination of its residential use. Therefore, this project will not displace a substantial volume of existing housing or a substantial number of people, and will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. <b>PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> Would the project result in:				
a) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(v) 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 project area and its additional demand in recognition of increased winery activities as proposed placed on existing services will be marginal. Fire protection measures are required as part of the development and there would be no expected impact to response time with adoption of standard conditions of approval. The Fire Department and Engineering services Division have reviewed the application and recommend approval as conditioned. School impact mitigation fees will be levied with the building permit application. Those fees assist local school districts with capacity building measures, and by law are considered full mitigation for any impacts. The project will have little impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from building permit fees, property tax increases, and taxes from the sale of wine will help meet the costs of providing public services to the property.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b. No portion of this project, nor any foreseeable result thereof, would significantly increase the use of existing recreational facilities. This project does not include recreational facilities that would have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</b> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-b. The project's private access road intersects Diamond Mountain Road, a public road, approximately a half mile southwest of its intersection with State Route 29. Diamond Mountain Road is a dead end collector street that continues approximately 3 miles beyond the project driveway providing access to approximately three dozen, generally larger and mostly forested hillside parcels containing a mix of residences, vineyards and smaller wineries. Traffic volumes on Diamond Mountain Road are low and free flowing at Level of Service A. There is a left turn lane from northbound Highway 29 onto Diamond Mountain Road. The segment of Highway 29 in the vicinity of Diamond Mountain Road and south of the City of Calistoga generally is operates without capacity limitation for most parts of the day. However, according to the Napa County General Plan EIR (2008), traffic volumes on Highway 29 at Lodi Lane and Deer Park, approximately 4 miles south of Diamond Mountain Road (this is the nearest Highway 29 Roadway segment evaluated in the General Plan EIR) operates presently at Level of Service D in the weekday p.m. peak hour and is projected to reach Level of Service F in future conditions due to the cumulative effects of growth both within Napa County and the surrounding region.

Attached and incorporated into this Initial Study/Negative Declaration is a traffic generation analysis prepared by W-trans, a licensed traffic engineering consulting firm. The analysis indicates that the proposed increases in visitation and marketing (above the original entitlement) will result in 15 additional daily trips, of which 6 would occur in the weekday p.m. peak hour. The W-trans report indicates that additional visitors (beyond the 20 maximum permitted under the current entitlement) would be required to arrive in an eight-passenger vehicle such that the total number of round trips at the project site would be maintained at the same level as presently exists. The commitment for by-appointment van/shuttle visitation will be incorporated into the project conditions of approval, and therefore, the project will not result in a discernable change in the level of traffic from conditions as they existed at the time of project submittal.

c. The project does not have any impact on air traffic patterns.

d/e. An exception to the County's winery access road standards is requested with this project. Although most of the approximately 1,000 ft. long private access road either presently meets the 18 ft. with 2 ft. shoulder road width, there are several sections where road width is proposed to remain as exists below the standard in order to avoid tree removal and further encroachments within creek setbacks. These exceptions have been reviewed by the County Public Works Department and Fire Marshal who support grant of the exception as currently designed. The applicant revised the original road design to meet design requirements requested by Public Works and the Fire Marshal. To grant a Road Exception the Planning Commission must find that the alternative design meets the same overall practical effect as a project that complies with the standard. As proposed, Public Works and the Fire Marshal recommend that the design meets the same overall practical effect.

- f. The project has been designed sufficient vehicle parking spaces to accommodate winery employees and visitation needs. The project will not result in inadequate parking.
- g. The proposed project does not conflict with any known policies or plans supporting alternative transportation.

**Mitigation Measures:** None Required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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/b. The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of 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. The project will not require construction of a new water well for compliance with the State regulations for a Transient Non-Community Water system, since the existing well will comply with the regulations. A replacement of the existing on-site wastewater treatment facilities is proposed to accommodate the project. In the report prepared by CAB Consulting Engineers (dated August 26, 2013), the engineer concluded that there is adequate water available to serve the systems. Since the wastewater disposal can be accommodated on-site in compliance with State and County regulations and since there is sufficient water on the site to support the system, the proposed project would not be expected to result in a significant impact to the environment.
- c. The project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, which will cause a significant impact to the environment.
- d. The project will require improvements to the domestic water system to install a backflow prevention device to insure the water quality complies with the requirements of a small water system under California Code. A Water System Technical Managerial and Financial Report was prepared by CAB Consulting Services, dated January 23, 2015, to support the additional visitation and Marketing Plan. The Water Availability Analysis indicates a total future demand of 10.36 af/yr, for the winery, vineyard, landscaping, and the domestic use related to the increase in visitation and production.
- e. Wastewater will be treated on-site and will not require a wastewater treatment provider.

- f. The proposed project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the projects demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the project.
- g. The proposed project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

- a. The project site has previously been disturbed and does not contain any known listed plant or animal species. The project will not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. No historic or prehistoric resources are anticipated to be affected by the proposed project nor will the proposed project eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
- b. With the imposition of standard and project specific conditions of approval, the project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology, and traffic impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The project would also increase the demands for public services to a limited extent, increase traffic and air pollutions, all of which contribute to cumulative effects when future development in Napa Valley is considered. Cumulative impacts of these issues are discussed in previous sections of this Initial Study and would not be of significant impact. The General Plan EIR indicates that several roadway segments, including State Highway 29, are presently operating at unsatisfactory levels and additional roadways segments will reach unsatisfactory levels in the future. New trips from the project are nominal consisting of 15 daily trips of which 6 occur in the p.m. peak hour. However the project will be required to implement a van/shuttle service for additional by-appointment visitation which will result in no net increase in the number of trips over existing conditions. The project therefore will not contribute significantly to the cumulative traffic impacts identified in the General Plan EIR.
- 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.