

“F”

**Initial Study/Negative Declaration
(or Mitigated Negative Declaration or
CEQA Memo)**

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

Initial Study Checklist

1. **Project Title:** Stag's Leap Wine Cellars, Use Permit Major Modification P13-00356 and Variance P13-00357.
2. **Property Owner:** Stag's Leap Wine Cellars, 5766 Silverado Trail, Napa, CA 94558; (707) 944-2020
3. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Brian Jones, 5766 Silverado Trail, Napa, CA 94558; (707) 261-6443
4. **Representative:** Jeffrey Redding, 2423 Renfrew Street, Napa, CA 94558; (707) 255-7375; jreddingaicp@comcast.net
5. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Shaveta Sharma; (707) 299-1358; shaveta.sharma@countyofnapa.org
6. **Project location and APN:** The project is located on a 40.22 acre site at 5766 Silverado Trail, Napa, approximately 3.2 miles south of Yountville Cross Road, designated Assessor's Parcel Number: 039-030-040.
7. **General Plan description:** Agricultural Resource (AR).
8. **Zoning:** Agricultural Preserve (AP) & Agricultural Watershed (AW).
9. **Background/Project History:** Stag's Leap Wine Cellars was established on March 21, 1973, by approval of Use Permit # U487273 for a 55,500 gallon/year winery and the construction of a 2,500 square foot winery building. No public wine tours were permitted as part of the operation of the winery. There were subsequent use permit modification approvals to expand the facility:
 - August 1976- Use Permit #867576** was approved by the Conservation, Development, and Planning Commission to construct a 3,600 square foot structure for storage, barrel aging, and office space.
 - July 1980- Use Permit #U517980** was approved by the Conservation, Development, and Planning Commission to construct a 5,000 square foot structure for storage, and office space. Tours by appointment were also added to the winery's operations.
 - April 1984- Use Permit #U438384** was approved by the Conservation, Development, and Planning Commission to construct a 9,000 square foot structure for barrel and general wine storage.
 - June 1985- Use Permit #U-468485** and was approved by the Conservation, Development, and Planning Commission to add public tastings for an unspecified number of guests and to remodel the retail sales room to add a 731 square foot public tasting area within Building #2.
 - November 1988- Use Permit #487273-MOD** was approved by the Conservation, Development and Planning Commission to increase the production capacity from 90,000 gallons to 210,000 gallons per year, construct a 20,842 square foot white wine processing building, and utilize 8,000 square foot of caves for barrel storage.
 - September 1997- Use Permit #97046-MOD** was approved by the Conservation, Development and Planning Department to install an engineered canopy over existing tank pad and working area.
 - December 2000- Use Permit #00055-MOD** was approved by the Conservation, Development and Planning Department to add a 1,718 square foot mezzanine within Building #5 and to cover an existing tank pad.
 - August 2002- Use Permit 02369MM-** A Minor Modification to U-487273 & U #90-28 was approved by the Conservation, Development and Planning Department to permit the construction of a reclaimed water storage facility, relocate vineyards,

landscape irrigation pumping facilities & modify, install or construct related piping, electrical and other facilities as required. A concurrent Lot line Adjustment to incorporate a portion of northern parcel to this APN, to facilitate this request was also approved.

March 2004- Use Permit #03469-MOD and #03648-VAR was approved by the Conservation, Development and Planning to increase the annual wine production from 210,000 gallons to 330,000 gallons, and increase employees from 70 full-time to 80 full-time, 12 part-time employees to remain same; increase the number of Marketing events for distributor tastings and lunches from 30 per year for up to 60 persons to 50 per year with 60 persons; increase the number of Marketing events for distributor tastings and dinners from 25 per year for up to 60 persons to 50 dinners per year with up to 60 persons; addition of 50 food and wine pairing seminars for up to 35 persons; remodel of Building #2 and construction of a new 800 square foot crush pad; construction of a new 5,300 square foot visitors center building and relocate the existing 731 square foot tasting room into the new tasting center; remodel and convert a portion of Building #3 from production to offices and restrooms; remodel and convert a portion of existing Building #5 from barrel room to offices; utilize the entire 38,000 square feet of caves for storage and marketing activities and construction of a catering prep kitchen from the existing 8,000 square feet utilized for barrel storage; relocation of the driveway and addition of 40 parking spaces for a total of 105 spaces; and expansion of the septic and wastewater treatment systems. The Variance allowed the construction of a winery building 460-540 feet from Silverado Trail within the 600 foot setback and 296-280 feet setback from a private road within the required 300 foot setback. This application stated that daily visitation was to remain at 300 persons maximum per day. The 120,000 gallon increase in production was also subject to the 75% rule.

Existing Winery characteristics: According to the applicant in 2014 the winery processed 329,000 gallons of wine; has a total of 67,877 square feet of production area and 25,094 square feet of accessory uses; employs 60 full-time employees and six part-time employees; tours and tastings for an average of 100 visitors per day and 700 visitors per week; and holds 150 annual marketing events with an average attendance of 70 persons, and a maximum attendance of 250 persons.

10. **Project Description:** Approval to modify the previous project approvals (Use Permit #867576 , Use Permit #U517980, #U438384, #U-4684885, Use Permit #487273-MOD, Use Permit #97046-MOD, Use Permit #00055-MOD, Use Permit #02369-, Use Permit #03469-MOD /#03468-VAR 8-VAR, 02369-MOD) for the existing Winery to allow the following:
- (a) demolition of two existing production and hospitality buildings totaling 8,514 square feet to be replaced by two new production buildings totaling 10,966 square feet in size;
 - (b) modify the existing Marketing plan of 150 annual events to allow 10 annual Tastings with Lunch for up to 80 persons, 40 annual Tastings with Lunch for up to 40 persons, 6 annual Tastings with Dinner for up to 100 persons, 20 annual Tastings with Dinner for up to 80 persons, 25 annual Tastings with Dinner for up to 35 persons; 50 Food and Wine Pairing seminars for up to 25 persons; two large private events with 250 persons, and participation in Auction Napa Valley;
 - (c) a new access driveway to the two new production buildings;
 - (d) restriping of existing parking area and addition of 13 parking spaces for a total of 118 spaces and three additional loading spaces;
 - (e) upgrades to existing wastewater systems including reserve area;
 - (f) new 738 sq. ft. covered fruit sorting and staging areas loading and staging areas;
 - (g) new 682 sq. ft. covered deck; and
 - (h) grading work resulting in removal of approximately 500 cubic yards of soil to be deposited off site.

The proposal also includes a Variance request for two new production buildings to encroach 474 feet into the required 600 foot setback from Silverado Trail. There are no changes to production, daily visitation, or the number of employees.

11. **Environmental setting and surrounding land uses:**
The project site is located on the northerly knoll of a 40.22 acre parcel located on the east side of the Napa Valley, approximately two miles southeast of the Town of Yountville. The parcel is zoned Agricultural Watershed on the knoll and is zoned Agricultural Preserve on the southerly, flat portion of the parcel. The irregular-shaped lot has 20% southward-facing slope, whereas the remainder of the property has 2-3% slope towards the east to Chase Creek that flows southerly along a portion of the eastern property line. The proposed building site is on an existing flat pad on the eastern edge of the knoll.

The existing development on the site consists of a 330,000 gallon/year winery facility comprised of six buildings, approximately 38,000 square feet of caves, covered tank barn, 105 parking spaces, both paved and unpaved access roads, a residence, and

guest cottage, vineyard office, and accessory equipment and storage buildings. Access to the site is provided directly off Silverado Trail by two roads. There is an existing left turn lane serving the winery entrance. Surrounding land uses include existing vineyard, winery and rural residential development. The nearest off-site residence is located across the site's northern boundary, and approximately 635 feet from the existing winery.

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

The project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County, including but not limited to building permits, grading permits, and waste disposal permits, in addition to CalFire. 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

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.

Shaveta Sharma, Planner III
Napa County Planning, Building, and Environmental Services

Date

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

Discussion:

- a. This proposed project is the demolition and rebuilding of two existing buildings at an existing operational winery. The majority of the project is to be constructed in the same area as two existing buildings with smaller construction and improvements taking place on other locations of the property and will occur in areas that have been previously disturbed. The design of the new buildings is of high aesthetic value and takes care to preserve a heritage Oak tree on the property. Silverado Trail is a designated "Scenic Highway" listed in the *Scenic Highway Element* of the Napa County General Plan. The project will not create any new impacts to a scenic vista, as the newly constructed buildings will replace two existing buildings. Additionally, there is significant existing vegetation and mature trees along the roadway that will ensure minimal visual impacts along Silverado Trail. The visual impacts as a result of the Variance request to place the proposed buildings approximately 174 feet from Silverado Trail will not create any significant impacts. The two new buildings will be located in the same location of two existing building, which were not subject to the 600 foot setback due to their existence prior to the Winery Definition Ordinance. The two new buildings will have a building height of 29 feet above grade level along Silverado Trail as compared to the existing 19 feet above grade level. Due the location of the proposed buildings in a similar footprint of the two buildings to be replaced, there is mature landscaping that will help shield the buildings from view along the roadway, despite the additional ten feet in height of the structures..
- b. This project does not involve the conversion of a scenic resource. The project is not subject to Napa County Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 18.106 (*Viewshed Protection Ordinance*) as it was determined the new structures would not be visible from the road due to existing mature vegetation in place.
- c. The proposed project includes two new structures of high architectural design in place of two existing buildings and consequently will not degrade the exiting character of the site and its surroundings.
- d. The newly proposed marketing events may result in a minor increase in night-time lighting. In accordance with County standards, all exterior lighting will be the minimum necessary for the operational and security needs. Light fixtures will be kept as low to the ground as possible and include shields to deflect the light downward and kept on-site so that surrounding properties are not reflected. Avoidance of highly reflective surfaces will be required, as well as standard County conditions to prevent light from being cast skyward. As designed, and as subject to standard conditions of approval, the project would not have a significant impact from light or glare.

All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward, shall be located as low to the ground as possible, and shall be the minimum necessary for security, safety, or operations and shall

incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. No flood-lighting or sodium lighting of the building is permitted, including architectural highlighting and spotting. Low-level lighting shall be utilized in parking areas as opposed to elevated high-intensity light standards. Lighting utilized during harvest activities is not subject to this requirement. Prior to issuance of any building permit for construction of the winery, 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 California Building Code.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. ¹ Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a/b/e. The proposed project will not convert any Farmland to a non-agriculture use. The proposed project would continue with agricultural uses, and will not conflict with any agriculture use. The winery uses the grapes from the vineyard in its production of wine. The proposed project would not remove any vineyard. The project site is zoned as Agricultural Watershed (AW) and Agricultural Preserve (AP). The project site is designated Prime Farmland and would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Important as shown on the Napa County Important Farmland Map 2002 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, pursuant to the				

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

Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. 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. The property has a County Agricultural Contract, no aspect of this proposal would conflict with the adopted contract. The winery would facilitate production of the grapes from on the property and adjacent parcels owned by the applicant. Additionally, the proposed new construction will take place on previously disturbed areas that are already used for winery activities.

c/d. The project site is zoned Agricultural Watershed (AW) and Agricultural Preserve (AP), which allows wineries upon grant of a use permit and modifications to previously approved use permits. 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 Coniferous Forest- Ponderosa Pine and Douglas Fir species. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

Discussion:

a-e. 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. On August 12, 2013, the Court of Appeal reinstated the District's thresholds of significance provided in Table 3-1 (Criteria Air Pollutants & Precursors Screening Levels Sizes) and they are applicable for evaluating projects in Napa County.

Over the long term, emission sources for the proposed project will consist primarily of mobile sources including vehicles visiting the site. The Air District's threshold of significance provided in Table 3-1 has determined that similar projects such as a quality restaurant that do not exceed a threshold of 47 ksf will not significantly impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2011 Pages 3-2 & 3-3.). Given the scope of the project's operations compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47ksf NOX (high quality restaurant) and 541ksf (general light industry), the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. (Please note: a high quality restaurant is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, but grossly overstates emissions associated with other portions of a winery, such as office, barrel storage and production, which generate fewer vehicle trips. Therefore, a general light industry comparison has also been used for other such uses.)

The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plan. Wineries typically are not producers of air pollution in volumes substantial enough to result in an air quality plan conflict. The project site lies within the Napa Valley, which forms one of the climatologically distinct sub-regions (Napa County Sub region) within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The topographical and meteorological features of the Valley create a relatively high potential for air pollution. Grading and construction activities may cause a temporary degradation of air quality from dust and heavy equipment during the construction phase of the proposed project. As part of the Conditions of Approval the applicant is required to comply with all BAAQMD guidelines for construction activities. The proposed construction and earthwork associated with the project would not result in significant adverse impacts to air quality. Over the long term, emissions resulting from the proposed project would consist primarily of mobile sources, including production-related deliveries and visitor and employee vehicles traveling to and from the winery. The resulting busiest day plus marketing total of 446 two-way trips is well below the threshold of significance established by BAAQMD which considers projects with generating fewer than 2,000 trips to be less than significant. The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

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. The project will not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. According to Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Watershed layer), the winery site is not located in any designated habitat areas of any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The only proposed development is located within previously disturbed areas on a site over 450 feet from the riparian area of Chase Creek. This project would result in less than significant impacts on any special-status species.
- b. There are no existing creek-crossings on the site. No encroachments or construction is proposed as part of this project that would have impacts on designated riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities. Therefore the impact of this project is less than significant.
- c. Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps and the Baseline Data Report (Chapter 15. Surface Water Hydrology, Map 15-6, Land Cover) do not indicate the presence of any wetlands or potential wetlands within the project boundary. The project would not result in substantial impacts to federally protected or potentially sensitive wetlands and would occur in a previously disturbed area.
- d. The project will take place on an already-disturbed winery site and would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.
- e. The proposed project would result in the removal of nine trees ranging from 12"-30" in size at DBH. The nine proposed trees consist of Coast Live Oaks, Valley Oaks, and one Cork Oak. The applicant will replace all trees removed at a 2:1 ratio consistent with County policy relating to tree removal. As the removed trees take place within a previously developed area, their removal does not constitute the removal of Oak Woodland. The project will take place on an already-disturbed winery site and would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.
- f. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans. There are no plans applicable to the subject parcel.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Archaeological Resources Layer, historical site, points & lines), no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified within the project site or on any contiguous parcel. There is no information in the record that would indicate that there is a potential for occurrence. In the event archaeological artifacts are encountered on the project site a qualified archaeologist will be retained by the applicant to record and evaluate the resources. This is considered a less-than-significant impact because the project site has been previously developed as no new construction is necessary for the expansion of the on-site septic system proposed as part of the project, as the existing system is adequate for the slight increase of wastewater from the additional marketing events. However, in the case of encountering any remains a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval:

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

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

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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. ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
 - iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Compliance with the latest editions of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.
 - iv.) According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) there are no landslide deposits in the proposed development area.
- b. The project's onsite wastewater system expansion will occur on slopes with less than 15% grade. The soils on site are comprised of Forward Gravelly Loam (9-30% slopes) and Bale Clay Loam (0-2% slopes) and are characterized by medium runoff with low erosion potential. The project is required to submit a site development plan, including implementation of storm water and erosion control Best Management Practices under the standards developed in the County's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination

System, Phase II Stormwater Permit, which is required by County Code and is a standard practice on all County development projects. Therefore, the potential for impacts is considered less than significant.

- c/d. According to preliminary geologic mapping of the St. Helena Quadrangle performed by the California Geologic Survey (CGS-2004), the property is underlain by Pre-Quaternary deposits and bedrock and the majority of the site is underlain by undifferentiated Holocene stream terrace deposits. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the project site has a low susceptibility for liquefaction on the northern half of the property and a very high susceptibility for liquefaction on the southern portion of the parcel. Development will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible.
- e. The site's wastewater system expansion is proposed as part of the project to serve the winery, visitors, and employees. The system will be designed by a licensed engineer and will be reviewed and approved by the Division of Environmental Services. There does not appear to be any limitation on this parcel's ability to support an on-site water system which will be able to support the proposed project.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

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

The applicant has incorporated some measures (preservation of open space in a conservation easement , energy conserving lighting, cool roofs, habitat restoration, connection to recycled water, low-impact development, recycle 75% of all waste, and compost 75% of all waste) and will incorporate additional GHG reduction methods including: generation of on-site renewable energy, VMT reduction plan, water efficient fixtures, water efficient landscape, compost food and garden material, planting of shade trees, site design, limit grading and tree removal, continue as "Napa Green Winery", continue as "Napa Green Land", use of recycled materials, education of staff and visitors, and retention of biomass via pruning or chipping.

The proposed project has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds and determined that the project would not exceed the 1,100 MT/yr of CO₂e. 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 winery features noted above would combine to further reduce emissions below BAAQMD thresholds.

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 for winery operations. A Business Plan will be filed with the Environmental Health Division should hazardous materials reach reportable levels.
- 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 an airport land use plan area or within two miles of any public airport or public use airport.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.
- g. The access driveway that serves the project meets Napa County Road and Street Standards. Therefore, the operational changes to the winery will not negatively impact or hinder emergency vehicle access. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division and found acceptable as conditioned.
- h. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. The project already complies and will continue to comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Discussion:

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

In general, recent studies have found that groundwater levels in the Napa Valley Floor exhibit stable long-term trends with a shallow depth to water. Historical trends in the Milliken-Sarco-Tulucay (MST) area, however, have shown increasing depths to groundwater, but recent stabilization in many locations. Groundwater availability, recharge, storage and yield is not consistent across the County. More is known about the resource where historical data have been collected. Less is known in areas with limited data or unknown geology. In order to fill existing data gaps and to provide a better understand of groundwater resources in the County, the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan recommended 18 Areas of Interest (AOIs) for additional groundwater level and water quality monitoring. Through the well owner and public outreach efforts of the (GRAC) approximately 40 new wells have been added to the monitoring program within these areas. Groundwater Sustainability Objectives were developed and recommended by the GRAC and adopted by the Board. The recommendations included the goal of developing sustainability objectives, provided a definition, explained the shared responsibility for Groundwater Sustainability and the important role monitoring as a means to achieving groundwater sustainability.

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). The subject property is located within central part of Napa Valley on the valley floor where monitoring wells evaluated in the LSCE report indicated no record declining groundwater supplies. The County has no record of problems or complaints of diminished groundwater supplies at the project site or in the general vicinity. The applicant has not experienced any issues with the availability of groundwater.

Minimum thresholds for water use have been established by the Department of Public Works using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS). 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. Any project which reduces water usage or any water usage which is at or below the established threshold is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels. The project is located on the valley floor in an area that has an established acceptable water use criteria of 1.0 acre foot per acre per year. The Allowable Water Allotment for the subject property is 27.4 acre-feet per year (af/yr), determined by multiplying its 27.4 acre Agricultural Preserve zoned portion of the site by a one af/yr/acre fair share water use factor. The project site could also have additional water allotment if the applicant were to calculate the groundwater availability of the 12.82 acre portion of their site zoned Agricultural Watershed. However, since the project uses significantly less than the water allotment allowed by the 27.4 acre AP zoned portion of the site the applicant has chosen not to determine the additional AW water allotment portion of groundwater availability for the site.

a-b. The project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements nor substantially deplete local groundwater supplies. The applicant submitted a Wastewater Feasibility Report (Summit Engineering, Inc., dated May 18, 2015) with the application. The report concludes that the proposed wastewater flows can be accommodated with an expansion of pressure distribution reserve areas on the project site.

The existing water system is sufficiently sized to accommodate the needed potable water supply connection points within the recently built production buildings. The additional marketing events as proposed as part of this project would only increase water use by 0.6% and its impact is negligible. The proposed operation of the water system will remain as a Transient Non-Community System (public water systems which serve at least 15 service connections or 25 or more persons for at least 60 days of the year). Peak (weekend) tasting visitation will continue to be an average of 100 visitors per day with a maximum of 300 visitors per day during the week. The existing well produces flow rate of 72 gallons per minute, which is capable producing the peak daily demand of 8,800 gpd in a period of 122.2 minutes. The report concludes that the proposed increase in use of the site is not expected to affect the ability for the existing public water system to meet the demands of the site.

A Water Availability Analysis was prepared for the project by Summit Engineering, Inc.. The threshold for this valley floor parcel is 27.4 af/yr, which is calculated by applying a rate of 1.0 af/yr multiplied by the acreage of the site Valley Floor portion of the site. As noted above, the findings of the Napa Valley Groundwater Monitoring Plan confirmed that the 1.0 af/yr valley floor threshold has proven to be

a sustainable limit for groundwater resources. The report indicates the total water demand on the parcel from the existing winery and associated improvements is 8.63 af/year, specifically:

Existing Use	Water Use (ac-ft/yr)
Cottage (1 bedroom, 1 week/month average or 84 days/yr @ 120 gpd)	0.03
Cottage Landscaping	0.50
Winery Processing for 330,000 gallon winery @ 6 gal PW/gal wine	6.08
Winery Landscaping ²	-
Employees (66 total)	1.11
Visitors (100 average)	0.56
Events with Lunch (60 persons, Qty 50)	0.14
Events with Dinner (60 persons, Qty 50)	0.14
Private Food & Wine Pairing Seminar (35 persons, Qty 50)	0.08
Acres vineyard irrigation only ¹	-
Total	8.63

Notes:

1. Vineyard is not irrigated from groundwater sources so is not included in the WAA totals.
2. Winery landscaping irrigated from process wastewater ponds, not groundwater sources so is not included in the WAA totals.

As a result of the decrease in number of marketing guests, the winery's usage will decrease by 0.03 af/yr. The exact numbers are detailed below:

Proposed Use	Water Use (ac-ft/yr)
Cottage (1 bedroom, 1 week/month average or 84 days/yr @ 120 gpd)	0.03
Cottage Landscaping	0.50
Winery Processing for 330,000 gallon winery @ 6 gal PW/gal wine	6.08
Winery Landscaping ²	-
Employees (66 total)	1.11
Visitors (300 peak day, 100 average)	0.56
Events w/ lunch (80 persons, Qty 10)	0.04
Events w/ lunch (40 persons, Qty 40)	0.07
Events w/ dinner (100 persons, Qty 6)	0.03
Events w/ dinner (80 persons, Qty 20)	0.07
Events w/ dinner (35 persons, Qty 25)	0.04
Event, pairing (25 persons, Qty 50)	0.06
Events, Trade (250 persons, Qty 2)	0.01
Acres vineyard irrigation only ¹	-
TOTAL	8.60

Notes:

1. Vineyard is not irrigated from groundwater sources so is not included in the WAA totals.
2. Winery landscaping irrigated from process wastewater ponds, not groundwater sources so is not included in the WAA totals.

The project site has a total water use of 9.63 af/yr, when including the existing single family residence on site. The estimated total water demand of 9.60 af/yr, representing a decrease of .03 af/yr over the existing condition, is below the 27.4 af/yr threshold

established for the parcel. Under past approvals for the winery, the property is already subject to the County's standard condition of approval requiring well monitoring as well as the potential to modify/alter permitted uses on site should groundwater resources become insufficient to supply the use.

In response to regional drought and the general Statewide need to protect groundwater resources, the Governor enacted new legislation requiring local governments to monitor and management groundwater resources. Napa County's prior work on the Napa Valley Groundwater Management Plan provides a strong foundation for Napa County to comply with this State mandated monitoring and management objective. As a direct result, the project site is now subject to this new legislation requiring local agencies to monitor groundwater use. Assembly Bill - AB 1739 by Assembly member Roger Dickinson (D-Sacramento) and Senate Bills 1168 and 1319 by Senator Fran Pavley (D-Agoura Hills) establish a framework for sustainable, local groundwater management for the first time in California history. The legislation requires local agencies to tailor sustainable groundwater plans to their regional economic and environmental needs. The legislation prioritizes groundwater basin management Statewide, which includes the Napa Valley/Napa River Drainage Basin, and sets a timeline for implementation of the following:

- By 2017, local groundwater management agencies must be identified;
- By 2020, overdrafted groundwater basins must have sustainability plans;
- By 2022, other high and medium priority basins not currently in overdraft must have sustainability plans; and
- By 2040, all high and medium priority groundwater basins must achieve sustainability.

The State has classified the Napa River Drainage Basin as a medium priority resource. Additionally, the legislation provides measurable objectives and milestones to reach sustainability and a State role of limited intervention when local agencies are unable or unwilling to adopt sustainable management plans. Napa County supports this legislation and has begun the process of developing a local groundwater management agency which is anticipated to be in place and functioning within the timeline prescribed by the State.

The proposed project will not result in a substantial increase the demand of ground water supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge or lowering of the local groundwater level. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Water Deficient Areas/Storage Areas*), the project site is not located within a water deficient area and the County is not aware of, nor has it received any reports of groundwater deficiencies in the area. The increase of 29,326 gallons of groundwater use resulting from the project would be less than the amount of groundwater used by a single-family residence which is approximately 244, 381 gallons annually.

- c-d. The project will not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off the cultivated agricultural vineyard site.
- e. The project has been reviewed and approved by the Engineering Division and along with the conditions of approval the project will not negatively affect any nearby creeks.
- f. There are no other factors in this project that would otherwise degrade water quality.
- g- h. No portion of the project site is located within the FEMA-designated 100-year floodplain and thus none will be located within the designated floodplain zone.
- i-j. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. Potential for tsunami is considered less-than-significant.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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. – c. The project would not occur within an established community, nor would it result in the division of an established community. The project complies with the Napa County Code and all other applicable regulations. The subject parcel is located in the AW (Agricultural Watershed) and AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning districts, 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 Agricultural Watershed and Open Space (AR) and Agricultural Resource (AR), which allow “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 a policy, General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-10, 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 Measure(s): None.

	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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

Discussion:

- a-b. The project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during the brief demolition and construction activities. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. The project would not result in potentially significant temporary construction noise impacts or operational impacts. Given the proximity to the neighbors, the closest of which is located approximately 635 feet away, 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; however, the proposed marketing plan could create additional noise impacts. The submitted marketing plan includes a number of events on a monthly, and quarterly basis, some of which would include up to 250 visitors (4 per year). 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 is developed, with a scattering of homes located in the immediate vicinity and directly adjacent to the site with the nearest residences located to the north. The existing winery building is set approximately 635 feet from the nearest residence. Continuing enforcement of Napa County's Noise Ordinance by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff, including the prohibition against amplified music, should ensure that marketing events and other winery activities do not create a significant noise impact. Events and music are required to finish by 10 p.m. every evening. The project will result in minimal increases in noise levels due to more frequent events with a greater number of attendees. Noise generated from the marketing and tours and tastings is not anticipated to be significant. There are no complaints on the County's record from existing Marketing activities. The proposed project will not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts.

- 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 Measure(s): None.

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

Discussion:

- a. – c. The project will not displace any housing or divide any established communities. The project will not contribute significantly to a cumulatively considerable increase in the demand for housing units within the communities of Napa County and the general vicinity. No individuals will be displaced as a result of this project.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	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 area and the additional demand placed on existing services would be marginal. Fire protection measures are required as part of the development pursuant to Napa County Fire Marshall conditions and there will be no foreseeable impact to emergency response times with the adoption of these conditions of approval. The Fire Department and Engineering Services Division have reviewed the application and recommend approval as conditioned. 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 Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. RECREATION. Would the project:				

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

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 Measure(s): None.

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

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a-b. The project is located on the east side of the Silverado Trail, approximately 3.2 miles south of Yountville Cross Road. The project includes an expansion of the winery's two production buildings and increases it by 2,482 square feet as well as the modification of the Marketing Program. The Marketing Plan proposed will modify the existing 150 events to decrease the number of annual guests from 7,750 persons annually to 7,225 persons annually. As a result, the number of trips generated by the proposal would decrease from current existing conditions.

Traffic conditions on roads and at intersections are generally characterized by their "level of service" or LOS. LOS is a convenient way to express the ratio between volume and capacity on a given link or at a given intersection, and is expressed as a letter grade ranging from LOS A through LOS F. Each level of service is generally described as follows:

LOS A- Free-flowing travel with an excellent level of comfort and convenience and freedom to maneuver.

LOS B- Stable operating conditions, but the presence of other road users causes a noticeable, though slight, reduction in comfort, convenience, and maneuvering freedom.

LOS C- Stable operating conditions, but the operation of individual users is substantially affected by the interaction with others in the traffic stream.

LOS D- High-density, but stable flow. Users experience severe restrictions in speed and freedom to maneuver, with poor levels of comfort and convenience.

LOS E- Operating conditions at or near capacity. Speeds are reduced to a low but relatively uniform value. Freedom to maneuver is difficult with users experiencing frustration and poor comfort and convenience. Unstable operation is frequent, and minor disturbances in traffic flow can cause breakdown conditions.

LOS F- Forced or breakdown conditions. This condition exists wherever the volume of traffic exceeds the capacity of the roadway. Long queues can form behind these bottleneck points with queued traffic traveling in a stop-and-go fashion. (2000 Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board)

Silverado Trail acts as a major north-south regional route through the Napa Valley, and provides direct access to the project site via the project's driveway. Based on Napa County's Traffic Database the nearest intersections of Silverado Trail and Yountville Cross Road and Silverado Trail and Oak Knoll Avenue are both characterized as a LOS D. Based upon on the revised marketing program, there would be a decrease of trips generated as a result of 525 fewer visitors to the winery. The removal of excess soils from the site would result in 31 trips. The soils will likely be deposited at the Napa Pipe project, though if they will not accept the soils they will be deposited at another approved location.

- c. No air traffic is proposed and there are no new structures proposed for this project that would interfere with or require alteration of air traffic patterns.
- d-f. Access to the existing winery will be from Silverado Trail onto the site. The project would result in no significant off-site circulation system operational impacts nor any sight line impacts at the proposed project driveway. The project will provide additional on-site paving to the two new buildings. The project has 105 existing parking spaces on site, with a proposed 13 additional spaces for a total of 118 spaces which would be sufficient to accommodate parking needs during normal business days for employees and visitors. Additional parking will be required for the larger marketing events, the applicant will provide valet and/or shuttle services for larger events with parking along vineyard rows and the other suitable areas on the site. The applicant also owns additional adjacent parcels to the north and east that are planted with vineyard that would be suitable for parking via a valet system. In the case that shuttle parking is utilized, a parking plan will be submitted for review and approval of the Planning division. No parking will be permitted within the right-of-way of Silverado Trail.
- g. There is no aspect of this proposed project that would conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

Discussion:

- a. The project will comply with Napa County Environmental Health requirements for its privately-maintained wastewater treatment system, consistent with Regional Water Quality Control Board standards.
- b. The project's existing wastewater system was expanded in 2004 and is sufficient to accommodate the additional flows from the revised marketing plan with upgrades to the reserve area. The system will be designed by a licensed engineer and will be reviewed and approved by the Division of Environmental Services.
- c. The project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, which will cause a significant impact to the environment.
- d. The project has sufficient water supplies to serve projected needs. The current use on the project site is 9.63 AF/YR. The projected water use for the project is 9.60 AF/YR. Napa County has established a threshold 27.4 AF/YR for this parcel; therefore the estimated water demand of 9.60 AF/YR is below the threshold established for the parcel. Discussion of the 27.4 threshold is discussed further in the Hydrology and Water Quality section. No further analysis is required.
- 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 Measure(s): None.

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

Discussion:

- a. The project 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 or 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. Potential air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, water, and traffic impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The project would also increase the demands for public services to a limited extent, increase traffic and air pollution, all of which contribute to cumulative effects when future development in Napa Valley is considered. The General Plan projects a traffic volume increase of 32% for Silverado Trail in 2030 for a total volume of 17,880 average daily trips. This project's contribution of 769 trips annually, or approximately two average daily trips (ADT), to that volume is not significant. As the applicant will schedule all marketing events outside of peak hours, and furthermore be required to schedule trips outside the peak hours by the conditions of approval, the increase in traffic from the revised marketing plan would not be a significant impact, either individually or cumulatively.
- 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.