

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:** Mountain Peak Winery Use Permit #P13-00320-UP
2. **Property Owner:** Hua Yuan, Mountain Peak Vineyards, LLC
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** John McDowell, Deputy Planning Director, (707) 299-1354; john.mcdowell@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and APN:** The project is located on a 41.76-acre parcel on the northwest side of Soda Canyon Road, approximately 6.1 miles north of its intersection with Silverado Road, 3265 Soda Canyon Road, Napa, CA, 94558; APN: 032-500-033.
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Donna B. Oldford; Plans4Wine, 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, farm management office and approximately 28 acres of vineyard (25.0 net acres of vineyard).
9. **Description of Project.** Request for approval of a Use Permit to allow: (1) Construction of a new 100,000 gallon per year winery including an approximately 33,424 square foot cave, approximately 8,046 square foot tasting and office building, and approximately 6,412 square foot covered outdoor crush pad and work area; (2) demolition of existing single family residence; (3) installation of twenty-six (26) parking spaces; (4) construction of two new driveways and private access roads with ingress/egress from Soda Canyon Road; (5) installation of a LYVE wastewater treatment system and community non-transient potable water supply sourced from on-site private wells including two (2) 100,000 gallons water tanks for vineyard irrigation and one (1) 20,000 gallon water tank for domestic supply; (6) disposal of all cave spoils on-site within existing vineyards; (7) nineteen (19) full time employees, four (4) part-time employees and four (4) seasonal harvest employees; (8) wine tours and tastings by prior appointment only for a maximum of eighty (80) visitors per day and maximum of 320 visitors per week; (9) a marketing plan including three (3) events per month for up to twelve (12) visitors, three events per month for up to twenty-four (24) visitors, four (4) events per year for up to seventy-five (75) visitors, and two (2) events per year for up to 125 visitors; and (10) on premises consumption of wines produced on site in the tasting room and outdoor terrace in accordance with Business and Professions Code Sections 23358, 23390 and 23396.5 (AB 2004-Evans Bill). The project also includes a request for an exception to the Napa County Road and Street Standards (RSS) to increase the maximum slope on a portion of the commercial access road to the covered crush pad and cave portals from 16% to 19.6%.

Improvements will occur in three separate areas of the property. The majority of the improvements will be located on the southwestern portion of the site nearest Soda Canyon Road and will include the cave, outdoor covered crush pad and work area, and tasting room with offices building. The cave will include four portals adjacent to the crush pad area with one of the portals having direct access into the mechanical and trash/recycling enclosure. The 33,424 sq. ft. of cave area will contain fermentation and barrel aging areas with 4,484 sq. ft. dedicated to tasting/marketing areas including an office and restroom. The cave will also include an employee break room and wine laboratory. At the northern end of the cave will be a fifth portal that connects to the basement level of the new tasting and office building. The three level 8,046 sq. ft. tasting and office building will be constructed approximately in the same location as the existing residence which will be demolished. The building will be constructed into the hillside with a subgrade basement, partially underground first story, and only the third level (second story) fully above ground. Building materials include a stone and/or stucco exterior and non-reflective metal roofing. This building will include a commercial kitchen in addition to two outdoor covered tasting decks. The 6,412 sq. ft. covered crush pad area will feature a similar non-reflective metal cover. The area surrounding the tasting and office building and cave will also include an underground 80,000 gallon fire protection water tank, customer parking area and the two new driveways and access roads from Soda Canyon Road. Approximately 24,000 cubic yards of cave spoils will be deposited within this project area. Cave construction

and deposition of cave spoil will result in the majority of this area being regraded with new vineyard and site landscaping being installed after grading work is completed. The landscaped area will include two unenclosed patios near the tasting room which will be used for tastings, including on-site wine sales and consumption pursuant to Assembly Bill AB-2004. During construction, a staging area and temporary stockpile area for cave spoils will be placed northeast of the proposed customer parking lot. This area will be replanted in vineyards at the completion of the project.

A total of 2.96 acres of vineyard will be permanently removed in order to construct the winery. The majority of this vineyard removal will occur in and around the location of the outdoor covered crush pad and the parking lot area of the tasting and office building. Access roads, the new well and the LYVE waste water system will also result in vineyard loss.

The second area of construction will occur on the western side of the property generally north of the proposed winery and will include a service drive accessing a stormwater detention basin, the wastewater treatment system and a cave spoils deposition area. The wastewater treatment system includes two 100,000 gallon above ground water tanks for storage of treated water to be reused for vineyard irrigation. Adjacent to these tanks is a 20,000 gallon domestic water storage tank. The new domestic water well will be located in the area immediately east of an existing vineyard well. Approximately 10,100 cubic yards of cave spoils will be deposited over an existing vineyard which will be replanted afterwards. Depth of spoils in this area will add a mean of 3 ft. of height above existing grade with a maximum of 7 ft. of fill. The third development area is on the eastern portion of the site and consists solely of a cave deposition area for approximately 5,900 cubic yards of fill. Mean height of the fill will be 3 ft. with a maximum of 8 ft. in height.

The applicant is requesting to conduct daily by-appointment wine tasting and tours for a maximum of 80 guests per day and maximum of 320 guests per week. Tastings would occur between 10 a.m. and 6 p.m., seven days a week in the tasting and office building, in outdoor areas near the building, and in a small portion of the cave. Marketing events are proposed consisting of 3 food and wine pairing events per month for a maximum of 12 persons and 3 events per month for a maximum of 24 persons. A maximum of 4 wine club and release events would happen annually for up to 75 visitors, and 2 events year per year would be held for auction-related events of up to 125 guests. As proposed, marketing would occur in addition to daily visitation. Food for events will be both prepared on-site and catered. Events will be conducted both within the winery and outside the cave and at the two landscape features near the tasting/office building.

10. **Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses.** The 41.76 acre subject property has a somewhat unusual shape essentially consisting of two roughly 20-acre rectangles joined at opposing corners in the middle of the parcel. The western "rectangle" contains vineyards, the existing main residence near Soda Canyon Road, a vineyard office on the northern portion, and an existing private road running along its eastern boundary that serves both the subject property as well as adjoining properties and properties beyond the site to the north. The eastern rectangle contains vineyards and is divided by an unnamed "blue line" stream. The overall site contains 28 acres of vineyard.

Site topography is moderately sloping averaging between 2 and 15 percent, with several small areas within the creek setback area at no greater than 30 percent slope. Elevations range between 1305 ft. above Mean Sea Level (MSL) and 1390 ft. above MSL. The site is located within the upper portion of the Rector Reservoir drainage basin and is outside of the 100 and 500 year flood hazard zones. Rector Reservoir is owned and operated by the State of California, and a portion of its water is used for public drinking supply for the Town of Yountville.

The United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Soils Map for Napa County indicates the project site is mapped as Boomer loam, 2 to 15 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. There is no known history of landslide or faulting on the subject property.

Native vegetation on the subject parcel is limited to the approximately 200 ft. wide by 1,000 ft. long stream corridor located on the eastern portion of the site. Vegetation in the area consists of a mixture of riparian species in the stream channel to oak woodland and chaparral outside of the stream channel.

Surrounding land uses consist of undeveloped hillside areas with substantial areas of vineyards and rural residential uses on generally large parcels. Focusing on the western portion of the site where the winery is proposed, the parcel west of the site is 49.67 acres and contains primarily native vegetation with a residence located approximately 500 ft. to the nearest shared property line. Beyond this property are several parcels ranging in size from 40 acres to 70 acres containing vineyards and native vegetation. To the south of the project across Soda Canyon Road are smaller agriculturally-zoned rural residential lots containing single family homes and appurtenant structures. The lot immediately across the street is 10 acres with other nearby lots ranging in size from 2 to 10 acres. The nearest residence from this direction is approximately 285 ft. from the subject property. East of the western portion of the site and taking access from a private road running through the subject property is a vineyard property with a residence located approximately 100 ft. from the shared property line and access road. North of the project site is a 16.3 acre rural residential property containing mostly native vegetation surrounding the home, which is approximately 200 ft. from the subject property.

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

Other Agencies Contacted

Federal Trade and Taxation Bureau
California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control

INCORPORATED ATTACHMENTS

- A. Water Availability Analysis for Mountain Peak Winery, Bartelt Engineering, Paul N. Bartelt, P.E., March 2016
- B. Updated Summary of April 2014 Constant Rate Pumping Test, Existing Onsite Water Well 3265 Soda Canyon Road, Napa County, CA Memorandum, Richard C. Slade & Associates, LLC., Consulting Groundwater Geologists, October 31, 2015
- C. Stormwater Control Plan for a Regulated Project Mountain Peak Vineyards, Bartelt Engineering, Paul N. Bartelt, P.E., March 2016
- D. Onsite Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study for the Mountain Peak Winery, Bartelt Engineering, Paul N. Bartelt, P.E., March 2016
- E. Soda Canyon Road Study, Bartelt Engineering, Paul N. Bartelt, P.E., March 2016
- F. Traffic Impact Report: Proposed Mountain Peak Winery Along Soda Canyon Road in the Napa Valley, Crane Transportation Group, Mark D. Crane, P.E., March 16, 2015
- G. Mountain Peak Winery, Environmental Noise Assessment, Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc., September 23, 2015

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.

Charlene Gallina for
Signature

10/27/16
Date

Name: John McDowell, Deputy Planning Director

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/b. The project site is not located on or near a scenic vista although the site and general area have scenic qualities. The site contains vineyards, a vineyard office, and a residence set amongst oak trees. These oak trees will be retained with the construction of the new tasting and office building. The project will not have a significant impact on scenic vistas. Furthermore, the project will not create substantial damage to scenic resources. The project is not located in close proximity to a state scenic highway.

Local regulations protecting scenic resources include Napa County Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 18.106 (Viewshed Protection Ordinance) and Chapter 18.108 (Conservation Regulations). The project complies with both of these County Code Chapters. The project site is not subject to Viewshed Protection Ordinance requirements because it is not visible from any designated Viewshed Road. The project complies with the Conservation Regulations which protect riparian areas and limit native vegetation removal in hillside areas. This project primarily will occur in areas currently planted in vineyards and in place of the existing residence. Existing oak trees in the vicinity of the residence will be retained.

c. The proposed project will be constructed on a portion of the property containing existing vineyards and residence. The cave will be embedded into the hillside with the portals and adjoining covered crush pad and work area oriented away from the public road. The tasting and office building will be constructed generally in the same location as the existing residence which will be demolished as part of the project. The setting around the house contains several mature oak trees which will be preserved and incorporated into the project landscaping. The proposed parking spaces would be located in front of the proposed winery structure. Landscaping and vineyards are proposed around the winery structures. The visual character of the site will not substantially change. 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.

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, however 2.96 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance consisting of vineyard will be converted to wine production facilities including access road, the project well, wastewater system, outdoor work area and parking lots. Given the low level of detail scaled on Napa County Important Farmland Map 2012 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, (source: Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency), these altered areas will continue to show a Farmland of Statewide Importance on the map. By way of reference, the map currently indicates that the area in and around the residence, which is not farmland, is shown as Farmland of Statewide Importance, as are portions of the stream corridor located on the eastern portion of the property. The proposed project would continue with agricultural uses and would not conflict with any agriculture use. The winery would use the grapes from the 25-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 33,424 square feet of caves, compared to the BAAQMD's screening criteria of 541,000 sq. ft. for general industrial, and 8,046 square feet of tasting and office building compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47,000 square feet for high quality restaurant 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. 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 285 feet from the nearest winery related improvements. 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 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) 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 woodlands and mixed hardwoods, although the subject property and substantial areas of surrounding properties have been developed with vineyards and rural residential uses. The project will result in substantial areas of the site being regraded due to deposition of cave spoils. However, all such grading will occur in areas previously developed that do not contain sensitive habitat. Two blue line streams are located in the general vicinity of the project but no grading activities will occur with the stream channels or within setbacks prescribed by Napa County Code, Chapter 18.108 (Conservation Regulations). Stream setbacks are determined by the degree of slopes at the top of stable back, and for this property range from 45 ft. for slopes of 1% to 5%, and 55 ft. for adjoining terrain at above 5% up to 10%. Attached and incorporated into this report is a preliminary Stormwater Control Plan for a Regulated Project Mountain Peak Vineyards by Bartelt Engineering which addresses erosion and stormwater runoff from the project site. This report indicates that erosion control measures will be included in the project in compliance with local and state requirements that will prevent a substantial adverse change to watercourses, including the two blue line streams in the vicinity. As such, the project does not have the potential to modify habitat or impact any sensitive habitat.
- b. The project will not conflict with any local or regional plans, policies or regulations protecting riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities directly as a result of the degree of existing vineyard and residential development on site. Local regulations protecting resources habitat and biological resources include Napa County Code, Chapter 18.108 (Conservation Regulations). As noted Section a. above, the project complies with the Conservation Regulations which protects riparian areas and limits native vegetation removal in hillside areas. This project primarily will occur in areas currently planted in vineyards and containing an existing single family home. Existing oak trees in the vicinity of the residence will be retained.
- 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 (Napa County Geographic Information System biological resources and natural diversity database layers. No impacts would occur.
- d. The site is developed with an existing 28-acre vineyard, vineyard office and residence. Therefore, the 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. Minimal tree removal is required to implement the project. Three blue oak trees located along Soda Canyon Road will be removed to install the driveways. In addition, existing ornamental Italian Cypress will be removed that line the driveway into the residence. 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: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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. The site includes an existing vineyard and residence where the proposed winery will be constructed. The property is not known to be located within an area that is known to be archaeologically sensitive. However, there are several known archaeological sites in the vicinity approximately a half mile east of the subject property located within Foss Valley. This property is outside of the valley and is not located along a major drainage or at the foot of the hills along creeks and was heavily forested with oak woodland and chaparral prior to modern times. The Napa County GIS, archaeological layer, which contains data from the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Information System (NWIC) base maps, shows no records of sensitive sites within a quarter mile of the subject property. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the following standard conditions of approval. If resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval:

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

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

- d. No human remains have been 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.

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 loam. These soils are moderately steep well drained soils on the side slopes of uplands formed from mixed igneous rocks. A preliminary site development plan, including draft storm water pollution plan for erosion control Best Management Practices has been submitted with this application and reviewed by the County Engineering Division for compliance with local and state erosion control compliance measures. Final project design will be subject to 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 loam, 2 to 15 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. The applicant's engineer has proposed a LYVE system as stated in the *Onsite Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study for the Mountain Peak Winery* prepared by Bartelt Engineering, R.C.E. (March 2016, Revised). The report finds that the proposed treatment system is suitable for the soils located on the project site and complies with County and State design standards. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this 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:

Napa County has been working to develop a Climate Action Plan (CAP) for several years. In 2012 a Draft CAP² (March 2012) was recommended using the emissions checklist in the Draft CAP, on a trial basis, to determine potential greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with project development and operation. At the December 11, 2012, Napa County Board of Supervisors (BOS) hearing, the BOS considered adoption of the proposed CAP. In addition to reducing Napa County's GHG emissions, the proposed plan was intended to address compliance with CEQA for projects reviewed by the County and to lay the foundation for development of a local offset program. While the BOS acknowledged the plan's objectives, the BOS requested that the CAP be revised to better address transportation-related greenhouse gas, to acknowledge and credit past accomplishments and voluntary efforts, and to allow more time for establishment of a cost-effective local offset program. The Board also requested that best management practices be applied and considered when reviewing projects until a revised CAP is adopted to ensure that projects address the County's policy goal related to reducing GHG emissions.

In July 2015, the County re-commenced preparation of the CAP to: i) account for present day conditions and modeling assumptions (such as but not limited to methods, emission factors, and data sources), ii) address the concerns with the previous CAP effort as outlined above, iii) meet applicable State requirements, and iv) result in a functional and legally defensible CAP. On April 13, 2016 the County, as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP, released Final Technical Memorandum #1: *2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016*³. This initial phase included: i) updating the unincorporated County's community-wide GHG emissions inventory to 2014, and ii) preparing new GHG emissions forecasts for the 2020, 2030, and 2050 horizons. Additional information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or <http://www.countyofnapa.org/CAP/>.

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 (Table 3-1 – Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors & GHG Screening Level Sizes) 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

² County of Napa, March 2012, Napa County Draft Climate Action Plan, Prepared by ICF International. Sacramento, CA

³ Supersedes February 2, 2016, version.

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.)

For the purposes of this analysis potential GHG emissions associated with winery 'construction' and 'development' and with 'ongoing' winery operations have been discussed.

GHGs are the atmospheric gases whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for the greenhouse effect, including carbon dioxide, methane, ozone, and the fluorocarbons, that contribute to climate change (a widely accepted theory/science explain human effects on the atmosphere). Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) gas, the principal greenhouse gas (GHG) being emitted by human activities, and whose concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity, also serves as the reference gas to compare other greenhouse gases. Agricultural sources of carbon emissions include forest clearing, land-use changes, biomass burning, and farm equipment and management activity emissions (http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/glossary/letter_c.html). Equivalent Carbon Dioxide (CO₂e) is the most commonly reported type of GHG emission and a way to get one number that approximates total emissions from all the different gasses that contribute to GHG (BAAMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2012). In this case, carbon dioxide (CO₂) is used as the reference atom/compound to obtain atmospheric carbon CO₂ effects of GHG. Carbon stocks are converted to carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e) by multiplying the carbon total by 44/12 (or 3.67), which is the ratio of the atomic mass of a carbon dioxide molecule to the atomic mass of a carbon atom (<http://www.nciasi2.org/COLE/index.html>).

One time "Construction Emissions" associated with the winery development project includes: i) the carbon stocks that are lost (or released) when existing vegetation is removed and soil is ripped in preparation for the new winery structure and associated infrastructure; and ii) emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area and construct the winery, including construction equipment and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as Equipment Emissions). These emissions also include underground carbon stocks (or Soil carbon) associated with the existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed.

In addition to the one time Construction Emissions, "Operational Emissions" of the winery are also considered and include: i) any reduction in the amount of carbon sequestered by existing vegetation that is removed as part of the project compared to a "no project" scenario (hereinafter referred to as Operational Sequestration Emissions); and ii) ongoing emissions from the energy used to maintain and operate the winery, including vehicle trips associated with employee and visitor trips (hereinafter referred to as Operational Emissions). See Section XVI, Transportation/Traffic, for anticipated number of operational trips. Operational Emissions from the proposed winery would be the primary source of emissions over the long-term when compared to one time construction emissions.

The proposed project has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds Table 3-1 (Operational GHG Screening Level Sizes). Given the size of the entire project, which is approximately 33,424 square feet of caves, compared to the BAAQMD's GHG screening criteria of 121,000 sq. ft. for general industrial, and 8,046 square feet of tasting and office building compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 9,000 square feet for high quality restaurant, the project was determined not to exceed the 1,100 MT of CO₂e/yr GHG threshold of significance.

Furthermore, the applicant has made a commitment to construct the project to a LEED Platinum performance standard and has indicated that the project will 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.

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.

As indicated above the County is currently preparing a CAP and as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP has released Final Technical Memorandum #1 (2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016). Table 1 of the Technical Memorandum indicates that 2% of the County's GHG emissions in 2014 were a result of land use change.

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, the project's 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"/>
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 vicinity of the proposed project site (Google Maps). 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 project has been designed to comply with County requirements for hillside developments. The project provides adequate emergency access, and buildings will comply with fire protection standards. The project includes a request for an exception to the County Road and Street Standards and to the State Responsibility Area Fire Safe Regulations to increase the maximum slope of the southern access road to the cave and outdoor work area from 16% to 19.6%. This exception has been reviewed by the County Engineering Division and the County Fire Marshal, who have recommended that the exception be granted. To grant an exception, the Planning Commission must find that the project site contains a legal or environmental constraint, and that the alternative design meets the "same overall practical effect" as meeting the standard. In this case, the Fire Marshall and Engineering Division support the project because there is a steep slope where meeting the 16% standard is infeasible, and the project design separates this service drive from the visitor drive, thus reducing total traffic on the steeper roadway segment. Achieving 16% is infeasible because the existing property slopes away from the public road where the driveway will be constructed at a slope of 15% and greater. Since the driveway connection requires a relatively level transition to the public road (less than 3% slope), a slope of greater the 16% is required in order for the driveway to slope back down to original grade. It will not be utilized by drivers unfamiliar with the road and thus serve the same overall practical effect. Therefore, the project is not considered to have the potential to significantly impact emergency services and response.
- 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"/>
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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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-Tulucay (MST) area, however, have shown increasing depths to groundwater, but recent stabilization in many locations. Groundwater availability, recharge, storage and yield is not consistent across the County. More is known about the resource where historical data have been collected. Less is known in areas with limited data or unknown geology. In order to fill existing data gaps and to provide a better understand of groundwater resources in the County, the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan recommended 18 Areas of Interest 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 Eastern 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, and thus requires preparation of a Tier II analysis that evaluates well production, effect on area wells and groundwater recharge rates. The applicant completed a Water Availability Analysis prepared by Bartelt Engineering, a licensed civil engineering firm, and a project specific hydrologic analysis was prepared by Richard C. Slade & Associates, Consulting Groundwater Geologist which included a parcel specific recharge evaluation. According to the recharge evaluation average annual groundwater recharge at the subject project is conservatively estimated to be on the order of 11 to 12 AF/yr. in a "minimum case" with 17 AF/yr. for long term estimated average annual rainfall. Estimated groundwater in storage beneath the property is 116.9 AF.

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. The applicant's engineer has proposed a LYVE system as stated in the *Onsite Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study for the Mountain Peak Winery* prepared by Bartelt Engineering, R.C.E. (March 2016, Revised). The report finds that the proposed treatment system is suitable for the soils located on the project site and complies with County and State design standards. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed the report and concurred with their findings. Impacts would be less than significant.

Presently there is one well on-site that has been pump tested at a flow rate of 50 gallons per minute. The 24-hour pump test demonstrated that this rate of pumping could be sustained without substantially drawing down the well, and without impact to other wells in the vicinity of the project which are all greater than 500 ft. from both the existing and proposed on-site wells. Presently, the existing well is used for both domestic purposes for the residence and vineyard office as well as the irrigation needs of the vineyard. The existing well is located on the western portion of the property north of the existing residence. The new domestic-only well will be drilled immediately east of the existing well as part of this project in order to meet sanitary requirements public drinking water requirements. A transient non-community water system is required because the project provides domestic water to greater than 25 persons over more than 60 days per year.

According to the Water Availability Analysis prepared by Bartelt Engineering for the proposed project, the total water demand on the parcel from the existing vineyard and associated improvements is 20.79 AF/yr., specifically:

Existing Mountain Peak Winery Property Water Demand	Water Use (ac-ft/yr)
Single-Family Residence (Includes Landscaping)	0.67
Vineyard Irrigation (28 acres including vineyard office)	20.12
TOTAL	20.79

Proposed Mountain Peak Winery Water Demand	Water Use (ac-ft/yr)
Winery Processing for 100,000 gallon winery	1.84
Marketing and Visitation	1.01
Vineyard (24.2 acres)	14.86
Landscaping	0.59
Process Wastewater Used for Irrigation	-1.84
TOTAL	16.46

The estimated water demand for vineyard use is reduced 5.26 AF/yr. from existing conditions to proposed conditions due to a 2.96 acre reduction in vineyard area resulting from construction of winery improvements. Also, the Water Availability Analysis estimates water demand for the vineyard at 129 gallons per vine per season, but projects that will change to 104 gallons per vine per season in the future. This change in vineyard water use is outside of the scope of the environmental review being conducted for this discretionary winery proposal, and in essence, represents an existing condition. Water use for the winery consists of 1.84 AF/yr. for wine processing, 1.01 AF/yr. for marketing and visitation, and .59 AF/yr. for landscaping, for a total of 3.44 AF/year. The proposed LYVE wastewater system will reuse 1.84 AF/yr. of water for irrigation purposes assuming 100,000 gallons of wine production occur. Ostensibly, groundwater used for wine production will be reused after treatment for irrigation, and thus up to 1.84 AF/yr. of the additional groundwater demand from the winery project will not constitute additional groundwater use since that water is currently used for irrigation. Thus, the project increases groundwater demand by 1.60 AF/yr. consisting of the 1.01 AF/yr. for marketing and visitation, and the .59 AF/yr. for landscaping. This increase in water use is more than off-set by changes in vineyard management practices reducing per vine water use from 129 gallons per season to 104 gallons per season. Consistent with current County practices, the project would be subject to the standard condition of approval limiting water use to the levels requested and analyzed with the use permit application (and this accompanying CEQA document), and requiring well monitoring with 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 Bartelt Engineering and the hydrological memorandum prepared by Richard C. Slade and Associates, no wells for neighboring properties are located within 500 feet of the existing and proposed on site wells, and blue line streams are located 510 ft. and 530 ft. respectively at the nearest point from the on-site wells indicating that potential well interference is negligible. 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"/>

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

Through the use permit process, the Planning Commission determines if the scale and scope of the project is suitable for its location and setting. 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"/>
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 nearest construction component of project site is approximately 285 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, destemmer and press activities occurring during the harvest crush season, and delivery and delivery trucks and other vehicles. Noise is also generated from visitation and marketing activities, especially from marketing activities that are conducted outdoors. Community noise is commonly described in terms of the “ambient” noise level which is defined as the all-encompassing noise level associated with a given noise environment. The Napa County General Plan EIR indicates the average, or equivalent, sound level (L_{eq}) for winery activities is 51dBA in the morning and 41dBA in the afternoon. Audibility of a new noise source and/or increase in noise levels within recognized acceptable limits are not usually considered to be significant noise impacts, but these concerns should be addressed and considered in the planning and environmental review processes.

The standard conditions of approval require that any exterior winery equipment be enclosed or muffled and maintained so as not to create a noise disturbance in accordance with the Napa County Code. 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). At the request of the County, the applicant submitted an Environmental Noise Assessment prepared by Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc., a qualified acoustical engineering consulting firm, which is attached and incorporated into this initial study. This analysis contains detailed evaluation of the individual noise generating components of the proposed project and finds that the project will not exceed noise thresholds delineation within the Napa County Noise Ordinance. Enforcement of Napa County's Noise Ordinance is conducted by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff and is intended to ensure that winery activities do not result a significant noise impacts after the operation has commenced.

The Environmental Noise Assessment projects that the project will not result in any exceedance of noise thresholds and therefore, impacts would be less than significant requiring no mitigation measures to be applied to the project. However, there are several components of the operation that come close to thresholds based on projected noise levels.

More specifically, the study indicates that noise from outdoor wine and food pairing events could be as high as 60 dBA for periods of less than 1 minute during a single hour at the closest receiving residence, which is 5 dBA less than the standard for noise lasting one minute or less, but at the threshold if that noise were to last cumulatively greater than 1 minute during the same hour. Likewise larger events for 75 persons are projected to reach 61 dBA at one residence and 60 dBA at another residence for the 1 minute threshold period, and the largest 125 person events are 62 dBA and 60 dBA for the same residences. Again, should actual levels occur at this volume and cumulatively last longer than 1 minute, the sound level could exceed the standard by 2 dBA for the residence.

Likewise, the County noise thresholds are reduced by 5 dBA at 10 p.m. Since marketing events are allowed to occur in the evening until 10 p.m. with clean up until 11 p.m., there is some potential that noise level will exceed standards should the event run past 10 p.m. or if clean-up activities produce similar noise levels. A noise level of 60 dBA after 10 p.m. would at the threshold for 1 minute duration or less, and would exceed noise limits by 5 dBA if cumulatively lasting longer than 1 minute over the course of an hour.

The sound consultant was not able to estimate noise levels for ventilation fans for the wine cave because their location in relation to the cave portals has yet to be determined. Fan noise levels could reach as high as 77 to 85 dBA at 5 feet from the fans. The portals for the cave range from 500 to 630 feet from the nearest residences, and it is projected that noise levels would range from 43 dBA to 45 dBA, which is 5 dBA below the daytime threshold but at the nighttime threshold.

Likewise, for truck traffic noise, the study indicates that heavy-duty trucks will typically produce sound at the nearest residence ranging from 51 to 59 dBA, which is below the 1 minute duration threshold of 65 dBA, but only 1 dBA below the threshold of 60 dBA should noise at 59 dBA occur for greater than 1 minute in any given hour.

To ensure compliance, the project will be conditioned as follows to require a noise study evaluating actual noise levels produced after the project has been implemented, and provides for attenuating measures to be added to the project should actual noise levels exceed County Code noise standards.

"1. Subject to review and approval by the Director of Planning, Building and Environmental Service (County Noise Officer), building permit plans shall include an acoustical report prepared by a qualified acoustics professional (retained by permittee) that demonstrates that the proposed ventilation and mechanical equipment do not exceed noise standards prescribed in Napa County Code Chapter 8.16 for receiving residential land use in the vicinity of the project. Any sound attenuating enclosure(s) shall be completed prior to issuance of a Final Certificate of Occupancy to implement the expansion authorized by the use permit. After implementation of the project, actual noise measures shall be conducted by a qualified acoustics professional to determine if sound levels generated comply with standards."

"2. After commencement of operations, the permittee shall provide an acoustical report prepared by a qualified acoustic professional evaluating actual noise levels resulting from wine production operations and conduct of outdoor marketing events. The study shall be submitted for review and approval by the Director of Planning, Building and Environmental Services (County Noise Officer) within 6 months of grant of final occupancy for both wine production and visitation/marketing. The study shall specifically evaluate noise levels produced by trucks entering/existing the site, bottling operations, outdoor work area operations, and outdoor marketing activities. Should noise levels prescribed in Napa County Code Chapter 8.16 be exceeded, the study shall provide recommendation on changes in operational characteristics and/or project design to attenuate noise to levels within standards subject to review and approval of the Director of Planning, Building and Environmental Services."

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
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 27 full and part time employees maximum. 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. 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 be removed but presently the home is not occupied on a full time basis and no persons would be displaced. The property owner would retain the right to construct a new home, second unit and guest cottage on the property pursuant to zoning regulations. 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:				

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measure(s): None 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. 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)

The project site is located 6.1 miles up Soda Canyon Road, which is a dead-end public roadway accessing Soda Canyon and the mountainous terrain located north and east of the canyon. Soda Canyon Road rises steeply as it climbs out of the canyon to a summit near Stag's Leap Peak before descending and traversing more gradually into the vicinity of the project. The road is similar in design characteristics to other mountain roads located throughout the County, including tight curves, minimal shoulder widths, and pitches with steep grades. Attached and incorporated herein is the Soda Canyon Road Study prepared by Bartelt Engineering, which details the design characteristics of the road. These conditions are an existing condition. As such, the project has been evaluated for its potential to result in significant changes

to the existing conditions.

The project will increase the number of automobiles and trucks that utilize Soda Canyon Road. Crane Transportation Group prepared a *Traffic Impact Report* for the proposed project dated March 16, 2015. Friday AM and PM peak period (8:00 AM to 9:00 AM) and (4:30 PM to 5:30 PM) as well as Saturday PM peak period (4:00 PM to 5:00 PM) turn movement traffic counts were conducted. According to the report, the project will result in 4 to 6 new trips during these periods when roadway capacity is most constrained. The majority of project trips will occur outside of peak hours due to proposed operational characteristics committed to by the applicant, and which will be imposed as a condition of approval. Most by-appointment visitation and marketing guest will arrive and depart the site outside of peak hours when County roadways have available capacity. Likewise, employee shifts will be schedule to occur outside of peak hours.

Soda Canyon Road functions at a high level of service (LOS A) even during peak traffic periods. Traffic volumes on the roadway are light when compared to most other public roadways in the County as a result of the dead-end nature of the road. The majority of traffic occurring throughout the day is generated from residents and/or property owners of Soda Canyon Road, and vineyard related traffic consisting of vineyard employees and farm management vehicles and trucks. Vineyard related trips occur throughout the day. Given these existing conditions, peak hour traffic volumes for the intersection of Silverado Trail and Soda Canyon Road indicate that the Friday AM peak period generates 58 outbound trips and 81 inbound trips to Soda Canyon Road. This equates roughly to slightly more than 2 trips per minute. Friday PM peak traffic has a similar volume of 109 outbound trips and 57 inbound trips. Saturday PM peak traffic is 87 outbound trips and 54 inbound trips. As stated above, the project will generate between 4 to 6 new trips on Soda Canyon Road during peak hours, which over the course of an hour will not readily be discernible change over existing volumes. Although through traffic on Silverado Trail causes delays to turning movements coming from of Soda Canyon Road, and Silverado Trail presently operates at LOS F CONFIRM during the weekday PM peak hour, the addition of 4 to 6 trips to this condition is not individually or cumulatively significant.

Cave spoils would be kept on-site, but truck traffic will occur on Soda Canyon Road during construction of the project. 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 from Soda Canyon Road but access will be reconfigured with two new driveways. One driveway will be serve visitors and the other driveway will access the production area of the winery. Crane Transportation Group evaluated sight lines for the proposed driveways and found that the proposed design complies with County standards, and recommended that vegetation/landscaping in the vicinity of the driveways be permanently maintained. Proposed site access was reviewed and approved by the Napa County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division, as conditioned.

Twenty six onsite parking spaces (including 3 ADA spaces) are proposed. Based upon the County standard of 2.8 persons per vehicle, with visitation occurring over the course of the day on a by-prior-appointment basis, and 1.05 persons per vehicle for employees the project will have sufficient parking for day-to-day needs as well as most marketing events. The applicant has committed to the use of shuttle buses, and ample areas to park exist on site for larger marketing events. 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:				
	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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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. The applicant's engineer has proposed a LYVE system as stated in the *Onsite Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study for the Mountain Peak Winery* prepared by Bartelt Engineering, R.C.E. (March 2016, Revised). The report finds that the proposed treatment system is suitable for the soils located on the project site and complies with County and State design standards. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this reports and concurred with their findings. Impacts would be less than significant.

Presently there is one well on site that produces a flow rate of 50 gallons per minute. It is used for both domestic purposes for the residence and vineyard office as well as the irrigation needs of the vineyard. The existing well is located on the western portion of the property north of the existing residence. A new domestic-only well will be drilled immediately east of the existing well as part of this project in order to meet sanitary requirements public drinking water requirements. A transient non-community water system is required because the project provides domestic water to greater than 25 persons over more than 60 days per year. 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 project will be served by two on site wells. The project is not in close proximity to any public water system. According to the *Water Availability Analysis* prepared for the project, there is sufficient water to serve both the existing uses and proposed project, and proposed groundwater use does not exceed recharge rates over time. 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 LYVE sanitary wastewater system with process wastewater reused for vineyard irrigation. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- f. The project would be served by Devlin Road Waste Transfer Station which has a capacity which exceeds current demand. The Devlin Road Waste Transfer Station has a permitted capacity to receive solid waste though 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?

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)?

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

Discussion:

a. As discussed in **Section IV** above, there is no suitable habitat for sensitive biological resources on or directly adjacent to the project area. 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 IS/ND 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.