

“A”

Draft EIR Executive Summary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

This summary is provided in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15123. As stated in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(a), “an environmental impact report (EIR) shall contain a brief summary of the proposed actions and its consequences. The language of the summary should be as clear and simple as reasonably practical.” As required by the Guidelines, this section includes: (1) a summary description of the proposed project; (2) a synopsis of environmental impacts and recommended mitigation measures; (3) identification of the alternatives evaluated and of the environmentally superior alternative; and (4) a discussion of the areas of controversy associated with the project.

SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

CS2 Wines (project applicant) proposes to construct a new winery with an annual production capacity of 100,000 gallons on a 10.89-acre site in unincorporated Napa County. The project would include construction of two winery buildings, unenclosed terraces, wine cave areas, parking, winery and domestic wastewater treatment system, landscaping, driveway improvements, and signage. As part of the project, an existing, unoccupied residence/bed and breakfast and associated structures would be demolished and removed from the site.

Project Objectives

The project applicant has developed the following objectives for the project:

- ▲ Construct and operate a new landmark winery in the upper Napa Valley, capable of producing up to 100,000 gallons of wine annually.
- ▲ Design a winery with high-quality architecture and landscaping and a sustainable design that also maintains existing topography and vineyards to the maximum extent practicable.
- ▲ Design the new winery such that environmental impacts are minimized and environmental resources are preserved.
- ▲ Promote water conservation through the use of recycled water or treated wastewater for outdoor irrigation.
- ▲ Achieve the highest feasible Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) standards for the project, while also qualifying for Napa Green Certified Land and Napa Green Certified Winery status.
- ▲ Construct the new winery on a site without removing any vineyards from production.
- ▲ Improve the existing viewshed by removing the existing three-story residence/bed and breakfast on the project site.
- ▲ Contribute to the local agricultural economy through the development of a winery that would use 95 percent Napa County grapes.
- ▲ Create a range of new job opportunities.
- ▲ Develop a viable on-premise marketing and sales program through a combination of tours and tastings with educational marketing events.

- ▲ Use the winery's hilltop location to educate visitors about the Napa Valley and the Agricultural Preserve by showing the location of landmark wineries and vineyards visible from the winery, as well as the vineyards owned by the project applicant.

Project Location

The project site is located north of the Town of Yountville in unincorporated Napa County. The proposed winery would be constructed on a 10.89-acre site east of State Route (SR) 29, and approximately 0.25 mile south of the Yount Mill Road/SR 29 intersection. Access to the project site is via an existing driveway from SR 29.

Project Characteristics

The project would consist of a new winery with an annual production capacity of 100,000 gallons on a 10.89-acre site in unincorporated Napa County. The project applicant is seeking an exception in the form of a use permit to the conservation regulations to grade/construct improvements on slopes exceeding 30 percent; a viewshed application that would allow construction on slopes 15 percent or greater and visible from a viewshed designated roadway (SR 29); and a variance for development that encroaches into the 300-foot setback from a shared driveway.

The following project components are proposed:

FACILITY DEMOLITION AND REMOVAL

- ▲ Demolition and removal of existing residence/bed and breakfast and associated structures.

WINERY PRODUCTION AND ACCESSORY AREAS

- ▲ **Reception building** (1,200 sf): Tours would begin in the single-story reception building.
- ▲ **Winery administration and visitor (WAV) building** (12,800 sf): The three-story WAV building would include space for wine tasting areas (indoor and outdoor), offices, hospitality, production/equipment storage, and a laboratory.
- ▲ **Winery caves:** construction of approximately 35,590 sf of cave area. The lower cave area (approximately 25,000 sf) would be dedicated to crushing, pressing, fermentation, and storage. The upper cave (approximately 10,000 sf) would house the barrel cellar and would also serve as the focal point of winery tours.

Other related improvements are proposed and include circulation and parking improvements (including the provision of 37 parking spaces as well as approximately 28 overflow parking spaces [for larger marketing events]); ancillary facilities including a three-sided box drainage culvert, landscaping, and signage; and utility infrastructure. These improvements are described in Chapter 2, "Project Description."

Operation of the winery would include tours, tastings, and marketing events. Tours and tastings would occur by appointment only. The maximum number of visitors would be limited to 1,000 per week. The maximum number of marketing events would be limited to 58 events per year. The winery would employ up to 19 full-time staff members daily.

Project construction is anticipated to begin no sooner than fall 2016/spring 2017 and would be completed in approximately two to three years. The winery would be fully operational and ready for visitors by 2019, though wine could be produced beginning in 2018.

Potential Approvals and Permits Required

Several agencies would be involved in the consideration of project elements. As the lead agency under CEQA, Napa County is responsible for considering the adequacy of the EIR and determining if the overall project should be approved.

Permits and approvals may be required from the following state and local agencies for project construction:

STATE

- ▲ **Bay Area Air Quality Management District:** Authority to construct (for devices that emit air pollutants); permit to operate; and Air Quality Management Plan consistency determination.
- ▲ **California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 3:** Compliance with the California Endangered Species Act (ESA); potential permits under Section 2081 of the Fish and Game Code if take of listed species is likely to occur.
- ▲ **California Department of Public Health:** Domestic water supply permit for a public non-community water system.
- ▲ **California Department of Transportation, District 4:** Encroachment permit and/or transportation management plan.
- ▲ **San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board:** NPDES construction stormwater permit (Notice of Intent to proceed under General Construction Permit) for disturbance of more than 1 acre; discharge permit for stormwater; and Clean Water Act Section 401 water quality certification or waste discharge requirements.

LOCAL

- ▲ **Napa County:** Approval of a use permit to establish a new winery; an exception to the conservation regulations to grade/construct improvements on slopes exceeding 30 percent, a variance to allow winery buildings to encroach into the 300-foot setback from a private road, and a viewshed application to construct on slopes 15 percent or greater and visible from a viewshed designated roadway (SR 29); and various ministerial approvals, including but not limited to building permits, grading permits, waste disposal permits, and well demolition permits.

The proposed driveway, as currently designed, is in compliance with the County's Road and Street Standards (RSS). On June 7, 2016, the Board of Supervisors tentatively approved revisions to the RSS for the purpose of submission to the State of California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection (SBOF) for certification. Upon certification by the SBOF, the RSS will return to the Board for final adoption.

The proposed revisions to the RSS will require the driveway to have a horizontal inside radius of curvature of not less than 50 feet, whereas the current RSS allow a 50-foot radius of curvature measured from the centerline of the driveway. If the revised RSS are adopted prior to an action on the project by the decision makers, application of this proposed standard would either require modification of the driveway to fully comply with the revised RSS or a request for a road exception due to environmental constraints.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES

Table ES-2, at the end of this chapter, provides a summary of the environmental impacts of the proposed project, the level of significance of the impact before mitigation, recommended mitigation measures, and the level of significance of the impact after the implementation of the mitigation measures.

SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

Alternatives to the proposed project that are evaluated in this DEIR include:

- ▲ **No Project Alternative**, which assumes no new development occurs on the project site;
- ▲ **Alternative 1**, which would include the same site layout as the proposed project, with a modified operations plan that would limit visitors to 800 per week and production of wine to 80,000 gallons per year; and
- ▲ **Alternative 2**, which would include an altered site layout and a modified operations plan that would limit visitors to 500 per week and production of wine to 70,000 gallons per year.

The following summary provides brief descriptions of the alternatives. Table ES-1 presents a comparison between Alternatives 1 and 2 and the proposed project. For a more thorough discussion of project alternatives, see Chapter 6, “Alternatives.”

Table ES-1 Summary Comparison of the Proposed Project and Alternatives 1 and 2			
Project Component	Proposed Project	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
Annual wine production	100,000 gallons	80,000 gallons	70,000 gallons
Reception building	1,200 square feet	Same as project	1,250 square feet
Winery administration and visitor building	12,800 square feet	8,360 square feet	5,850 square feet; relocated from the top of the hill to the same level as the upper cave
Winery caves	35,590 square feet	Same as project	32,530 square feet
Existing residence/bed & breakfast	To be demolished	Same as project	To be replaced with new residence
Maximum number of visitors per week	1,000 visitors/week	800 visitors/week	500 visitors/week
Marketing events per year	58 events	50 events	48 events
Employees	19 employees	17 employees	16 employees

Source: Compiled by Ascent Environmental in 2015

No Project Alternative

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(1) requires that the no project alternative be described and analyzed “to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the project with the impacts of not approving the project.” The no project analysis is required to discuss “the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published...as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services” (Section 15126.6[e][2]).

Under this alternative, the project would not be built on the project site, and as a result, none of the approvals that would be required by the County under the project would occur. The project site would remain in its existing condition, with the unoccupied residence/bed and breakfast and 2.2 acres of vineyards continuing to operate under their existing use permits. With regard to the residence/bed and breakfast, the Applicant has a current use permit to operate a bed and breakfast establishment that would provide overnight accommodations for a maximum of six visiting guests. It is likely that under this operational scenario, the bed and breakfast would be owner-occupied, assisted by one employee (manager/groundskeeper), and up to three rooms would be available for occupancy. Therefore, under the no project alternative, it would be expected that up to 10-15 daily vehicle trips associated with patrons,

employees (owner and family), and deliveries would occur on a daily basis. Assuming 50 percent average occupancy, typical trip generation would be 20 trips/day at harvest; with 100 percent occupancy and a full vineyard crew on-site, peak trip generation would be 40 trips/day.

Alternative 1

For Alternative 1, maximum annual wine production would be reduced from 100,000 gallons to 80,000 gallons, compared with the project. In addition, the reception building would be the same as the project, but the WAV building would be reduced from approximately 12,800 square feet to approximately 8,360 square feet. The winery caves would also be the same as the project, and the existing residence/bed and breakfast would be removed under this alternative, similar to the project. The maximum number of visitors would be reduced from 1,000 per week to 800 per week, the maximum number of marketing events would be reduced from 58 to 50 per year, and the number of employees would be reduced from 19 to 17. But for the change to the WAV building, the site plan for this alternative would be the same as the project.

Alternative 2

For Alternative 2, maximum annual wine production would be reduced from 100,000 gallons to 70,000 gallons, compared with the project. In addition, the reception building would be similar to the project (an increase of only 50 square feet), but the WAV building would be reduced from approximately 12,800 square feet to approximately 5,850 square feet and it would be relocated from the top of the hill to the same level as the upper cave. The winery caves would be reduced from approximately 35,590 square feet to approximately 32,530 square feet. The existing residence/bed and breakfast would be removed under this alternative, but it would be replaced with a new residence of approximately 4,700 square feet (similar in size to the existing structure). The maximum number of visitors would be reduced from 1,000 per week to 500 per week, the maximum number of marketing events would be reduced from 58 to 48 per year, and the number of employees would be reduced from 19 to 16.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

The California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 15126.6 suggests that an EIR should identify the “environmentally superior” alternative. “If the environmentally superior alternative is the ‘no project’ alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.”

The no project alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, as all of the significant impacts of the project would be avoided. However, the no project alternative would not meet any of the project’s objectives because a winery would not be constructed on-site.

Alternative 2 is the environmentally superior alternative of the other alternatives considered. With this alternative, significant impacts to aesthetics, biological resources, transportation, greenhouse gas emissions, and air quality would be reduced or avoided, when compared to the project. Further, this alternative would meet all project objectives as it would construct a landmark winery in the Upper Napa Valley, design a winery with high-quality architecture, minimize environmental impacts, promote water conservation through recycled water use, meet LEED standards, leave existing vineyards intact, remove the three-story residence from the viewshed, use 95 percent Napa County grapes, provide tours and tastings, and would educate visitors about the Napa Valley and Agriculture Preserve.

Alternative 1 would be environmentally superior to the project because its reduced size and capacity would result in reductions to the project’s significant impacts to transportation, greenhouse gas emissions, air quality, and water supply and groundwater. Further, this alternative would meet all project objectives.

However, because of this alternative's larger size and capacity compared to Alternative 2, impacts for certain environmental resources (e.g., transportation, greenhouse gas emissions, and air quality) would be somewhat greater than what would occur under Alternative 2. For this reason, while this alternative is superior to the project, it would not be superior to Alternative 2.

AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

The County prepared and circulated an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the project on February 14, 2014 (Appendix A). A public hearing was held on March 19, 2014 and was continued to April 16, 2014, then to June 18, 2014 (meeting was cancelled), and then to July 2, 2014 to provide the public with information about the project's components and to allow the project applicant to address public concerns regarding the project.

The IS/MND and project was approved by the Napa County Planning Commission on July 2, 2014. During the public review period and at public hearings for the project, the County received public comments primarily pertaining to aesthetics and lighting, noise, water supply, traffic access and impacts to surrounding roadways, and consistency with County policies. In response to public comment, the applicant modified the project request to include water conservation measures, groundwater monitoring measures, changes to lighting, changes to the evening uses, light reflection reduction measures, and changes to winter hours of operation. The applicant also modified the number of visitors that would be allowed for tours and tastings. These modified operational measures were included in the project's revised conditions of approval.

In July 2014, an appeal of the Planning Commission's decision was filed. Over several weeks, the applicant and appellant met and attempted to resolve the appeal through mediation. Despite their efforts, the mediation was unsuccessful. Because some of the issues raised by the appellant warrant further environmental analysis, County staff and the applicant believed that an EIR would be necessary to more fully evaluate the potential impacts associated with the project. The County Board of Supervisors rescinded the Planning Commission's approval of the project and adoption of the IS/MND on December 16, 2014, at County staff's request and with the support of the applicant and the appellant.

In accordance with Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21092 and CCR Section 15082, the County issued a notice of preparation (NOP) on April 29, 2015 to inform agencies and the general public that an EIR was being prepared and to invite comments on the scope and content of the document (Appendix B). A noticed scoping meeting for the EIR occurred on May 13, 2015.

Based on the comments received during the NOP comment period, the major areas of controversy associated with the project are:

- ▲ construction on steep grade;
- ▲ visual effects, including compliance with the County's viewshed ordinance;
- ▲ traffic impacts along SR 29, including trucks turning in and out of the project site;
- ▲ parking;
- ▲ wastewater treatment and disposal;
- ▲ consistency with the Napa County General Plan; and
- ▲ alternatives to the project.

The County and the project applicant have and will continue to respond to these issues.

All of the substantive environmental issues raised in the NOP comment letters and at the scoping meeting have been addressed or otherwise considered during preparation of this DEIR (see Scoping Comment Matrix in Appendix B).

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
3.2 Land Use			
Impact 3.2-1: Potential for division of an established community. The project area includes open space, vineyards, several restaurants and wineries, a Bed & Breakfast establishment, and scattered rural residences. No formal developed communities are present near the project site; therefore, the project would not result in the division of an established community. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.2-2: Conflict with relevant plans, policies, and zoning adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The Napa County General Plan (2008) contains policies that promote the preservation of agriculturally productive areas. The project applicant would secure necessary permits to ensure the project would maintain appropriate compliance with relevant plans, policies, and zoning designed to mitigate an environmental effect. Because the project would adhere to the County-approved land uses on property designated Agricultural Resource; no conflicts with relevant policies or plans would occur and this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
3.3 Aesthetics			
Impact 3.3-1: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. The project would increase the prominence of the built environment in views from SR 29 and adjacent residences. Although available plans and simulations of the project features indicate that the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on the viewshed observed from SR 29, these renderings assume that the building finishes would be limited to earth tones that blend the facility into the colors of the surrounding vegetation, and that the existing and proposed vegetation would be installed and maintained for the life of the project. If these elements of the project are modified, the project may not be in conformance with the Viewshed Protection Program. For this reason, the project would have a potentially significant impact.	PS	Mitigation Measure 3.3-1a: Maintenance of landscaping. The County shall issue a determination that the proposed landscaping plan would meet the viewshed ordinance requirement that the predominant portion (i.e., 51 percent or greater) of the structures would be screened from views from SR 29 prior to project approval. Landscaping consistent with approved landscaping plans shall be completed prior to final occupancy. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the winery buildings, the property owner shall execute and record in the county recorder's office a use restriction, in a form approved by county counsel, requiring building exteriors, and existing and proposed covering vegetation, as well as any equivalent level of replacement vegetation to be maintained by the owner or the owner's successor so as to maintain conformance with Zoning Ordinance Section 18.106.050B. The details of these plantings shall be documented in a planting plan submitted to the County for review and approval. One annual report that describes the revegetation effort, survival of the plantings, including plantings associated with habitat restoration (see Mitigation Measure 3.4-2 in Section 3.4, "Biological Resources"), and Oak woodland planting plan (see Mitigation Measure 3.4-3 in Section 3.4, "Biological Resources"), and any recommendations for maintenance and work needed to ensure a successful restoration effort, shall be prepared by a licensed or	LTS

LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, and SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
		certified professional and submitted to the Napa County Planning Division each year for a minimum of five years. Mitigation Measure 3.3-1b: Approval of proposed color palate. Pursuant to Napa County Code requirements, the colors used for the roof, exterior walls, and built landscaping features of the winery shall be limited to earth tones that blend the facility into the colors of the surrounding vegetation. The applicant shall obtain the written approval of the Planning, Building, & Environmental Services Department prior to painting the building.	
Impact 3.3-2: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings. The proposed winery buildings would change the character of the project site from predominantly undeveloped to winery and viticulture uses. Based on the scale of the project and visibility of structures from SR 29, it could result in a potentially significant impact on the visual quality of the site.	PS	Mitigation Measure 3.3-2: Implement Mitigation Measures 3.3-1a and 3.3-1b. The applicant shall implement Mitigation Measures 3.3-1a and 3.3-1b.	LTS
Impact 3.3-3: Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect views in the project area. The project would result in new structures on the project site. The design of the winery buildings includes large windows, while the new driveway and parking areas would require lighting for safety. These project elements have the potential to result in emission of substantial amounts of light and skyglow that would have a potentially significant impact on views in the project area.	PS	Mitigation Measure 3.3-3: Prepare a lighting plan. Prior to issuance of any building permit pursuant to this approval, two 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. The plan shall detail, and commit to, project features intended to reduce potential effects from lighting, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ providing the minimum lighting needed for safety and wayfinding; ▲ shielding and down casting all exterior lighting; ▲ use of low level, indirect lighting wherever exterior lighting is installed at the buildings; ▲ locating all exterior lighting as low to the ground as possible; ▲ installing motion-activated and timed bollard fixtures that are low-to-the-ground only at the curves of the winery driveway; ▲ louvers installed at the WAV building that will significantly diminish the amount of light escaping the building; ▲ no use of flood lights or sodium lights; and ▲ all project lighting will be compliant with the most recent update of the “Nonresidential Compliance Manual for California’s Energy Efficiency Standards” and the most recent update of the California Building Code. 	LTS

LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, and SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
3.4 Biological Resources			
<p>Impact 3.4-1: Disturbance to or loss of special-status wildlife species and habitat during construction activities. Implementation of the project, including tree removal, could result in the degradation of habitat and loss of nesting white-tailed kite or loggerhead shrike and roosting special-status bats. Ground-disturbing activities related to the construction activities such as facility demolition, grading, excavation, and tree removal could result in a substantial adverse effect on these species. Therefore, the potential loss of special-status wildlife species would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-1a: Avoid or minimize the loss of bird nests. The Applicant shall implement the following measures to avoid or minimize loss the nests of raptors and special-status birds, including white-tailed kite and loggerhead shrike:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ to the extent feasible, vegetation removal, grading, and other ground disturbing activities shall be carried out during the nonbreeding season (September 1-February 14) for migratory birds. ▲ If construction activity is scheduled to occur during the nesting season (February 15 to September 15), the Applicant shall utilize a qualified biologist to conduct preconstruction surveys and to identify active nests on and within 500 feet of the project site that could be affected by project construction. The surveys shall be conducted before the approval of grading and/or improvement plans (as applicable) and no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days before the beginning of construction in a particular area. If no nests are found, no further mitigation is required. ▲ If active nests are found, impacts shall be avoided by establishment of appropriate buffers around the nests. No project activity shall commence within the buffer area until a qualified biologist confirms that any young have fledged or the nest is no longer active. A 500-foot buffer around raptor nests are generally adequate to protect them from disturbance, but the size of the buffer may be adjusted by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW depending on site specific conditions. Monitoring of the nest by a qualified biologist during and after construction activities shall be required if the activity has potential to adversely affect the nest. <p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-1b: Conduct surveys for bats before tree removal or structure demolition, consult with CDFW, and develop exclusion methods and compensatory mitigation if appropriate. Prior to construction, suitable roosting habitat (assumed to be trees or structures on the project site) for roosting bats on the project site shall be surveyed by a qualified biologist. Surveys shall consist of a daytime pedestrian survey looking for evidence of bat use (e.g., guano) and may also include an evening emergence survey to note the presence or absence of bats if warranted. The type of survey will depend on the condition of the potential roosting trees. If no bat roosts are found, then no further study is required. If evidence of bat use is observed, the number and species of bats using the roost shall be determined. Bat detectors may be used to supplement</p>	LTS

LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, and SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>survey efforts, but are not required.</p> <p>If roosts of special-status bats are determined to be present and must be removed, the bats shall be excluded from the roosting site before the tree is removed. A program addressing compensation, exclusion methods, and roost removal procedures shall be developed in consultation with CDFW before implementation. Exclusion methods may include use of one-way doors at roost entrances (bats may leave but not reenter), or sealing roost entrances when the site can be confirmed to contain no bats. Exclusion efforts may be restricted during periods of sensitive activity (e.g., during hibernation or while females in maternity colonies are nursing young). The loss of each roost (if any) shall be replaced in consultation with CDFW and may include construction and installation of bat boxes suitable to the bat species and colony size excluded from the original roosting site. If determined necessary during consultation with CDFW, replacement roosts shall be implemented before bats are excluded from the original roost sites. Once the replacement roosts are constructed and it is confirmed that bats are not present in the original roost site, the roost trees may be removed.</p>	
<p>Impact 3.4-2: Loss and/or modification of riparian habitat and fill or other disturbance of waters of the United States during construction. Based on site development plans, construction of a box culvert to replace an existing culvert is expected to avoid fill of waters of the United State including wetlands. However, temporary construction could encroach on and cause removal of riparian vegetation (though above the ordinary high water mark) and cause minor disturbance to soils, which could indirectly and temporarily affect these sensitive habitats. Because grading and excavation could occur close or adjacent to these areas, they could be affected through either removal of vegetation, excessive ground disturbance to the bed and bank, or incidental placement of fill materials in aquatic areas. This would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2: Avoid and minimize impacts to sensitive natural communities and compensate for loss of riparian and wetland habitats. As a first priority, the Applicant will seek to avoid impacts to riparian areas and waters of the United States, including wetlands, through various design refinements, educational, and awareness measures.</p> <p>A qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction environmental awareness training to educate construction crews about sensitive areas near to the construction footprint and the need for avoidance of areas below the OHWM. Additionally, at the direction of the qualified biologist and prior to construction, these sensitive areas shall be flagged or fenced with brightly visible construction flagging and/or fencing if feasible to ensure that grading, excavation, or other ground-disturbing activities would not occur within these areas. Foot traffic by construction personnel shall also be limited in these areas to prevent the introduction of invasive or weedy species. Periodic inspections during construction shall be conducted by a construction team or monitoring biologist to ensure the fencing/flagging is in good working condition through the construction period.</p> <p>If avoidance of impacts to riparian areas is infeasible, the Applicant shall implement the following measures to minimize the loss and degradation of riparian vegetation/stream habitat:</p>	LTS

LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, and SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>a. Prior to beginning construction that could affect the bed or bank of seasonal streams, the Applicant shall provide written notification to CDFW describing the proposed activity and including all required information as described under Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code, and pay the applicable notification fees.</p> <p>b. If CDFW determines, after reviewing the completed notification, that the activity may substantially adversely affect a fish or wildlife resource, the Applicant shall obtain a streambed alteration agreement from CDFW and conduct project construction activities in accordance with the agreement, including implementing reasonable measures to protect wildlife resources, such as preconstruction surveys for special-status species, flagging construction limits, establishing no-disturbance buffers for sensitive resources to be avoided, minimizing vegetation removal to the extent possible.</p> <p>If deemed necessary by CDFW, a habitat restoration and maintenance plan that describes the impacts and proposed compensation measures shall be provided to the agency(ies) for their approval prior to installation of the new crossing. Mitigation will be at a minimum 1:1 compensation to loss ratio for native woody species so that a no net loss of mixed riparian woodland will be planted along the drainage channel as mitigation. A higher compensation ratio could be stipulated by CDFW through the Streambed Alteration Agreement process. The mitigation/restoration plan, prepared by a qualified biologist will have the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ A list of native trees, including Native Oak trees, and shrubs to be planted, sizes and spacing. ▲ Mitigation shall be at minimum 1:1 compensation to loss ratio (for area where vegetation is permanently disturbed). ▲ Plant species selected shall be native species adapted to the area and be species known to grow within the existing plant community. ▲ Plantings shall be done during the optimal season for the species being planted which is typically in the winter season. ▲ An 80 percent survival rate over a period of five years for new plantings shall be the target success criteria. ▲ Invasive exotic plant species shall be controlled to the maximum extent practicable to accomplish the revegetation effort. Himalayan blackberry, giant reed, periwinkle and non-native trees such as weeping willow, blackwood acacia, 	

LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, and SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>and English hawthorne specifically will be targeted for removal within the restoration area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Chemical control of invasive exotic plant species shall be conducted by a certified pesticide applicator per labeled directions and all other federal, state, and local laws and regulations and will be certified for use in an aquatic environment. ▲ All disturbed areas shall be seeded with a native herbaceous seed mix to be developed as part of the restoration plan. ▲ An annual report shall be prepared each year for a minimum of five years and submitted to Napa County Planning Division, and CDFW that describes the revegetation effort, survival of the plantings and any recommendations for maintenance and work needed to ensure a successful restoration effort. ▲ Work in the drainage should be conducted when the creek is dry, generally after the month of June 	
<p>Impact 3.4-3: Conflict with Napa County General Plan policies. The project would be consistent with Napa County General Plan policies regarding conservation of most fish and wildlife resources by minimizing, where feasible, the extent of new development in biologically sensitive areas such as the drainages surrounding the project and implementing mitigation for potential effects to riparian resources. However, Napa County General Plan Policy Con-24 addresses the preservation of oak woodland and according to the policy, oak woodland must be preserved or replaced at a ratio of 2:1 (minimum) when retention is infeasible. The project includes removal of oak woodland but would not meet the 2:1 replacement/preservation minimum criteria. This would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-3: Design a planting plan to include minimum ratio of area impacted by the project. Prior to removal of oak woodland, the Applicant shall prepare a planting plan. This plan shall demonstrate the replacement of oak woodland or preservation of like habitat at a minimum 2:1 ratio for either number of trees removed or canopy area affected that cannot feasibly be retained as stipulated by Napa County General Plan Policy CON-24. This may include increasing the number of native oaks planned to be planted (from the current planned number of 143 to at least twice the number of oak trees removed, estimated to be an additional 79 oak trees). Alternatively, the Applicant could choose to implement replacement plantings and preserve some or all of the existing oak trees on-site from future disturbance in perpetuity. The Applicant would need to enter into a conservation agreement with the County. Approximately 4.2 acres of oak woodland would remain on-site and could meet the minimum preservation requirements absent replacement plantings. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant must demonstrate that its oak tree replacement plan meets the replacement/preservation requirements of County Policy CON-24. This plan shall be prepared by a qualified landscape architect and shall be approved by Napa County. The plan shall document that a minimum of 80 percent survival rate of replaced trees shall be achieved over a period of five years.</p>	LTS

LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, and SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
3.5 Noise			
<p>Impact 3.5-1: Short-term, construction-related noise impacts. Project construction activities would involve the use of heavy construction equipment that generates noise. In addition, blasting for excavation of cave areas could potentially be required that would also generate substantial noise levels. A single-family residence is located off site approximately 650 feet from the construction center and 460 feet from potential blasting areas. Based on construction noise modeling, construction activities could reach a maximum noise level at the nearest off-site residence of 67 dB Lmax and 65 dB Leq. These noise levels would not exceed the Napa County noise standards for construction noise (i.e., 75 dBA during the daytime and 65 dBA during the nighttime). Further, construction activities would be limited to the daytime hours when people are less likely to be at home and, therefore, not as affected by noise. Short-term construction noise would not result in the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of applicable standards, or a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.5-2: Short-term, construction-related vibration impacts. Project construction activities would involve the use of heavy construction equipment and potential blasting for construction of the upper and lower caves. Thus, blasting would be the greatest source of ground vibration. A single-family residence and a barn structure are the nearest vibration-sensitive land uses to the potential blasting at the lower cave. The upper cave location is over 500 feet from any structure or sensitive land use and, therefore, blasting at this location would not have adverse effects to people or structures. Based on reference ground vibration and noise levels, blasting activities would not exceed the recommended levels for structural damage or human disturbance at the nearby structures. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.5-3: Long-term increase in noise levels from operation of on-site stationary noise sources. The project would include new stationary noise sources such as bottling facilities and on-site marketing events that generate noise from music and from people congregating/talking. Bottling activities would occur during normal business hours and would not continue into the night, when people are more sensitive to noise and ambient levels are typically the quietest. Further, project-generated stationary noise sources would not result in noise levels that exceed applicable Napa County noise standards or</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, and SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
levels that would result in a substantial long-term increase in noise. This impact would be less than significant.			
Impact 3.5-4: Project-related traffic noise increase. Traffic generated by the project would result in less than 1 dB increase in traffic noise on SR 29. This level of noise increase would not be perceptible to the human ear and, therefore, would not be considered a substantial increase in noise. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
3.6 Transportation			
Impact 3.6-1: Arterial level of service impacts (Project and Cumulative). Trips generated by the project were added to Existing, Near-Term, and Cumulative arterial traffic volumes to obtain Plus Project volumes on SR 29 north and south of the Project Driveway. Under Existing and Near-Term Plus Project conditions, the project would contribute vehicular traffic on SR 29, but would not cause it to worsen from the currently acceptable LOS to an unacceptable LOS. Under Cumulative weekday p.m. peak hour conditions, the arterial would continue to operate at unacceptable levels (LOS E-F), but the project contribution would be below the one percent threshold of significance. Thus, the project and cumulative impacts on arterial level of service would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.6-2: Existing Plus Project intersection level of service impacts. Trips generated by the project were added to Existing traffic volumes to obtain Existing Plus Project turning movement volumes (Exhibit 3.6-6). Under Existing Plus Project conditions, the project would contribute vehicular traffic at the study intersection but would not cause it to worsen from the currently acceptable LOS to an unacceptable LOS, and signal warrants would not be met. Therefore, the project would result in a less-than-significant impact under Existing Plus Project Conditions.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.6-3: Near-Term Plus Project intersection level of service impacts. Trips generated by the project were added to Near-Term traffic volumes to obtain Near-Term Plus Project turning movement volumes (Exhibit 3.6-7). Under Near-Term Plus Project conditions, the project would contribute vehicular traffic at the study intersection, but would not cause it to worsen from the currently acceptable LOS to an unacceptable LOS, and signal warrants would not be met. Therefore, the project would result in a less-than-significant impact under Near-Term Plus Project Conditions.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, and SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
Impact 3.6-4: Cumulative Plus Project intersection level of service impacts. Trips generated by the project were added to Cumulative traffic volumes to obtain Cumulative Plus Project turning movement volumes (Exhibit 3.6-8). Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, the project would contribute vehicular traffic at the study intersection, which would continue to operate at unacceptable LOS, but peak hour signal warrants would not be met. Therefore, the project would contribute to a less-than-significant impact under Cumulative Plus Project Conditions.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.6-5: Marketing event-related traffic impacts. The number of proposed marketing and special events is 58 per year, of varying scale from 50 to 200 guests. Additional traffic associated with these events depending on their time could be substantial and could result in an exceedance of typical traffic for the winery, and traffic associated with the events could result in the exceedance of adopted thresholds. This would be a significant impact.	S	Mitigation Measure 3.6-5: Prepare a marketing event transportation plan. The Applicant shall prepare a marketing event transportation plan in consultation with Napa County. The plan shall identify the type and size of events and shall identify the expected arrival and departure times for staff and guests of the events. The purpose of the plan will be to ensure that marketing events are planned and employee shifts scheduled to avoid staff and event-related visitor vehicle trips during the weekday p.m. peak period (4-6 p.m.) and weekend afternoon peak period (1-3 p.m.) so that adopted traffic thresholds are not exceeded.	LTS
Impact 3.6-6: Construction-related traffic impacts. Traffic generated during project construction would be attributable to trucks and construction workers' trips to and from the site. These trips could result in impacts to the operation of the study intersection. However, the Applicant has agreed to stagger work shifts so that they do not occur during the peak commute periods. Therefore, no significant construction traffic impacts would be anticipated. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.6-7: Pedestrian and bicycle facilities impacts. Currently, SR 29 has wide striped shoulder areas (unofficial Class II bike lanes) in both directions. The project would provide two bicycle racks on-site to accommodate visitors or staff who may wish to bike to the site. Further, the project would not conflict with any of the County's plans to implement pedestrian and/or bicycle improvements in the project area. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.6-8: Access and circulation impacts – internal pedestrian circulation. The project includes three proposed parking lots throughout the project site. Employees and delivery trucks would use the Lower Cave lot, while visitors would be directed to the Upper Cave lot and, from there, would access the upper building through the caves. Further, each of the three parking lots would include one van-accessible parking space. Therefore, because each parking lot would include accessible parking spaces	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, and SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
and adequate pedestrian access would be provided through the caves, onsite internal pedestrian access would be adequate and less than significant.			
Impact 3.6-9: Access and circulation impacts – adequate driveway sight distance. The Project Driveway would be relocated approximately 120 feet south of the current driveway location and would provide a corner-sight distance of 660 feet in accordance with Caltrans Highway Design Manual requirements. Because adequate sight distance would be provided to allow the safe entry and departure of vehicles in accordance with Caltrans standards, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.6-10: Access and circulation impacts – adequate emergency vehicle circulation. The project's site plan has been reviewed and the internal circulation and the project driveway (upon project construction) were found to be adequate. The Registered Professional Engineer, Hugh Alexander Linn, conducted a truck turning analysis and verified the adequacy of internal truck circulation and emergency vehicle access. Therefore, the impact to access and circulation would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.6-11: Access and circulation impacts – southbound access to project driveway. With project implementation, the existing site driveway would be relocated about 120 feet to the south. The design of the southbound access driveway via a two-way left turn lane (TWLTL) does not conflict with the California Highway Design Manual, and would not substantially increase safety hazards for vehicles entering and departing from the site. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.6-12: Safety impacts. The project would be designed to meet all of the design and safety standards established by the County, and would provide adequate sight distances for vehicles entering and exiting the site. No safety impacts from hazardous design features would occur. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
3.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
Impact 3.7-1: Project-generated greenhouse gas emissions. The level of GHG emissions associated with the proposed project would exceed the threshold of 1,100 MT CO _{2e} /year. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in a substantial cumulative contribution to GHG emissions and conflict with the objective of Napa County General Plan Policy CON-65, which aims to reduce GHG emissions in the county. This would be a significant impact.	S	Mitigation Measure 3.7-1: Incorporate design features into project to reduce project-related operational GHG emissions. In addition to meeting LEED standards as part of the project, the applicant shall: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Install an array of solar panels on and/or around the new facility to meet the facility's full electricity demand on a year-round basis and additional solar panels, as feasible, to offset GHG emissions exceeding annual BAAQMD thresholds. A 765-kW solar panel system would be needed to generate enough emissions-free 	LTS

LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, and SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>solar electricity (1,182 megawatts per hour [MWh]) to offset GHG emissions from the project and meet thresholds. Locations for solar panels installation include but are not limited to rooftops, cleared on-site ground areas, and off-site property. This system may involve the use of on-site batteries for storing solar generated electricity for use during times of the week when demand is highest. A minimum of 5,000 sf of rooftop space and 18,000 sf of ground-level area would be available for solar panel installation, subject to County design and siting requirements. Although the project site has an area of over 10 acres, most areas are covered by oak woodland, which are protected under multiple County ordinances. An 18,000-sf cleared area located above the proposed caves would not have trees or proposed development to block solar panels and has been identified as the most suitable area on-site to support ground-level, freestanding solar panels. Based on the estimated available ground-level and rooftop space at the project site (approximately 23,000 sf), a 364-MW solar panel system could be built at the project site, assuming a 20 degree southward facing tilt and a module with 16 percent efficiency. The on-site system is estimated to only provide up to 562 MWh per year. It should be noted that for any non-rooftop areas considered on-site (e.g., cleared ground-level areas), the solar panels shall be subject to the County's Viewshed Protection Ordinance Program (Chapter 18.106 of the Napa County Code) and shall be reviewed by the County to confirm its compliance. (Ground mount or otherwise freestanding solar panels/arrays are not subject to the Viewshed Ordinance; however carports would be subject to this ordinance.) Depending on this review, this may further constrain the size of the solar system on-site. However, by complying with the County's Viewshed Protection Program, and the mitigation measures outlined in this EIR pertaining to sensitive biological resources, cultural resources, and water quality, no new significant environmental impacts would occur with construction of the solar panels. Construction of solar panels require minimal ground disturbance, would not generate traffic with the exception of a few workers during construction, and would not generate air emissions during operation.</p> <p>If the applicant cannot demonstrate that a 765-kW system can be provided on-site, construction and operation of an additional solar panel system, up to 203-kW, would be required and could be located on off-site rooftop locations, such as a local school or other parcel. Construction of the solar panels at off-site locations would occur on rooftops and shall comply with the County's requirements for solar panel installation on existing structures. No new</p>	

LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, and SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>significant effects would occur. For off-site areas, the applicant shall coordinate with off-site participants and shall demonstrate to the County that a total of 1,182 MW of solar generation is provided between on-site and off-site locations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Install at least one electric vehicle charging station for use by guests and employees to encourage use of plug-in electric and hybrid vehicles. ▲ Provide preferential parking spaces for passenger vehicles that arrive with four or more passengers to encourage carpooling to and from the site. To qualify as preferential, these spaces may be located closer to the winery administration and visitors building than other parking spaces or be under shade structures. ▲ Prohibit burning of removed vegetation or demolition debris on site during project construction or operation. <p>For all large healthy trees (i.e., breast height diameter of one foot or greater) subject to removal, the applicant shall seek to participate in an urban and community forestry program (such as the UrbanWood program managed by the Urban Forest Ecosystems Institute [Urban Forest Ecosystems Institute 2007]) in which tree wood is harvested for an end-use that would retain its carbon sequestration (e.g., furniture building, cabinet making, lumber). Alternatively, all other non-harvestable trees and woody biomass subject to removal as well as all clean wood from demolition of the existing residence and associated structures shall be hauled to a biomass power plant or converted to mulch to be used for landscaping.</p>	
<p>Impact 3.7-2: Impacts of climate change on the project. Climate change is expected to result in a variety of effects that would influence conditions on the project site. These effects include increased temperatures, increased wildfire risk and sea level rise; and changes to timing and intensity of precipitation, resulting in increased stormwater runoff and flood risk. However, numerous State and County programs and policies are in place to protect the project against and respond to wildland fire, sea level rise, and flooding. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>3.8 Air Quality</p>			
<p>Impact 3.8-1: Short-term, construction-generated emissions of ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. The project's short-term construction-generated emissions would exceed BAAQMD significance thresholds for NO_x. This would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.8-1: Use Tier 3-rated generators during cave construction. The applicant shall require its construction contractors to only use generator sets rated to achieve EPA Tier 3 emission standards or better. These generators may be powered by diesel or other fuels (e.g., natural gas, propane) so long as they achieve EPA Tier 3 emission standards. Alternatively, the electricity required to power the cave excavation</p>	LTS

LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, and SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
		equipment can be supplied from the grid if a viable connection can be established. The applicant shall demonstrate its plan to fulfill the requirements of this measure in a report submitted to the County and BAAQMD before beginning any cave excavation activity.	
Impact 3.8-2: Short-term construction emissions of toxic air contaminants. Construction-related activities would result in temporary, short-term project-generated emissions of TACs, particularly diesel PM. However, because of the relatively low mass of diesel PM generated during project construction, the relatively short duration in which construction would occur, the fact that the TAC-emitting construction activity would not be centralized around any single location on the project site throughout the construction period, and the highly dispersive properties of diesel PM, construction-generated TACs would not expose sensitive receptors to an incremental increase in cancer risk greater than 10 in one million or a hazard index greater than 1.0. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.8-3: Exposure of sensitive receptors to odors during construction. The project would introduce new odor sources into the area (e.g., diesel exhaust emissions from delivery trucks). However, these types of odor sources already operate in and near the project area and do not result in odor complaints. Also, the project would not locate sensitive land uses in close proximity to any existing odor sources. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
3.9 Water Supply and Groundwater			
Impact 3.9-1: Water supply impacts. The annual water demand for the project is expected to be approximately 1,352,282 gallons (4.15 afy); which could adequately be met by existing on-site wells (RCS 2014). This demand would be partially offset (approximately 0.75 afy) by use of recycled water to provide vineyard and landscape irrigation from a new on-site domestic wastewater treatment system. Based on well pump tests for on-site wells, sufficient groundwater supplies are available to meet the project's peak day demand and average daily demand without resulting in adverse groundwater drawdown conditions. Implementation of the County's groundwater permit application process and the project's proposed water conservation measures would further reduce potential water supply impacts. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.9-2: Groundwater recharge impacts. Using the water use criteria for Napa	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, and SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
<p>Valley Floor locations, the 10.89-acre project site has a water availability calculation of 10.89 afy. The project would result in an estimated water use of 4.15 afy. Based on the County's WAA's Tier 1 criteria for water use, the project would remain below the established fair share for groundwater use on the project site. In addition, based on results of the constant rate pumping test, the project is not anticipated to interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater level on the project site or off-site wells. Implementation of the County's groundwater permit application process and the project's proposed water conservation measures would further reduce the project's impacts on groundwater recharge. This would be less than significant.</p>			
<p>Mitigation Measures from Initial Study</p>			
<p>Biological Resources: Drainage and Riparian Vegetation. Two constructed drainages are found on the lower portion of the site. One constructed drainage runs from the west, beneath State Route 29 in a 24-inch metal culvert, to the east and then alongside the existing driveway. The west to east drainage connects to another constructed drainage that runs from the south to north at the edge of the flat portion of the site. The south to north drainage flows beneath the existing driveway within an 18-inch culvert. Along this drainage are mixed riparian woodlands. The existing driveway will be widened by about 10-feet to meet county standards and the existing culvert will be replaced by a three-sided box culvert in approximately the same location as the existing culvert. According to the Wildlife Research Associates, the ordinary high water mark of the creek at this location is approximately 5 feet wide, which is a small enough span to allow for design and installation of a 3-sided box culvert that begins and ends above the ordinary high water mark on either side of the channel which is not within the jurisdiction of the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps). The additional 10 feet of road will result in approximately 50 square feet of channel that will be covered by a culvert, which would be a new impact since the existing 10 feet is covered by an existing culvert. There may also be impacts related to construction of the new access road. Approximately 0.04 acres of mixed riparian woodlands may be impacted by these improvements.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Prior to issuance of a building or grading permit for the proposed box culvert, the project applicant shall provide documentation from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) that a streambed alteration agreement has been issued or that said department does not deem such permitting necessary. The terms and conditions of that permitting are subject to CDFW concurrence and may be modified as deemed necessary by that department. If deemed necessary by CDFW, a habitat restoration plan that describes the impacts and proposed compensation measures will be provided to the agency(ies) for their approval prior to installation of the new crossing. Mitigation will be at a 2:1 compensation to loss ratio so that a minimum of 0.08 acres of mixed riparian woodland will be planted along the drainage channel as mitigation. The mitigation/restoration plan, prepared by a qualified biologist will have the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ A list of native trees and shrubs to be planted, sizes and spacing. ▲ Mitigation will be at 2:1 compensation to loss ratio or 0.08 acres. ▲ Plant species selected shall be native species adapted to the area and be species known to grow within the existing plant community. ▲ Plantings will be done during the optimal season for the species being planted which is typically in the winter season. ▲ An 80 percent survival rate over a period of 5 years for new plantings will be the target success criteria. ▲ Invasive exotic plant species will be controlled to the maximum extent practicable to accomplish the revegetation effort. Himalayan blackberry, giant reed, 	<p>LTS</p>

LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, and SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>periwinkle and non-native trees such as weeping willow, blackwood acacia, and English hawthorne specifically will be targeted for removal within the restoration area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Chemical control of invasive exotic plant species will be conducted by a certified pesticide applicator per labeled directions and all other federal, state, and local laws and regulations and will be certified for use in an aquatic environment. ▲ All disturbed areas will be seeded with a native herbaceous seed mix to be developed as part of the restoration plan. ▲ An annual report will be prepared each year for a minimum of five years and submitted to Napa County Planning Division, and CDFW that describes the revegetation effort, survival of the plantings and any recommendations for maintenance and work needed to ensure a successful restoration effort. ▲ Work in the drainage should be conducted when the creek is dry, generally after the month of June. <p>Method of Monitoring: The applicant shall submit evidence of permits from CDFW to the Planning Division, if required, prior to issuance of permits related to improvements affecting the drainage channels and a habitat restoration plan is so required.</p>	
<p>Biological Resources: Nesting Birds. Protocol level botanical surveys were conducted in the spring and summer of 2009 by Pacific Biological & Consulting, as well as surveys for sensitive wildlife and wetlands. Additional surveys of the site were conducted in October 2013 by Wildlife Research Associates. Although no special-status birds were observed on the project site during the surveys, the report did note several stick nests and more generally, that potential nesting habitat occurs for listed and non-listed special-status species of birds. Project activities such as earthmoving and grading during the nesting season (February 15 to August 15) have the potential to result in direct mortality of these species. In addition, human disturbances and construction noise have the potential to cause nest abandonment and death of young or loss of reproductive potential at active nests located near project activities.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Prior to any earth-disturbing activities occurring during the nesting season (February 15 to August 15), a pre-construction nesting bird (both passerine and raptor) survey of the grasslands and adjacent trees shall be performed by a qualified biologist within seven (7) days of ground breaking. If no nesting birds are observed no further action is required and grading shall occur within one week of the survey to prevent “take” of individual birds that could begin nesting after the survey.</p> <p>If active bird nests (either passerine and/or raptor) are observed during the pre-construction survey, a disturbance-free buffer zone shall be established around the nest tree(s) until the young have fledged, as determined by a qualified biologist. The radius of the required buffer zone can vary depending on the species, (i.e., 75-100 feet for passerines and 200-300 feet for raptors), with the dimensions of any required buffer zones to be determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW.</p> <p>To delineate the buffer zone around a nesting tree, orange construction fencing shall be placed at the specified radius from the base of the tree within which no machinery or workers shall intrude. After the fencing is in place there will be no restrictions on grading or construction activities outside the prescribed buffer zones.</p>	LTS

LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, and SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
		Method of Monitoring: Applicant shall be responsible for conducting surveys. If species are found the DFG shall be consulted to determine if any significant impacts are anticipated and what mitigation measures, if any, will be required.	
Biological Resources: Special-Status Bats. Protocol level botanical surveys were conducted in the spring and summer of 2009 by Pacific Biological & Consulting, as well as surveys for sensitive wildlife and wetlands. Additional surveys of the site were conducted in October 2013 by Wildlife Research Associates. In addition to nesting bird species, special-status bats have the potential to roost in hollow cores in trees and structures on the project site. Human disturbances and construction noise have the potential to cause roost abandonment and death of young or loss of reproductive potential at active nests located near project activities.	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-3a: To prevent direct mortality of bats that may occupy or re-occupy the residence and cave or begin to roost in the pump house, sheds, garage and outbuilding, the following measures are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Partial dismantling shall be used to reduce the roost suitability of the residence and detached garage, and will be conducted no fewer than 7 days prior to building demolition. ▲ Partial dismantling shall occur between approximately March 1 or when evening temperatures are above 45° F and rainfall less than ½” in 24 hours occurs, and April 15, prior to parturition of pups. The next acceptable period is after pups become self-sufficiently volant – September 1 through about October 15, or prior to evening temperatures dropping below 45° F and onset of rainfall greater than ½” in 24 hours. ▲ To reduce roost suitability, the central portions of the flat roof sections of the residence, including the tower, shall be modified by cutting several 3’ x 3’ sections through the roof materials, underlayment, and if deemed safe, the roof rafters. Concurrently, all doors and windows shall be opened and remain open no fewer than 7 days prior to demolition. ▲ Seven days prior to demolition of sheds and garage outbuilding, all doors shall be opened or removed. ▲ Seven days prior to construction activities inside the wine cave, the front doors should be opened during daylight hours. Additionally, installing tight-fitting rubber weather stripping around the door perimeter is recommended to prevent entry by bats. 	LTS
		<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-3b: To prevent direct mortality of bats that may roost in tree cavities, crevices, exfoliating bark, or foliage within the 33 trees identified on the site, the following measures are recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Potential habitat trees shall be removed only between approximately March 1 or when evening temperatures are above 45° F and rainfall less than ½” in 24 hours occurs, and April 15, prior to parturition of pups. The next acceptable period is after pups become self-sufficiently volant – ▲ September 1 through about October 15, or prior to evening temperatures dropping 	

LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, and SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>below 45° F and onset of rainfall greater than ½” in 24 hours.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Tree removal shall be conducted using a two-stage process over two consecutive days (e.g. Tuesday and Wednesday, or Thursday and Friday). With this method, small branches and small limbs containing no cavity, crevice or exfoliating bark habitat on habitat trees, as identified by a qualified bat biologist are removed first on Day 1, using chainsaws only (no dozers, backhoes, etc.). The following day (Day 2), the remainder of the tree is to be removed. The disturbance caused by chainsaw noise and vibration, coupled with the physical alteration, has the effect of causing colonial bat species to abandon the roost tree after nightly emergence for foraging. Removing the tree the next day prevents re-habituation and re-occupation of the altered tree. ▲ Trees containing suitable potential habitat must be trimmed with chainsaws on Day 1 under initial field supervision by a qualified bat expert to ensure that the tree cutters fully understand the process, and avoid incorrectly cutting potential habitat features or trees. After tree cutters have received sufficient instruction, the qualified bat expert does not need to remain on the site. ▲ All other vegetation other than trees within the Limit of Work should be removed prior to tree removal, according to the dates provided above. If vegetation must be removed outside those dates, a 50’ buffer around each habitat tree should be observed to reduce likelihood of abandonment of the roost and young. ▲ If non-habitat trees must be removed outside seasonal periods of bat activity as described above, a 50’ buffer around each habitat tree should be observed to reduce likelihood of abandonment of the roost and young. ▲ In order to minimize potential take of solitary bats such as <i>L. blossevillii</i> or <i>L. cinereus</i>, tree removal should begin with the smaller trees and vegetation on the site, followed by smaller trees in each location where trees are to be removed. Only chainsaws should be used, to create a noise disturbance that will be sufficient to cause roosting individual <i>L. blossevillii</i> or <i>L. cinereus</i> to abandon the site. Using these methods will prevent take of colonial roosting bats and minimize potential for take of individual, obligate tree-roosting bats, while being economically and logistically feasible. <p>Method of Monitoring: Applicant shall be responsible for conducting surveys. If species are found the DFG shall be consulted to determine if any significant impacts are anticipated and what mitigation measures, if any, will be required.</p>	
Cultural Resources. There is a possibility that subsurface archaeological deposits may	PS	Mitigation Measure CULT-1a: The project applicant shall design and implement a Worker	LTS

LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, and SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
<p>exist within the proposed development area, as archaeological sites may be buried with no surface manifestation, or may be obscured by vegetation.</p>		<p>Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) that will be provided to all construction personnel and supervisors who will have the potential to encounter and alter heritage and cultural resources. The topics to be addressed in the WEAP will include, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ types of heritage and cultural resources expected in the project area; ▲ types of evidence that indicates heritage or cultural resources might be present (e.g., ceramic shards, trash scatters, lithic scatters); ▲ what to do if a worker encounters a possible resource; ▲ what to do if a worker encounters bones or possible bones; and ▲ penalties for removing or intentionally disturbing heritage and cultural resources, such as those identified in the Archeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA). <p>Method of Monitoring: A qualified archaeologist shall conduct the training before the beginning of any demolition or project construction activities.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure CULT-1b: Should any previously unknown prehistoric or historic resources be encountered during on-site construction activities, earthwork within 100 feet of these materials shall be stopped and evaluated by a qualified archaeologist. Once the archaeologist has had the opportunity to evaluate the significance of the find and suggest appropriate mitigation measures, as necessary, said measures shall be carried out prior to any resumption of related ceased earthwork. All significant cultural resource materials recovered shall be subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and a report prepared by the qualified archaeologist according to current professional standards.</p> <p>Method of Monitoring: A qualified archaeologist shall evaluate any finds of potentially significant surface scatter or buried cultural material. The qualified archaeologist will coordinate with the project owner’s construction manager to stop all work in the vicinity of the find until it can be assessed. If the discovery is determined to not be significant then work will be allowed to continue.</p>	
<p>Transportation/Traffic. Access to the proposed winery will be from a new driveway off SR-29 designed to meet county requirements, replacing the existing driveway. The proposed location of the new driveway, south of the existing driveway, locates it farther away from the driveway for the Mustard’s Grill restaurant reducing potential conflicts for vehicles exiting/entering both driveways. The submitted traffic study indicated existing</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure TRANS-1: The project applicant shall remove the shrub/low tree north of the project driveway casing the obstruction identified in the Traffic Study prior to final occupancy of the winery.</p> <p>Method of Monitoring: The existing vegetation causing the obstruction shall be removed prior to final occupancy of the winery.</p>	LTS

LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, and SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impact	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
<p>vehicle speeds on SR 29 Lane were measured at about 49-54 miles per hour (mph) during the weekday PM peak period and the Saturday afternoon peak period, respectively. Stopping sight distances, based on Cal Trans design standards for these vehicle speeds would be 450-500 feet measured along the two travel lanes on SR-29. Vehicle visibility was more than 500 feet when looking in either direction more than meeting the Cal Trans standard. However, the traffic study noted that there is a shrub/low tree on the north side of the driveway that blocks sight distance to the north and recommends removal of this obstruction. The traffic study also evaluated the driveway for a dedicated right turn lane. While inbound right turn volumes did not warrant a right turn lanes they did warrant a right turn taper.</p>		<p>Mitigation Measure TRANS-2: The applicant shall provide a right turn taper at the project driveway.</p> <p>Method of Monitoring: Prior to final occupancy of the winery, a right turn taper shall be completed at the project driveway.</p>	

LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, and SU = Significant and unavoidable

This page intentionally left blank.