

APPENDIX C

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

Initial Study Checklist (form updated February 2015)

1. **Project Title:** Dalla Valle Vineyards, Use Permit P14-00121 and Viewshed P15-00198
2. **Property Owner:** Naoko Dalla Valle, 7776 Silverado Trail, Oakville, CA 94562.
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number, and Email:** Emily Hedge; (707) 259-8227; emily.hedge@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and APN:** The project is located on a 26.61 acre parcel on the east side of Silverado Trail. The entrance to the common access driveway is approximately 1,300 feet north of the Silverado Trail and Oakville Cross Road intersection, within the AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district; 7776 Silverado Trail, Oakville, CA 94562; APN: 031-060-027.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Naoko Dalla Valle, 7776 Silverado Trail, Oakville, CA 94562. OR Lester Hardy, 1312 Oak Avenue, St. Helena, CA, 94574.
6. **General Plan Description:** Agricultural Watershed Open Space (AWOS) Designation.
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Watershed (AW) District.
8. **Background/Project History:** The 26.61 acre parcel includes an existing residence, second dwelling, and winery building. No changes are proposed to the residence or second dwelling as part of this project. Approximately 20 acres out of the 26.61 acres are planted in vineyards.

June 10, 1985 – Small Winery Use Permit Exemption June 10, 1985 was approved by the Conservation, Development and Planning Department to permit Dalla Valle Vineyards to produce up to 20,000 gallons per year within a 2,500 sq. ft. winery building. Hours of operation were approved for six days a week from 8 am to 5 pm with two full-time and two part-time employees. No tours and tastings were authorized; no visitors were anticipated.

August 21, 1986 – Use Permit #U-588586 was approved by the Zoning Administrator to permit a single family farm labor dwelling. In 1999, the property owner converted the farm labor dwelling into a second unit.

April 21, 2000 – Minor Modification #99303-MOD was approved by the Zoning Administrator to permit an expansion of the approved winery building by 259 sq. ft. to accommodate a larger office, a lab/workroom, and a covered entry vestibule.

August 21, 2007 – Minor Modification #P07-00553-MODVMIN was approved by the Director of Conservation, Development and Planning to build a pre-engineered metal roof structure (50' x 24') over the existing crush pad. The roof structure is open to the weather on three sides; the fourth side is adjacent to the existing winery building.

June 24, 2015 – Well permits E15-00493 and E15-00494. The applicant submitted two well permits for irrigation of existing vineyards. Permit issuance is pending approval of this Use Permit.

In review of the project history, staff believes that although there are no issues with the approvals of the modifications, the previous approvals should not have been processed as modifications to the Small Winery Use Permit Exemption. In order to allow the proposed addition of the barrel storage building and any future modifications, staff has determined that the winery should come under a Use Permit. The Use Permit would encompass the winery as it currently operates and would incorporate the addition of the barrel storage building.

9. **Description of Project:** Approval of a Use Permit to encompass the existing Dalla Valle Vineyards winery and to allow the following activities:
- (a) Construction of a new 5,400 sq. ft. barrel storage building that includes a barrel room, work room, lab, entryway, foyer, vestibule, work room, chemical storage, mechanical room, crush equipment storage, restroom, vineyard storage, and conference/blending room;
 - (b) Construction of a covered outdoor production area approximately 1,270 sq. ft.;
 - (c) Construction of a pump house and utilities enclosure;
 - (d) Removal of approximately 1,300 sq. ft. of existing outdoor production area approved under Minor Modification P07-00553;
 - (e) Removal of 0.25 acres of vineyards;
 - (f) Installation of approximately 2,800 sq. ft. of new landscaping;
 - (g) Upgraded fire turn around;
 - (h) Continuation of existing asphalt driveway along proposed barrel building to replace existing gravel driveway;
 - (i) Proposed 56,000 gallon water tank to be used for domestic and process water;
 - (j) Relocation of existing power lines to accommodate the location of the proposed barrel building; and
 - (k) Two new wells

The project includes a review of the proposed new barrel storage building under the Viewshed Protection Program (Chapter 18.106 of the Napa County Code) to review the visibility of the new construction from County designated Viewshed roads.

The project also includes a request for an exception to the Napa County Road and Streets Standards (RSS). The exception proposes a reduced horizontal curve radius at one existing location, three existing nonstandard turnouts, and nonstandard turnout spacing at two locations as described in the letter from Delta Consulting & Engineering dated May 2, 2014. The road modification request is due to legal constraints (construction outside the existing easement), to avoid grading on steep slopes, and to preserve mature native trees that would otherwise have to be removed. All sections of the common driveway and private driveway not requesting a road exception will meet the Napa County Road and Street Standards. See exception request for additional detail.

The project does not propose any changes in annual production, hours of operation, number of employees, visitation, or marketing. The winery does not have public visitation, visitation by appointment only, or marketing events. The new building will increase storage area for the winery and will make it possible to move barrels and equipment out of the existing production areas.

10. **Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses:**

The 26.61 acre parcel is located on the hillside east of Silverado Trail. The entrance to the common access driveway is approximately 1,300 feet north of the Silverado Trail and Oakville Cross Road intersection.

Existing land uses include a single-family residence, second unit, winery, and vineyards. Approximately 20 acres are planted in vineyard. Approximately one acre of the site is currently developed with the existing structures.

Elevation on the site ranges from approximately 410 feet above mean sea level to approximately 530 feet above mean sea level. The project site is located on gently sloping soil (less than 15%). The property has both Boomer loam and Boomer gravelly loam soil types.

The property is located in the Vinehill Creek and Conn Creek drainages. A blue line stream identified as Vinehill Creek is located more than 350 feet from the northern property line.

The property is currently accessed by an existing common driveway which extends approximately 3,800 feet from the intersection with Silverado Trail. An approximately 800 foot existing private driveway extends from the intersection with the common driveway and leads to the existing winery and residence. The access road utilizes an existing bridge that crosses a portion of Vinehill Creek approximately 850 feet up the common driveway.

Surrounding land uses include rural residential, agriculture, and vineyards. Oakville Ranch Winery is located approximately 2,000 feet or 0.35 miles to the east. The nearest offsite residence is located over 500 feet to the northeast of the proposed barrel building.

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

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

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

None Required.

Other Agencies Contacted

None Required.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

The conclusions and recommendations contained herein are professional opinions derived in accordance with current standards of professional practice. They are based on a review of the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps, the other sources of information listed in the file, and the comments received, conversations with knowledgeable individuals; the preparer's personal knowledge of the area; and, where necessary, a visit to the site. For further information, see the environmental background information contained in the permanent file on this project.

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature Emily Hedge

Date 8/25/15

Name: Emily Hedge, Planner II

Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services
Department

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

Discussion:

Construction of new structures located on any minor or major ridgeline are subject to the County's Viewshed Protection Program when they are visible from scenic roadway candidates identified in the Community Character Element of the Napa County General Plan and/or a designated area under the Viewshed Protection Program (Chapter 18.106 of the Napa County Code) including Silverado Trail, Oakville Crossroad, Highway 29, and Highway 128. The Community Character Element includes a policy that new development projects located within view of a scenic corridor should be subject to site and design review to ensure that such development does not destroy the scenic quality of the corridor. In conformance with this policy, the County's Viewshed Protection Program provides for review of projects in locations such as the project site, and establishes standards that must be met prior to project approval.

Structures are required to be located and/or screened from view such that visual impacts are reduced. Use of existing natural vegetation, new landscaping, topographical siting, architectural design, and colortone are mentioned in the Viewshed Protection Program as viable ways to reduce the visual impact. Either these techniques must be applied to effectively "screen the predominant portion" (defined as 51% or more of viewable areas as it relates to views or screening of structures and benches and shelves from designated roads) of the proposed structures, or the applicant must seek an exception pursuant to County Code Section 18.106.070.

Whether or not an exception is needed, the proposed project cannot be approved unless the County finds it to be in conformance with the Viewshed Protection Program, which is expressly designed to protect the scenic quality of the County and to promote architecture and designs that are compatible with hillside terrain and minimize visual impacts (See County Code Section 18.106.010). For this reason, the project that is ultimately approved for this site must be one which has addressed potentially significant visual impacts, and by definition, such a project -- while noticeable from surrounding areas -- would not substantially degrade scenic views or visual quality pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In addition, prior to the issuance of a building permit, the property owner shall be required to execute and record in the County recorder's office a use restriction, in a form approved by county counsel, requiring building exteriors, and existing and proposed covering vegetation, as well as any equivalent level of replacement vegetation, to be maintained by the owner or the owner's successors so as to maintain conformance with County Code, Section 18.106.050(B).

a-c Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms, geological features, water, trees and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of a beautiful or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken in. As generally described in the **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses** section above, the surrounding land uses include rural residential, agriculture, and vineyards. The nearest offsite residence is located over 500 feet to the northeast portion of the project site.

Although the barrel building site is located on slopes of less than 15%, the proposed structure is located on a ridgeline that is potentially visible from County designated viewshed roads and therefore was reviewed for potential visibility. The project site is currently developed with an existing residence, second unit, vineyards, and a winery structure. The new barrel room building is proposed to the north side of the existing winery building and outdoor production area and to the northeast of the existing residence. The proposed building is potentially visible from Silverado Trail, Oakville Cross Road, Highway 29, and Highway 128 along the western side of the property. From many locations, the new construction will be substantially screened by the existing residence and existing winery building. In order to screen the building and soften the western elevation, new landscaping is proposed along the western side of the proposed barrel storage building. As proposed, new landscaping will include a combination of trees and shrubs, and the existing vineyards on the western portion of the property will remain. With the installation of the landscaping potential views from viewshed roads will be reduced and the project will be substantially screened.

There are no rock outcroppings visible from the road or other designated scenic resources on the property.

- d. The construction of the new barrel storage room will result in the installation of additional lighting. Although the project is in an area that has a certain amount of existing nighttime lighting, the installation of new sources of nighttime lights may affect nighttime views. The winery hours of operations are 8am to 5pm and therefore new lighting associated with the barrel storage room should not impact nighttime views. Pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approval for wineries, outdoor lighting will be required to be shielded and directed downwards, with only low-level lighting allowed in parking areas. As designed, and as subject to the standard condition of approval, below, the project will not have a significant impact resulting from new sources of outside lighting.

All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward, shall be located as low to the ground as possible, shall be the minimum necessary for security, safety, or operations, shall be on timers, and shall incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. No flood-lighting or sodium lighting of the building is permitted, including architectural highlighting and spotting. Low-level lighting shall be utilized in parking areas as opposed to elevated high-intensity light standards. Lighting utilized during harvest activities is not subject to this requirement. Prior to issuance of any building permit pursuant to this approval, two copies of a detailed lighting plan showing the location and specifications for all lighting fixtures to be installed on the property shall be submitted for Planning Division review and approval. All lighting shall comply with California Building Code.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.¹ Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b/e. The property has portions designated Unique Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance. The site of the proposed barrel storage building is designated as Statewide Importance and is currently developed with vineyards. The development of the building will require the removal of approximately 0.25 acres of vineyards.

The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use policies AG/LU-2 and AG/LU-13 recognize wineries, and any use consistent with the Winery Definition Ordinance and clearly accessory to a winery, as agriculture. As a result, this application will not result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use.

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.

The subject parcel is not currently under a Williamson Act contract. There are no other changes included in this proposal that would result in the conversion of Farmland beyond the immediate project site.

c/d. The project site is zoned Agricultural Watershed (AW), which allows wineries upon grant of a use permit. According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps (based on the following layers – Sensitive Biotic Oak Woodlands, Riparian Woodland Forest and Coniferous Forest) the project site does not contain woodland or forested areas. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-c. The project site lies within the Napa Valley, which forms one of the climatologically distinct sub-regions (Napa County Sub region) within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The topographical and meteorological features of the Valley create a relatively high potential for air pollution. On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Board of Directors unanimously adopted thresholds of significance to assist in the review of projects under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The thresholds were designed to establish the level at which the District believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA and were posted on the Air District's website and included in the Air District's May 2011 updated CEQA Guidelines.

On March 5, 2012 the Alameda County Superior Court issued a judgment finding that the Air District had failed to comply with CEQA when it adopted the thresholds. However, on August 31, 2013, the Court of Appeals reinstated the Air District's thresholds of significance provided in Table 3-1 (Criteria Air Pollutants & Precursors Screening Levels Sizes) which are applicable for evaluating projects in Napa County. Furthermore, Air District's 1999 CEQA Guidelines (p.24) states that projects that do not exceed a threshold of 2,000 vehicle trips per day will not impact air quality and do not require further study.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management Plan has determined that light industrial projects or manufacturing that do not exceed a threshold of 541,000 sq. ft. or 992,000 sq. ft., respectively, will not significantly impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2010, page 3-1.). Given the size of the winery would be approximately 9,500 sq. ft., comprised of the existing winery building (2,800 sq. ft.), the new barrel room (5,400 sq. ft.), and the new covered outdoor production area (1,300 sq. ft.), compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 541,000 sq. ft. for light industrial or 992,000 sq. ft. for manufacturing uses, the project would contribute a less-than-insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan.

The Air District's threshold of significance provided in Table 3-1 has determined that light industrial projects or manufacturing facilities that do not exceed a threshold of 541,000 sq. ft. or 992,000 sq. ft., respectively, will not significantly impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2011 Pages 3-2 & 3-3). Given that the size of the winery would be approximately 9,500 square feet compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 541,000 sq. ft. or 992,000 sq. ft., for NOx (oxides of nitrogen) for light industrial or for manufacturing uses, respectively, the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan.

Over the long term, emission sources for the project will continue to consist primarily of mobile sources including vehicle trips associated with the existing residence and second unit and winery employee vehicle trips. According to the Institute of Transportation Engineers, a

single-family home would generate 10 vehicle trips per day, 2-4 total trips during the PM peak (4-6pm). For the existing residence and second unit, this would result in approximately 20 trips per day, with 4-8 occurring during the PM peak. No changes are proposed to the residence or second dwelling as part of this project and residential traffic is not anticipated to increase. The winery trip generation sheet included in the application calculates approximately 10 daily trips associated with the winery. This project does not propose any changes to the amount of production, number of employees, or hours of operation. Winery traffic is not anticipated to increase.

Vehicle trips generated are significantly below BAAQMD's recommended threshold of 2,000 vehicle trips/day for purposes of performing a detailed air quality analysis. Given the relatively small number of vehicle trips generated by this project, compared to the size of the air basin, project related vehicle trips would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan.

There are no projected or existing air quality violations in this area to which this project would contribute, nor would it result in any violations of any applicable air quality standards. As discussed above, the existing vehicle trips associated with the project are well below the thresholds of significance. The proposed project would not increase vehicle trips from the existing levels and would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plan.

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

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

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

Furthermore, while earthmoving and construction on the site will generate dust particulates in the short-term, the impact would be less than significant with dust control measures as specified in Napa County's standard condition of approval relating to dust:

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

- e. While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. Construction-phase pollutants will be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. The project will not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The 26.61 acre parcel includes an existing residence, second dwelling, and winery building. No changes are proposed to the residence or second dwelling/farm labor dwelling as part of this project. Approximately 20 acres out of the 26.61 acres are planted in vineyards. Approximately 0.25 acres of vineyards will be removed and new landscaping, totaling approximately 0.05 acres, will be added. Two 8" oak trees will be removed and minimal vegetation clearing will be completed for modifications to the road and two 10" juniper trees will be removed for improvements to the fire truck turnaround.

a/b. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers - plants CNPS points & polygons, plant surveys, red legged frog core area and critical habitat, vernal pools & vernal pool species, Spotted Owl Habitat – 1.5 mile buffer and known fish presence) no known candidate, sensitive, or special status species have been identified as occurring within the property boundaries. The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any special status species, or species of particular concern. In addition, the site has been previously developed with vineyards, a winery, residence, parking area, and driveway. The project would only require removal of existing vineyards. Furthermore, there are no species or site conditions, which would be considered essential for the support of a species with limited distribution or considered to be a sensitive natural plant community. The potential for this project to have an impact on special status species is less than significant.

c/d. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – water bodies, vernal pools & vernal pool species) there are no wetlands on the property or on neighboring properties that would be affected by this project. The project activities will not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with their corridors or nursery sites, because no sensitive natural communities have been identified on the property. Therefore, the project as proposed would have no impact to biological resources.

e/f. This project would not interfere with any ordinances protecting biological resources. There are no tree preservation ordinances in effect in the County. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans. The project does not conflict with any County ordinance or requirement to preserve existing trees, and therefore is considered as not having potential for a significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No 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"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-c. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology surveys, sensitive areas, and flags) no historical, or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified on the property. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Archaeology sites,) a portion of Archeological Site 150, denoted as an “approximate” location crossed a small portion of the northwest corner of the property. The proposed barrel room is approximately 450 feet from the boundary of the archaeological site. Based on the proposed project plans, there would be no impact to cultural resources. However, if resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval:

“In the event that archeological artifacts or human remains are discovered during any subsequent construction in the project area, work shall cease in a 50-foot radius surrounding the area of discovery. The permittee shall contact the 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.”

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a.
- i.) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.
 - ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
 - iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Compliance with the latest editions of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.
 - iv.) According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) there are no landslide deposits in the proposed barrel storage building site. A small landslide deposit is located on the western property line approximately 550 feet from the proposed barrel storage building site.
- b. The proposed development is minimal and will occur on slopes nearly level to gently sloping soil (5-15%). The proposed barrel storage building site is generally flat. Based upon the Soil Survey of Napa County, prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the soils on site are comprised of a soil type of Boomer loam. A portion of the western property is comprised of Boomer gravelly loam (30-50%). No development is proposed on this portion of the property. The proposed project will require incorporation of best management practices and will be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance, which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable.
- c/d. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Surficial Deposits layer), the property is underlain by Pre-Quaternary deposits and bedrock. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer), the project site has a very low susceptibility for liquefaction on the parcel. Development will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible.
- e. The project has a currently permitted on-site septic system with a design capacity of 1,100 gallons per day. The existing usage, 117 gallons per day of "Domestic" and 950 gallons per day of "Other", is less than the design capacity. The proposed barrel room includes a restroom, lab, work room, and blending/conference room. Waste flow amounts are not anticipated to increase with the new barrel storage room as there will be no increase in production or number of employees. The Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the application and determined that the existing sanitary wastewater system is adequate to serve the facility's septic needs. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b. Overall increases in Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions in Napa County were assessed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the Napa County General Plan Update and certified in June 2008. GHG emissions were found to be significant and unavoidable in that document, despite the adoption of mitigation measures incorporating specific policies and action items into the General Plan.

Consistent with these General Plan action items, Napa County participated in the development of a community-wide GHG emissions inventory and "emission reduction framework" for all local jurisdictions in the County in 2008-2009. This planning effort was completed by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency in December 2009, and served as the basis for development of a refined inventory and emission reduction plan for unincorporated Napa County.

In 2011, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) released California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Project Screening Criteria and Significance of Thresholds [1,100 metric tons per year (MT) of carbon dioxide and carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e)]. This threshold of significance is appropriate for evaluating projects in Napa County.

During our ongoing planning effort, the County requires project applicants to consider methods to reduce GHG emissions consistent with Napa County General Plan Policy **CON-65(e)**. (Note: Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, because this initial study assesses a project that is consistent with an adopted General Plan for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was prepared, it appropriately focuses on impacts which are "peculiar to the project," rather than the cumulative impacts previously assessed.)

The applicant proposes to incorporate GHG reduction methods including: installation of energy conserving lighting and water efficient fixtures, installation of a clay tile cool roof, infrastructure for an electrical vehicle charging station, and utilization of recycled process waste water for irrigation.

GHG Emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the Cal Green Building Code, tightened vehicle fuel efficiency standards, and more project-specific on-site programs including those features noted above would combine to further reduce emissions below BAAQMD thresholds.

The increase in emissions expected as a result of the project will be relatively modest and the project is in compliance with the County's efforts to reduce emissions as described above. For these reasons, project impacts related to GHG emissions are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts normally used in winery operations. A Business Plan will be filed with the Environmental Health Division should the amount of hazardous materials reach reportable levels. However, in the event that the proposed use or a future use involves the use, storage or transportation of greater the 55 gallons or 500 pounds of hazardous materials, a use permit and subsequent environmental assessment would be required in accordance with the Napa County Zoning Ordinance prior to the establishment of the use. During construction of the project some hazardous materials, such as building coatings/ adhesives/ etc., will be utilized. However, given the quantities of hazardous materials and the limited duration, they will result in a less-than-significant impact.
- b. The project would not result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site.
- d. The proposed site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.
- e. The project site is not located within two miles of any public airport.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.
- g. The proposed project will not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan.
- h. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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 wide 25% 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 the County of Napa has not adopted or implemented mandatory water use restrictions. The County requires all Use Permit applicants to complete necessary water analyses in order to document that sufficient water supplies are available for the proposed project.

To better understand groundwater resources, on June 28, 2011 the Board of Supervisors approved creation of a Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee (GRAC). The GRAC's purpose was to assist County staff and technical consultants with recommendations regarding groundwater, including data collection, monitoring, well pump test protocols, management objectives, and community support. The County retained Luhdorff and Scalmanini (LSCE) who completed a county-wide assessment of groundwater resources (Napa County Groundwater Conditions and Groundwater Monitoring Recommendations Report (Feb. 2011); developed a groundwater monitoring program (Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2013 (Jan. 2013) and also completed a 2013 Updated Hydrogeologic Conceptualization and Characterization of Groundwater Conditions (Jan. 2013).

Groundwater Sustainability Objectives were recommended by the GRAC and adopted by the Board of Supervisors which 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 LSCE study 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 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).

At the May 12, 2015 Board of Supervisors meeting, the Public Works Director presented an update the Water Availability Analysis (WAA) based on the input of the GRAC, public comment, and Planning Commission input.

A Water Availability Analysis is required for any discretionary project that may utilize groundwater or will increase the intensity of groundwater use of any parcel through an existing, improved, or new water supply system (Napa County Groundwater Conservation Ordinance, Section 13.15.010).

The revised three tiered WAA approach is as follows:

Tier 1: Water Usage Volumes: The WAA includes a section for evaluating proposed water usage (volume) and thresholds for acceptable use. These yearly thresholds are 1.0 acre-ft. allowed/acre of land on the valley floor 0.3 acre ft. allowed/acre of land in the MST. A parcel-specific analysis for hillside parcels and other “non-Napa Valley areas” is required. The parcel-specific analysis requires an applicant to identify existing and planned water uses on the parcel, and to then calculate and compare the planned usage to the parcel's recharge characteristics.

Tier 2: Well to Well Interference:

The basic steps of the new Tier 2 “well to well” interference analysis are as follows:

- Step 1: If project well is >500 feet away from other wells; no further analysis is required (Note: The well to be used for the project (“project well”) could be an existing or new well);
- Step 2: If the well does not meet the distance standard under Step 1, determine appropriate location of well (or adequacy of existing well) following further analysis of the site specific conditions such as: distance to the nearest well Hydrogeological setting, operational procedures and well construction details (i.e. design pump rates, depth, screen and seal depths).

The Tier 2 analysis also provides guidance for how to analyze potential impacts on springs that are in use and are located near the project site.

Tier 3: Groundwater/Surface Water Interaction: Required only when substantial evidence in the record indicates the need to do so.

- a. The proposed project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project does not include any modification to the existing wastewater system. The Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the application and determined that the existing sanitary wastewater system is adequate to serve the facility's septic needs. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality. Any earth disturbing activities will be subject to the County's Stormwater Ordinance which would include measures to prevent erosion, sediment, and waste materials from entering waterways both during and after any construction activities. Given the County's Best Management Practices, which comply with RWQCB requirements, the project does not have the potential to significantly impact water quality and discharge standards.
- b. For this project a Water Availability Analysis was prepared by Delta Consulting and Engineering. The analysis, dated August 24, 2015, includes a Tier 1 analysis detailing the existing and proposed groundwater uses and an analysis of the aquifer recharge rate as well as a Tier 2. The project site currently contains three wells and four 10,000 gallon storage tanks which supply water for the winery, the main residence, the second dwelling unit, vineyard irrigation, and vineyard heat protection.

Although the winery is currently only producing 5,000 gallons per year, the report provides a conservative analysis and calculates the water usage associated with wine production at the full permitted production capacity of 20,000 gallons per year.

Tier 1 Analysis

As demonstrated in the tables below, the project will result in a minor decrease in overall water use (0.03 acre-feet per year) due to the removal of approximately 0.25 acres of vineyards required for construction of the proposed barrel storage building. Although approximately 0.05 acres of new landscaping will be installed for screening, the water usage associated with the new landscaping is less than the water usage for the vineyard. No changes are proposed to amount of production or number of employees and no water usage increase associated with the barrel building is anticipated.

Existing Water Usage		
Residential		Acre-feet per year
Main residence	0.500	AF per Year
Second Dwelling	0.200	AF per Year
Winery		
Process Water	0.430	AF per Year
Domestic Water	0.100	AF per Year
Employees	0.037	AF per Year
Vineyard Irrigation	5.250	AF per Year
Vineyard Heat Protection	0.050	AF per Year
Total Water Usage	6.567	AF per Year

Proposed Water Usage		
Residential		
Main residence	0.500	AF per Year
Second Dwelling	0.200	AF per Year
Winery		
Process Water	0.430	AF per Year
Domestic Water	0.100	AF per Year
Employees	0.037	AF per Year
Vineyard Irrigation	5.188	AF per Year
Vineyard Heat Protection	0.050	AF per Year
Landscaping	0.030	AF per Year
Total Water Usage	6.534	AF per Year

Proposed Decrease in Water Usage		
Existing Water Usage	6.567	AF per Year
Proposed Water Usage	6.534	AF per Year
Expected Water Usage Decrease	-0.032	AF per Year

As part of the improvements for the proposed barrel storage building, the winery is required to install a new water tank for fire protection (sprinkler and hydrant) water storage. With the new proposed 56,000 gallon water tank, the applicant has applied to the County for two additional wells. The two new wells will assist in replenishing the new fire water tank and also allow flexibility in meeting the winery water demand during the peak irrigation and/or production periods.

The report calculated the aquifer recharge rates based on local precipitation, soil permeability, and the land gradient. Based on the analysis of these factors, the site-specific aquifer recharge potential is estimated at 6.84 acre-feet. The estimated annual proposed water use for the parcel is 6.53 acre-feet, approximately 0.31 acre-feet less than the recharge rate. The estimated water use on this parcel is less than the applicable water use criteria of ground water recharge and therefore the Tier 1 Water Criterion is met.

Tier 2 Analysis

The applicant reviewed County Environmental Health Division well records for adjacent properties and provided evidence that there are no other wells within 500 feet of the project wells and proposed new wells.

The report concludes that based on the analysis completed, the existing winery and proposed barrel room development meets both Tier 1 and Tier 2 Criteria and is therefore in compliance with the requirements of the WAA. Based on the evidence provided, the project will have a less than significant impact on groundwater supply and recharge rates. However, due to the small difference between the calculated aquifer recharge rate and the proposed water usage, staff will apply a condition requiring groundwater monitoring in order to develop a record of groundwater conditions at the project site over time, to enable an evaluation of groundwater levels associated with the project, and to allow for further analysis of water usage if deemed necessary by County staff.

- c-e. The project proposal will not substantially alter any drainage patterns on site or cause an increase in erosion on or off site. The project would be required to incorporate an erosion control plan to manage onsite surface drainage and erosion of onsite soils during construction and winter months (October to April). By incorporating a Standard Measures erosion control plan, this project would have a less than significant impact on drainage and siltation. There are no existing or planned stormwater systems that would be affected by this project.

- f. There is nothing included in this proposal that would otherwise substantially degrade water quality. As discussed above, the Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the application and determined that the existing sanitary wastewater system is adequate to serve the facility's septic needs. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality.
- g-i. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Floodplain and Dam Levee Inundation* layers), the project site is not located within a flood hazard area, nor would it impede or redirect flood flows or expose structures or people to flooding. The project site is not located within a dam or levee failure inundation zone.
- j. In coming years, higher global temperatures are expected to raise sea level by expanding ocean water, melting mountain glaciers and small ice caps, and causing portions of Greenland and the Antarctic ice sheets to melt. The Intergovernmental panel on Climate change estimates that the global average sea level will rise between 0.6 and 2 feet over the next century (IPCC, 2007). However, the project area is located, at its lowest point, at approximately 410 feet above mean sea level. There is no known history of mud flow in the vicinity. The project will not subject people or structures to a significant risk of inundation by tsunamis, seiche, or mudflows.

Mitigation Measures: None.

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

Discussion:

- a. The existing winery is located in an area dominated by agricultural, open space and rural residences. The proposed improvements are in support of the ongoing agricultural use in the area. This project will not divide an established community.
- b. The subject parcel is located in the AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district, which allow wineries and uses accessory to wineries subject to use permit approval. The proposed project is compliant with the physical limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance. The County has adopted the Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO) to protect agriculture and open space and to regulate winery development and expansion in a manner that avoids potential negative environmental effects.

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

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

The General Plan includes two complimentary policies requiring wineries to be designed generally of a high architectural quality for the site and its surroundings. The proposed winery will convey the required permanence and improving the buildings overall attractiveness. There are no applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the property.

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b. Historically, the two most valuable mineral commodities in Napa County in economic terms have been mercury and mineral water. More recently, building stone and aggregate have become economically valuable. Mines and Mineral Deposits mapping included in the Napa County Baseline Data Report (*Mines and Mineral Deposits*, BDR Figure 2-2) indicates that there are no known mineral resources nor any locally important mineral resource recovery sites located on or near the project site.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII.	NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. The project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during limited project construction. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. The project would not result in potentially significant temporary construction noise impacts or operational impacts. Given the proximity to the neighbors, the closest of which is located over 500 feet to the northeast, there is a relatively low potential for impacts related to construction noise to result in a significant impact. Furthermore, construction activities would generally occur during the period of 7am-7pm on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity. All construction activities will be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). The proposed project will not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts. Conditions of approval would require construction activities to be limited to daylight hours, vehicles to be muffled, and backup alarms adjusted to the lowest allowable levels.

c/d. Noise from winery operations is generally limited and the winery does not have public visitation or marketing events. The Napa County Noise Ordinance, which was adopted in 1984, sets the maximum permissible received sound level for a rural residence as 45 db between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. While the 45 db limitation is strict (45 db is roughly equivalent to the sound generated by a quiet conversation), the area surrounding the subject property features primarily large hillside properties containing vineyards, rural residences. The nearest residence is located over 500 feet to the northeast.

e/f. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a. The Association of Bay Area Governments' *Projections 2003* figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase some 23% by the year 2030 (*Napa County Baseline Data Report*, November 30, 2005). Additionally, the County's *Baseline Data Report* indicates that total housing units currently programmed in county and municipal housing elements exceed ABAG growth projections by approximately 15%. Four employees were authorized under the Small Winery Use Permit Exemption approved June 10, 1985. Employee numbers were not increased under any subsequent modifications and are not requested to changes with this project. The project will be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs.

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

b/c. This application will not displace a substantial volume of existing housing or a substantial number of people and will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a/b. The project would not significantly increase the use of recreational facilities, nor does the project include recreational facilities that may have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b. The property includes an existing residence, second dwelling, and winery building. The property is currently accessed by an existing common driveway which extends approximately 3,800 feet from the intersection with Silverado Trail. An approximately 800 foot existing private driveway extends from the intersection with the common driveway and leads to the existing winery and residence.

Vehicle trips associated with the existing residence and second unit and winery employees are not anticipated to change or increase. According to the Institute of Transportation Engineers, a single-family home would generate 10 vehicle trips per day, 2-4 total trips during the P.M. peak traffic period (4-6 P.M.). For the existing residence and second unit, this would result in approximately 20 trips per day, with 4-8 occurring during the P.M. peak traffic period. No changes are proposed to the residence or second dwelling as part of this project and residential traffic is not anticipated to increase. The winery trip generation sheet included in the application calculates approximately 10 daily trips, including 3 during the P.M. peak. This project does not propose any changes to the amount of production, number of employees, or hours of operation. Winery traffic is not anticipated to increase.

c. This proposed project would not result in any change to air traffic patterns.

d-e. The proposal also includes a request for an exception to the Napa County Road and Streets Standards (RSS), submitted to the Engineering Services Division. The exception proposes a reduced horizontal curve radius at existing location, three existing nonstandard turnouts, and nonstandard turnout spacing at two locations as described in the letter from Delta Consulting & Engineering dated May 2, 2014. The road modification request is due to legal constraints (construction outside the existing easement), to avoid grading on steep slopes, and to preserve mature native trees that would otherwise have to be removed. See exception request for additional detail. All sections of the common driveway and private driveway not requesting a road exception will meet the Napa County Road and Street Standards. The project would result in no significant off-site circulation system operational impacts or any sight line impacts at the proposed project driveway.

To grant an exception to the RSS, the Planning Commission must find that the alternative design meets the same overall practical effect as a project that complies with the standards. As proposed, the Engineering Services Division and Fire Marshal recommend that the design meets the same overall practical effect and support approval of the request subject to the conditions of approval provided in their memorandum dated August 13, 2015.

- f. The winery has 6 existing parking spaces. No additional parking spaces are proposed. The project will maintain adequate parking.
- g. There is no aspect of this proposed project that would conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and will not result in a significant impact.
- b. The project will not require construction of any new water treatment facilities that will result in a significant impact to the environment. Water will be provided through an existing well. Wastewater is processed with an existing on-site septic system.
- c. The project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, which will cause a significant impact to the environment.
- d. As discussed in Section IX. Hydrology and Water Quality, a Water Availability Analysis was prepared by Delta Consulting and Engineering. The analysis, dated August 24, 2015, includes a Tier 1 and a Tier 2 analysis. The project site currently contains three wells and four 10,000 gallon storage tanks which supply water for the winery, the main residence, the second dwelling unit, vineyard irrigation, and vineyard heat protection. The applicant has applied to the County for two additional wells to assist in replenishing the new fire water tank and also allow flexibility in meeting the winery water demand during the peak irrigation and/or production periods.

Due to the removal of approximately 0.25 acres of vineyards required for construction of the proposed barrel storage building the project will result in a minor decrease in overall water use (0.032 acre-feet per year) from the existing water usage of 6.567 acre-feet per year to the proposed water usage of 6.534 acre-feet per year. Although approximately 0.05 acres of new landscaping will be installed for screening, the water usage associated with the new landscaping is less than the water usage for the vineyard. The report calculated the aquifer recharge rate at an estimated 6.84 acre-feet per year, which is slightly higher than the estimated proposed water usage of 6.534 acre-feet per year. No changes are proposed to amount of production or number of employees and no water usage increase associated with the barrel building is anticipated.

The report concludes that based on the analysis completed, the existing winery and proposed barrel room development meets both Tier 1 and Tier 2 Criteria and is therefore in compliance with the requirements of the WAA. Based on the evidence provided, the project will have a less than significant impact on groundwater supply and recharge rates and the parcel will have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project.

- e. Wastewater will be treated on-site and will not require a wastewater treatment provider.
- f. The project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the projects demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the project.
- g. The project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. The project site has previously been disturbed and does not contain any known listed plant or animal species. The project as proposed will not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. No historic or prehistoric resources are anticipated to be affected by the proposed project nor will the proposed project eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
- b. The project includes bringing an existing winery under a use permit and approving the addition of a new barrel room and outdoor covered area. The project does not propose new development that would have a significant impact on the environment or substantially change the existing conditions. With the imposition of standard and project specific conditions of approval, the project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- c. There are no environmental effects caused by this project that would result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, whether directly or indirectly. No hazardous conditions resulting from this project have been identified. The project would not have any environmental effects that would result in significant impacts.

Mitigation Measures: None Required.