

“F”

Initial Study/Negative Declaration

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

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated February 2015)

1. **Project Title:** Opus One Winery Use Permit Major Modification No. P14-00177-UP
2. **Property Owner:** Opus One Winery, 7900 St. Helena Highway, Oakville, CA 94562
3. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Gary Caravantes, 7900 St. Helena Highway, Oakville, CA 94562
4. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Shaveta Sharma; (707) 299-1358;
shaveta.sharma@countyofnapa.org
5. **Project location and APN:** Located at 7900 S. Helena Highway, 2.8 miles north of the Town of Yountville, on a ± 49.3 acre site 2,076 feet east of the intersection with State Route 29, designated Assessor's Parcel Number: 031-020-007
6. **General Plan description:** Agricultural Resource (AR).
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Preserve (AP).
8. **Background/Project History:** Opus One Winery was established on February 1989, by approval of Use Permit #88889 for a 82,000 gallon per year winery and the construction of a 60,000 s.f. winery building. Tours and tastings by appointment only was permitted at this time, however no specific number was included in the request or approval. There were subsequent use permit modification approvals to expand the facility:

February 1, 1989- Use Permit #88889 was approved by the Conservation, Development, and Planning Commission to establish a 82,000 gallon per year winery and construct a 60,000 s.f. structure production building, including a 400 s.f. kitchen and 1,320 s.f. tasting room. Tours and Tastings by appointment were included in the request and approval; no number of visitors was specified. The winery included 56 parking spaces.

February 21, 1990- Use Permit #U88889-MOD was approved by the Conservation, Development, and Planning Commission to add 20,000 s.f. of production space to the existing winery building. No other changes were requested or approved.

October 2, 2002- Use Permit #02373-MOD was approved by the Conservation, Development, and Planning Commission to increase production from 82,000 gallons per year to 110,000 gallons per year. No other changes were requested or approved.

July 18, 2008- Use Permit #P07-00745-MOD was approved by the Conservation, Development, and Planning Commission to construct a 14,324 s.f. farm management facility, that will house tractors and equipment, provide storage for supplies, have a workshop for repairs and provide some office area. No other changes were requested or approved.

Existing Winery characteristics: According to the applicant, in 2015 the winery processed 116,580 gallons of wine; has a total of 80,000 s.f. winery building; conducts daily tours and tastings by appointment for an average of 1,200 visitors weekly, 20 marketing events annually with a maximum of up to 300 guests, and employs 65 full-time employees and ten part-time employees.

9. **Project Description:** Approval to modify the previous project approvals (Use Permit #88889, Use Permit #U88889-MOD, Use Permit #02373-MOD, Use Permit #P07-00745-MOD), for the existing Winery to allow the following:
- a. Increase in annual production from 110,000 gallons per year to 250,000 gallons per year;
 - b. Construct a 51,906 s.f. addition to the rear of the existing winery building which will include: a fermentation tank room, barrel preparation areas, barrel storage, equipment storage, wine tasting and visitor center with veranda, wine case goods storage, offices, conference rooms, breakrooms, restrooms, and extension of a loading dock;
 - c. Recognize and increase daily tours and tastings by appointment from 165 visitors on the weekdays, 500 visitors on the weekend, and 1,200 visitors maximum weekly to 200 visitors on the weekdays, 500 visitors on the weekends, and 1,450 visitors weekly maximum;
 - d. Add a marketing program consisting of ten (10) events for ten (10) guests, ten (10) events for 25 guests, ten (10) events for 100 guests, and five (5) events for 300 guests;
 - e. Construct 15 new parking spaces, including three handicap spaces, for a total of 122 parking spaces;
 - f. Provide higher aeration capacity for the existing wastewater system as necessary; and
 - g. Increase in the number of employees from 65 full-time employees and ten part-time employees to 75 full-time and five part-time employees.

10. **Environmental setting and surrounding land uses:**

The ± 49.3 acre, rectangular-shaped parcel is bound to the east by the Napa River, to the north by an 8-acre parcel with a residence and vineyard, to the south by a 16-acre parcel including an agricultural waste water treatment facility and a residence, and to the west by a 49.3 acre parcel including vineyards for the Opus One winery. The project site is developed with an existing 80,000 s.f. winery building and associated vineyards and has been in use since the early 1990s. A farm management building, approximately 14,324 s.f. in size, was added in 2008, the improvements are adjacent to a paved access road used for employees and deliveries. According to the United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Soil Survey of Napa County, California, about one-third of the property consists of Bale Loam with 0-2% slopes; the northern one-third consists of Bale Clay loam, with 0-2% slopes, and the eastern portion consists of Yolo Loan with 0- 2% slopes; the site generally drains from southwest to northeast into the Napa Valley River which borders the eastern property line. The property vicinity is within the Napa Valley River Watershed.

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

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

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

CalTrans.

Other Agencies Contacted

Federal Trade and Taxation Bureau
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.

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

Date

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

Discussion:

a-c Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms, geological features, water, trees and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of a beautiful or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken-in. As generally described in the **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses** section, above, this area is defined by a mix of vineyard, winery, rural residential uses, and the Napa River along the eastern property line. The project would not result in substantial damage to scenic resources or substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because all new construction would be behind existing development. The project site is currently developed with a winery, farm management building, vineyards, access road, parking lot, three wells, wastewater pond, water storage tank, and an electrical room. The proposal includes construction of a 51,906 s.f. expansion of the existing winery building, fifteen parking spaces, and expansion of the aeration system of the existing wastewater pond. The building and parking lot will be to the rear of the existing winery building and would create no new visual impacts along State Route 29. There are no rock outcroppings visible from the road or other designated scenic resources on the property.

d The expansion of winery uses may result in the installation of additional lighting that may have the potential to impact nighttime views. Although the project is in an area that has a certain amount of existing nighttime lighting, the installation of new sources of nighttime lights may affect nighttime views. Pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approval for wineries, outdoor lighting will be required to be shielded and directed downwards, with only low level lighting allowed in parking areas. As designed, and as subject to the standard condition of approval, below, the project will not have a significant impact resulting from new sources of outside lighting.

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

Prior to issuance of any building permit pursuant to this approval, two (2) copies of a detailed lighting plan showing the location and specifications for all lighting fixtures to be installed on the

property shall be submitted for Planning Division review and approval. All lighting shall comply with the California Building Code.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b/e. The project site is designated Prime Farmland and would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Important as shown on the Napa County Important Farmland Map 2002 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. Approximately one acre of vines will be removed to accommodate the winery building expansion; however the parcel would still retain 35 acres of vines on the property. There are no other changes included in this proposal that would result in the conversion of Farmland beyond the immediate project site. General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use policies AG/LU-2 and AG/LU-13 recognize wineries, and any use consistent with the Winery Definition Ordinance and clearly accessory to a winery, as agriculture. As a result, this application will not result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

On March 5, 2012 the Alameda County Superior Court issued a judgment finding that the Air District had failed to comply with CEQA when it adopted the thresholds. On August 12, 2013, the Court of Appeal reinstated the District's thresholds of significance provided in Table 3-1 (Criteria Air Pollutants & Precursors Screening Levels Sizes) and they are applicable for evaluating projects in Napa County.

Over the long term, emission sources for the proposed project will consist primarily of mobile sources including vehicles visiting the site. The Air District's threshold of significance provided in Table 3-1 has determined that similar projects such as a quality restaurant that do not exceed a threshold of 47 ksf will not significantly impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2011 Pages 3-2 & 3-3.). Given the size of the project is 131,906 s.f. compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47ksf NOX (high quality restaurant) and 541ksf (general light industry), the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. (Please note: a high quality restaurant is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, but grossly overstates emissions associated with other portions of a winery, such as office, barrel storage and production, which generate fewer vehicle trips. Therefore, a general light industry comparison has also been used for other such uses.) The proposed project would account for

376 maximum daily trips, inclusive of employees and visitation, on a typical weekday, 428 trips on harvest-season day with no marketing events, and the largest marketing events would generate 272 trips.

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 of 700 two-way trips 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:

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

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

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

e. While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. Construction-phase pollutants will be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. The project will not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. As noted earlier the closest off-site residence is 1,100 feet away, to the south, from the proposed winery.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers - plants CNPS points & polygons, plant surveys, red legged frog core area and critical habitat, vernal pools & vernal pool species, Spotted Owl Habitat – 1.5 mile buffer and known fish presence) no known candidate, sensitive, or special status species have been identified as occurring within the project boundaries. The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any special status species, or species of particular concern, as there are none identified in the project area. The proposal and associated construction are minimal with no significant grading or tree removal required. In addition, the

site has been developed with a winery, vineyard, farm management building, water tank, three wells, and a wastewater pond. Furthermore, there were no species or site conditions which would be considered essential for the support of a species with limited distribution or considered to be a sensitive natural plant community. The site has not been identified in any local/regional or State plans as being a sensitive community. The potential for this project to have an impact on special status species is less than significant.

- c/d. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – water bodies, vernal pools & vernal pool species) no water bodies are present on the project site. The project applicant has submitted a Stormwater Control Plan for the review and approval of the Engineering Division. The project's associated construction activities will incorporate all BMPs as required by the Engineering Division to prevent runoff and/or contamination of the nearby Napa River, along the eastern property line. The winery expansion will be constructed in a previously developed footprint (the existing parking lot), that is not a wildlife corridor. Therefore, project activities will not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with their corridors or nursery sites.
- e/f. This project would not interfere with any ordinances protecting biological resources. There are no tree preservation ordinances in effect in the County. The project will result in the removal eleven of olive trees ranging from 18"-30" in canopy size. As the olive trees are not native their removal does not create any significant impact to biological resources. 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.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a-c. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology surveys, sites, sensitive areas, and flags) no historic sites have been identified on the property. However, if resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval:

In the event that archeological artifacts or human remains are discovered during construction, work shall cease in a 50-foot radius surrounding the area of discovery. The permittee shall contact the PBES Department for further guidance, which will likely include the requirement for the permittee to

hire a qualified professional to analyze the artifacts encountered and to determine if additional measures are required.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a.
- i.) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.
 - ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
 - iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Compliance with the latest editions of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.
 - iv.) According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) there are no landslide deposits in the proposed development area.
- b. The proposed development is modest and will occur on slopes ranging from 0% to 2%, the average slope for winery building expansion is less than five percent. Based upon the Soil Survey of Napa County, prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), about one-third of the property consists of Bale Loam with 0-2% slopes; the northern one-third consists of Bale Clay loam, with 0-2% slopes, and the eastern portion consists of Yolo Loam with 0-2% slopes; the site generally drains from southwest to northeast into the Napa Valley River which borders the eastern property line. The project will require incorporation of best management practices and will be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable.
- c/d. According to preliminary geologic mapping of the St. Helena Quadrangle performed by the California Geologic Survey (CGS-2004), the property is underlain by Holocene Fan deposits. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the project site has a medium susceptibility for liquefaction on the entirety of the property. Development will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible.
- e. The existing winery utilizes an existing wastewater management system, originally installed at the site in 1990. The existing aerated pond system and existing mound system with additional treatment will be utilized to handle the additional flows produced from this project. The expansion and operational changes to the system will be designed by a licensed engineer and will be reviewed and approved by the Division of Environmental Health. There does not appear to be any limitation on this parcel's ability to support an on-site water system which will be able to support the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

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

The applicant proposes to incorporate GHG reduction methods including: habitat restoration, alternative fuel and electrical vehicles in fleet, energy conserving lighting, energy star roof/cool roof, connection to recycled water, low-impact development, recycle 75% of all waste, intend to become a "Napa Green Winery".

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts normally used in winery operations. A Business Plan will be filed with the Environmental Health Division should the amount of hazardous materials reach reportable levels. However, in the event that the proposed use or a future use involves the use, storage or transportation of greater than 55 gallons or 500 pounds of hazardous materials, a use permit and subsequent environmental assessment would be required in accordance with the Napa County Zoning Ordinance prior to the establishment of the use. During construction of the project some hazardous materials, such as building coatings/ adhesives/ etc., will be utilized. However, given the quantities of hazardous materials and the limited duration, they will result in a less-than-significant impact.

- b. The project would not result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site.
- d. The proposed site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.
- e. The project site is not located within two miles of any public airport.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.
- g. The proposed project will not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan.
- h. The project would not add any structures or people to any area that is adjacent to wildlands. The area around the project site is developed, with vineyards, residences, and wineries. The project will increase the size of the building and people to the site, and they could be at risk due to the future fires. The impacts of this exposure is less than significant as the site will have adequate emergency access for employees and visitors to exit the property, and for fire personnel to enter and contain any blaze.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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-Tuluca (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 understanding 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 of 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 County has no record of problems or complaints of diminished groundwater supplies at the project site or in the general vicinity.

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.

a/b. The project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements nor substantially deplete local groundwater supplies. The three current wells produce at 50, 18, and 8 gpm respectively. The projected water use for the project is 19.62 AF/YR. Current water use for the vineyard is 12.3 AF/YR and will remain the same. The vines do receive frost protection, but that is supplied from the treated wastewater. The winery currently uses 3.82 AF/YR and will use 6.67 AF/YR as a result of the proposed expansion. Landscaping currently utilizes 0.4 AF/YR and will halve to 0.2 AF/YR as the landscaping is reduced in half. The Farm Management Building utilizes 0.45 AF/YR and that will remain unchanged with the proposal. Due to the project's location on the Valley Floor, the project has a fair share water allotment factor of 1.0 acre-foot per acre. For this project multiplying the parcel size by the fair share factor results in a 49.3 AF/YR allotment. The proposed water use of 19.62 AF/YR is well below the available groundwater of 49.3 AF/YR available to the site and no further analysis is needed. Below is a table that breaks down each source of existing and proposed water use:

| WATER USE ESTIMATE CALCULATIONS | | |
|--|--|----------|
| | Estimated Water Use (Acre- Feet / Year) | |
| | Existing | Proposed |
| Winery Domestic & Process Water Use | | |
| Winery - Daily Visitors | 0.90 | 0.96 |
| Winery - Marketing Events | 0.03 | 0.04 |
| Winery - Employees | 0.89 | 1.02 |
| Winery - Production | 2.02 | 4.6 |
| Total Winery Water Use | 3.82 | 6.7 |
| Irrigation Water Use | | |
| Landscape | 0.4 | 0.2 |
| Vineyards | 12.3 | 12.3 |
| Total Irrigation Water Use | 12.7 | 12.5 |
| Farm Management Building | 0.45 | 0.45 |
| Total Combined Water Use | 17.03 | 19.62 |

Notes:

- (1) 3 gallons of water per visitor is based on project wastewater disposal feasibility report by Summit Engineering.
- (2) 15 gallons of water per guest is based on project wastewater disposal feasibility report by Summit Engineering.
- (3) 10 gallons of water per guest is based on project wastewater disposal feasibility report by Summit Engineering.

c-e. The project proposal will not alter any drainage patterns on site or cause an increase in erosion on or off site. The project would be required to incorporate an erosion control plan to manage onsite surface drainage and erosion of onsite soils during construction and winter months (October to April). The Farm Management Building constructed in 2008 incorporated a rainwater capture feature which captures and directs rainwater to a precast pre-package lift station, and is then transferred to the adjacent reservoir for grape vineyards irrigation. Additionally, by incorporating

standard measures in the grading plan, this project would have a less than significant impact on drainage and siltation. There are no existing or planned stormwater systems that would be affected by this project.

- f. There is nothing included in this proposal that would otherwise substantially degrade water quality. The Division of Environmental Health has approved the existing Non-Transient Non-Community Water System and has found the existing system adequate to meet the facility's expanded needs as conditioned. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality.
- g-i. The project site is not located within a flood hazard area, nor would it impede or redirect flood flows or expose structures or people to flooding. The project site is not located within a dam or levee failure inundation zone.
- j. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows.

Mitigation Measures: None.

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

Discussion:

- a-c. The project would not occur within an established community, nor would it result in the division of an established community. The project complies with the Napa County Code and all other applicable regulations. The subject parcel is located in the AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning district, which allows wineries and uses accessory to wineries subject to use permit approval. The proposed project is compliant with the physical limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance. The County has adopted the Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO) to protect agriculture and open space and to regulate winery development and expansion in a manner that avoids potential negative environmental effects.

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

The proposed use of the property for the "fermenting and processing of grape juice into wine" (NCC §18.08.640) supports the economic viability of agriculture within the county consistent with General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-4 ("The County will reserve agricultural lands for agricultural use including lands used for

grazing and watershed/ open space...") and General Plan Economic Development Policy E-1 (The County's economic development will focus on ensuring the continued viability of agriculture...).

The General Plan includes two complimentary policies requiring wineries to be designed generally of a high architectural quality for the site and its surroundings. There are no applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the property.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|------|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| XII. | 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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"/> |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

a/b. The project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during the temporary construction of the project. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. The project would not result in potentially significant temporary construction noise impacts or operational impacts. Given the proximity to the neighbors, the closest of who is located over 1,700 feet to the northeast, there is a relatively low potential for impacts related to construction noise to result in a significant impact. Furthermore, construction activities would generally occur during the period of 7am-7pm on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity. All construction activities will be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). The proposed project will not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts. Conditions of approval would require construction activities to be limited to daylight hours, vehicles to be muffled, and backup alarms adjusted to the lowest allowable levels.

c/d. Noise from winery operations is generally limited; however, the proposed marketing plan could create additional noise impacts. The marketing events have occurred at the winery dating back several years and to date, no noise complaints have been filed with the County. The submitted marketing plan includes a number of events on a weekly, monthly and annual basis, some of which would include up to 300 visitors (5 per year). The Napa County Noise Ordinance, which was adopted in 1984, sets the maximum permissible received sound level for a rural residence as 45 db between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. While the 45 db limitation is strict (45 db is roughly equivalent to the sound generated by a quiet conversation), the area surrounding the subject property is developed with few homes located in the immediate vicinity and with the nearest residence located 1,700 feet to the southwest. The proposed winery building is set back approximately 1,600 feet from the centerline of State Highway 29. Continuing enforcement of Napa County's Noise Ordinance by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff, including the prohibition against amplified music, should ensure that marketing events and other winery activities do not create a significant noise impact. Events and music, including clean-up, are required to finish by 10 p.m. every evening.

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. Staffing for the winery would include up to a maximum of 75, with 65 of these employees already existing workers. The Association of Bay Area Governments' *Projections 2003* figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase some 23% by the year 2030 (*Napa County Baseline Data Report*, November 30, 2005). Additionally, the County's *Baseline Data Report* indicates that total housing units currently programmed in county and municipal housing elements exceed ABAG growth projections by approximately 15%. The ten additional employees which are part of this project will most likely lead to some population growth in Napa County. However, relative to the County's projected low to moderate growth rate and overall adequate programmed housing supply, that population growth does not rise to a level of environmental significance. In addition, the project will be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b. The project site is located along State Route 29 (SR-29) which provides the primary access to the project site driveway, with secondary access provided by Oakville Cross Road. The two existing winery driveways meet County Standards and sight distance requirements, and has adequate queuing capacity. The secondary access is primarily for employees, with visitors using the SR-29 access. The project includes the construction of an expanded winery building, additional hospitality functions, and office uses. As part of the overall Use Permit modification proposal, the existing winery would increase production from 116,580 gallons of production in 2015 to 250,000 gallons and would slightly increase overall employment from current levels. In addition, there would be a moderate increase in current guest visitation levels from 1,200 to 1,450 per week. Marketing activities would primarily occur outside the weekday peak traffic periods, with at least 80% scheduled outside the weekday peak traffic periods (7:00-8:00 AM; 4:00-6:00 PM), and weekend peak traffic period (1:00-4:00 PM). The applicant submitted a traffic study prepared by *Omni-Means Engineering Solutions* dated February 12, 2016 to supplement the application. The traffic study evaluated the trip generation from the project as it relates to short-term (Year 2016) and long-term (Year 2030), and cumulative traffic conditions. The study found that there would be no potentially significant impacts as a result of the proposal in either the short-term, long-term, or cumulative conditions.

The proposed Opus One Winery use modification project would generate 61 net new daily trips during the weekday and zero (0) net new daily trips during the weekend periods (respectively) based on normal weekday and weekend operations. There would be an increase of 23 weekday PM peak hour trips and zero weekend mid-day peak hour trips with proposed project uses over existing conditions. This increase in daily and peak hour net new roadway trips represents the difference between existing traffic operations (that reflect current winery activities) with ultimate use modification requests. Currently, the winery is averaging approximately 165 visitors a day and 500 visitors on its busiest day (Saturday). The proposed use modification would increase these visitation levels to approximately 200 visitors on average on a weekday for daily tours and tastings with weekend visitation unchanged at 500 visitors on its busiest day (maximum). Employment levels would increase slightly during the weekdays from an average of 65 employees per day to 75 per day (employment would remain unchanged on the weekend). Overall production would increase from 116,580 gallons to 250,000 gallons (annually).

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)

SR- 29 acts as the primary north-south regional route through the Napa Valley and provides direct access to the project site. Based on the most recent Caltrans daily traffic counts conducted along SR-29 (between Oakville Grade Road and Rutherford Road), SR- 29 has a current annual average daily traffic volume of 23,400 vehicles. During the peak month, the roadway carries 25,500 ADT. Based on Napa County roadway segment level-of-service (LOS) thresholds, these ADT volumes represent LOS F conditions for a two-lane rural arterial roadway. Oakville Cross Road carries approximately 1,770 ADT (west of Money Road) based on Napa County count data and this would represent LOS B conditions consistent with a two-lane collector street.

The three project study intersections evaluated for this analysis are as follows:

1. Opus One Driveway/State Route 29 (St. Helena Highway)
2. Opus One Driveway/Oakville Cross Road
3. Oakville Cross Road/State Route 29 (St. Helena Highway)

All project study intersections are unsignalized, minor-street stop-sign controlled intersections. As calculated in the submitted traffic study, the Opus One Driveway/SR-29 intersection is operating at LOS C during both the weekday PM peak hour and during the weekend (Saturday) mid-day peak hour. The Opus One Driveway/Oakville Cross Road intersection is operating at LOS A during the same time periods. Finally, the Oakville Cross Road/SR-29 intersection is operating at LOS F during both the weekday PM peak and weekend mid-day peak hours. It is noted that stated intersection LOS at the Oakville Cross Road/SR-29 intersection refers to the stop-sign controlled eastbound-westbound turn movements from either Oakville Cross Road or Walnut Lane onto SR-29.

With the proposed project expected to add approximately 61 daily trips to SR-29, this would represent an addition of less than 1 percent (0.003) to the daily volumes on the highway. The combined existing plus project volume of 23,461 daily trips would remain at LOS F operating conditions for a two-lane rural arterial highway based on established County thresholds. ADT on Oakville Cross Road would remain virtually unchanged at 1,776 vehicles with proposed project activity and would continue to operate at LOS A conditions. With near-term plus project conditions, daily traffic volumes on SR-29 would increase to 25,304 ADT. Again, this would represent LOS F conditions for a two-lane, rural arterial highway based on County thresholds. ADT on Oakville Cross Road would remain at 1,986 vehicles (the same as near-term [no project] conditions). This would represent LOS B conditions based on County thresholds.

- c. This proposed project would not result in any change to air traffic patterns.
- d.-e. Access to the proposed winery will be from SR-29, onto the site and as existing meets County Road and Street Standards and CALTRANS requirements. The project would result in no significant off-site circulation system operational impacts nor any sight line impacts at the proposed project driveway.
- e. The project proposes a total of 122 parking spaces. These parking spaces would be sufficient to accommodate parking needs during normal business days for employees and visitors. Additional parking will be required for the larger marketing events, the applicant will provide valet services for larger events with parking along vineyard rows and other suitable areas on the site. No parking will be permitted within the right-of-way of SR-29.
- f. There is no aspect of this proposed project that would conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a. The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and will not result in a significant impact.
- b. The project will not require construction of any new water treatment facilities that will result in a significant impact to the environment. Water will be provided by either the existing well or a new well, it cannot be established that the existing well has the necessary seal. A new wastewater system will be constructed on site. The system will be designed by a licensed engineer and will be reviewed and approved by the Division of Environmental Health.
- c. The project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, which will cause a significant impact to the environment.
- d. The project has sufficient water supplies to serve projected needs. The existing water use for the site is 17.03 AF/YR and projected water use for the winery expansion is 2.59 AF/YR. The submitted groundwater study submitted by *Summit Engineering* has established a threshold of 49.3 AF/YR for this parcel; therefore the total estimated water demand of 19.62 AF/YR is below the threshold established for the parcel. No further analysis is required.
- e. Wastewater will be treated on-site and will not require a wastewater treatment provider.
- f. The project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the projects demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the project.
- g. The project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

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

Discussion:

a. The project as proposed will not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, 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 habitat restoration, alternative fuel and electrical vehicles in fleet, energy conserving lighting, energy star roof/cool roof, connection to recycled water, low-impact development, recycle 75% of all waste, intend to become a "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." SR-29 is listed as two-lane Rural Throughways on the General Plan Circulation Map and already operates at a LOS F. As discussed above under Section XVI Transportation, the project would not create any project specific or cumulatively significant impacts to traffic.

c. There are no environmental effects caused by this project that would result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, whether directly or indirectly. No hazardous conditions resulting from this project have been identified. The project would not have any environmental effects that would result in significant impacts.

Mitigation Measures: None Required.