

“E”

**Initial Study/Mitigated Negative
Declaration**

APPENDIX C

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

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated February 2015)

1. **Project Title:** Sodhani Winery Use Permit #P14-00402-UP & Viewshed Permit #P16-00111-VIEW
2. **Property Owner:** Arvind Sodhani
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Jason R. Hade, AICP, Planner III, (707) 259-8757; jason.hade@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and APN:** The project is located on an 11.1-acre parcel on the west side of State Highway 29, approximately 0.5 miles northwest of its intersection with Ehlers Lane, 3283 St. Helena Highway North, St. Helena CA, 94574; APN: 022-080-004.
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Donna B. Oldford; 2620 Pinot Way, St. Helena, CA 94574; (707) 963-5832
6. **General Plan description:** Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space (AWOS) Designation.
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Watershed (AW) District
8. **Background/Project History:** The site is currently occupied by a single-family residence and approximately 6.4 acres of vineyards which would be used to produce estate grown wine.

Proposed project access has been significantly revised from the initial proposal in order to eliminate the need for a left-turn lane on State Highway 29. As suggested by County Public Works staff and reviewed by Caltrans, a new second driveway would be constructed to provide access to the subject site via State Highway 29.

9. **Description of Project.** The Use Permit and Viewshed Permit application proposes the following:
 - A. Construction of a new 12,000 gallon per year winery and associated winery structure (cut and cover cave), totaling 7,150 square feet in area to include: 6,696 square foot production area (fermentation room, barrel storage, wine storage, storage/mechanical area, restroom, lab, refuse, and outdoor area); 454 square feet of accessory use area (office, break room, and entry area); with a maximum building height of approximately 35 feet above natural grade and 23 feet above the grade of the receiving area.
 - B. Hours of operation: 6:00 AM to 6:00 PM (production hours, except during harvest), seven (7)-days a week;
 - C. Employment of: two employees (two full time with one residing on-site) non harvest; two additional employees (two part time) during harvest, for a total maximum of four employees;
 - D. Employee hours: 6:00 AM to 6:00 PM, one (1) shift.
 - E. Construction of four (4) parking spaces (three (3) standard spaces and one ADA space);
 - F. Installation of landscaping;
 - G. Construction of a new 20-foot wide driveway from proposed winery to State Highway 29;
 - H. Installation of an in-ground wastewater treatment system;
 - I. Removal of an existing water tank and construction of six 10,000 gallon water storage tanks, 156 square foot fire pump house, and associated piping; and
 - J. Disposal of cave spoils on-site near the eastern property line as shown on the submitted site plan. While most cave spoils would be kept on-site, it may be necessary to off-haul up to 5,200 cubic yards of excess spoils.

No visitation or marketing events are proposed.

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

The project also includes a request for an exception to the Napa County Road and Street Standards (RSS). The request proposes an exception to the State Responsibility Area Fire Safe Regulations for maximum longitudinal slope for a total of 450 feet of the 2,100 foot winery access road because of unique features of the natural environment which include steep slopes and heritage oak trees. This segment, totaling approximately 450 feet in length is proposed to have an average longitudinal slope of 18 percent and a maximum longitudinal slope of 20 percent. The Napa County RSS permit a maximum longitudinal slope of 16 percent.

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

Site topography is moderately sloping with average slopes less than 30 percent. The site is located within the Napa River watershed and outside of the 100 and 500 year flood hazard zones. The United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Soils Map for Napa County indicates the project site is mapped as Boomer gravelly loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes. Based upon the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Liquefaction layer) the area of the project site proposed for development has a very low susceptibility for liquefaction.

Native vegetation of the general area consists of oak woodland and mixed hardwoods. An assessment for Northern Spotted Owls was conducted for the subject site (Sodhani Winery Project, 2016).

Existing improvements at the project site include a single-family residence, two water tanks, driveway, and approximately 6.4 acres of vineyards. Surrounding land uses consist of large lot residential development, wineries, agricultural vineyards, and the Bale Grist Mill State Park. The closest residence to the proposed winery structure would be approximately 565 feet. No existing vineyards would be removed as part of the proposal.

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

The project would also require several ministerial permits by the County, including but not limited to an encroachment permit, building permits, grading permits, and waste disposal permits.

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

California Department of Fish and Wildlife.
California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

Other Agencies Contacted

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature Jason R. Hade

Date 5/12/16

Name: Jason R. Hade, AICP, Planner III

Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services
Department

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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. The project site is not located within a scenic vista. As such, no impacts would occur.
- b. The project site is subject to *Napa County Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 18.106 (Viewshed Protection Ordinance)* because State Highway 29 is identified as a designated public road in the *Napa County General Plan*. As proposed, the project has been designed in substantial conformance with the County's viewshed protection manual because it would avoid grading on slopes in excess of 30 percent and would be located more than 25-feet below the minor ridgeline. As shown in the submitted viewshed analysis, the proposed winery would not be visible from State Highway 29 because of the existing contours of the property and existing vegetation which includes large oak trees. Further, the winery structure would be minimally visible from Silverado Trail because of the distance of the project site from this roadway and existing vegetation and topography. The proposed water tanks would be located behind the existing garage and residence. No rock outcroppings or historic buildings are located at the subject site. Impacts would be less than significant based upon the project's conformance with the County's viewshed protection manual and below-grade design.
- c. The proposed project includes a new winery structure with a living roof which would be embedded into the hillside as a cut and cover cave. Proposed architectural design of the winery structure would utilize a concrete building retaining wall and stone retaining walls flanking the exposed entry. The cave entry would feature a wood plank door and wood sliding barn doors as well as a covered outdoor receiving area for grapes. The proposed parking spaces would be located in front of the proposed winery structure and would not be visible from State Highway 29. Landscaping is proposed above the winery structure. As such, the project would not degrade the existing character of the site and its surroundings and impacts would be less than significant.
- d. The proposed winery structure may result in a minor increase in night-time lighting. In accordance with County standard conditions of approval, all exterior lighting shall be the minimum necessary for the operational and security needs. Light fixtures shall be kept as low to the ground as possible and include shields to deflect the light downward and kept on-site so that surrounding properties are not reflected. Avoidance of highly reflective surfaces is required, as well as other conditions to prevent light from being cast skyward. As designed, and as subject to standard conditions of approval, the project would have a less than significant impact from light or glare.

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

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

Mitigation Measure(s): None 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 Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

a/b/e. The proposed project would not convert any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agriculture use because the area proposed for winery development is designated "Farmland of Local Importance" 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 continue with agricultural uses and would not conflict with any agriculture use. The winery would use the grapes from the 6.4 acre vineyard in its production of wine. The project site is zoned as Agricultural Watershed (AW). The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use policies AG/LU-2 and AG/LU-13 recognize wineries, and any use consistent with the Winery Definition Ordinance and clearly accessory to a winery, as agriculture. The property is not under a County Agricultural Contract. Impacts would be less than significant.

c/d. The project site is zoned Agricultural Watershed (AW) which allows wineries upon grant of a use permit. According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps (based on the following layers – Sensitive Biotic Oak Woodlands, Riparian Woodland Forest and Coniferous Forest) the project site does not contain Coniferous Forest- Ponderosa Pine and Douglas Fir species. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

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

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

III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create objectionable dust or odors affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

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

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

Over the long term, emission sources for the proposed project will consist primarily of mobile sources including vehicles visiting the site. The Air District's threshold of significance provided in Table 3-1 has determined that similar projects such as a quality restaurant that do not exceed a threshold of 47,000 sq. ft. will not significantly impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2011 Pages 3-2 & 3-3.). Given the size of the entire project, which is approximately 7,150 square feet of enclosed floor area compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47ksf (high quality restaurant) and 541ksf (general light industry) for NO_x (oxides of nitrogen), the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. (Please note: a high quality restaurant is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, but grossly overstates emissions associated with other portions of a winery, such as office, barrel storage and production, which generate fewer vehicle trips. Therefore, a general light industry comparison has also been used for other such uses.)

The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plan. Wineries as proposed here are not producers of air pollution in volumes substantial enough to result in an air quality plan conflict. The project site lies within the Napa Valley, which forms one of the climatologically distinct sub-regions (Napa County Sub region) within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The topographical and meteorological features of the Valley create a relatively high potential for air pollution. Over the long term, emissions resulting from the proposed project would consist primarily of mobile sources, including production-related deliveries and employee vehicles traveling to and from the winery. As stated above, one of the two full-time employees would reside on-site and no visitation or marketing program is proposed as part of the project. 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 adheres to these relevant best management practices identified by the Air District and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts would be less than significant:

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

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

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

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

- e. While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. The closest residence is approximately 565 feet from the winery structure. Construction-phase pollutants would be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. The project would not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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. Native vegetation of the general area consists of oak woodland and mixed hardwoods. An assessment for Northern Spotted Owls (NSO) was conducted for the subject site by Pamela Town, Consulting Wildlife Biologist (Sodhani Winery Project, 2016). Although no suitable NSO habitat was identified at the project site, there is NSO suitable directly adjacent to the project area. Construction during the nesting season of February 1 to July 9 has the potential to impact NSO within this suitable habitat adjacent to the project site. Accordingly, the mitigation measure identified below shall be implemented. The implementation of mitigation measure BIO-1 would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level of less than significant.
- b. There are no existing creeks or creek-crossings on the site. No encroachments or construction is proposed as part of this project that would have impacts on designated riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur.
- c. Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps and the Baseline Data Report (Chapter 15. Surface Water Hydrology, Map 15-6, Land Cover) do not indicate the presence of any wetlands or potential wetlands within the project boundary. The project would not result in substantial impacts to federally protected or potentially sensitive wetlands as these resources are not present at the site. No impacts would occur.
- d. The site is developed with an existing 6.4 acre vineyard and residence. Therefore, proposed project would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. No wildlife corridors are present at the subject site. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. According to the Northern Spotted Owl assessment conducted for the project, eight Douglas fir trees are proposed for removal as well as one Olive tree (Sodhani Winery Project, 2016). None of the identified tree species to be removed are currently considered sensitive, of special status or limited distribution within the County's General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans because there are no plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measure:

MM BIO-1: Prior to commencement of vegetation removal and earth-disturbing activities during nesting season from February 1 to July 9, a qualified wildlife biologist shall conduct preconstruction surveys for Northern Spotted Owls within 500-feet of earthmoving

activities. The preconstruction survey shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to vegetation removal and ground disturbing activities are to commence. A copy of the survey shall be provided to the County Planning Division and the Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) prior to commencement of work. If Northern Spotted Owls are found during preconstruction survey, a 500-foot no-disturbance buffer shall be created around active owl sites. These buffer zones may be modified in coordination with DFW based on existing conditions at the project site. Buffer zones shall be incorporated into the project plans and maintained for the duration of the project. If a 15 day or greater lapse of project-related work occurs, another pre-construction survey and consultation with DFW shall be required before project work can be reinitiated.

No surveys shall be required if construction activity occurs outside of the nesting season from February 1 to July 9.

Monitoring: If construction activity is to occur during the nesting season from February 1 to July 9, the pre-construction survey prepared by a qualified wildlife biologist shall be submitted to Planning Division staff prior to issuance of the grading permit.

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

Discussion:

a-c. According to a records search prepared for the subject site, review of Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Information System (NWIC) base maps indicate five known archaeological sites within a quarter-mile of the project site, but none in close proximity to the project area (Archival Results for the Sodhani Vineyards Driveway Project, St. Helena, Napa County, 2015). Additionally, review of the Office of Historic Preservation’s Historic Properties Directory found no local, state, or federally listed historical resources at this location. There are no reported ethnographic villages or camps on or near the study location (Archival Results for the Sodhani Vineyards Driveway Project, St. Helena, Napa County, 2015). According to the records search, because the project area is not located along a major drainage or at the foot of the hills along creeks, there is a low possibility of surface prehistoric archaeological resources within the project area (Archival Results for the Sodhani Vineyards Driveway Project, St. Helena, Napa County, 2015). Impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the following standard condition of approval:

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

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

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

above. Impacts would be less than significant.

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 would be required to comply with the current California Building Code which would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
 - iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Compliance with the current California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.
 - iv.) Based upon the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Liquefaction layer) the area of the project site proposed for development has a very low susceptibility for liquefaction as well as landslides. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. Soils in the study area consist of Boomer gravelly loam. These soils are moderately steep well drained soils on the side slopes of uplands formed from mixed igneous rocks and were utilized for timber and watershed (Archival Results for the Sodhani Vineyards Driveway Project, St. Helena, Napa County, 2015). The project would be required to submit a site development plan, including implementation of storm water and erosion control Best Management Practices under the standards developed in the County's National

Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Phase II Stormwater Permit, which is required by County Code and is standard practice on all County development projects. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c/d. The United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Soils Map for Napa County indicates the project site is mapped as Boomer gravelly loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes. Based upon the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Liquefaction layer) the area of the project site proposed for development has a very low susceptibility for liquefaction. Compliance with the California Building Code would reduce any potential liquefaction or expansive soils impacts to a less than significant level.
- e. A new on-site sewage disposal system would be required to serve the proposed winery. As stated in an *Onsite Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study for the Sodhani Winery* prepared by Michael R. Muelrath, R.C.E. on December 5, 2014, "based on the proposed site configuration, onsite soil conditions, and estimated wastewater flows, we have determined there are at least two options for properly disposing of the process and sanitary wastewater generated at the proposed winery" (Onsite Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study for the Sodhani Winery, 2014). The two options identified in the study consist of a sanitary wastewater subsurface drip disposal field and process wastewater hold and haul or a sanitary wastewater subsurface drip disposal field and process wastewater treatment for irrigation. A third option was identified in supplemental information dated February 26, 2016 and provided by the applicant. "In this scenario the sanitary and process wastewater streams from the winery and residence would be combined, pretreated and disposed of via a subsurface drip disposal field similar to the disposal field described in Option #1 and Option #2 in the original report" (Sodhani Winery Onsite Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study Supplemental Information 3283 St. Helena Highway, St. Helena, CA 94574 APN 022-080-004 (P14-00402), 2016). Anticipated truck trips from the hold and haul option noted above are evaluated within **Section XVI**, Transportation/Traffic. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed these reports and concurred with their findings. Impacts would be less than significant.

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 project would: incorporate the following voluntary best management practices: energy conserving lighting; installation of water efficient fixtures; water efficient landscaping; composting 75 percent of food and garden material; planting of shade trees within 40 feet of the south side of the building elevation; site design (living roof); minimizing tree removal and grading; local food production; sustainable practices education to staff; utilization of 70 to 80 percent cover crop; and retaining biomass removed via pruning and thinning by chipping and reusing the material rather than burning it.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 would not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts utilized in typical winery operations. A Business Plan would be filed with the Environmental Health Division should hazardous materials reach reportable levels. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. Hazardous materials such as diesel, maintenance fluids, and paints would be used onsite during construction. Should they be stored onsite, these materials would be stored in secure locations to reduce the potential for upset or accident conditions. The proposed project consists of a winery that would not be expected to use any substantial quantities of hazardous materials. Therefore, it would not be reasonable for the proposed project to create upset or accident conditions that involve the release of hazardous materials into the environments. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site. According to Google Earth, the nearest school to the project site is Robert Louis Stevenson Middle School, located approximately 2.65 miles to the southeast. No impacts would occur.
- d. Based on a search of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control database, the project site does not contain any known EPA National Priority List sites, State response sites, voluntary cleanup sites, or any school cleanup sites. No impact would occur as the project site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.
- e. Based upon the Napa County Planning General Maps (Angwin Airport and Napa Airport layers), the project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport. No impacts would occur.
- f. No impact would occur as the project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.
- g. The proposed access driveway improvements and on-site circulation configuration meets Napa County Road and Street Standards except for an approximately 450 foot long section of the proposed access road. A request for an exception to the Napa County Road and Street Standards proposes an exception to the State Responsibility Area Fire Safe Regulations for maximum longitudinal slope for a total of 450 feet of the 2,100 foot winery access road because of unique features of the natural environment which include steep slopes and heritage oak trees. This segment, totaling approximately 450 feet in length is proposed to have an average longitudinal slope of 18 percent and a maximum longitudinal slope of 20 percent. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division and found acceptable, as conditioned. Therefore, the proposed winery would not obstruct emergency vehicle access and impacts would be less than significant.
- h. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. The proposed project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s): None 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"/>

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

Discussion:

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

In general, recent studies have found that groundwater levels in the Napa Valley Floor exhibit stable long-term trends with a shallow depth to water. Historical trends in the Milliken-Sarco-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 understand of groundwater resources in the County, the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan recommended 18 Areas of Interest (AOIs) for additional groundwater level and water quality monitoring. Through the well owner and public outreach efforts of the (GRAC) approximately 40 new wells have been added to the monitoring program within these areas. Groundwater Sustainability Objectives were developed and recommended by the GRAC and adopted by the Board. The recommendations included the goal of developing sustainability objectives, provided a definition, explained the shared responsibility for Groundwater Sustainability and the important role monitoring as a means to achieving groundwater sustainability.

In 2009 Napa County began a comprehensive study of its groundwater resources to meet identified action items in the County's 2008 General Plan update. The study, by Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE), emphasized developing a sound understanding of groundwater conditions and implementing an expanded groundwater monitoring and data management program as a foundation for integrated water resources planning and dissemination of water resources information. The 2011 baseline study by LSCE, which included over 600 wells and data going back over 50 years, concluded that "the groundwater levels in Napa County are stable, except for portions of the MST district". Most wells elsewhere within the Napa Valley floor with a sufficient record indicate that groundwater levels are more affected by climatic conditions, are within historical levels, and seem to recover from dry periods during subsequent wet or normal periods. The LSCE Study also concluded that, on a regional scale, there appear to be no current groundwater quality issues except north of Calistoga (mostly naturally occurring boron and trace metals) and in the Carneros region (mostly salinity). The subject property is located within the Western Mountains subarea of Napa County according to the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2013. The County has no record of problems or complaints of diminished groundwater supplies at the project site or in the general vicinity. The applicant has not experienced any issues with the availability of groundwater.

Minimum thresholds for water use have been established by the Department of Public Works using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS) and the studies prepared by LSCE. These reports are the result of water resources investigations performed by the USGS in cooperation with the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. Any project which reduces water usage or any water usage which is at or below the established threshold is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels. The project is categorized as "all other areas" based upon current County Water Availability Analysis policies. The applicant completed a Water Availability Analysis prepared by Matthew O'Connor, PhD, O'Connor Environmental, Inc. which included a parcel specific recharge evaluation. According to the recharge evaluation, "mean annual groundwater recharge in Area 2 is estimated to be not less than 22.8 af/yr. The minimum estimate of mean annual recharge in Area 2 pro-rated for the project parcel area of 11.1 acres is 4.85 af/yr (11.1 acre parcel/52.2 acre recharge zone x 22.8 af/yr." (Water Availability Analysis 3283 St. Helena Highway, St. Helena, County of Napa, APN 022-080-004, 2015). As shown in Figure 1 of the WAA, Area 1 represents the maximum potential extent of the drainage area affecting recharge, Area 2 represents the likely minimum effective recharge area, and Area 3 represents the project parcel.

a-b. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements nor substantially deplete local groundwater supplies. A new on-site sewage disposal system would be required to serve the proposed winery. As stated in an *Onsite Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study for the Sodhani Winery* prepared by Michael R. Muelrath, R.C.E. on December 5, 2014, "based on the proposed site configuration, onsite soil conditions, and estimated wastewater flows, we have determined there are at least two options for properly disposing of the process and sanitary wastewater generated at the proposed winery" (Onsite Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study for the Sodhani Winery, 2014). A third option was identified in supplemental information dated February 26, 2016 and provided by the applicant. "In this scenario the sanitary and process wastewater streams from the winery and residence would be combined, pretreated and disposed of via a subsurface drip disposal field similar to the disposal field described in Option #1 and Option #2 in the original report" (Sodhani Winery Onsite Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study Supplemental Information 3283 St. Helena Highway, St. Helena, CA 94574 APN 022-080-004 (P14-00402), 2016). Anticipated truck trips from the hold and haul option noted above are evaluated within **Section XVI**, Transportation/Traffic. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed these reports and concurred with their findings.

Two wells are located on the project parcel. One well lies near the southeast corner of the parcel and is not potable because of high concentrations of arsenic, but is suitable for vineyard irrigation. The second well is located near the southwestern corner of the parcel and provides potable water for the existing residence and would also provide potable water for the proposed winery. (Water Availability Analysis 3283 St. Helena Highway, St. Helena, County of Napa, APN 022-080-004, 2015)

According to the Water Availability Analysis prepared by O'Connor Environmental, Inc. for the proposed project, the total water demand on the parcel from the existing vineyard and associated improvements is 3.9 af/year, specifically.

Existing Sodhani Vineyards Water Demand	Water Use (ac-ft/yr)
Single-Family Residence (Includes Landscaping)	0.75
Vineyard Irrigation (6.4 acres includes heat and frost protection)	3.15
TOTAL	3.9

As a result of the proposed project, there would be an increase in water use from the proposed winery. A detailed analysis of the increase to 4.45 af/year is provided below.

Proposed Sodhani Winery Water Demand	Water Use (ac-ft/yr)
Winery Processing for 12,000 gallon winery	0.26
Employees	--
Harvest (2 part time)	0.02
Non-harvest (2 full time)	0.02
Landscape	0.25
TOTAL	0.55

The estimated water demand of 4.45 af/yr, representing an increase of 0.55 af/yr over the existing condition, is below the 4.85 af/yr minimum mean estimated annual recharge for the parcel. The project would be subject to the County's standard condition of approval requiring well monitoring as well as the potential to modify/alter permitted uses on site should groundwater resources become insufficient to supply the use.

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

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

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

The proposed project would not result in a substantial increase the demand of ground water supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge or lowering of the local groundwater level. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Water Deficient Areas/Storage Areas*), the project site is not located within a water deficient area and the County is not aware of, nor has it received any reports of groundwater deficiencies in the area. According to the Water Availability Analysis prepared for the proposal, "the nearest neighbor's well is located 504 feet from the proposed project well, indicating that potential well interference is negligible and requiring no further evaluation per the WAA procedures" (Water Availability Analysis 3283 St. Helena Highway, St. Helena, County of Napa, APN 022-080-004, 2015). Impacts would be less than significant.

- c-d. The project would not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off the cultivated agricultural vineyard site. Impacts would be less than significant.

- e. The preliminary grading and drainage plan and stormwater control plan have been reviewed by the Engineering Division. As conditioned, impacts would be less than significant.
- f. The proposed project would implement standard stormwater quality treatment controls to treat runoff prior to discharge from the project site. The incorporation of these features into the project would ensure that the proposed project would not create substantial sources of polluted runoff. In addition, the proposed project does not have any unusual characteristics that create sources of pollution that would degrade water quality. Impacts would be less than significant.
- g- h. No portion of the project site is located within the FEMA-designated 100-year floodplain. No impact would occur.
- i-j. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. The project would not occur within an established community, nor would it result in the division of an established community. No impact would occur.
- b. The project complies with the Napa County Code and all other applicable regulations. The subject parcel is located in the AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district, which allow wineries and uses accessory to wineries subject to use permit approval. The proposed project is compliant with the physical limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance. The County has adopted the WDO to protect agriculture and open space and to regulate winery development and expansion in a manner that avoids potential negative environmental effects.

Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-1 of the 2008 General Plan states that the County shall, "preserve existing agricultural land uses and plan for agriculture and related activities as the primary land uses in Napa County." The property's General Plan land use designation is Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space (AWOS) which allow "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 consistent with the Napa County General Plan.

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

The General Plan includes a policy, General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-10, requiring wineries to be

designed generally of a high architectural quality for the site and its surroundings. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Mitigation Measure(s): None 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) indicate that there are no known mineral resources nor any locally important mineral resource recovery sites located on or near the project site. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	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 would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during grading and construction activities. Construction activities would be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. As such, the project would not result in potentially significant temporary construction noise impacts or operational impacts. Because the nearest residence to the project site is approximately 565 feet away, there is a low potential for impacts related to construction noise to result in a significant impact. Further, construction activities would occur during the period of 7am-7pm on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity. All construction activities would be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). The proposed project would not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts. Conditions of approval would require construction activities to be limited to daylight hours, vehicles to be muffled, and backup alarms adjusted to the lowest allowable levels. Impacts would be less than significant.

c-d. Wineries are the predominant non-residential land uses within the County. Noise from winery operations is generally limited and intermittent, meaning the sound level can vary over the course of the year, depending on the activities at the winery. The primary noise-generating activities are equipment associated with wineries include refrigeration equipment, bottling equipment, barrel washing, de-stemmer and press activities occurring during the harvest crush season, and delivery and delivery trucks and other vehicles. Community noise is commonly described in terms of the "ambient" noise level which is defined as the all-encompassing noise level associated with a given noise environment. The Napa County General Plan EIR indicates the average, or equivalent, sound level (Leq) for winery activities is 51dBA in the morning and 41dBA in the afternoon. Audibility of a new noise source and/or increase in noise levels within recognized acceptable limits are not usually considered to be significant noise impacts, but these concerns should be addressed and considered in the planning and environmental review processes.

The standard conditions of approval require that any exterior winery equipment be enclosed or muffled and maintained so as not to create a noise disturbance in accordance with the Napa County Code. The applicant has indicated that the winery equipment such as a crusher or de-stemmer (60-67 dBA average at 70 feet), would be located within the indoor area of the winery building. With the location of the equipment within the building and the distance between the equipment and the receptors, the potential noise impacts will not reach a level of significance. Moreover, no visitation or marketing events are proposed so there would be no noise generated from those activities. The winery would close at 6:00 PM each day. The Napa County Noise Ordinance, which was adopted in 1984, sets the maximum permissible received sound level for a residence in a rural area as 45 dBA between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. While the 45 dBA limitation is strict (45 dBA is roughly equivalent to the sound generated by a quiet conversation), the area surrounding the subject property is developed, with large lot residential uses and vineyards with the nearest residence located approximately 565 feet from winery building site. Continuing enforcement of Napa County's Noise Ordinance by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff would further ensure that winery activities do not create a significant noise impact. The proposed project would not result in long-term significant permanent noise impacts because of the proposed project design and lack of visitation or marketing events.

e-f. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or near a private airstrip. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

b/c. The existing single-family residence at the project site would remain and no persons would be displaced. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measure(s): 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measure(s): None 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measure(s): None 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 (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-b. The project site is located on an 11.1-acre parcel on the west side of State Highway 29, approximately 0.5 miles northwest of its intersection with Ehlers Lane. State Highway 29 in the project vicinity has single travel lanes in each direction, two to three foot wide paved shoulders, and a posted speed limit of 50 miles per hour. The highway is level and has a minor horizontal curve at the existing driveway connection. A guardrail is in place along the east side of the highway in the vicinity of the existing driveway. Tall trees line both sides of the highway and utility poles line the east side of the highway behind the guardrail.

The project includes the construction of a new 12,000 gallon per year winery including a winery structure (cut and cover cave) totaling 7,150 square feet, four parking spaces, and construction of a new 20-foot wide driveway from the proposed winery to State Highway 29.

Crane Transportation Group prepared a *Traffic Impact Report* for the proposed project on May 28, 2015. Friday AM and PM peak period (7:00 AM to 9:00 AM) and (3:00 PM to 6:00 PM) as well as Saturday PM peak period (noon – 6:00 PM) turn movement traffic counts were conducted at the existing driveway intersection with State Highway 29 on March 13, 2015 and March 14, 2015, respectively. Peak traffic count hours were 7:45 AM to 8:45 AM and 4:00 PM to 5:00 PM on Friday and 3:15 PM to 4:15 PM on Saturday afternoon. According to the report, there were no left turns from northbound State Highway 29 into the driveway during any of the three peak traffic hours. During 11 hours of counts over the two survey days, three left turns occurred from northbound State Highway 29 into the driveway (Traffic Impact Report SR Intersection with the Driveway Serving the Proposed Sodhani Winery in Napa County, 2015).

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)

As proposed, the project would generate two PM peak trips during a typical weekday and two PM peak trips during a typical Saturday. Seven daily trips are estimated to occur during a crush Saturday. No more than two additional truck trips per week would be generated by the proposed process wastewater hold and haul system, if that wastewater disposal option is selected. By comparison, a single family residence is anticipated to generate approximately 9.57 new daily trips per day based upon the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition. The need for a left turn lane on State Highway 29 at the project driveway was evaluated as part of the project's traffic study based on the criteria contained in the *Napa County Road and Street Standards, 2011*. The study found volumes during peak traffic hours on a Friday or Saturday would not warrant provision of a left turn lane either for existing plus project or year 2030 cumulative plus project traffic conditions. The County's Public Works Department concurred that based upon the proposal's anticipated traffic levels, a left turn lane would not be warranted. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact on the study intersection and State Highway 29. Impacts would be less than significant.

While most cave spoils would be kept on-site, it may be necessary to off-haul up to 5,200 cubic yards of excess spoils which would result in approximately 520 truck trips or 17 daily trips over a four-week construction period. However, these potential construction impacts would be temporary in nature and subject to standard conditions of approval from the Engineering and Conservation Division as part of the grading permit review process. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c. No air traffic is proposed and there are no new structures proposed for this project that would interfere with or require alteration of air traffic patterns. No impact would occur.
- d -f. After implementation of the proposed project, the site would continue to be accessed via an existing driveway on State Highway 29. As shown on the project plans, a new 20-foot wide driveway to State Highway 29 would also be constructed to serve the proposed winery. The traffic study reviewed the site distance at the existing driveway for exiting drivers and determined it was greater than 1,000 feet to the north along State Highway 29 and approximately 700 feet to the south along State Highway 29. Caltrans criteria for acceptable sight lines at a private driveway intersection is stopping sight distance. As described in the Caltrans Highway Design Manual, stopping site distances for 40 and 50 mile per hour speeds are 300 feet and 430 feet, respectively. Based upon these criteria, sight lines at the existing project driveway connection to State Highway 29 are acceptable (Traffic Impact Report SR Intersection with the Driveway Serving the Proposed Sodhani Winery in Napa County, 2015). Crane Transportation Group also prepared a *Sight Line Evaluation at Proposed Sodhani Winery Driveway Location Along State Route 29* which identified the sight lines at the proposed driveway for exiting drivers as greater than 1,000 feet to the north along State Highway 29 and approximately 600 feet to the south along State Highway 29. Based upon the Caltrans criteria above, "sight lines at the proposed project driveway connection to SR 29 would be acceptable" (Sight Line Evaluation at Proposed Sodhani Winery Driveway Location Along State Route 29, 2015). Proposed site access was reviewed and approved by the Napa County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division, as conditioned.

Four onsite parking spaces (3 standard spaces and one ADA space) are proposed. Based upon the County standard of 2.8 persons per vehicle and 1.05 persons per vehicle for employees the minimum parking required for the proposed winery would be four spaces. No visitation or marketing events are proposed and one full-time employee would reside on-site. Sufficient parking would be available for the proposed project and impacts would be less than significant.

- g. As proposed, the project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation. As described above, no visitation or marketing events are proposed and one full-time employee would reside on-site. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				

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

Discussion:

a/b. The project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and would not result in a significant impact on the environment relative to wastewater discharge. Wastewater disposal would be accommodated on-site and in compliance with State and County regulations. A new on-site sewage disposal system would be required to serve the proposed winery. As stated in an *Onsite Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study for the Sodhani Winery* prepared by Michael R. Muelrath, R.C.E. on December 5, 2014, "based on the proposed site configuration, onsite soil conditions, and estimated wastewater flows, we have determined there are at least two options for properly disposing of the process and sanitary wastewater generated at the proposed winery" (*Onsite Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study for the Sodhani Winery, 2014*). The two options identified in the study consist of a sanitary wastewater subsurface drip disposal field and process wastewater hold and haul or a sanitary wastewater subsurface drip disposal field and process wastewater treatment for irrigation. A third option was identified in supplemental information dated February 26, 2016 and provided by the applicant. "In this scenario the sanitary and process wastewater streams from the winery and residence would be combined, pretreated and disposed of via a subsurface drip disposal field similar to the disposal field described in Option #1 and Option #2 in the original report" (*Sodhani Winery Onsite Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study Supplemental Information 3283 St. Helena Highway, St. Helena, CA 94574 APN 022-080-004 (P14-00402), 2016*). Anticipated truck trips from the hold and haul option noted above are evaluated within **Section XVI, Transportation/Traffic**, above. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed these reports and concurred with their findings.

Two wells are located on the project parcel. One well lies near the southeast corner of the parcel and is not potable because of high concentrations of arsenic, but is suitable for vineyard irrigation. The second well is located near the southwestern corner of the parcel and provides potable water for the existing residence and would also provide potable water for the proposed winery. (*Water Availability Analysis 3283 St. Helena Highway, St. Helena, County of Napa, APN 022-080-004, 2015*). The Water Availability Analysis concluded that sufficient water would be available to serve the proposed project. Water system implementation would include the installation of six 10,000 gallon water tanks located behind the existing garage and residence to serve the winery. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. The preliminary grading and drainage plan and storm water control plan have been reviewed by the Engineering Division. As conditioned, impacts would be less than significant.

- d. As discussed in **Section IX** above, the minimum mean annual recharge for the project site is estimated at 4.85 af/yr. According to the Water Availability Analysis prepared for the project, two wells are located on the project parcel. One well lies near the southeast corner of the parcel and is not potable because of high concentrations of arsenic, but is suitable for vineyard irrigation. The second well is located near the southwestern corner of the parcel and provides potable water for the existing residence and would also provide potable water for the proposed winery. (Water Availability Analysis 3283 St. Helena Highway, St. Helena, County of Napa, APN 022-080-004, 2015). The Water Availability Analysis concluded that sufficient water would be available to serve the proposed project. According to the Water Availability Analysis, a total future demand of 4.45 af/yr would be required to serve the site which is below the parcel's estimated water recharge noted above. In summary, the existing yield would be sufficient to serve all uses on the property. Any project which reduces water usage or any water usage which is at or below the established threshold is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels. Impacts would be less than significant as there is sufficient water supply available to serve the proposed project.
- e. Wastewater would be treated via a sanitary wastewater subsurface drip disposal field and process wastewater hold and haul or a sanitary wastewater subsurface drip disposal field and process wastewater treatment for irrigation. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- f. The project would be served by Keller Canyon Landfill which has a capacity which exceeds current demand. As of January 2004, the Keller Canyon Landfill had 64.8 million cubic yards of remaining capacity and has enough permitted capacity to receive solid waste through 2030. Impacts would be less than significant.
- g. The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. As discussed in **Section IV** above, although no suitable NSO habitat was identified at the project site, there is NSO suitable directly adjacent to the project area. Mitigation is proposed for this biological topic that would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level of less than significant. As identified in **Section V** above, no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified within the project site. In the event archaeological artifacts are found, a standard condition of approval would be incorporated into the project. Impacts would be less than significant with the incorporation of the biological resources mitigation measure and standard condition of approval related to cultural resources.

- 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 the installation of energy conserving lighting; installation of water efficient fixtures; water efficient landscaping; composting 75 percent of food and garden material; planting of shade trees within 40 feet of the south side of the building elevation; site design (living roof); minimizing tree removal and grading; local food production; sustainable practices education to staff; utilization of 70 to 80 percent cover crop; and retaining biomass removed via pruning and thinning by chipping and reusing the material rather than burning it.

Potential impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The project trip generation was calculated from winery operations, where the calculated trips reflect 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." Within the project site vicinity, State Highway 29 is listed as two-lane Rural Throughways on the General Plan Circulation Map and already operates at a LOS E. The proposed project would not lead to a deterioration of the level of service on Highway 29 because it would add less than one percent to the existing volume. Potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

PROJECT REVISION STATEMENT
Sodhani Winery Use Permit #P14-00402 and Viewshed Permit #P16-00111

I hereby revise Sodhani Winery Use Permit #P14-00402 and Viewshed Permit #P16-00111 for the construction of a 12,000 gallon winery on an 11.1-acre parcel (Assessor's Parcel No. 022-080-004) located at 3283 St. Helena Highway North, St. Helena CA, to include the measure specified below:

MM BIO-1: Prior to commencement of vegetation removal and earth-disturbing activities during nesting season from February 1 to July 9, a qualified wildlife biologist shall conduct preconstruction surveys for Northern Spotted Owls within 500-feet of earthmoving activities. The preconstruction survey shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to vegetation removal and ground disturbing activities are to commence. A copy of the survey shall be provided to the County Planning Division and the Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) prior to commencement of work. If Northern Spotted Owls are found during preconstruction survey, a 500-foot no-disturbance buffer shall be created around active owl sites. These buffer zones may be modified in coordination with DFW based on existing conditions at the project site. Buffer zones shall be incorporated into the project plans and maintained for the duration of the project. If a 15 day or greater lapse of project-related work occurs, another pre-construction survey and consultation with DFW shall be required before project work can be reinitiated.

No surveys shall be required if construction activity occurs outside of the nesting season from February 1 to July 9.

Arvind Sodhani further commit themselves and successors-in-interest to (a) inform any future purchasers of the property of the above commitments; (b) include in all property leases a provision that informs the lessee of these restrictions and binds them to adhere to them, and (c) inform in writing all persons doing work on this property of these limitations.

Arvind Sodhani understands and explicitly agrees that with regards to all California Environmental Quality Act and Permit Streamlining Act (Government Code Sections 63920-63962) deadlines, this revised application will be treated as a new project. The new date on which said application will be considered complete is the date on which an executed copy of this project revision statement is received by the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services.



Arvind Sodhani
(Owner)



Date

Sodhani Winery
Use Permit #P14-00402& Viewshed Permit #P16-00111
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Potential Environmental Impact	Adopted Mitigation Measure	Monitoring and Reporting Actions and Schedule	Implementation	Monitoring	Reporting & Date of Compliance/Completion
<p>Impact BIO-1: Biological Resources. Construction of #P14-00402-UP has the potential to directly impact suitable nesting habitat for the Northern Spotted Owl.</p>	<p>MM BIO-1: Prior to commencement of vegetation removal and earth-disturbing activities during nesting season from February 1 to July 9, a qualified wildlife biologist shall conduct preconstruction surveys for Northern Spotted Owls within 500-feet of earthmoving activities. The preconstruction survey shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to vegetation removal and ground disturbing activities are to commence. A copy of the survey shall be provided to the County Planning Division and the Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) prior to commencement of work. If Northern Spotted Owls are found during preconstruction survey, a 500-foot no-disturbance buffer shall be created around active owl sites. These buffer zones may be modified in coordination with DFW based on existing conditions at the project site. Buffer zones shall be incorporated into the project plans and maintained for the duration of the project. If a 15 day or greater lapse of project-related work occurs, another pre-construction survey and consultation with DFW shall be required before project work can be reinitiated.</p> <p>No surveys shall be required if construction activity occurs outside of the nesting season from February 1 to July 9.</p>	<p>If construction activity is to occur during the nesting season from February 1 to July 9, the pre-construction survey prepared by a qualified wildlife biologist shall be submitted to Planning Division staff prior to issuance of the grading permit.</p>	<p>P</p>	<p>PD</p>	<p>PC <u> </u></p>

Notes: P = Permittee, PD = Planning Division, BD = Building Division, AC = Agricultural Commissioner, DFW = Dept of Fish & Wildlife, CT = CALTRANS, EH = Environmental Health, PW = Public Works Dept, PE/G =Project Engineer/Geologist
 PC = Prior to Project Commencement CPI = Construction Period Inspections FI = Final Inspection OG = Ongoing