

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

Subsequent Initial Study Checklist
August 2015

1. **Project Title:** Materra, Cunat Premium Vineyards (Use Permit Major Modification Application P15-00071 – MOD)
2. **Property Owner:** Cunat Premium Vineyards, LLC
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Dana Ayers, (707) 253-4388, dana.ayers@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel No. (APN):** 4326 Big Ranch Road (nearest cross street Oak Knoll Avenue), unincorporated Napa County, APN 036-160-003
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Cunat Premium Vineyards, LLC, 4326 Big Ranch Road, Napa County, California 94558
6. **General Plan Land Use Designation:** Agricultural Resource
7. **Zoning:** AP (Agricultural Preserve) District
8. **Project History:**

On January 7, 2009, the Planning Commission approved a use permit (Use Permit Application P08-00428 – UP) for Cunat Premium Vineyards to operate a wine production facility (Materra Winery) with visitation and marketing events on a 50-acre property located at 4326 Big Ranch Road, in unincorporated Napa County. Up to that time, the property had been used for agricultural vineyard purposes for roughly 50 years and was developed with a residence, barn and four other accessory structures related to the agricultural use. Grapes grown on-site were either sold to wineries or, more recently, processed off-site for bottling under the Materra wine label created in 2007. A Williamson Act contract, which ensured preservation of the property for agricultural use in exchange for certain property tax benefits, had been in effect on the property since 1975. The contract further allowed establishment of wineries on the property with a conditional use permit. The Williamson Act contract remains in effect to date, and current uses on-site are consistent with the contract.

Prior to approving the use permit for the then-proposed Materra Winery, the Planning Commission adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the project. The initial study (IS) that informed the MND identified a potentially significant impact in the area of Traffic and Transportation, and identified a mitigation measure that required re-alignment of the winery access driveway from Big Ranch Road so as not to create unsafe vehicular traffic movements at the intersection of Big Ranch Road with Oak Knoll Avenue. Potential impacts in all other areas discussed in the initial study were found to be less than significant.

The Planning Commission's 2009 use permit approval included: 1) an annual production capacity of 50,000 gallons of wine; 2) three full-time employees, three part-time employees, and up to four seasonal employees; 3) winery hours of operation between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday (harvest and crush season excepted); 4) an appointment-only tasting room, with attendance of up to 18 guests per day and no more than 40 guests per week; 5) 12 annual marketing events for up to 25 people, plus 12 annual marketing events for up to 50 people and two annual marketing events for up to 100 people; and 6) construction of a 15,371 square foot production building, a separate 5,094 square foot hospitality building (both buildings of a Mediterranean architectural style), and 5,145 square feet of loading area and outdoor crush pad. Following demolition of existing structures on-site and construction of the winery, approximately 47 acres of vineyard would remain on-site. Though not included with that action, the applicant at the time expressed intent to build a new single-family residence on an estimated one acre of the property, which would further reduce on-site vineyard acreage to 46.

On March 24, 2014, the Napa County Planning Director approved Very Minor Modification Application P13-00283 – VMM. With that approval, the project entitlements were revised to include: 1) a change in the architectural style of the winery buildings, from Mediterranean to French farmhouse; 2) a decrease in the hospitality room area from 5,094 square feet to 3,268 square feet, and construction of the hospitality room in the same structure as the barrel storage room; 3) an increase in the winery production building area from 15,371 square feet to 22,850 square feet; 4) alignment of the winery access driveway from Big Ranch Road, to a new location 200 feet south of Oak Knoll Avenue, consistent with the adopted MND mitigation measure; and 5) on-premise wine consumption, consistent with Assembly Bill 2004 (Evans), in the tasting room/barrel storage building and adjacent landscaped area.

Construction of the winery and installation of related on-site improvements and infrastructure commenced in late 2010 and were completed in April 2015. As noted above, site improvements incorporated the implementation of the mitigation measure required with the adoption of the 2009 MND. The original residence, barn and accessory structures were demolished in 2014 (Napa County Building Permit B14-00712). There are currently no active permits for any new single-family residence on-site, though the applicant still has plans for future construction of a house on the property.

Current development on the property consists of the two winery buildings described above (barrel storage/hospitality and production/employee areas); a 17-stall visitor parking lot and separate, six-stall employee parking lot; asphalt-paved access roads to and around the winery buildings, including a 20-foot wide driveway to the winery buildings from Big Ranch Road; a racking area and uncovered crush pad; landscaping, including a bioswale for water quality purposes; and various utility infrastructure improvements that include underground septic tanks, aboveground water storage tanks (10,500 gallons and 72,000 gallons), a septic system leachfield with reserve area, and conduit under the asphalt between the production building and the primary leachfield to accommodate a utility connection for a future installation of photovoltaic panels over the leachfield. Following completion of winery construction, and upon replanting of approximately 12 acres of vines that were removed in order to accommodate the winery's construction, the 50-acre property will have approximately 46 acres of land planted in vines.

Since 2008, Cunat Premium Vineyards has been undergoing a process to replant the existing vineyards on-site and anticipates receiving a higher yield of seven tons per acre from the new vines as compared to the older vines, which had an average yield of two tons per acre. Cunat also has contracts for purchase of Napa County grapes from 189 acres of off-site vineyards. Therefore, on March 5, 2015, the winery owner submitted to the Planning Division a request for a use permit modification (Major Modification Application P15-00071 – MOD) in order to increase the maximum allowable production capacity of the winery, from the originally-approved 50,000 gallons of wine to 85,000 gallons of wine per year.

9. Background:

This Subsequent Initial Study for the Materra Winery evaluates the potential environmental impacts of the proposed increase in annual wine production and its associated site improvements, above that which was anticipated in the 2009 permit approvals (as later amended). To the extent that new data to inform the discussion of each topic area has been become available since 2009, that information is referenced in this current document.

Topic areas for which the 2009 IS/MND identified no potential impact, and for which this current analysis arrived at the same conclusion based on the current proposal and available information, are categorized in this Subsequent Initial Study as having "No Impact." Where the 2009 IS/MND identified a potential impact in a particular topic area of the initial study, this Subsequent Initial Study analyzed the potential for the severity of that identified impact to intensify or lessen as a result of the now-proposed production increase. For those impacts for which this current analysis did not anticipate a more severe level of adverse intensity of the impact, as compared to the 2009 IS/MND analysis, this current analysis identifies the currently-proposed project as having "No New Impact." Where this current analysis suggests that the currently-proposed project (85,000 gallons of wine per year) might increase the adverse severity of a potential impact previously identified in the 2009 IS/MND, this analysis considers the extent of that increase and categorizes the potential impact as "Less than Significant," "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," or "Potentially Significant," as appropriate and based on the conclusions outlined in the corresponding discussion.

10. Description of Project:

Approval of a Use Permit Major Modification (P15-00071 – MOD) to:

- A. Increase in the winery's permitted annual production from 50,000 gallons of wine to 85,000 gallons of wine; and
- B. Modify the existing septic system on-site to include a new, 2,000-gallon, below-ground septic tank alongside the 5,000-gallons of underground tank storage area behind (east of) the new winery production building, in order to accommodate the additional process waste water from the proposed increase in production.

The winery buildings and outdoor processing areas on-site would not and do not need to be expanded for sake of the production increase, and the project proponent is not requesting any increases be made to the winery's approved parking, employment, or visitation and marketing programs.

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

As explained above, the 50-acre property is currently developed with a wine production facility and 34 acres of vineyards, with an additional 12 acres to be replanted now that construction of the winery is complete. Like the subject site, surrounding properties are zoned AP District and have a General Plan land use designation of Agricultural Resource. Land uses on surrounding properties are also primarily agricultural and include residential and limited commercial uses, as described below:

North: Oak Knoll Avenue borders the site to the north. Beyond Oak Knoll Avenue are four parcels, including a 1.4-acre parcel developed with a single-family residence, two parcels (42.5 acres and 16 acres) planted with vineyards, and the 3.1-acre Oak Knoll Inn bed and breakfast.

South: Two parcels, including a two-acre single-family residential parcel and an 81.3-acre parcel developed with the Monticello Cellars winery and planted vineyard lands.

East: The Napa River borders the site to the east. Beyond the river are two parcels, including a 4.7-acre single-family residential parcel and a 24.8-acre parcel planted with vineyards.

West: Big Ranch Road borders the site to the west. Beyond Big Ranch Road are two parcels, including a 9.7-acre parcel developed with a single-family residence and planted with vineyards, and a 41.1-acre parcel planted with vineyards.

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

The project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County, including but not limited to grading permits and waste disposal permits. Permit revisions may also be required by the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

None required.

Other Agencies Contacted

Taxation Trade Bureau
California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control

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 SUBSEQUENT 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 SUBSEQUENT 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.

Dana Ayers

Dana Ayers, Planner III
Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department

8/25/15

Date

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | No New Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|---------------|

I. **AESTHETICS.** Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

There are no new environmental impacts to scenic vistas or resources that are anticipated to result from the requested use permit modification.

Discussion:

As discussed in the 2009 IS/MND, construction of the Materra Winery included demolition of existing residential and accessory agricultural buildings on the property and retention of existing vineyards. The new winery buildings and residential structure were identified as new structures on the property; however, their presence on the property was not considered a significant change to the appearance of the site, as there were existing buildings on the site at the time the project was analyzed, and significant acreage (over 90 percent of the site) was projected to be retained in vineyard use. The combination of vineyard, winery buildings, and a planned new residence on the property was found to be consistent with development of surrounding properties on Big Ranch Road, which properties are also predominantly rural residential and agricultural in character. Coupling this with the winery buildings' 664-foot setback from Big Ranch Road and the retention of vineyards and landscaping within that setback, aesthetic impacts of the winery were found to be less than significant.

- a-c. With the exception of a new septic tank, which would be installed below ground surface, there are no new physical changes proposed for the site beyond what was analyzed in 2009. Construction of the winery production, storage and hospitality buildings and surrounding improvements was completed in April 2015. The residential structure that was referenced in the 2009 IS/MND has not been built, so that the acreage remaining outside of the winery buildings, including the 664-foot setback from Big Ranch Road, continues to be available for grape growing. (The area currently available and planned for vineyard plantings is approximately 46 acres, or 92 percent of the total site acreage; addition of the residence in the future would reduce that acreage to an estimated 45 acres). Large parcels that abut the subject site are also developed with large tracts of vineyards, such that the subject site has an appearance that complements its context. The site is also located on the Napa Valley floor; although it is plainly seen from Big Ranch Road and Oak Knoll Avenue, it is not prominently visible from any General Plan designated scenic roadway, is not situated atop a ridgeline, and has shallow slopes of no more than five percent, so that it is not subject to the County's Viewshed Protection Program (Napa County Code Chapter 18.106).
- d. The proposed use permit modification encompasses a change to the operation (annual production) of the winery, which increase in production requires installation of a new underground septic tank in non-vineyard area alongside existing septic tanks. No existing structures would be demolished, and no new buildings would be built to accommodate the proposed increased production capacity. With the proposed production increase, hours of operation of the winery are not proposed to be extended beyond the previously-approved 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. (excluding harvest and crush season), so that additional evening or nighttime lighting (after 5:00 p.m.) would not occur. During a recent visit to the site as part of final inspection of the new winery, storage and hospitality buildings, Planning staff confirmed that existing outdoor lighting was installed in compliance with condition of approval no. 8 of Use Permit P08-00428 – UP, which prohibited flood lighting and high pressure sodium lamps and allowed only low-level lighting in vehicle access areas.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | No New Impact |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|---------------|

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.¹ Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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"/> | <input 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"/> | <input 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"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

There are no new environmental impacts to agricultural and forest resources that are anticipated to result from the requested use permit modification.

Discussion:

The 2009 IS/MND identified no impacts in the area of agricultural and forest resources. At the time that analysis was done, there were no forest resources on the site; the property was primarily in agricultural use for growing of crops, as it had been for over 50 years. With construction of the Materra Winery and residence, the property was estimated to have retain significant vineyard acreage, up to an estimated 46 acres on the 50-acre site.

a/b. The California Department of Conservation maps identify the property as Prime Farmland. A Williamson Act contract, which ensured preservation of the property for agricultural use in exchange for certain property tax benefits, has been in effect on the property since February 25, 1975, when it was approved by the Napa County Board of Supervisors. In addition to agriculture, the contract allowed one single-family residence with accessory structures as a permitted use of the site, and it further allowed establishment of wineries on the property with a conditional use permit. The existing vineyard use and the winery use then proposed with Use Permit Application P08-00428 – UP are both consistent with the allowable uses identified in the contract.

c/d. Since adoption of the 2009 IS/MND, no forest resources have been developed on the site, although the vineyard use has remained. The Williamson Act contract executed in 1975 remains in effect to date, and the current uses on-site (vineyard plus winery) are consistent with the terms of the contract.

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

e. The proposed use permit amendment would increase the annual production capacity of the winery in order to accommodate an increase in vine yield that the property owner expects to occur with replanting of the grape vines on-site. Thus, the proposed amendment is reliant on the retention of agricultural use (grape growing) on-site. Following completion of construction of the winery buildings in April 2015, 46 of the 50 acres on the property have remained available for vineyard use. Accounting for the additional one acre that the 2009 IS/MND anticipated might be removed for sake of future construction of a single-family dwelling (a permitted use on the property under both zoning and the Williamson Act contract), approximately 45 acres would remain in agricultural (vineyard) use on the property. This remaining 45 acres is slightly lower than the vineyard acreage (46 acres) estimated to be retained on the property in the 2009 IS/MND but still represents 90 percent of the total parcel area.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | No New Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project: | | | | | |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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"/> | <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"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

There are new but less than significant environmental impacts to air quality that are anticipated to result from the requested use permit modification.

Discussion:

The 2009 IS/MND prepared for the original use permit entitlement anticipated less than significant impacts to air quality as a result of implementation of the then-proposed project, explaining that construction impacts would be short-term and subject to compliance with conditions of approval that would require dust control during the construction process (condition no. 17 of Exhibit B, P08-00428 – UP). Because the predominant use on the site would remain a vineyard, the analysis did not suggest that there would be any significant new air quality impacts resulting from the post-construction condition of the property. The initial study further identified no sensitive receptors within one mile of the property and concluded that there would be no objectionable odors created by the then-proposed use of the site for grape growing and processing.

On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) Board of Directors adopted updated thresholds of significance to assist local agencies in the nine-county Bay Area in the review of projects' potential environmental impacts pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The thresholds were designed to establish the level at which the BAAQMD believed air pollution emissions would cause significant air quality and climate impacts in the region; were posted on the BAAQMD website; and were incorporated into the BAAQMD's updated 2011 CEQA Guidelines. The thresholds were subsequently challenged, and in March 2012, the Alameda County Superior Court issued a judgment finding that the BAAQMD had failed to comply with CEQA when it adopted the thresholds. The court did not determine whether the thresholds were valid on their merits but instead found that the adoption of the thresholds was a project under CEQA. The BAAQMD subsequently appealed the Alameda County Superior Court's

decision, and the matter is currently pending final decision by the California Supreme Court. Based on the Court's direction, the BAAQMD cannot recommend that local agencies use the 2010 thresholds to analyze the potential environmental impacts of proposed projects, and thus, the BAAQMD has removed the 2010 thresholds from their most current CEQA guidelines (2012). However, agencies may choose to use the thresholds identified in the BAAQMD's 2011 CEQA Guidelines, or other data sources available through the BAAQMD, in order to analyze the potential environmental impacts of projects; thus, as the best available information, the BAAQMD's 2011 CEQA Guidelines are applicable for evaluating projects in Napa County.

The proposed project consists of an increase in production of 35,000 gallons of wine annually, with no building additions or changes to employment, visitation or marketing programs of the approved winery. The requested production increase would result in an increase of approximately 210 one-way truck trips (105 roundtrip truck trips) annually for deliveries and distribution of supplies and product; an estimated 40 of those trips (20 roundtrips) would occur during the harvest season. (See Section XVI, Transportation/Traffic, for a more detailed description of these trips).

a-c. Over the long term, emission sources for the proposed project consist primarily of mobile sources, including vehicles visiting the site. The BAAQMD's screening criteria suggest that similar projects such as a high quality restaurant of up to 47,000 square feet, and a general light industrial use of up to 541,000 square feet, would not significantly impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2011, pages 3-2 & 3-3). Given the size of the winery's hospitality space (3,268 square feet compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47,000 square feet) and production/barrel storage areas (22,850 square feet compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 541,000 square feet), the project and its associated trips would not contribute a significant amount of air pollution to the region and thus would not have a significant air quality impact. (Note: A high quality restaurant is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollution emissions but grossly overstates emissions associated with other portions of a winery, such as office, barrel storage and production, which generate fewer vehicle trips. Therefore, a general light industry comparison has also been used for other such uses.)

Since adoption of the 2009 IS/MND, the BAAQMD has also adopted an updated Clean Air Plan (2010), which outlines a regional program and a set of measures to reduce ozone, ozone precursors, particulate matter, greenhouse gas emissions, and other sources of air pollution. As noted in the 2009 IS/MND, the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area as a region was in non-attainment for ozone and particulate matter (PM) at the time of project approval, and the region as a whole remains in non-attainment for those two air pollutants. Sources of ozone and PM include combustion (e.g., burning of fossil fuels or vegetation), fugitive dust from earth-moving activities, and vehicle use (including engine combustion and tire and brake pad wear).

The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Wineries in general are not producers of air pollution in quantities substantial enough to result in an air quality plan conflict. The project site lies within the Napa Valley, which forms one of the climatologically distinct sub-regions (Napa County Sub region) within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The topographical and meteorological features of the Valley create a relatively high potential for air pollution. Over the long term, emissions resulting from the proposed use permit modification would consist primarily of mobile sources, including vehicle emissions from production-related deliveries to and from the site.

As noted above, the combustion process of engines in passenger and heavy duty vehicles is a source of air pollutants, including particulate matter as well as carbon dioxide and nitrogen dioxide, two precursors to formulation of ozone. The proposed use permit modification includes no requested changes to employee or visitation levels, such that there would be no increase in emissions from passenger vehicles as compared to that considered in the 2009 approval documents. Emissions from heavy duty on-road vehicles (freight trucks) would potentially increase due to the increase in truck trips to import grapes, deliver supplies and transport the increased quantity of wine to off-site locations for sale or distribution (also see the Transportation/Traffic section of this Subsequent Initial Study). Although these trips would increase emissions, the 2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan notes that emissions from these heavy duty vehicles are regulated by standards of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and California Air Resources Board, and that as those standards have intensified, emissions (particularly nitrogen oxides and particulate matter) from these types of vehicles have and will continue to decrease (3-29, 3-30). Indeed, U.S. Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics data demonstrates this downward trend in heavy duty vehicle emissions since 1990.

The winery operators, in the use permit modification application, identified other measures listed in the 2010 Clean Air Plan with which the winery's existing and programmed operations are consistent. These measures include installation of photovoltaic panels on-site for generation of solar power to the winery (Napa County Greenhouse Gas [GHG] checklist, Best Management Practice [BMP] 1), which is consistent with the Clean Air Plan's Stationary Source Measure (SSM) 15 and Energy and Climate Measure (ECM) 2. In addition, the applicant's GHG checklist indicates that the existing, recently-built buildings feature insulated, light colored "cool roofs" to reduce the heat island effect (BMP 10) consistent with the Clean Air Plan's ECM 3, and a commitment not to burn vegetation from the vineyard (BMP 32) consistent with the Clean Air Plan's SSM 7. While certain components of the

winery's operation implement elements of the Clean Air Plan, other measures would not be implemented as they are not typically applicable to agricultural operations. As such, the proposed modification would not obstruct implementation of the applicable Clean Air Plan for the San Francisco region.

In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from earthmoving and construction activities required for project construction. Earthmoving and construction emissions would have a temporary effect, consisting mainly of dust generated during grading and other construction activities and exhaust emissions from construction-related equipment and vehicles. The proposed use permit modification would require ground disturbance for installation of the underground septic tank, which would result in fugitive dust in the immediate vicinity of the worksite. However, work to install the tank would be limited to 25 cubic yards within a 200 square foot footprint on-site and would be temporary, lasting for up to two weeks. The short duration of the work and compliance with standard conditions would not cause a substantial increase in particulate matter and would therefore result in a less than significant construction impact related to the region's current non-attainment status for this criteria pollutant.

The BAAQMD recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction-related air quality impacts:

During all construction activities, the permittee shall comply with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Basic Construction Mitigation Measures as provided in Table 8-1, May 2011 Updated CEQA Guidelines:

- A. *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.*
- B. *All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.*
- C. *All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.*
- D. *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.*
- E. *All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour.*
- F. *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.*
- G. *Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 14, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.*
- H. *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.*

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.

With the project proponent's adherence to these relevant best management practices identified by the BAAQMD and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts are considered to be less than significant.

- d/e. Since adoption of the 2009 IS/MND, and based on comparison of 2007 and current aerial photos and permit records, no additional residential units, healthcare facilities and similar structures that might house individuals with respiratory illnesses, or other sensitive receptors have been introduced on any of the parcels immediately adjacent to the property. While the BAAQMD defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known to be operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative odor impacts to sensitive receptors.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | No New Impact |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|---------------|

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

There are no new environmental impacts to biological resources that are anticipated to result from the requested use permit modification.

Discussion:

a-e. The property is generally flat, having a slope of less than five percent. The Napa River borders the property to the east; however, construction of the winery buildings and associated improvements is approximately 1,500 feet west of the river and well outside of the required 35-foot minimum setback established under the water quality and riparian area conservation regulations identified in Napa County Code Chapter 18.108. The property has been in agricultural use for over 50 years, and with the exception of the river setback area on the east side of the property, native vegetation – and the native species habitat that would have been fostered by that vegetation – has long been removed from the property for sake of maintained crop and vineyard plantings.

The proposed use permit modification would modify the annual production capacity – an operational characteristic of the approved winery – with no changes necessary to the size or location of now existing wine production and storage buildings. The proposed improvements necessary to accommodate the increased production include installation of a 2,000-gallon septic tank; however, this tank would be underground, such that the original grade would be restored following its installation and the 25 cubic yards of spoils spread in a shallow two- to three-inch thick layer across the vineyards, and it would be positioned in the vicinity of the winery buildings and adjacent to existing vineyard plantings, over 1,000 feet west of the riverbank conservation area. As with the original approvals, no new development would occur within the river setback areas required by County Code Section 18.108.025. It is further noted that the property owner's recently-completed improvements have included removal of invasive non-native plants around the property, considered to be a beneficial impact and countermeasure to the spread of invasive species in the general environment.

- f. There is no habitat conservation plan (HCP) or natural community conservation plan (NCCP) that has been adopted or is being implemented in unincorporated Napa County.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | No New Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. 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 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"/> | <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 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"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

There are new but less than significant environmental impacts to cultural resources that are anticipated to result from the requested use permit modification.

Discussion:

Construction of the Materra Winery included demolition of existing residential and accessory agricultural buildings on the 50-acre property. As noted in the 2009 IS/MND prepared for the project, the structures were not considered architecturally significant and were therefore not determined to be locally significant historic resources; thus, their demolition was not determined to result in any potentially significant environmental effects. The 2009 IS/MND also concluded that no archaeological resources, sensitive areas or sites, paleontological resources or unique geologic features would be affected by the project, as there were no records of such resources having been discovered on the property.

a-d. The proposed use permit modification consists of a request to amend the operational characteristics of the winery, and more specifically, to increase annual allowable production of wine. No expansion of the now constructed winery, storage and hospitality buildings is requested or required with the currently proposed amendment, such that no excavation of soil for new building foundations would be required. The requested production increase would require excavation of soil and ground disturbance for purposes of installation of a new, 2,000-gallon septic tank in a previously-disturbed area where septic tanks were recently installed just east of the production building. Although there are no known archaeological resources on the property, and none were recorded during the recent construction of the new winery buildings and underground tanks installed on-site in the vicinity of the proposed septic tank, the low (valley floor) elevation and proximity of the property to the Napa River would suggest that the property's general vicinity might have attracted indigenous peoples. If resources are found during any earth-disturbing activities associated with the proposed 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:

In the event that archaeological 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 Planning, Building, and Environmental Services Department 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 shall be contacted by the permittee 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.

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

There are no new impacts related to geology and soils that are anticipated to result from the requested use permit modification.

Discussion:

a/b. All potential impacts related to geology and soils were determined to be less than significant in the 2009 IS/MND for the Materra Winery. As discussed in the 2009 IS/MND, the property at 4326 Big Ranch Road is not located within any Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone designated by the state Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. Although no fault zone underlies the property, the site is generally located within a region of active fault zones, including those of the West Napa, Mayacama, Concord, Great Valley, North Hayward, Hunting Creek-Berryessa and San Andreas faults. Movement along any of these faults is anticipated to result in intensities of VII and VIII on the Modified Mercalli Scale at the project site; these "very strong" to "severe" intensities would be felt by most people and are likely to result in some damage to well-built structures. Due to the young age of the winery production and storage buildings and related site improvements (one to five years) and requirement for new structures to comply with the 2013 California Building Code, damage to any of the newly-built and recently-inspected structures on the property is anticipated to be minor and would not expose people to substantial hazards related to ground shaking during an earthquake. During the recent 2014 Napa earthquake, the applicant reported no damage had occurred to the structures that were then under

construction on the property. The applicant's consultant has also reported that racks within the barrel storage building are appropriately braced in accordance with seismic safety standards.

The property is generally flat, with slopes of under five percent. Given that the site is predominantly flat, underlain with fine silt/loamy soil (Yolo loam) and located in the valley, soil movement and erosion potential is anticipated to be low (by contrast, higher erosion potential is anticipated in areas of steep slopes or more moderate slopes with loose, sandy soils). The property also has a "very low" landslide potential, as identified on landslide risk maps produced by the California Department of Conservation and Association of Bay Area Governments. Regional maps of liquefaction suggest that the property is within an area of low to moderate liquefaction potential; the highest liquefaction potential on the property occurs in the vicinity of the Napa River banks on the eastern end of the site, where no structures have been or are proposed to be placed with this proposed use permit modification.

c-e. The Yolo loam that underlays the site generally has a low to moderate shrink-swell potential and moderate limitations in use for septic system absorption fields; these soil limitations, however, can be overcome with proper design, such as expansion of the leachfield area. As previously-described, existing above and below-grade structures on the site were built under permits from the Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department, and prior to receiving such permits, the property owner or his contractor would have been required to demonstrate structural stability of the proposed building foundations, as well as functionality of the then-proposed septic system. It is re-iterated, however, that the current use permit modification request includes construction of no new buildings and installation of no new septic system leachfield. The proposed septic system improvement consists solely of an underground tank to allow for increased retention time during peak flows of winery production process wastewater. No increase in the area of the existing septic system leachfield nor in its overall design is necessary to accommodate the requested production increase.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | No New Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| VII. GREENHOUSE GAS (GHG) EMISSIONS. Would the project: | | | | | |
| a) Generate a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions in excess of applicable thresholds, adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District or the California Air Resources Board, which may have a significant impact on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <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"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

There are new but less than significant environmental impacts resulting from greenhouse gas emissions that are anticipated to result from the requested use permit modification.

Discussion:

The 2009 IS/MND did not include a discussion specific to GHG emissions but did suggest that air quality impacts of the addition of a winery to the property, in general, would not be significant because emissions associated with the vineyard maintenance and operation (primarily from vehicles) was an existing condition that would continue following construction of the then-proposed winery. Since January 2009, the CEQA Guidelines have been amended to include a section that is specific to GHG emission impacts of a proposed project.

a. Overall increases in GHG emissions in Napa County were assessed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the Napa County General Plan Update and certified by the Napa County Board of Supervisors 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.

As discussed in the Air Quality section of this Subsequent Initial Study, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines thresholds of significance for air pollutants, including GHG emissions. The BAAQMD's threshold of significance for proposed projects' potential GHG emissions was set at 1,100 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (MTCO_{2e}) per year. (The primary categories of GHG on which most GHG analysis is based are carbon dioxide, methane, nitrogen dioxide, and synthetic fluorinated gases. These gases typically are the result of combustion and decomposition of organic matter; burning of fossil fuels; farming and livestock operations; and space conditioning and other metal and chemical production processes. The effect that each category of GHG has on causing the global warming effect is exponentially greater than the impact of carbon dioxide, to the degrees of tens to tens of thousands times that of a unit of carbon dioxide. Thus, greenhouse gases are measured in "carbon dioxide equivalents, CO_{2e}," a comparison that uses the unit of carbon dioxide as a common denominator. CO_{2e} are measured in units of metric tons, equal to approximately 2,200 pounds.) Though the BAAQMD cannot endorse the use of the 1,100 MTCO_{2e} threshold due to court decision, agencies may choose to use the threshold as best available information; thus, the 1,100 MTCO_{2e} threshold 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 EIR was prepared, it appropriately focuses on impacts which are "peculiar to the project," rather than the cumulative impacts previously assessed.)

The proposed project would increase the production capacity permitted for a now existing winery. Using comparable land use categories as described in the Air Quality discussion, a project with 9,000 square feet of hospitality area or 121,000 square feet of barrel storage/production area would potentially generate more than 1,100 MTCO_{2e} annually and would be considered to have a potentially significant impact on the environment; the recently-built winery is smaller than those screening criteria. Furthermore, as described in the Air Quality section of this initial study, the winery was built using light colors, extended overhangs, and insulated panels, which in combination serve to reduce the winery's space conditioning needs. The winery's built utility infrastructure also included installation of conduit between the septic system leachfield and production buildings, which will ultimately connect the winery buildings to a three- to five-foot tall photovoltaic (PV or solar) panel installation that the applicant intends to construct over the leachfield within calendar year 2015. Combined with a series of additional solar panels on the roof of the winery buildings, the PV panels will provide all of the winery's energy needs; thus, this analysis assumes no GHG would be generated by fossil fuels burned to create electricity to serve the winery over the long-term. As indicated in the 2009 IS/MND, with the winery's operation, the previously-established vineyard operations would continue, with roughly an equivalent acreage (46 acres without construction of the residence, or 45 acres with the residence) to that analyzed in 2009 (47 acres without the residence, or 46 acres with the residence). Thus, GHG impacts associated with vineyard maintenance (primarily from fossil fuel combustion in vineyard equipment and vehicles) would be roughly equal to or just slightly less than that analyzed in the 2009 IS/MND.

As stated in the Air Quality section of this Subsequent Initial Study, the BAAQMD currently cannot endorse use of its previously-adopted, 2010 air quality and GHG emission thresholds, though agencies may choose to use them or other resources available through or suggested by the BAAQMD. As described in the paragraphs above, the proposed amendment would increase truck trips to and from the winery, but the additional GHG emissions from the increase in trips to deliver the additional grape tonnage and product would fall well below the recommended threshold of significance. Should the property owner not pursue installation of the PV panels on-site to provide an alternative energy source to the winery, the potential GHG emissions would increase compared to the approved, built project but would still result in a less than significant GHG impact.

- b. The County of Napa does not have an adopted climate action plan, though the applicant's intent to install a roof-mounted photovoltaic array, as indicated in the Greenhouse Gas Best Management Practices Checklist attached to the use permit modification application, is consistent with adopted General Plan goals (CON-68, CON-70) that encourage the County and permittees to pursue use of renewable energy sources.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | No New Impact |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|---------------|

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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"/> | <input 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"/> | <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 result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <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 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 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"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

There are no new impacts related to hazards or hazardous materials that are anticipated to result from the requested use permit modification.

Discussion:

- a/b. The applicant has indicated that no hazardous materials or chemicals are used or stored on-site in significant quantities as to cause a significant hazard to the public as a result of a spill or other accidental release. The proposed project would not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts normally used in winery operations. The project proponent/winery operator would be required to file a Business Plan 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., would be utilized. However, given the quantities of hazardous materials and the limited area and duration of construction necessary to install the necessary new septic tank, the use of such materials would result in a less than significant impact.
- c. The winery and proposed operational modifications thereto would not affect schools within one-quarter mile. The school closest to the winery site is Sunrise Montessori School, which is over a half-mile southwest of the subject property.
- d. The property is not on the California Environmental Protection Agency's list of hazardous sites (Government Code Section 65962.5).

- e/f. The winery and proposed operational modifications thereto would not cause an unsafe condition within two miles of an airport or airstrip, as the winery site is not within two miles of any public or private airport or airstrip. Napa County Airport, the closest airport to the site, is over 10 miles south of the site, and the property at 4326 Big Ranch Road is outside of the boundaries of the land use compatibility plan for that airport.
- g. The Napa County Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) outlines procedures, including establishing leadership roles and responsibilities of various agency staff, that guide local preparedness, response, recovery and resource management efforts associated with occurrence of a natural disaster, significant emergency, or other threat to public safety. The proposed winery use permit modification would not result in closure or permanent obstruction of adjacent public rights-of-way, and no component of the implementation of the EOP would otherwise be impaired by proposed modification of the use permit to increase the winery's permitted annual production capacity.
- h. With the exception of the native plant growth along the riverbanks on the eastern end of the parcel, the property is substantially landscaped with vineyards and surrounded by other properties planted with vineyards, and thus is not considered high risk for damage from wildland fires. Three sides of the steel winery structures themselves are bounded by asphaltic concrete access drives and loading areas, with the fourth side separated from the available vineyard area by unplanted soil.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | No New Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project: | | | | | |
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <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"/> | <input 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"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Expose people or structures to significant risk of loss or injury as a result of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

There are new but less than significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality that are anticipated to result from the requested use permit modification.

Discussion:

- a. The proposed increase in production of wine would result in a corresponding increase in the quantity of process wastewater generated at the winery. The applicant has also indicated intent to use mobile bottling services as an interim measure, until stationary bottling facilities are built inside the production building. The combination of increased production and utilization of mobile bottling services would increase the quantity of process-related wastewater and potential for stormwater contamination from product spillage. The winery currently has an uncovered crush pad with a diversion valve that directs process wastewater and crush pad liquids to a landscaped bioswale east of the customer parking lot, where the water is allowed to settle for natural biofiltration. The valve is equipped with a rain sensor, so that following the flush of the first rains, the valve automatically redirects rainfall flows to the storm drainage system. This design of the system was intended to prevent contamination of the storm drain system with grape juice, making potential adverse impacts to stormwater quality less than significant. To comply fully with current regulations of the Napa County / Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies stormwater quality permit, the winery operator will be required to obtain an Industrial General Permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

- b. On January 14, 2014, Governor Jerry Brown declared a drought emergency in the state of California. The declaration stopped short of imposing mandatory conservation measures statewide. Mandatory water restrictions are being left to individual jurisdictions. On April 1, 2015, Governor Brown issued Executive Order B-29-15 imposing restrictions to achieve a statewide 25 percent reduction in potable urban water usage through February 28, 2016. However, such restrictions were not placed on private well users in rural areas. At this time, Napa County 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 their proposed projects.

To better understand groundwater resources, on June 28, 2011, the Napa County 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 retained Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE), who completed a county-wide assessment of groundwater resources (Napa County Groundwater Conditions and Groundwater Monitoring Recommendations Report, February 2011); developed a groundwater monitoring program (Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2013, January 2013) and also completed a 2013 Updated Hydrogeologic Conceptualization and Characterization of Groundwater Conditions (January 2013).

Groundwater Sustainability Objectives were recommended by the GRAC and adopted by the Board of Supervisors. These objectives acknowledged the important role of monitoring as a means to achieving groundwater sustainability and the principles underlying the sustainability objectives. In 2009, Napa County began a comprehensive study of its groundwater resources to meet identified action items in the County's 2008 General Plan update. The study, conducted by LSCE, emphasized developing a sound understanding of groundwater conditions and implementing an expanded groundwater monitoring and data management program as a foundation for integrated water resources planning and dissemination of water resources information. The 2011 baseline study by LSCE, which included over 600 wells and data going back over 50 years, concluded that the groundwater levels in Napa County are stable, except for portions of the MST [Milliken Sarco Tulocay] district. Most wells elsewhere within the Napa Valley Floor with a sufficient record indicate that groundwater levels are more affected by climatic conditions, are within historical levels, and seem to recover from dry periods during subsequent wet or normal periods. The LSCE study also concluded that, on a regional scale, there appear to be no current groundwater quality issues except north of Calistoga (mostly naturally occurring boron and trace metals) and in the Carneros region (mostly salinity). LSCE prepared the 2014 Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report, presented to the Napa County Board of Supervisors on March 3, 2015.

Minimum thresholds for water use have been established by the Napa County Department of Public Works, using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS), the GRAC recommendations, and the LSCE reports. These reports are the result of water resources investigations performed by the USGS in cooperation with the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation

District and LSCE. The County has concluded that the annual 1.0 acre-foot of water per parcel acre criteria on the Valley Floor has proven to be both scientifically and operationally adequate. Any project that reduces water usage or any water usage that is at or below the established threshold is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels.

The proposed increase in wine production would increase the winery's demand for water. The 2009 IS/MND noted that the property receives irrigation water from two on-site wells and an existing reservoir on the property to the south of the site. Under California State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Rights, License 11513 (amended September 2008), the property owner is also licensed to draw supplemental water from the Napa River for irrigation and frost protection purposes, in an amount not to exceed 76.5 acre-feet per year (35 acre-feet for reservoir storage between January 15 and March 15, and up to 2.99 cubic feet per second between March 15 and May 15 for replenishment of storage).

Concurrently with the submittal of the use permit modification application, the applicant's engineer submitted an estimate of water use associated with the requested production increase. The report was prepared in accordance with current Napa County Water Availability Analysis Guidelines (May 2015) and indicated that with the proposed increase in production, estimated water use at the site would be 40.51 acre-feet per year. The anticipated increase is 1.73 acre-feet per year more than what the estimated water use was as of the 2009 use permit approval. However, both the 2009 and current estimates of water use are within the maximum 50 acre-feet per year (one acre-foot per acre on the property) that the County has established as a sustainable level of groundwater extraction. It is further noted that the 40.51 acre-feet per year does not account for reductions in groundwater draws as a result of the 76.5 acre-feet per year that the property owner is licensed to draw from the Napa River, and so, it is considered a conservative estimate of water use associated with the proposed modification.

Comparison Estimated Water Use of Proposed Use Permit Modification vs. Existing Entitlement

| | Estimated Use, 2009 Use Permit (acre-feet / year) | Current Use (acre-feet / year) | Proposed Modification (acre-feet / year) |
|--|---|--------------------------------|--|
| Production/Winery Processing | 1.33 | 1.07 | 1.83 |
| Employees | (included in above) | 0.06 | 0.06 |
| Visitors | (included in above) | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| Events | (included in above) | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| Landscaping | (included in above) | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Vineyard (see note) | 36.8 | 27.2 | 36.8 |
| Future Residence (not part of this modification request) | 0.65 | 0 | 0.75 |
| TOTAL | 38.78 | 29.4 | 40.51 |

(Note: "Current Use" of water reflects approximately eight acres of vines that were removed to accommodate construction of the now-built winery, septic system leachfields and construction staging areas, plus four acres that were built with the residence and barn that were recently demolished. Current vineyard acreage is, therefore, approximately 34 acres. Planned vineyard acreage, without the future residence, re-introduces those 12 acres into production and is thus estimated at 46 acres, with an estimated water use of 36.8 acre-feet /year.

Estimated water use of the future residence is included for reference as part of the "Proposed Modification," and if built, would reduce the vineyard area to approximately 45 acres, with an estimated water use of 36 acre-feet / year.)

- c-f. The property is generally flat, having a slope of less than five percent. The Napa River borders the property to the east; however, construction of the winery buildings and associated improvements is approximately 1,500 feet west of the river and well outside of the required 35-foot minimum setback established under the water quality and riparian area conservation regulations identified in County Code Chapter 18.108.

As with the original approvals, no physical changes or new development would occur within the Napa River or the river setback areas required by County Code Section 18.108.025. The proposed use permit modification would modify the annual production capacity – an operational characteristic of the approved winery – with no changes necessary to the size or location of now existing wine production and storage buildings, and no additional asphaltic concrete surfaces that would have the potential to increase the volume of stormwater runoff from the site. The proposed 2,000-gallon septic tank necessary to accommodate the increased production would also be over 1,000 feet west of the riverbank conservation area and would be below ground surface, such that the original grade would be restored following its installation and the spoils from ground excavation spread in a shallow two- to three-inch thick layer across the vineyards.

During installation of the tank, the applicant's contractors must comply with the County's stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) requirements to ensure that best management practices (BMPs) are adopted in order to minimize the amount of sediment and other pollutants leaving the site during construction activities. The following condition regarding stormwater control, which will require the incorporation of BMPs during development, is a standard site improvement and engineering services-specific condition that would apply to the project, if approved:

The permittee shall comply with all construction and post-construction storm water pollution prevention protocols as required by the County Engineering Services Division, and the State Regional Water Quality Control Board (SRWQCB).

The project would have a less than significant impact on water quality with the implementation of Best Management Practices required by the standard conditions of approval.

g-j. The 2009 IS/MND identified no significant impacts related to water-damaging events. With no new occupied buildings or housing units proposed to be added to the property with this modification, the potential amended project impacts remain less than significant in this area. The property is located well inland of the Pacific Ocean coast and the shores of the San Pablo Bay where risk of inundation by seiche or tsunami tends to greatest. The site is also predominantly flat, with slopes of zero to five percent (the eastern boundary of the site, along the banks of the Napa River, does have steeper slopes, but no structures or vineyards are proposed in that portion of the property); therefore, the proposed project is not likely to subject persons or structures to risk of damage as a result of landslide or mudflow. The winery buildings and site improvements have been constructed outside of the 100-year floodplain; the buildings have also been situated outside of the 500-year floodplain, with only parking spaces and landscaped swales potentially incurring some damage as a result of a 500-year flood. While vines might incur damage as a result of flooding of the Napa River, as might occur with extended duration rainstorms, the winery's occupied structures (such as offices, employee work and break rooms and hospitality areas within the storage and production buildings) would not be damaged.

The property is potentially subject to damage as a result of failure of the Rector Creek or Conn dams located approximately six and nine miles (respectively) north of the site; however, damage is anticipated to be limited to vineyards and minor physical damage as a result of shallow flooding of buildings. Both Rector Creek and Conn Creek are tributaries to the Napa River, and Napa County GIS maps indicate that failure of either dam would result in flooding to those portions of the site closest to the riverbanks, up to elevations of 60-65 feet. With a finished floor of 61 feet in the hospitality and barrel storage areas, the occupied areas of the proposed winery would experience inundation of water approximately three feet deep.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | No New Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project: | | | | | |
| a) Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan (HCP) or natural community conservation plan (NCCP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

There are no new land use and planning impacts that are anticipated to result from the requested use permit modification.

Discussion:

The 2009 IS/MND identified no land use or planning impacts related to establishment of the Materra Winery on the property. As noted in that document, the property was developed with 46 acres of vineyard and residential and agricultural buildings, and the then-proposed winery use was consistent with the zoning and General Plan land use designations of the property.

- a. The predominant agricultural use (vineyard) would remain the predominant land use on the property following construction of the winery; with recent completion of the winery buildings, 46 acres or 92 percent of the site remains available for vineyard plantings. As described on page 2 of this initial study, surrounding land uses are also predominantly agricultural and rural residential, such that the vineyard and winery uses integrate with the surroundings rather than divide established communities.
- b. As indicated in previous sections of this document, the proposed use permit modification involves no building expansion to accommodate the proposed production increase, and the new septic tank proposed to be installed on the property would be proximate to the recently-built winery structures and roughly 1,500 feet away from the Napa River, the closest native natural resource to the property. The proposed modification would therefore be consistent with adopted policies and zoning regulations intended to preserve water quality and water resources, such as those contained in Napa County Code Chapter 18.108 and referenced in General Plan Policy CON-4, which prohibit new development within 35 feet of the riverbank (also see section IV above) and aim to preserve watersheds in support of the County's agricultural goals.

Additionally, the property and winery owner has requested the use permit modification as a means to provide additional permit capacity that accommodates the higher vine yield he anticipates with the new vineyard plantings on-site. By continuing to foster use of the property for primarily agricultural use, consistent with the property's active Williamson Act contract, the proposed modification is also consistent with General Plan Conservation policies (Policy CON-2, Policy CON-9) intended to preserve agricultural lands as the dominant land use in unincorporated Napa County, and analysis submitted by the applicant's engineer in accordance with current Napa County guidelines indicates that the winery would not draw unsustainable quantities of groundwater (i.e., one acre-foot of water per acre of land per year) for sake of the proposed production increase (Policy CON-53). It is further noted that the applicant's intent to install a roof-mounted photovoltaic array, as indicated in the Greenhouse Gas Best Management Practices Checklist attached to the use permit modification application, is consistent with adopted General Plan goals (CON-68, CON-70) that encourage the County and permittees to pursue use of renewable energy sources.

- c. There is no HCP or NCCP that has been adopted or is being implemented in unincorporated Napa County.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | No New Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project: | | | | | |
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

There are no impacts to mineral resources that have been identified as potentially resulting from the initial use permit approval or the requested use permit modification.

Discussion:

The 2009 IS/MND identified no impacts occurring with respect to mineral resources as a result of the then-proposed construction of a winery on the subject site. This conclusion was consistent with descriptions of mineral resources known to occur within unincorporated Napa County, which, as described in Chapter 2 of the Napa County Baseline Data Report (BDR; 2005), mostly occur in the southern and northern areas of the County, generally at higher elevations than the valley floor where the subject site is located.

a/b. BDR Figure 2.2 identifies no mineral or mining resources on or in the vicinity of the Materra winery site. The proposed use permit modification would continue the predominantly agricultural use of the site and would not result in permanent conversion of the agricultural property to urban development and land uses. Thus, the amendment would continue to have no impact on known mineral resources.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | No New Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| XII. NOISE. Would the project result in: | | | | | |
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <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"/> | <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"/> | <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"/> | <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 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"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

There are new but less than significant noise impacts are anticipated to result from the requested use permit modification.

Discussion:

- a-c. The proposed production increase request was not accompanied by a request to change or extend the hours of operation of the winery as entitled. Thus, while there might be a minor increase in noise generated by vehicles used for shipment of the increased volume of fruit and wine, noise generated by the winery operations would continue to fall within previously-analyzed hours of the day, within a 10-hour window between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Without any physical changes to the winery production structures, the separation of the winery buildings from the closest residential structures on the east side Big Ranch Road would continue to exceed 500 feet.
- d. As discussed in previous sections of this initial study, the requested amendment, if approved, would require grading and excavation of soil in order to accommodate installation of one new, 2,000-gallon underground septic tank. Equipment used in the excavation and installation process could include backhoes and heavy duty trucks, which might generate short-term, construction-related noise. As limited by Napa County Code (Section 8.16.080.B.2), construction efforts would be prohibited between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. in order to preserve the ambient noise environment during the more sensitive evening and nighttime hours. Daytime noise impacts related to on-site installation of the new tank would be considered less than significant due to their limited duration (up to 14 days, as estimated by the applicant's engineer). The 500-foot distance between the winery facility and the closest residential structure would also serve to dissipate noise between the project site and the closest sensitive receptor (resident).
- e/f. The winery site is not within two miles of any public or private airport or airstrip. Napa County Airport, the closest airport to the site, is over 10 miles south of the site, and the property at 4326 Big Ranch Road is outside of the boundaries of the land use compatibility plan for that airport.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | No New Impact |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|---------------|

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

There are no new impacts related to population and housing that are anticipated to result from the requested use permit modification.

Discussion:

a-c. The 50-acre parcel currently has no residences, as the previously-existing residential structures on the property were demolished to accommodate construction of the wine production facilities and expansion of the vineyard. Thus, no residents would be displaced and no residences would be lost as a result of the proposed use permit modification. With the proposed modification, the predominant use of the property would remain agricultural with on-site agricultural product processing (winery); no new residences or publicly-accessible infrastructure expansions would occur with the amendment. The addition of one, 2,000-gallon septic tank that would be necessary for the requested production increase would serve only the winery use on-site and is not considered an expansion of infrastructure that would induce further population growth in the area. The long-term, planned addition of one new residence on the property would be consistent with the rural, single-family development pattern of other properties in the vicinity of the site, would be permitted by the Napa County Zoning Code and under the terms of the existing Williamson Act contract, and is likewise not considered an indicator of substantial population growth in the neighborhood of the site.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | No New Impact |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|---------------|

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in:

- | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services listed below: | | | | | |
| i) Fire protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) Police protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- iv) Parks?
- v) Other public facilities?

There are no new impacts related to public services that are anticipated to result from the requested use permit modification.

Discussion:

a. The property is located within the service areas of both the Napa County Sheriff's Department (Beat 4) as well as the Napa County Fire Department. The recently-built winery production buildings were built according to current Building and Fire Codes and were inspected by building inspectors and fire officials as part of the final permit inspection process. Improvements included installation of a water storage tank to ensure fire flows during response to a fire emergency on-site.

If approved, the proposed modification would increase the permitted production capacity of an existing winery. The proposal includes no residential units nor introduction of new residents that would utilize existing parks and potentially increase student enrollment in schools located in the area of the winery. No new parks or other public recreational amenities or institutions are proposed to be built with the proposed amendment to the approved use permit. Also see discussion under Section XV, Recreation, below.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | No New Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| XV. RECREATION. Would the project: | | | | | |
| a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

There are no new impacts related to recreational facilities that are anticipated to result from the requested use permit modification.

Discussion:

a/b. The proposed project would increase the permitted production capacity of an existing winery. As noted in the 2009 IS/MND and in discussions above, the predominant use (up to 92 percent) of the property is agricultural and would remain so should the use permit amendment be approved by the County. The current proposal includes no residential units nor introduction of new residents that would utilize existing parks in the area, potentially accelerating the facilities' deterioration. Similarly, the proposal includes no increase in the permitted number of winery employees (up to 10) or guests (up to 18 per day, with a maximum of 40 per week), some of whom might also visit recreational facilities in the area during breaks or before or after work or winery visits. No new parks or other public recreational amenities are proposed to be built with the proposed amendment to the approved use permit.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | No New Impact |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|---------------|

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system and/or conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-16, which seeks to maintain an adequate Level of Service (LOS) at signalized and unsignalized intersections, or reduce the effectiveness of existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <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"/> | <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"/> | <input 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 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"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

There are new but less than significant traffic and transportation impacts are anticipated to result from the requested use permit modification.

Discussion:

a/b. With the requested modification, the winery operator is not requesting any changes to the winery's approved visitation, employment and marketing event program. As such, the modification would result in no increases in winery-related traffic from visitors or winery employees, beyond what was previously analyzed in the 2009 IS/MND.

Over half of the grapes processed at the winery would be grown on-site, although there would be a seasonal increase in truck trips associated with an increase in the quantity of grapes purchased from other wineries (up to 30,000 gallons' worth) as compared to that approved and analyzed under the original 2009 use permit (approximately 18,000 gallons' worth). This difference in on-haul of grapes from off-site Napa County vineyards equates to approximately 40 net new truck trips per year (20 inbound and 20 outbound), or roughly one new roundtrip truck trip every other day during the six-week harvest season. Throughout the year, truck trips to deliver goods and supplies, and to distribute wine to off-site locations would also increase as the volume of wine produced on-site increases. Using trucks with 6,500-gallon capacity, and affording no reductions for product over the entitled production of 50,000 gallons that might be sold on-site, a 35,000-gallon per year annual increase in production would result in an estimated 10 more annual trips (five inbound and five outbound) related to wine distribution. Using assumptions from the County's Traffic Information Sheet Addendum, deliveries of goods and supplies would add another, approximately 160 trips to the roadway system (80 inbound and 80 outbound), for a total annual increase of approximately 210 net new trips per year associated with the proposed, 35,000-gallon annual production increase. As noted above, this increase equates to roughly one new roundtrip truck trip every other day during the harvest season, and two new roundtrip truck trips each week during the remainder of the year, and is considered to be a less than significant impact to the existing roadway system due to this infrequency.

- c. As noted in Section VIII (Hazards and Hazardous Materials) of this initial study, Napa County Airport, the closest airport to the site, is over 10 miles south of the winery property, and the property at 4326 Big Ranch Road is outside of the boundaries of the land use compatibility plan for that airport. Thus, the winery is not within the vicinity of an airport or airstrip, and the proposed use permit modification to increase production capacity would have no association with a change to air traffic.
- d/e. The 2009 IS/MND identified a potentially significant impact related to automobile traffic safety. In order to avoid vehicle movement conflicts that might result from insufficient distance between the Oak Knoll Avenue (west)/Big Ranch Road T-intersection, and the then-proposed winery driveway on Big Ranch Road, the 2009 IS/MND specified a mitigation measure that required either: (a) shifting of the winery driveway 200 feet south of the Oak Knoll Avenue (west)/Big Ranch Road intersection; or (b) shifting the winery driveway northward so as to align with Oak Knoll Avenue and create a fourth leg at the Oak Knoll Avenue (west)/Big Ranch Road intersection. The property owner selected option (a), and the built improvements completed in April 2015 fully address the previously-identified impact. On-site improvements include an access driveway to the winery from Big Ranch Road, with a secondary service access to Big Ranch Road via a driveway near the southwestern corner of the property. The two access points provide a loop "road" around the winery buildings, providing adequate emergency access to the developed portion of the site and a large loading area south of the production building that is outside of paved access roads on-site. Prior to issuance of a certificate of final occupancy for the newly-built winery structures, Cal-Fire staff inspected the site to confirm compliance of the built improvements with Fire Code regulations.
- f. As noted above, the modification would result in no increases in winery-related traffic from visitors, event guests or winery employees, beyond what was previously analyzed in the 2009 IS/MND. Likewise, no additional parking stalls are proposed to be added to the site.
- g. As noted above, the proposed project would add new truck trips to the existing roadway system, including Big Ranch Road, from which the winery has its access. The Napa Countywide Bicycle Plan, adopted by the Board of Supervisors in June 2012, after adoption of the 2009 IS/MND, identifies Big Ranch Road as well as West Oak Knoll Road as proposed locations for a Class II bicycle facility (on-street bike lane), and the General Plan encourages public and private sector coordination in implementation of the plan (Policy CIR-35). Both road right-of-ways include sufficient width to accommodate the paving and striping necessary for the planned lanes. Both lanes are currently unfunded projects.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | No New Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project: | | | | | |
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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?
- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

There are new but less than significant impacts related to utilities and service systems that are anticipated to result from the requested use permit modification.

Discussion:

- a-c. As noted in the discussion of Hydrology and Water Quality above, the winery utilizes an existing automated diversion valve system that, coupled with on-site biofiltration, serves as a stormwater quality preservation measure on-site. No expansions to the existing on-site stormwater quality measures are necessary to accommodate the proposed production increase. As described in the modification application, the proposed production increase would require installation of a new, 2,000-gallon underground septic tank, but as discussed further in the Air Quality and Noise sections of this Subsequent Initial Study, the installation of the new tank is not anticipated to generate significant construction emission or noise impacts due to the small area and short-term duration of construction.
- d. The proposed production increase is not anticipated to require extraction of groundwater at a quantity over one acre-foot per acre of the site per year, a quantity that the County has determined to be a sustainable level of groundwater extraction in the low-lying valley areas. The Water Availability Analysis submitted with the use permit modification application estimated water use at the site at 40.51 acre-feet per year with the proposed amendment, an increase of 1.73 acre-feet per year as compared to analysis conducted with the 2009 use permit approval. Both the 2009 estimated water use and the increase estimated with the currently requested modification, even without accounting for 76.5 acre-feet per year that the property owner is licensed to draw from the Napa River, are within the 50 acre-feet per year (one acre-foot per acre on the property) that the County has established as a sustainable level of groundwater extraction. (Also see Section IX, Hydrology and Water Quality.)
- e. Because the property utilizes existing on-site septic systems for wastewater treatment and existing wells and reservoirs for water, no determination of service or will-serve letters from utility providers are required for the proposed project.
- f/g. The Greenhouse Gas Best Management Practices checklist that the applicant submitted with the use permit modification indicated that the winery operations include recycling of 75 percent of all waste at the winery, and composting of 75 percent of food and garden material. Non-recyclable and non-organic waste is collected by Napa Valley Disposal Service and ultimately deposited at the Keller Canyon Landfill (located in unincorporated eastern Contra Costa County), which, having reached roughly 15 percent of its capacity in the first 12 years of its approximated 50 years of operation (which began in 1992), and extrapolating that same rate of material to date, has adequate capacity remaining to accommodate any non-recyclable and non-organic waste generated from the winery's proposed production increase.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

- c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Discussion:

a. The proposed project consists of an increase in the permitted annual production capacity—from 50,000 gallons per year to 85,000 gallons per year—of a previously-entitled winery. Associated with the proposed production increase is the installation of a new, 2,000-gallon underground septic tank to accommodate the increase in process wastewater flows. As described above, no other physical changes to the site would be required for sake of the amendment, and no expansion of vineyard lands or winery structures into sensitive riparian setbacks on the property would occur.

b. Noise and air quality impacts associated with installation of the tank would be temporary in nature, and so would be less than significant. Stormwater quality measures consisting of an automated diversion valve (to separate flows of stormwater and process wastewater) and landscaped bioswale were built on the property with construction of the recently-built winery. Water use on the site would increase as a result of the proposed production increase, but as described in the Hydrology and Water Quality section of this Subsequent Initial Study, would be within the County's acceptable threshold of no more than one acre-foot of water per parcel acre per year for full winery operation, without accounting for any offset of water use as a result of extraction of water from the adjacent water reservoir and Napa River.

Vehicle trips associated with employees and visitors would remain unchanged from the 2009 approvals, although truck trips would increase by approximately 210 trips (105 roundtrips) annually as a result of deliveries of supplies and grapes from off-site vineyards and off-site distribution of the additional product. Approximately 40 of these trips (20 roundtrips) would occur during the harvest season, effectively resulting in an additional one truck trip every other day during the limited six-week season. This volume of increase in truck trips and associated air emissions therefrom are also considered less than significant, as described in further detail in the Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Transportation/Traffic sections of this Subsequent Initial Study.

c. There are no schools, hospitals or other facilities housing sensitive receptors within a quarter-mile of the winery site. Noise from construction that would occur with installation of the proposed septic tank would be temporary, lasting up to two weeks, and would be limited to day time hours, and would be subject to best management practices intended to limit fugitive dust and protect stormwater quality. The proposed increase in production would add heavy duty truck trips to Big Ranch Road, at a frequency of roughly one roundtrip every other day during the harvest season and two roundtrips each week during the remainder of the year. Adding air emissions from the increased truck trips to the currently permitted winery operation, emissions would still fall below thresholds of significance for air quality impacts. No other operational changes to the permitted winery operation are proposed with this modification request, and these potential impacts, due to their temporary nature and infrequency, would not result in substantial adverse effects on human beings in the immediate or general area of the winery site.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | No New Impact |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|---------------|

XIX. SUBSEQUENT NEGATIVE DECLARATION

- a) Are substantial changes proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects?
- b) Are substantial changes proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects?

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Have substantial changes occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Have substantial changes occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Has new information of substantial importance been identified, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted which shows any of the following | | | | | |
| i) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents have declined to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents have declined to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

The 2009 IS/MND identified no significant environmental effects within the exception of a traffic safety impact related to the design of the winery access driveway at Big Ranch Road. The applicant subsequently implemented the required mitigation measure (re-alignment of the winery access driveway) with construction of the on-site improvements. There are no outstanding mitigation measures identified in that study, with which the project proponent must comply.

a-e. Based on the analysis in the sections above, the proposed increase to annual wine production would have less than significant environmental effects, and none of the potential impacts identified in the 2009 IS/MND would be substantially more severe than was considered in that earlier document. Since the original initial study was adopted and the project originally entitled in 2009, additional requirements, resources and regional thresholds have been recommended in order to assist in the analysis of potential air quality emissions; however, as described in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas sections of this Subsequent Initial Study, air pollutants and emissions associated with the proposed production increase (primarily from the additional truck trips and limited-term installation of the new septic tank), would be less than significant and below the regional thresholds identified in those respective discussions. The methodology for analyzing potential water impacts of a proposed project has also been reviewed in the past three years, but the standard of one acre-foot of water used per acre of property per year remains the accepted standard, and as explained above, the proposed production increase would not exceed that standard, even without accounting for any offset of water use as a result of extraction of water from the adjacent water reservoir and Napa River.

Mitigation Measures: None required.