

# 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:** Summers Winery, Use Permit Major Modification P14-00232-MOD and Variance P14-00233-VAR
2. **Property Owner:** Jim and Beth Summers, 1171 Tubbs Lane, Calistoga, CA 94515.
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number, and Email:** Emily Hedge; (707) 259-8227; [emily.hedge@countyofnapa.org](mailto:emily.hedge@countyofnapa.org)
4. **Project Location and APN:** The project is located on a 25.3 acre parcel on the north side of Tubbs Lane, approximately 0.25 of a mile east from the intersection with Highway 128. The project is within the AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning district; 1171 Tubbs Lane, Calistoga, CA 94515; APN: 017-160-015.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Jeff Redding, Land Use Planning Services, 2423 Renfrew Street, Napa, 94559.
6. **General Plan Description:** Agricultural Resource (AR) Designation.
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Preserve (AP) District.
8. **Background/Project History:** The 25.3 acre parcel includes an existing winery building, covered crush pad, parking lot, single-family residence which has been illegally converted for use as a tasting room, outdoor patio, bocce ball court, and vineyards. Approximately 21 acres are planted in vineyard and approximately one acre of the site is currently developed with the existing structures and improvements.

**November 2, 1983 – Use Permit #U-238384** was approved to permit a 20,000 gallon per year winery with no public tours or tastings.

**September 18, 1985 – Use Permit #U-108586** was approved to expand the existing winery with an approximately 1,600 square foot addition for wine storage.

**March 5, 1997 – Use Permit #96408-UP** was approved to increase production capacity to 50,000 gallons per year; an increase in the size of the winery building from approximately 2,100 square feet to 5,850 square feet, including converting approximately 530 square feet into a tasting room; increase crush pad from 960 square feet to 2,400 square feet; increase parking from five to twenty spaces; increase employees from zero to two full time and two part time; and add retail sales of wine produced on the property, private tours and tastings by prior appointment, and limited marketing activities (eight food and wine tastings per year by private invitation only for not more than 30 guests per event).

**May 20, 2003 – Use Permit Modification #03075-MOD** was approved to allow for the construction of an approximately 950 square foot cover for an existing crush pad, window replacements, and two off-site directional signs located within Tubbs Lane right-of-way.

**November 14, 2013 – Very Minor Modification P13-00397-VMM** application to allow for retail sale of wine related merchandise in compliance with Napa County Code Section 18.20.30.J.4 and to allow on premises consumption of the wines produced on-site, consistent with Business and Professionals Code Sections 23356, 23390, and 23396.5 also known as AB 2004 (Evans 2008, or the Picnic Bill). The request for this modification has been closed due to Code Enforcement case CE13-00255 which opened shortly after this modification was submitted. The applicant decided to process the requests of the Very Minor Modification with the Major Modification that would be used to correct the Code Enforcement violation.

**CE13-00255 – Code Enforcement** for conversion of a residence to a commercial use and utilizing the former residence as a tasting room as well as converting the approved tasting room into production space. No building permits were obtained for the conversion work. This violation is active, but is undergoing corrective measures through this Major Modification P14-00232.

9. **Description of Project:** Approval of a Use Permit Major Modification to allow the following activities:
- (a) Recognize the conversion of the existing 2,350 square foot residence to a tasting room;
  - (b) Recognize the conversion of the existing 530 square foot tasting room within the winery into a storage room;
  - (c) Expand the visitation program from maximum tours and tastings of 12 person per day to 20 persons per day;
  - (d) Increase wine production from 50,000 to 100,000 gallons;
  - (e) Construct a new 5,400 square foot covered tank farm;
  - (f) On-premise consumption of the wines produced on-site, consistent with Business and Professionals Code Sections 23356, 23390, and 23396.5 also known as AB 2004 (Evans 2008, or the Picnic Bill) in the tasting room and on the adjacent patio;
  - (g) Deletion of condition #10 of use permit #96408-UP that prohibits outside social activities;
  - (h) Allow the sale of wine related merchandise in compliance with Napa County Code Section 18.20.30.J.4;
  - (i) Update fire suppression facilities and install two additional 21,000 gallon water storage tanks and pump;
  - (j) Install new domestic and process wastewater treatment and disposal with authorization for the use of a hold and haul system during the construction transition period and very extended wet weather periods;
  - (k) Install storm water detention and conveyance facilities;
  - (l) Increase the number of on-site parking spaces to 15;
  - (m) Realign the existing parking and landscaped areas;
  - (n) Add one loading dock; and
  - (o) Architectural modifications the existing residential structure.

The project also includes an application for a variance to allow the construction of the covered tank farm within the required 600 foot winery setback from Tubbs Lane (arterial county road). The covered tank farm is proposed approximately 327 feet from the centerline of Tubbs Lane. As viewed from Tubbs Lane the tank farm is located approximately 145 feet behind the existing winery building, which was approved and built prior to adoption of the Winery Definition Ordinance. Conversion of the residence, which existing prior to the adoption of the Winery Definition Ordinance, is not subject to the 600 foot road setback (Napa County Code Section 18.104.230.C).

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

The 25.3 acre parcel is located on the valley floor, less than half a mile north of the City of Calistoga. The property is on the north side of Tubbs Lane, approximately 0.25 of a mile north from the intersection with Highway 128. The property is currently accessed by a driveway off of Tubbs Lane.

Existing land uses include a winery building, covered crush pad, parking lot, former single-family residence which has been illegally converted for use as a tasting room, outdoor patio, bocce ball court, and vineyards. Approximately 21 acres are planted in vineyard and approximately one acre of the site is currently developed with the existing structures and improvements.

Elevation on the site ranges from approximately 395 feet above mean sea level to approximately to 410 feet above mean sea level. The project site is located on gently sloping soil (less than 5%). The property has Bale loam soil with zero to two percent slopes.

The property is located in the Blossom Creek drainage. The closest portion of Blossom Creek is located approximately 200 feet southwest from the corner of the property and more than 1,500 feet southwest from the closest part of the existing winery building.

Surrounding land uses include rural residential, agriculture, vineyards, and wineries. Surrounding wineries include Envy Wines, located across Tubbs Lane, Tamber Bey Vineyards, located approximately 900 feet north on Tubbs Lane, and the approved Coquerel Family Winery, located northwest of the property off of Highway 128. The nearest offsite residence is located across Tubbs Lane, approximately 450 feet southeast of the existing winery 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.

*Emily Hedge*

Signature

*October 27, 2015*

Date

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. <b>AESTHETICS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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, vineyards, and wineries. The nearest offsite residence is located approximately 450 feet south of the project site.

a-c. The proposed project would not be located in an area which would damage any known scenic vista, or damage scenic resources, trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings. The project includes an application for a variance to allow the construction of the covered tank farm within the required 600 foot winery setback from Tubbs Lane (arterial county road). The covered tank farm is proposed approximately 327 feet from the centerline of Tubbs Lane. As viewed from Tubbs Lane, the covered tank farm would be approximately 145 feet behind the existing winery building, which was approved and built prior to adoption of the Winery Definition Ordinance. Architectural modifications to the existing residence would raise the roofline, but would not change the building footprint or move the structure any closer to the road frontage.

The tank farm is consistent with agricultural and winery use development on adjacent properties. Although the proposed covered tank farm and modifications to the existing residence would be visible from Tubbs Lane and portions of State Highway 128, the project is not located on slopes greater than 15 percent or on a ridgeline and therefore is not subject to the County's Viewshed Projection Program.

d. The covered tank farm will create a new source of nighttime lighting. The tank farm lighting will be located under the canopy and directed downward to reduce visibility from adjacent properties. The winery hours of operations are 10am to 5pm and therefore new lighting associated with the converted tasting room should not impact nighttime views.

Although the project is in an area that has a certain amount of existing nighttime lighting, the installation of new sources of lights, if they were to remain on past daylight hours, may affect 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 (2) copies of a detailed lighting plan showing the location and specifications for all lighting fixtures to be installed on the property shall be submitted for Planning Division review and approval. All lighting shall comply with the California Building Code.*

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. <b>AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.</b> <sup>1</sup> 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 is designated Prime Farmland (based on GIS layer Department of Conservation Farmlands 2012). The property is currently planted with 21.3 acres of vineyards and approximately 1.0 acre developed with the existing residence and winery building. The construction of the covered tank farm requires the removal of approximately 0.7 acres of vineyards. The conversion of the residence to a hospitality area would not result in any removal 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. Therefore, this application will not result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use.

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 Preserve (AP), 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.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

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 14,200 sq. ft., comprised of the existing winery building and covered crush pad (6,500 sq. ft.), the new covered tank farm (5,400 sq. ft.), and the converted tasting room (2,300 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 14,200 sq. ft. 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.

The winery trip generation sheet included in the application calculates the existing conditions at approximately 20 total weekday daily trips with 7 PM peak trips. The sheet calculates the trips associated with the proposed winery modifications at approximately 23 daily weekday trips with 8 PM peak trips associated with the proposed modifications to the winery. This represents an addition of 3 daily weekday trips and one additional PM peak trip over the existing trips. The proposed project would generate approximately 19 daily trips and 9 PM peak trips on a typical Saturday. This represents an additional 2 daily trips and 1 PM peak trip on a typical Saturday.

The applicant submitted a Traffic Impact Report prepared by Crane Transportation Group, dated December 19, 2014, which analyzes existing and proposed traffic conditions. The report included more detailed data that determined that the proposed project would result in one (1) to two (2) more visitor vehicles accessing the project site per day on a weekday, with three (3) additional visitor vehicles accessing the project site per day on a weekend day. The project will result in, at most, one (1) outbound trip during harvest Friday PM peak traffic hour along Tubbs Lane, with, at most, one (1) inbound or one (1) outbound trip during the harvest Saturday PM peak traffic hour.

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 significantly 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:

*During all construction activities the permittee shall comply with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Basic Best Management Practices, 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 when average wind speeds exceed 20 mph.*

- 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. <b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 25.3 acre parcel includes an existing residence and winery building. The project proposes the construction of a covered tank farm and recognition of the conversion of the existing residence to a tasting room. Approximately 21.3 acres are planted in vineyards. Approximately 0.7 acres of vineyards will be removed for construction of the tank farm.

a/b. The entire site has been developed with a winery building, covered crush pad, parking lot, single-family residence (illegally converted for use as a tasting room), outdoor patio, bocce ball court, and vineyards. Little to no natural habitat remains; therefore it is unlikely that any special status species are present. The proposed improvements will occur in areas previously disturbed and developed and will not require the removal of any native vegetation.

Review of the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Natural Diversity Database (F&G) and Spotted Owl Habitat), shows that Burke's goldfields is located in the area surrounding the property, saline clover has the potential to be located on the property frontage along Tubbs Lane, and the southwestern portion of the property, expanding south into the hillside, has potential as Spotted Owl Habitat. As stated above, the entire property is currently planted with vineyards or developed with the residence and the winery structures, and possesses little to no native vegetation or habitat for special status species. Furthermore, the only vegetation removal will be approximately 0.7 acres of vineyards in the location of the proposed covered tank farm. Therefore there are no 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 – wetlands (NWI), wetlands & vernal pools) 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. <b>CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 – Archaeology sites), four sites denoted as an “approximate” archeological site, cross portions of the property. The Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Historical sites, Historical Sites – Lines, Archaeology layers – flags, sensitive areas) no historical or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified on the property. In 1997 an archaeological survey was completed for a 150 foot by 200 foot building envelope and proposed underground power line. No archaeological resources were discovered within the survey boundaries.

The proposed covered tank farm is located on an area that has previously been disturbed with the planting of vineyards; therefore it is unlikely that cultural resources would be present at the proposed site. 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 construction, work shall cease in a 50-foot radius surrounding the area of discovery. The permittee shall contact the PBES 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. <b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a.
- i.) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed 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. The residence will be remodeled to come into compliance with current building codes.
  - iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Liquefaction layer) the property is in an area generally subject to a "high" tendency to liquefy. All proposed construction and remodel work will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction. Compliance with the latest editions of the California Building Code for seismic stability would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible, resulting in 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 covered tank farm location.
- b. The proposed development will occur on slopes nearly level to gently sloping soil (less than 5%). 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 bale loam (0 to 2 percent slopes). 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 and Geology layers), the property is underlain by Quaternary surficial deposits and Holocene alluvium deposits. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer), the property is in an area generally subject to a "high" tendency to liquefy. All proposed construction and remodel work will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction. Compliance with the latest editions of the California Building Code for seismic stability would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible, resulting in less than significant impacts.

- e. The property currently has a 1,500 gallon septic tank for the residence and an existing process wastewater system for the winery that consists of four 1,500 gallon septic tanks and an 800 gallon pump tank. RSA+ prepared a winery wastewater feasibility report, dated June 27, 2014, for the proposed utilization of a sub-surface drip system for treating the domestic wastewater and a surface drip irrigation system to treat the winery process wastewater. A hold and haul system may be installed during the transition period from the existing system or for emergency situations.

The site currently has an estimated usage of 140 gallons per day of "domestic" waste and 1,250 gallons per day of "other" waste (winery process). As a result of the project the site has an estimated usage of 480 gallons per day of "domestic" waste and 2,500 gallons per day of "other" waste. The winery domestic wastewater system has been sized to accommodate the unit values for the number of visitors and employees presented in the Use Permit application and is designed for a capacity of 600 gallons per day. The report demonstrates that enough dispersion area is available making a sub-surface drip system a feasible option for treating the domestic wastewater and that it is feasible to treat the winery process wastewater using a drip irrigation system. The designs proposed in the report meet the Napa County Environmental Health Division's design standards for the treatment of winery and domestic wastewater. The Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the application and determined that the proposed wastewater systems are 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
<b>VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Generate a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions in excess of applicable thresholds adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District or the California Air Resources Board which may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with a county-adopted climate action plan or another applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

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

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

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

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

The applicant proposes to incorporate GHG reduction methods including: pre-plumbing the roof of the covered tank farm for installation of photovoltaics, planting of water efficient landscaping, and utilization of recycled process waste water for irrigation. Remodel work required for the conversion of the residence to the tasting room will be required to meet current Cal Green Building Code. The applicant currently utilizes energy conserving lighting in the winery building and has bike parking.

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
<b>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.	<b>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b> Would the project:				
	a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	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 study, by Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE), emphasized developing a sound understanding of groundwater conditions and implementing an expanded groundwater monitoring and data management program as a foundation for integrated water resources planning and dissemination of water resources information. The 2011 baseline study by LSCE, which included over 600 wells and data going back over 50 years, concluded that "the groundwater levels in Napa County are stable, except for portions of the MST district". Most wells elsewhere within the Napa Valley Floor with a sufficient record indicate that groundwater levels are more affected by climatic conditions, are within historical levels, and seem to recover from dry periods during subsequent wet or normal periods. The LSCE Study also concluded that, on a regional scale, there appear to be no current groundwater quality issues except north of Calistoga (mostly naturally occurring boron and trace metals) and in the Carneros region (mostly salinity). LSCE prepared the 2014 Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report, presented to the Napa County Board of Supervisors on March 3, 2015, which clearly states that, based on the network of monitored groundwater level in the area, the groundwater levels in the area south of Calistoga are stable, even in context of the current drought. However, it should be noted that the subject property is located on the Napa Valley Floor north of the Calistoga area.

Minimum thresholds for water use have been established by the Napa County Department of Public Works, using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS), the GRAC recommendations, and the LSCE reports. These reports are the result of water resources investigations performed by the USGS in cooperation with the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District and LSCE. LSCE concluded that the 1.0 acre-ft./acre criteria on the Valley Floor have proven to be both scientifically and operationally adequate.

- a. The proposed project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. RSA+ prepared a winery wastewater feasibility report, dated June 27, 2014, for the proposed utilization of a sub-surface drip system for treating the domestic wastewater and a surface drip irrigation system to treat the winery process wastewater. The report demonstrates that enough dispersion area is available, making a sub-surface drip system a feasible option for treating the domestic wastewater, and that it is feasible to treat the winery process wastewater using a drip irrigation system. The project proposes two 10,000 gallon tanks to store treated process wastewater. A hold and haul system may be installed during the transition period from the existing system.

The designs proposed in the report meet the Napa County Environmental Health Division's design standards for the treatment of winery and domestic wastewater. The Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the application and determined that the proposed wastewater systems are adequate to serve the facility's septic needs. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality, specifically, naturally occurring boron and trace metals.

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.

In order to comply with the California Safe Drinking Water Act and related laws, the Environmental Health Division is requiring installation of a non-community water system. The applicant will be required to drill a new well meeting the construction standards of Title 22 California Code of Regulations. Installation of a water system will ensure that public health and safety is maintained and the project will have a less than significant impact on water quality standards.

- b. According to the Water Availability Analysis (WAA) Tier One submitted with the application, based on the parcel size of 25.3 acres with a parcel Location Factor of 1.0 acre feet per acre per year (Valley Floor) the site would have an Allowable Water Allotment of 25.3 acre feet per year.

RSA+ prepared a Water Demand Analysis, dated September 17, 2014, detailing the existing and proposed ground water uses. According to the analysis, there will be an overall reduction in annual water demand from 3.9 million gallons per year (12 acre feet per year) to 3.5

million gallons per year (10.8 acre feet per year). Reductions in demand are due to reuse of treated process wastewater for vineyard irrigation and removal of vineyards required for the construction of the covered tank farm. The anticipated usage of 10.8 acre feet per year is below the estimated Allowable Water Allotment of 25.3 acres.

Use	Existing (Gallons per Year)	Existing (Acre feet per Year)	Proposed (Gallons per Year)	Proposed (Acre feet per Year)
Landscaping	114,000	0.3	131,000	0.4
Domestic - Existing: - Residence - Winery employees - Winery visitation	64,000 [43,800] [11,970] [7,770]	0.2		
Domestic – Proposed: - Winery employees - Winery visitation	_____	_____	24,000 [11,970] [12,150]	0.1
Winery Process Water	250,000	0.8	500,000	1.5
Vineyard	3,490,000	10.7	3,360,000	10.3
Vineyard Irrigation with treated process wastewater	0	0	- 500,000	- 1.53
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,918,000</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3,515,000</b>	<b>10.8</b>

The project site currently contains four wells and one 6,000 gallon storage tank which supply water for the winery and residence. The project proposes installation of two additional 21,000 gallon water storage tanks for fire protection.

Based on the anticipated reduction in water usage, the project is not expected to substantially deplete local groundwater supplies.

- 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 installation of a water system is required to comply with the California Safe Drinking Water Act and related laws. The division reviewed the proposed sanitary wastewater system and determined that it 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* layer), the project site is not located within a flood hazard area. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Dam Levee Inundation* layer), the project site is located within the Kimball Dam overflow pond inundation area. If the overflow pond were to fail, all employees and visitors would have to be evacuated to an area of refuge. No housing is proposed as part of this project since the applicant is requesting recognition of the conversion of the residence to hospitality use for the winery.
- j. In coming years, higher global temperatures are expected to raise sea level by expanding ocean water, melting mountain glaciers and small ice caps, and causing portions of Greenland and the Antarctic ice sheets to melt. The Intergovernmental panel on Climate change estimates that the global average sea level will rise between 0.6 and 2 feet over the next century (IPCC, 2007). However, the project area is located, at approximately 400 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:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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, rural residences, and wineries. The proposed improvements are in support of the ongoing agricultural use in the area. This project will not divide an established community.
- b/c. The subject parcel is located in the AP (Agricultural Preserve) 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 recognize 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. There are no applicable 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. <b>NOISE.</b> Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 residential neighbors, the closest of which is approximately 450 feet to the south, 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. 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 primarily features properties containing vineyards, rural residences, and wineries. Given the proximity to the residential neighbors, the closest of which is approximately 450 feet to the south, there is a relatively low potential for impacts related to noise to result in a significant impact.
- 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. <b>POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b> Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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%. Two full-time and two part-time were approved under Use Permit #96408-UP. The project does not include an increase in employees. 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. The existing residence is not currently being used as a residence; therefore the conversion to the tasting room will not displace people.

**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 Marshal 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. <b>RECREATION.</b> Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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. <b>TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</b> Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system and/or conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-16, which seeks to maintain an adequate Level of Service (LOS) at signalized and unsignalized intersections, or reduce the effectiveness of existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-23, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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:

The property includes an existing winery and appurtenant development and a residence that has been converted to a tasting room. The project proposes an increase in visitation from 12 persons per day to 20 persons per day, an increase in wine production from 50,000 to 100,000 gallons, construction of the covered tank farm, and recognition of the conversion of the residence to tasting room. The project does not propose an increase in the number of employees or the number of marketing events. Following this modification vehicle trips associated with project will consist of winery visitation, winery operation, and employee vehicle trips.

a/b. The applicant submitted a Traffic Impact Report prepared by Crane Transportation Group, dated December 19, 2014, which analyzes existing and proposed traffic conditions for: Roadway Segment Level of Service; Intersection Level of Service; and Signalization Needs. The Traffic Impact Report noted that in the project area evaluated for the study, during the 2014 harvest conditions, all segments of Tubbs Lane, S.R. 128, and S.R. 29 were operating at acceptable levels of service during Friday and Saturday PM peak traffic conditions. In addition, the S.R. 128/Tubbs Lane and S.R. 29/Tubbs Lane intersections were also operating at acceptable levels of service during these same time periods. However, peak hour volumes at the S.R. 128/Tubbs Lane intersection currently exceed rural peak hour signal warrant criteria levels during both the Friday and Saturday peak traffic hours, while volumes at the S.R. 29/Tubbs Lane intersection currently exceed rural warrant criteria levels during the Friday PM peak traffic hour (Federal Highway Administration 2012 Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), Section 4C). The report utilized the following criteria for analyzing project impacts regarding Intersection Level of Service: If "Without Project" volumes at an unsignalized intersection already meet peak hour signal warrant criteria levels and the level of service is already at an unacceptable level, an increase in traffic of one (1) percent or more due to the project is considered significant and would require mitigation.

The report determined that the proposed project would result in one (1) to two (2) more visitor vehicles accessing the project site per day on a weekday, with three (3) additional visitor vehicles accessing the project site per day on a weekend day. The project will result in, at most, one (1) outbound trip during harvest Friday PM peak traffic hour along Tubbs Lane, with, at most, one (1) inbound or one (1) outbound trip during the harvest Saturday PM peak traffic hour. It was anticipated that the near term horizon (year 2015), circulation system operating conditions during harvest would be similar to 2014 conditions.

For Year 2015 Impacts "Roadway Segment Level of Service" the report determined that project traffic would not produce a significant impact to roadway segment level of service and that all evaluated roadway segments would maintain acceptable LOS B or C operation with the addition of project traffic. There would be the addition of one (1) project vehicle along Tubbs Lane and S.R. 128 during either the Friday or Saturday peak traffic hours.

For Year 2015 Impacts "Intersection Level of Service" the report determined that project traffic would not produce a significant level of service impact at either the S.R. 128/Tubbs Lane or S.R. 29/Tubbs Lane intersections during either the Friday or Saturday year 2015 PM peak traffic hours. Project traffic would not change any acceptable operation to unacceptable conditions. Overall intersection operation would remain LOS A at both intersections and operation of the Tubbs Lane stop sign controlled approaches to both S.R. 128 and S.R. 29 would remain an acceptable LOS B. Also, there would be no change in vehicle delay due to project traffic at either intersection during either the Friday or Saturday PM peak traffic hours.

For Year 2015 Impacts "Signalization Needs" the report determined that project traffic would not produce a significant signalization need impact at either the S.R. 128/Tubbs Lane or S.R. 29/Tubbs Lane intersections during either the Friday or Saturday year 2015 PM peak traffic hours along local roadways. Project traffic would not increase by one (1) percent or more when "Without Project" volumes would already meet peak hour signal warrant criteria levels and the volumes would not meet the MUTCD signal warrant #3 criteria (peak hour volume warrant). During the Friday PM peak hour, when volumes at both the S.R. 128/Tubbs Lane and S.R. 29/Tubbs Lane intersections would already meet rural peak hour signal warrant #3 criteria levels, increases due to the addition of project traffic would be 0.1% or less. During the Saturday PM peak hour, when volumes at the S.R. 128/Tubbs Lane intersection would already meet rural signal warrant #3 criteria levels, the increase due to the addition of project traffic would be 0.1% or less.

For Year 2030 Impacts "Roadway Segment Level of Service" the report determined that project traffic would not produce a significant roadway segment level of service and that all evaluated roadway segments would maintain acceptable LOS B to D operation with the addition of project traffic. There would be the addition of one (1) project vehicle along Tubbs Lane and S.R. 128 during either the Friday or Saturday peak traffic hours.

For Year 2030 Impacts "Intersection Level of Service" the report determined that the project traffic would not produce a significant level of service impact at either the S.R. 128/Tubbs Lane or S.R. 29/Tubbs Lane intersections during either the Friday or Saturday PM peak traffic hours along local roadways. Project traffic would not change any acceptable operation to unacceptable conditions, nor would it increase volumes by 1 percent or more when "Without Project" operation would be unacceptable. The S.R. 128/Tubbs Lane intersection would have unacceptable operation during both the Friday and Saturday PM peak hours without project traffic. However, project traffic would increase volumes less than 0.1%.

For Year 2030 Impacts "Signalization Needs" the report shows that project traffic would not produce a significant signalization needs impact at either the S.R. 128/Tubbs Lane or S.T. 29/Tubbs Lane intersections during either the Friday or Saturday year 2030 PM peak traffic hours along local roadways. Project traffic would not increase volumes to meet signal warrant #3 criteria nor would it increase volumes by 1 percent or more when "Without Project" volumes would already meet peak hour signal warrant criteria levels. During the Friday and Saturday PM peak hours, when volumes at both the S.R. 128/Tubbs Lane or S.T. 29/Tubbs Lane intersection would already meet rural peak hour signal warrant #3 criteria levels, increases due to the addition of project traffic would be 0.1% or less.

The Traffic Impact report also analyzed the left turn lane requirement for the site. Currently there is no left turn lane provided on the eastbound Tubbs Lane approach to the Summers Winery driveway and a continuous double yellow centerline is provided between the S.R. 128 and S.R. 29 intersections, prohibiting passing along the entire length of the roadway.

Utilizing traffic data collected during crush season in September 2014, the Traffic Impact Report found that the weekday daily two-way volumes, Average Daily Trips (ADT) of 39 vehicles on the Tubbs Lane/project access driveway intersection already meets County warrant criteria for provision of a left turn lane on the eastbound Tubbs Lane intersection approach. However, a supplemental letter was submitted by RSA+ that further evaluated the projected driveway volumes on Tubbs Lane. The analysis utilized 23.2 daily trips, calculated from the Use Permit application Trip Generation Sheet, and found that the proposed winery driveway does not meet the warrant for a left turn lane.

The Deputy Director of Public Works reviewed the Traffic Impact Report and the RSA letter. The Traffic Impact Report utilized traffic volumes representative of peak season activity, not the annual average figures, as calculated on the Trip Generation Sheet. The Deputy Director of Public Works stated that the use of annual average figures is consistent with County standard practice for evaluating the warrant for the left turn lane. He concurred with the conclusion reached by RSA and determined that a left turn lane was not warranted at the site.

- c. This proposed project would not result in any change to air traffic patterns.
- d-e. The Traffic Impact Report determined that the sight lines at the project driveway connection to Tubbs Lane are acceptable. The project proposed upgrades to the entrance to comply with Napa County Road and Street Standards. The project proposes realignment of the existing parking and parking landscaping. The project will maintain adequate emergency access. As discussed above, the Deputy Director of Public Works concurred with the conclusion reached by RSA+ and determined that a left turn lane was not warranted at the site. The project would not result in any significant off-site circulation system operational impacts or any sight line impacts at the proposed project driveway.
- f. The winery has 16 existing parking spaces. The project proposes reducing parking to 15 spaces. The project will have adequate parking.
- g. There is no aspect of this proposed project that would conflict with 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.	<b>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> Would the project:				
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 the Hydrology and Water Quality section, according to the Water Availability Analysis (WAA) Tier One submitted with the application, based on the parcel size of 25.3 acres with a parcel Location Factor of 1.0 acre feet per acre per year (Valley Floor) the site would have an Allowable Water Allotment of 25.3 acre feet per year. RSA+ prepared a Water Demand Analysis, dated September 17, 2014, detailing the existing and proposed ground water uses. According to the analysis, there will be an overall reduction in annual water demand from 3.9 million gallons per year (12 acre feet per year) to 3.5 million gallons per year (10.8 acre feet per year). Reductions in demand are due to reuse of treated process wastewater for vineyard irrigation and removal of vineyards required for the construction of the covered tank farm, as well as removal of a residential water use. The anticipated usage of 10.8 acre feet per year is below the estimated Allowable Water Allotment of 25.3 acres. The project is not expected to substantially deplete local groundwater supplies.
- 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
<b>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The project site has previously been disturbed with residential and winery development and vineyards, 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 does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Although potential air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and traffic impacts, discussed in the respective sections above, all contribute to cumulative effects when future development in Napa Valley is considered, the analysis determined that all potential impacts were less than significant and would not contribute significantly to cumulative impacts.

Potential impacts from an increase in air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions are addressed as discussed in the project's Greenhouse Gas Voluntary Best Management Practices. The applicant proposes to incorporate greenhouse gas reduction methods including: pre-plumbing the roof of the covered tank farm for installation of photovoltaics, planting of water efficient landscaping, and utilization of recycled process waste water for irrigation. Remodel work required for the conversion of the residence to the tasting room will be required to meet current Cal Green Building Code. The applicant currently utilizes energy conserving lighting in the winery building and has bike parking.

Potential traffic impacts would not significantly 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. Under the Napa County General Plan, traffic volumes are projected to increase and will be caused by a combination of locally generated traffic as well as general regional growth. The General Plan EIR indicates that much of the forecasted increase in traffic on the arterial roadway network will result from traffic generated outside of the county; however the project will contribute a small amount toward the general overall increase. The project trip generation was calculated from winery operations, where the calculated trips reflect total visitation, on-site employees and wine production trips generated by the winery.

General Plan Policy CIR-16 states that "The County will seek to maintain an arterial Level of Service D or better on all County roadways, except where the level of Service already exceeds this standard and where increased intersection capacity is not feasible without substantial additional right of way." As discussed above under Section XVI Transportation, the Traffic Impact Report, concluded that all evaluated roadway segments would maintain acceptable LOS B to D operation; increased traffic from the proposed project would not change any acceptable intersection level of service operations to unacceptable conditions and increased traffic would not increase volumes more than one percent for an intersection already operating at an unacceptable level; and increased traffic would not produce a significant signalization need and project traffic would not increase volumes by one percent for an intersection already meeting the signal warrant criteria levels.

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.