

“F”

Initial Study/Negative Declaration

APPENDIX C

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

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated February 2015)

1. **Project Title:** Bouchaine Vineyards Use Permit Major Modification #P14-00408 and Variance #P14-00409
2. **Property Owner:** Bouchaine Vineyards, Incorporated
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Jason R. Hade, AICP, Planner III, (707) 259-8757; jason.hade@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and APN:** The project is located on a 102.28 acre parcel on the west side of Buchli Station Road, approximately 0.25 miles south of its intersection with Las Amigas Road, 1075 Buchli Station Road, Napa, CA, 94559; APN: 047-320-031.
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Chris Kajani; 1075 Buchli Station Road, Napa, CA 94559; (707) 252-9065
6. **General Plan description:** Agricultural Resource (AR) Designation.
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Watershed (AW) – Airport Compatibility Combination – (AC) District.
8. **Background/Project History:** Bouchaine Winery has operated at its present location since 1961 before Use Permits for wineries were required. The current property owners acquired the property in 1981 at which time the winery's annual maximum production capacity was 225,000 gallons per year.

Use Permit #U-528283 was approved by the Planning Commission on August 3, 1983 and authorized the construction of a wastewater disposal pond at the subject site. A modification of Use Permit #U-528283 to convert an existing private tasting room to a public tasting room and to conduct public tours and tastings at the existing winery facility was subsequently approved by the Planning Commission on October 19, 1988.

A Certificate of Extent of Legal Nonconformity was issued by the Zoning Administrator in 1993 which recognized two winery structures which both encroach into the required front yard and road setbacks.

Use Permit #93033-UP was approved by the Planning Commission on October 6, 1993 and permitted the construction of three cupolas along the building ridgeline at a height of 49.5-feet above the original ground elevation exceeding the 35-foot maximum airport height restriction.

A modification for Use Permit #U-528283 was approved by the Zoning Administrator on October 8, 1993 which authorized the remodel and rehabilitation of the existing winery as well as the installation of a 60,000 to 70,000 gallon water storage tank for fire protection.

On June 20, 1997, the Zoning Administrator approved a modification to Use Permit #U-528283 to increase the size of an existing outdoor deck by 342 square feet, install a business identification sign, and establish a marketing plan.

On October 13, 2000, the Zoning Administrator approved Minor Use Permit Modification #99513-MOD which authorized custom production of up to 24,500 gallons of wine per year by up to four custom producers. A Certificate of Extent of Legal Nonconformity was also granted in 2000 which recognized the winery's annual maximum production capacity as 225,000 gallons per year.

The most recent modification request, Use Permit Modification #03092-MOD, was approved by the Planning Commission on August 6, 2003, and permitted the construction of an additional 300-feet of septic leach line, two off-site directional signs, two additional custom production clients, and the addition of several marketing events.

A review of County permit records indicates temporary event permits have been issued at the winery beginning in 1997. The two largest temporary events are April in Carneros and Holiday in Carneros which are each held for two days on an annual basis and typically attract up to 300 persons per event. The modified marketing program outlined in detail below does not propose these events. No complaints

have been received by County staff concerning these temporary events.

9. **Description of Project.** Approval to modify an existing 225,000 gallon winery within a 117,325 square foot winery coverage area to allow the following:
- A. Construction of a new hospitality center totaling 4,897 square foot in accessory use area to include: 1,360 square foot conference room; 750 square foot public tasting room; 126 square foot art display area; 95 square foot retail display area; 600 square foot commercial kitchen; 888 square feet of office space; 140 square foot storage area; men's and women's restrooms; phone room; with a maximum building height of approximately 19 feet and 2,108 square foot patio.
 - B. Construction of a 1,608 square foot enclosed dry storage area addition to the existing production building and construction of a new enclosed solid waste and recyclables center at the northeast corner of the existing production building;
 - C. Interior remodeling of the existing 3,053 square foot wine club/office building to include: an expanded wine club and kitchen area totaling 1,146 square feet and 301 square feet of additional office space.
 - D. Demolition of the current southern entrance to the perimeter road and two unoccupied existing single-family residences;
 - E. Construction of a new southern entrance road and thirty five (35) space parking lot (three ADA spaces) for a total of fifty three (53) on-site parking spaces;
 - F. Installation of landscaping and new entry monument sign;
 - G. Water system permit implementation to include a new 12,000 gallon water storage tank, storm drain relocation, and minor trenching;
 - H. Hosted daily tours and tastings for wine trade personnel and the public for a maximum of 60 persons per weekday and 150 persons per day on weekends. Note that the existing 750 square foot tasting room was established prior to the County's Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO) without limitation to the number of tastings and would be relocated to the proposed hospitality center;
 - I. A Modified Marketing Program as follows:
 - 1. Fifteen (15) private promotions and dinners per year with a maximum of 50 guests;
 - 2. Two (2) annual wine auctions per year with a maximum of 50 guests;
 - 3. Fifty (50) wine related groups with catered meal per year with a maximum of 25 guests;
 - 4. Fifty (50) additional meetings (tasting, speeches, lunch, or dinner) per year with a maximum of 80 guests;
 - 5. Forty eight (48) chef's dinner series events per year with a maximum of 80 guests;
 - 6. Fifty two (52) special wine and food events per year with a maximum of 60 guests;
 - 7. Three thousand six hundred fifty (3,650) wine and food pairings per year with a maximum of four guests.
 - 8. Food to be catered and prepared on-site.

The marketing plan modification would increase from a total of 30 events with an estimated 2,540 participants annually to 217 events for a maximum 13,060 participants annually and a maximum of 3,650 wine and food pairings with a maximum of 14,600 participants annually. Total annual visitation would be 44,260 guests (31,200 tasting visitors + 13,060 marketing visitors).

- J. Hours of operation: 7:00 AM to 4:30 PM (production hours except during harvest) and 10:30 AM to 5:30 PM (visitation hours), 7-days a week;
- K. Employment of: 21 employees (16 full time; 5 part time) non harvest; 3 additional employees (1 full time and 2 part time) during harvest, for a total maximum of 24 employees;
- L. Employee hours: 7:00 AM to 5:30 PM, 2 shifts; and
- M. No increase in the production capacity is requested.

The project also includes a Variance request to reduce the required minimum setback for the winery/production building modification to Buchli Station Road from 300-feet to the existing 39-foot setback;

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

The majority of the 102.28-acre project site contains slopes which do not exceed 15 percent with the exception of several areas within the southwest section of existing vineyards. Site elevations range from approximately 25 feet to 75 feet above sea level. The site is located within the Napa River watershed approximately 1.25 miles west of the Napa River and outside of the 100 and 500 year flood hazard zones. The geology of the property is pre-Quaternary deposits and bedrock. It is underlain by one soil type, the Haire series, a neutral to strongly acid alluvial fine loam derived from sandstone and granodiorite. These soils are moderately well drained with slow to rapid runoff and very slow permeability. Based upon the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Liquefaction layer) the project site has a very low susceptibility for liquefaction.

Native vegetation of the general area consists of grassland, but the site is primarily planted in 98.79 acres of vineyards. The Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Natural Diversity Database) identify the project area to be sensitive for showy Indian clover. However, a focused rare plant survey was conducted on May 20, 2015 within the project area and did not identify any showy Indian clover or any other special-status plant species (1075 Buchli Station Road, Napa, Napa County California Plant Survey, 2015).

The existing winery covers 117,325 square feet or 2.63 percent of the parcel consisting of a 23,064 square foot wine production facility, 2,736 square foot covered crush pad area, 6,561 uncovered crush pad area, 3,409 square feet of accessory uses including a 3,053

tasting room, office, and storage building, a 18 public space parking lot, access driveways; two water tanks; and the sanitary and process waste disposal systems. The remaining accessory use area includes a conference room and office space within the production facility. Two existing unoccupied single-family residences are also present at the site and slated for demolition as part of the project. Surrounding land uses consist of large lot residential development and agricultural vineyards to the north, east, and west of the project site and an agriculture support related business/storage yard to the south. The closest residence is approximately 515 feet from the winery structure. Approximately 1.23 acre of vines would be removed for the construction of the proposed project and 0.10 acres replanted as part of the project's proposed landscape plan.

11. **Other agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).
The project would also require several ministerial permits by the County, including but not limited to building permits, grading permits, and waste disposal permits.

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies
None Required.

Other Agencies Contacted
Federal Trade and Taxation Bureau
California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature Jason R. Hade

Name: Jason R. Hade, AICP, Planner III

Date 1/27/16

Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services
Department

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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. The project site is not located within a scenic vista. As such, no impacts would occur.
- b. The project site is not located within a state scenic highway or subject to *Napa County Zoning Ordinance*, Chapter 18.106 (*Viewshed Protection Ordinance*) because Buchli Station Road is not identified as a designated public road in the *Napa County General Plan*. No rock outcroppings or historic buildings are located at the subject site. No impacts would occur.
- c. The proposed project includes a new hospitality center structure to be constructed outside of the applicable setback and the enclosing of a dry storage area within an existing production building footprint. Proposed architectural design of the hospitality center would complement the existing winery and utilize high quality materials such as wood siding and stone. The proposed additional parking spaces would be located behind the hospitality center effectively screening this area from view from Buchli Station Road. Landscaping is proposed along the perimeter of parking area and hospitality structure as well. Two existing single-family residences in poor condition would also be removed as part of the proposed project. As such, the project would not degrade the existing character of the site and its surroundings and impacts would be less than significant.
- d. The proposed hospitality center and additional marketing events may result in a minor increase in night-time lighting. In accordance with County standards, all exterior lighting would be the minimum necessary for the operational and security needs. Light fixtures would 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 would 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 less than significant impact from light or glare.

All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward, shall be located as low to the ground as possible, shall be the minimum necessary for security, safety, or operations, shall be on timers, and shall incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. No flood-lighting or sodium lighting of the building is permitted, including architectural highlighting and spotting. Low-level lighting shall be utilized in parking areas as opposed to elevated high-intensity light standards. Lighting utilized during harvest activities is not subject to this requirement.

Prior to issuance of any building permit pursuant to this approval, two (2) copies of a detailed lighting plan showing the location and specifications for all lighting fixtures to be installed on the property shall be submitted for Planning Division review and approval. All lighting shall comply with the California Building Code.

Mitigation 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

a/b/e. The proposed project would convert approximately one acre of Unique Farmland to a non-agriculture use because approximately 1.23 acres of vineyard would be removed to facilitate construction of the proposed hospitality center and associated parking area. However, 0.10 acres of vineyard would be replanted for a total net loss of 1.13 acres of vineyard. The proposed project would continue with agricultural uses and would not conflict with any agriculture use. The winery uses the grapes from the vineyard in its production of wine. The project site is zoned as Agricultural Watershed (AW). The project site is designated Farmland of Statewide Importance and Unique Farmland and would result in the conversion of approximately one acre of Unique Farmland 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 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 but no aspect of this proposal would conflict with the adopted contract. Impacts would be less than significant.

c/d. The project site is zoned Agricultural Watershed (AW) 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 would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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.

	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/c. On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Board of Directors unanimously adopted thresholds of significance to assist in the review of projects under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The thresholds were designed to establish the level at which the District believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA and were posted on the Air District's website and included in the Air District's May 2011 updated CEQA Guidelines.

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

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 47,000 sq. ft. will not significantly impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2011 Pages 3-2 & 3-3.). Given the size of the entire project, which is approximately 9,558 square feet of new enclosed floor area including approximately 750 square feet of floor area for tasting/hospitality uses compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47ksf (high quality restaurant) and 541ksf (general light industry) for NO_x (oxides of nitrogen), 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 as proposed here 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. 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 is well below the threshold of significance. The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state Ambient air quality standard.

d. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from earthmoving and construction activities required for project construction. Earthmoving and construction emissions would have a temporary effect; consisting mainly of dust generated during grading and other construction activities, exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles, and relatively minor emissions from paints and other architectural coatings. The Air District recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction

impacts. If the proposed project adhere to these relevant best management practices identified by the Air District and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts are considered less than significant:

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

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

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

Water and/or dust palliatives shall be applied in sufficient quantities during grading and other ground disturbing activities on-site to minimize the amount of dust produced. Outdoor construction activities shall not occur when average wind speeds exceed 20 miles per hour.

- e. While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. The closest residence is approximately 530 feet from the winery building site. Construction-phase pollutants will be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. The project will not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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 Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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:

- Native vegetation of the general area consists of grassland, but the site is primarily planted in 98.79 acres of vineyards. The Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Natural Diversity Database) identify the project area to be sensitive for showy Indian clover. However, a focused rare plant survey was conducted on May 20, 2015 within the project area and did not identify any showy Indian clover or any other special-status plant species (1075 Buchli Station Road, Napa, Napa County California Plant Survey, 2015). Moreover, the biological survey determined that the project area does not have the potential to support showy Indian clover or other special-status plant species and does not contain other potential sensitive biological resources such as sensitive vegetation communities. Impacts would be less than significant.
- There are no existing creeks or 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, less than significant impacts would occur.
- 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. No impacts would occur.
- The proposed project would be implemented within a previously disturbed 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. Impacts would be less than significant.
- Two olive trees would be removed as part of the proposal. However, olive trees are not subject to any local tree preservation policies or ordinances. Moreover, the project is proposed within an area that has been previously disturbed. Impacts would be less than significant.
- 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 because there are no plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b/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. In the event archaeological artifacts are encountered on the project site a qualified archaeologist would be retained by the applicant to record and evaluate the resources. Impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the following standard condition of approval.

In the event that archeological artifacts or human remains are discovered during construction, work shall cease in a 50-foot radius surrounding the area of discovery. The permittee shall contact the PBES Department for further guidance, which will likely include the requirement for the permittee to hire a qualified professional to analyze the artifacts encountered and to determine if additional measures are required.

If human remains are encountered during the development, all work in the vicinity must be, by law, halted, and the Napa County Coroner informed, so that the Coroner can determine if an investigation of the cause of death is required, and if the remains are of Native American origin. If the remains are of Native American origin, the nearest tribal relatives as determined by the State Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted by the permittee to obtain recommendations for treating or removal of such remains, including grave goods, with appropriate dignity, as required under Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

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

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:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a.
- i.) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.
 - ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project would be required to comply with the current California Building Code which 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 current 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 is a small questionable bedrock area in the southwestern corner of the project site. However, as no grading or development is proposed for this area impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The project's onsite wastewater system expansion would occur on slopes with less than 15 percent grade. The geology of the property is pre-Quaternary deposits and bedrock. It is underlain by one soil type, the Haire series, a neutral to strongly acid alluvial fine loam derived from sandstone and granodiorite. These soils are moderately well drained with slow to rapid runoff and very slow permeability. The project would be 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 standard practice on all County development projects. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c/d. According to preliminary geologic mapping of the Cuttings Wharf Quadrangle performed by the California Geologic Survey (CGS-2004), the property is underlain by pre-Quaternary deposits and bedrock. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the project site has a very low susceptibility for liquefaction. Compliance with the California Building Code would reduce any potential liquefaction or expansive soils impacts to a less than significant level.
- e. The site's wastewater system expansion is proposed as part of the project to serve the winery, visitors, and employees. According to a

Septic System Feasibility Report for Domestic Wastewater prepared by Theodore J. Walker, Registered Environmental Health Specialist on October 13, 2014, the existing septic system has adequate disposal capacity to serve the proposed project. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings. Impacts would be less than significant.

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 project would incorporate the following voluntary best management practices: solar panels on roof of new hospitality center; bio retention swales in the proposed parking areas, as well as landscaping; motion sensitive lighting; natural ventilation within production areas and hospitality center; preferred parking locations for carpools, bicycle parking, on-site showers for employees, and electric vehicle charging stations; use of recycled water from the Los Carneros Water District; water efficient landscaping; and the planting of new trees on south side of the proposed dry storage area and hospitality center building. The project also intends to become a certified Napa Green Winery.

The proposed project has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds and it was determined that the project would not exceed the 1,100 MT/yr of CO₂e. Greenhouse Gas Emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the Cal Green Building Code, vehicle fuel efficiency standards, and the project-specific on-site programs identified above would combine to further reduce emissions below BAAQMD thresholds.

The increase in emissions anticipated as a result of the project would be minor and the project is in compliance with the County's efforts to reduce emissions as described above. Accordingly, projects impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- The proposed project would not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts utilized in typical winery operations. A Business Plan would be filed with the Environmental Health Division should hazardous materials reach reportable levels. Impacts would be less than significant.
- Hazardous materials such as diesel, maintenance fluids, and paints would be used onsite during construction. Should they be stored onsite, these materials would be stored in secure locations to reduce the potential for upset or accident conditions. The proposed project consists of a modification to an existing winery that would not be expected to use any substantial quantities of hazardous materials. Therefore, it would not be reasonable for the proposed project to create upset or accident conditions that involve the release of hazardous materials into the environments. Impacts would be less than significant.
- There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site. According to Google Earth, the nearest school to the project site is Los Amigos Elementary, located approximately 0.3 miles to the north. No impacts would occur.
- Based on a search of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control database, the project site does not contain any known EPA National Priority List sites, State response sites, voluntary cleanup sites, or any school cleanup sites. No impact would occur as the project site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.

- e. The northeastern portion of the project site is located within Zone E, the influence area of the Napa County Airport, according to the *Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*. However, the proposed hospitality center is located to the west of this area of the site and lies outside of Zone E. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f. No impact would occur as the project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.
- g. The proposed access driveway and on-site circulation reconfiguration meets Napa County Road and Street Standards. Therefore, the operational changes to the winery would not obstruct 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 currently complies and would continue to comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. Impacts would be less than significant.

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"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 the Carneros subarea of Napa County where very limited historical data exists concerning groundwater levels according to the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2013. 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. While the project was previously categorized as being located within the Valley Floor/Carneros Region in an area that has an established acceptable water use criteria of 1.0 acre foot per acre per year, the Carneros Region is now considered "all other areas" based upon current County Water Availability Analysis policies. The applicant completed a Water Availability Analysis which included a parcel specific recharge evaluation. According to the recharge evaluation, "application of the Soil Water Balance (SWB) model to the project recharge area revealed that average water year recharge was approximately 3.9 inches/yr or 301.3 ac-ft/yr. During drought conditions, recharge was significantly lower at approximately 0.7 inches/yr or 54.1 ac-ft/yr. These recharge estimates are conservative in that they represent recharge from infiltration of precipitation only. Significant additional recharge may occur through streambed infiltration, groundwater inflows from outside the defined project recharge area, and/or from excess irrigation." (Bouchaine Vineyards, Inc. Supplemental Water Availability Analysis Tier I Recharge Estimation and Tier II Well Interference Analysis, 2015).

a/b. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements nor substantially deplete local groundwater supplies. The site's wastewater system is proposed as part of the project to serve the winery, visitors, and employees. According to a *Septic System Feasibility Report for Domestic Wastewater* prepared by Theodore J. Walker, Registered Environmental Health Specialist on October 13, 2014, the existing septic system has adequate disposal capacity to serve the proposed project. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings.

The proposed operation of the water system would 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). As part of the water system permit implementation, well #6 would be added to the system with a capacity of 7,200 gallons per day (or 0.022 af) of groundwater for a total supply of 23,040 gallons per day (or 0.071 af) from on-site wells (Water Availability Analysis, 2015). A pump test was conducted for well #6 as part of the Water Availability Analysis which indicates a yield of 10 gallons per minute after nine hours of continuous pumping (Well Inspection Report for Bouchaine, 2014).

According to the Water Availability Analysis (WAA) prepared by Firma Design Group for the proposed project, the total water demand on the parcel from the existing winery and associated improvements is 16.28 af/year, specifically.

Existing Bouchaine Vineyards Water Demand	Water Use (ac-ft/yr)
Vineyard Irrigation ¹	12.34
Landscaping	0.41
Winery Processing for 225,000 gallon winery	3.22
Employees (15 total)	0.14
Visitors	0.17
TOTAL	16.28

Notes:

1. Vineyard is irrigated with off-site, non-groundwater sources or from winery process water and stormwater runoff out of existing process water pond, not additional well pumping.

As a result of the proposed project, there will be an increase in water use from the proposed increase in visitation and marketing events. A detailed analysis of the increase to 18.27 af/year is provided below.

Proposed Bouchaine Vineyards Water Demand	Water Use (ac-ft/yr)
Vineyard Irrigation ²	12.12
Landscaping	0.68
Winery Processing for 225,000 gallon winery	4.84
Employees	--
Harvest (17 full time)	0.045
Harvest (7 part time)	0.009
Non-harvest (16 full time)	0.123
Non-harvest (5 part time)	0.026
Visitors	--
Walk-In Wine Tasting	0.168
By Appointment Wine Tasting with "Flavor Bites"	0.052
Marketing Program	--
Private Promotions and Dinners (50 people 15/year)	0.014
Annual Wine Auction (50 people 2/year)	0.002
Wine Related Groups w/Catered Meal (25 guests 50 year)	0.017
Additional Meetings (Tasting, Speeches, Lunch, or Dinner) (80 people 50/year)	0.048
Chef's Dinner Series (80 people 48/year)	0.080
Special Wine and Food Events (60 people 52/year)	0.050
TOTAL	18.27

Notes:

- Vineyard is irrigated with off-site, non-groundwater sources or from winery process water and stormwater runoff out of existing process water pond, not additional well pumping.

The estimated water demand of 18.27 af/yr, representing an increase of 1.99 af/yr over the existing condition, is well below the 301.3 ac-ft/yr average water year recharge calculation for the site as well as 54.1 ac-ft/yr anticipated recharge under drought conditions. 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. As part of the proposed project, Bouchaine Vineyards also intends to connect to the Los Carneros Water District's recycled water system which is now operational. However, that potential water source was not considered in the WAA as it is not guaranteed.

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 would not result in a substantial increase the demand of ground water supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge or lowering of the local groundwater level. A Tier II Well Interference Analysis was conducted as part of the WAA. Two nearby off-site wells were identified to be located within 500-feet of the project site. As noted in the WAA, the closest project well is Well 1 which is 286 and 447-ft away from the two neighboring wells. Well 6 is 366-ft from one neighboring well and Well 3 is more than 500-ft from the closest neighboring well. According to the WAA, "the well interference analysis indicates that the magnitudes of drawdown at neighboring wells at expected pumping rates and durations will not exceed 4.6-ft, significantly less than the 10 to 15-ft criteria specified in the Napa County WAA Guidance Document. This evaluation is based on analysis of the drawdown resulting from pumping each of the project wells individually at the pumping rates noted herein." (Bouchaine Vineyards, Inc. Supplemental Water Availability Analysis Tier I Recharge Estimation and Tier II Well Interference Analysis, 2015). 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 applicant has owned the property for 22 years and has not experienced any groundwater deficiency issues. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c/d. The project would 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. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. The preliminary grading and drainage plan and stormwater control plan have been reviewed by the Engineering Division. As conditioned, impacts would be less than significant.
- f. Water quality was analyzed as part of the project's water system permit application and found to be of good quality (Bouchaine Winery Water System Domestic Water Supply Permit, 2015) Moreover, laboratory analysis results indicated the water meets all primary standard maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) with the exception of proposed well number six for aluminum. Secondary MCLs were exceeded for iron (well numbers three and six) and manganese (well numbers one and six). A review of all parcels within 500-feet of the subject site's property line was conducted to identify any potential hazardous spills and none were identified. The MCLs issues discussed above would be addressed by blending and softening as required as part of the Water System Permit. Impacts would be less than significant.
- g/h. No portion of the project site is located within the FEMA-designated 100-year floodplain. No impact would occur.
- i/j. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. Impacts would be 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"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The project would not occur within an established community, nor would it result in the division of an established community. No impact would occur.
- b. The project complies with the Napa County Code and all other applicable regulations with the exception of a variance requested to reduce the required minimum setback for the winery/production building modification to Buchli Station Road from 300-feet to the existing 39-foot setback. However, the proposed project seeks to enclose a portion of the existing production building which is 39-feet from Buchli Station Road and was constructed prior to the adoption of the Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO). The proposed modification would occur within the existing building footprint and no further expansion into the required 300-foot setback would occur. The subject parcel is located in the AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district, which allow wineries and uses accessory to wineries subject to use permit

approval. The proposed project is compliant with the physical limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance. The County has adopted the 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 Resource (AR) which allows "agriculture, processing of agricultural products, and single-family dwellings." More specifically, General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-2 recognize wineries and other agricultural processing facilities, and any use clearly accessory to those facilities, as agriculture. The project would allow for the continuation of agriculture as a dominant land use within the county and is 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. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c. No impact would occur as there are no applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the site.

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"/>
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. No impact would occur.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. The project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during grading and construction activities. Construction activities would be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. As such, the project would not result in potentially significant temporary construction noise impacts or operational impacts. Because the nearest residence to the project site is approximately 515 feet to the north of the existing production building and approximately 885 feet to the northeast of the proposed outdoor component of the hospitality center, there is a low potential for impacts related to construction noise to result in a significant impact. Further, construction activities would occur during the period of 7am-7pm on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity. All construction activities would be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). The proposed project would 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. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c/d. Wineries are the predominant non-residential land uses within the County. Noise from winery operations is generally limited and intermittent, meaning the sound level can vary over the course of the year, depending on the activities at the winery. The primary noise-generating activities are equipment associated with wineries include refrigeration equipment, bottling equipment, barrel washing, destemmer and press activities occurring during the harvest crush season, and delivery and delivery trucks and other vehicles. Community noise is commonly described in terms of the "ambient" noise level which is defined as the all-encompassing noise level associated with a given noise environment. The Napa County General Plan EIR indicates the average, or equivalent, sound level (L_{eq}) for winery activities is 51dBA in the morning and 41dBA in the afternoon. Audibility of a new noise source and/or increase in noise levels within recognized acceptable limits are not usually considered to be significant noise impacts, but these concerns should be addressed and considered in the planning and environmental review processes.

The standard conditions of approval require that any exterior winery equipment be enclosed or muffled and maintained so as not to create a noise disturbance in accordance with the Napa County Code. No increase in production capacity is proposed as part of the project. The proposed marketing activities could create additional noise impacts, with the submitted marketing plan including 217 events

on an annual basis with the largest events permitting up to 80 guests. The Napa County Noise Ordinance, which was adopted in 1984, sets the maximum permissible received sound level for a residence in a rural area as 45 dBA between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. While the 45 dBA limitation is strict (45 dBA is roughly equivalent to the sound generated by a quiet conversation), the area surrounding the subject property is developed, with large lot residential uses and vineyards with the nearest residence located approximately 530 feet from winery building site. The potential for the creation of significant noise from visitation is significantly reduced, since the tasting areas are predominantly within the winery itself. 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 further ensure that marketing events and other winery activities do not create a significant noise impact. Events and non-amplified music are required to finish by 10:00 p.m. every evening. The proposed project would not result in long-term significant permanent noise impacts.

e/f. The northeastern portion of the project site is located within Zone E, the influence area of the Napa County Airport, according to the *Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*. However, the proposed hospitality center is located to the west of this area of the site and lies outside of Zone E. Based on this information, overflight annoyance noise impacts would be less than significant.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a. The proposed staffing for the winery is indicated as a maximum of 24 employees. The water and waste disposal analysis reports prepared its analysis based on 24 employees at the facility. Based on the analyzed numbers, there would be an increase of nine employees, for a maximum of 24 employees at this facility. The Association of Bay Area Governments' *Projections 2003* figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase approximately 23 percent by the year 2030 (*Napa County Baseline Data Report*, November 30, 2005). Additionally, the County's *Baseline Data Report* indicates that total housing units currently programmed in county and municipal housing elements exceed ABAG growth projections by approximately 15 percent. The additional employee positions proposed would result in minor population growth in Napa County, but would not rise to a level of environmental significance. In addition, the project would be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs.

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

b/c. Although the project includes the demolition of two single-family residences, the existing residences are currently unoccupied and in very poor condition. Therefore, the project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere and impacts would be less than significant.

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 as a result of the proposed project would be minimal. Fire protection measures would be required as part of the development pursuant to Napa County Fire Marshall conditions and there would be no foreseeable impact to emergency response times with compliance with these conditions of approval. The Fire Department and Engineering Services Division have reviewed the application and recommend approval, as conditioned. School impact fees, which assist local school districts with capacity building measures, would be levied pursuant to building permit submittal. The proposed project would have minimal impact on public parks as no residences are proposed. Impacts to public services would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

Discussion:

- a. The project would not significantly increase use of existing park or recreational facilities based on its limited scope. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. No recreational facilities are proposed as part of the project. No impact would occur.

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 site is located on the west side of Buchli Station Road, approximately 0.25 miles south of its intersection with Las Amigas Road,

south of the City of Napa and State Route 12-121. State Route 12 provides access to Sonoma County to the West and continues east through Napa County. State Route 121 provides access from State Route 37 in southern Sonoma County to the City of Napa. Buchli Station Road is a local road that runs in the north-south direction adjacent to the project site and dead-ends approximately 0.4 miles south of the project's driveway. Other local roads within the project vicinity include Las Amigas Road, Duhig Road, and Cuttings Wharf Road.

The project includes the construction of a new hospitality center, modification of the current tasting room/office/storage building, enclosing of a dry storage area within the existing production building, reconfiguration of the winery's southern entrance road, construction of a 35-space parking area with three ADA spaces, and modification of the existing marketing plan. The marketing plan modification would increase from a total of 30 events with an estimated 2,540 participants annually to 217 events for a maximum 13,060 participants annually and a maximum of 3,650 wine and food pairings with a maximum of 14,600 participants annually. The application also includes an on-site employee increase to a maximum of 24 employees.

Whitlock and Weinberger Transportation, Inc. prepared a *Traffic Impact Study for the Expansion of Bouchaine Vineyards* on April 14, 2015. A review of existing traffic volumes included mechanical tube counts at two locations on Buchli Station Road, two locations on Las Amigas Road, and on Duhig Road and Cuttings Wharf Road near the project site from Thursday, October 23, 2014 to Sunday, October 26, 2014. The traffic volume counts were conducted during the peak harvest/crush period for the Napa Valley (September/October, 2014) and reflect "peak month" volumes. Higher than typical volumes were observed on Buchli Station Road south of the winery because of the construction traffic at the time the traffic counts were taken.

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)

State Route 12-121 is currently operating at LOS E while Duhig Road and Cuttings Wharf Road are operating at LOS A. Peak hours for each roadway segment reviewed within the study are identified within the table below.

Road Name	Weekday	Weekend
Buchli Station Road south of Bouchaine Vineyards	3:30 PM - 4:30 PM	6:15 PM - 7:15 PM
Buchli Station Road north of Bouchaine Vineyards	3:30 PM - 4:30 PM	4:30 PM - 5:30 PM
Las Amigas Road west of Buchli Station Road	3:30 PM - 4:30 PM	4:30 PM - 5:30 PM
Las Amigas Road east of Buchli Station Road	4:00 PM - 5:00 PM	12:15 PM - 1:15 PM
Duhig Road	3:00 PM - 4:00 PM	1:15 PM - 2:15 PM
Cuttings Wharf Road	3:45 PM - 4:45 PM	4:15 PM - 5:15 PM

The study found that the proposed project would result in an increase of an average of 78 daily trips (including an average of 33 daily trips for special events) during the weekday, 16 trips during the PM peak hour, 87 trips (including an average of 33 daily trips for special events) during the weekend and 29 trips during the weekend midday peak hour, including the change in tasting room visitors from existing conditions to the level proposed under plus project conditions. The largest requested events would have up to 80 attendees per event and occur 24 times a year from 7:00 to 10:00 PM after the evening peak period. These events would typically be held on Saturday evenings and would be

anticipated to generate 58 trip ends for guests plus ten trips for staff arriving and departing. On average, there would be a net increase of 33 daily trips related to special events on-site with the project.

Cumulative operating conditions were determined with trips generated by six other approved projects within four miles of Bouchaine Vineyards added to existing volumes. A list of the approved projects is included within the study.

According to the study, State Route 12-121 is projected to continue to operate deficiently at LOS E under cumulative conditions. Under Future conditions, Duhig Road and Cuttings Wharf Road are expected to operate acceptably at LOS A. State Route 12-121 would operate at LOS E under the future conditions scenario. The addition of project trips to either cumulative or future traffic volumes would result in no measurable change to operation on the study roadways. As indicated in the study, the project adds a maximum of eight vehicle trips to any one segment of SR 12-SR/121 during the weekday PM peak hour, and with an existing volume of 2,504 this equates to 0.3 percent, or less than one percent. Similarly, on the weekend the project is expected to add up to 15 trip ends to the existing volume of 2,675, which is a 0.6 percent increase, also less than one percent. Therefore, the project would result in a nominal increase in trips on the study roadways. Additionally, a project specific condition would ensure that all additional marketing events be scheduled outside peak weekend and weekday traffic hours. Impacts would be less than significant.

- 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. No impact would occur.
- d/f. After implementation of the proposed project, the site would continue to be accessed via two existing driveways on Buchli Station Road approximately 1,500 and 1,700 feet south of its intersection with Las Amigas Road. The project would result in no significant off-site circulation system operational impacts nor any sight line impacts at the project driveways. The need for left turn lanes on Buchli Station at the project driveways was evaluated as part of the project's traffic study based on the criteria contained in the *Napa County Road and Street Standards, 2011*. Based on the proposal's traffic levels, a left turn lane would not be warranted at the driveways serving the project site. Proposed site access was reviewed and approved by the Napa County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division, as conditioned.

The project has 18 existing parking spaces on site, with a proposed 35 additional spaces (three ADA spaces included) for a total of 53 spaces. Based upon the County standard of 2.6 person per vehicle during weekdays and 2.8 persons per vehicle during weekends and 1.05 persons per vehicle for employees the minimum parking required for the largest proposed event (80 visitors and 15 employees) would be 46 spaces. Sufficient parking would be available for the proposed project and impacts would be less than significant.

- g. As proposed, the project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation. The project would implement preferred parking locations for carpools, bicycle parking, on-site showers for employees, and electric vehicle charging stations to provide enhanced alternative transportation options for visitors and employees. No impact would occur.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. The project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and would not result in a significant impact on the environment relative to wastewater discharge. Wastewater disposal would be accommodated on-site and in compliance with State and County regulations. The site's wastewater system is proposed as part of the project to serve the winery, visitors, and employees. According to a *Septic System Feasibility Report for Domestic Wastewater* prepared by Theodore J. Walker, Registered Environmental Health Specialist on October 13, 2014, the existing septic system has adequate disposal capacity to serve the proposed project. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings.

The proposed operation of the water system would 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). As part of the water system permit implementation, a well number six would be added to the system with a capacity of 7,200 gallons per day (or 0.022 af) of groundwater for a total supply of 23,040 gallons per day (or 0.071 af) from on-site wells (Water Availability Analysis, 2015). A pump test was conducted for well number six as part of the Water Availability Analysis which indicates a yield of 10 gallons per minute after nine hours of continuous pumping (Well Inspection Report for Bouchaine, 2014). An application for a Domestic Water Supply Permit was prepared by the Firma Design Group, Inc. in November 2014 and concluded that there is adequate water available to serve the project. Water system permit implementation would include a new 12,000 gallon water storage tank, storm drain relocation, and minor trenching. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c. Although the project would require the minor expansion of existing drainage facilities, the preliminary grading and drainage plan and storm water control plan have been reviewed by the Engineering Division. As conditioned, impacts would be less than significant.
- d. As discussed under **Section IX** above, water system permit implementation would include the addition of well number six to the system with a capacity of 7,200 gallons per day of groundwater for a total supply of 23,040 gallons per day from on-site wells (Water Availability Analysis, 2015). Water system permit implementation would include a new 12,000 gallon water storage tank, storm drain relocation, and minor trenching. An application for a Domestic Water Supply Permit was prepared by the Firma Design Group, Inc. in November 2014 and concluded that there is adequate water available to serve the project. The Water Availability Analysis concluded that sufficient water would be available to serve the proposed project. According to the Water Availability Analysis, a total future demand of 18.27 af/yr would be required to serve the site which is well below the parcel's water allotment noted above. In summary, the existing yield in addition to the proposed sixth well would be sufficient to serve all uses on the property. 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. Impacts would be less than significant as there is sufficient water supply available to serve the proposed project.
- e. Wastewater would be treated on-site and would not require a wastewater treatment provider. As such, no impact would occur.
- f. The project would be served by Keller Canyon Landfill which has a capacity which exceeds current demand. As of January 2004, the Keller Canyon Landfill had 64.8 million cubic yards of remaining capacity and has enough permitted capacity to receive solid waste through 2030. Impacts would be less than significant.
- g. The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion:

a. As discussed in Section IV above, a focused rare plant survey was conducted on May 20, 2015 within the project area and did not identify any showy Indian clover or any other special-status plant species (1075 Buchli Station Road, Napa, Napa County California Plant Survey, 2015). Further, the biological survey determined that the project area does not have the potential to support showy Indian clover or other special-status plant species and does not contain other potential sensitive biological resources such as sensitive vegetation communities. As identified in Section V above, no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified within the project site. In the event archaeological artifacts are found, a standard condition of approval would be incorporated into the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology, and traffic impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The project would also increase the demands for public services to a limited extent, increase traffic and air pollutions, all of which contribute to cumulative effects when future development in Napa Valley is considered. Cumulative impacts of these issues are discussed in previous sections of this Initial Study, wherein the impact from an increase in air pollution is being addressed as discussed in the project's Greenhouse Gas Voluntary Best Management Practices including but not limited to installation of solar panels on roof of new hospitality center; bio retention swales in the proposed parking areas, as well as landscaping; motion sensitive lighting; natural ventilation within production areas and hospitality center; preferred parking locations for carpools, bicycle parking, on-site showers for employees, and electric vehicle charging stations; use of recycled water from the Los Carneros Water District; water efficient landscaping; and the planting of new trees on south side of the proposed dry storage area and hospitality center building. The project also intends to become a certified Napa Green Winery.

Potential impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The project trip generation was calculated from winery operations, where the calculated trips reflect total visitation, on-site employees and wine production trips generated by the winery. Under the Napa County General Plan, traffic volumes are projected to increase and will be caused by a combination of locally generated traffic as well as general regional growth. The General Plan EIR indicates that much of the forecasted increase in traffic on the arterial roadway network will result from traffic generated outside of the county, however the project will contribute a small amount toward the general overall increase.

General Plan Policy CIR-16 states that "The County will seek to maintain an arterial Level of Service D or better on all County roadways, except where the level of Service already exceeds this standard and where increased intersection capacity is not feasible without substantial additional right of way." State Highway 12/121 is listed as two-lane Rural Throughways on the General Plan Circulation Map and already operates at a LOS E. As discussed above under Section XVI, Transportation, the proposed project would not lead to a deterioration of the level of service on Highway 12/121 because it would add less than one percent to the existing volume. Potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

- c. All impacts identified in this ND are less than significant and do not require mitigation. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in environmental effects that cause substantial adverse effects on human being either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None.