

“D”

Mitigated Negative Declaration

APPENDIX C

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

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated February 2015)

1. **Project Title:** Beau Vigne Winery Use Permit Modification #P15-00200
2. **Property Owner:** Ed Snider dba Beau Vigne, PO Box 6412, Napa, CA 94581
3. **Project Sponsor's name and address:** Ed Snider c/o Beau Vigne, PO Box 6412, Napa, CA 94581
4. **Project representative name and address:** Jeff Redding, Land Use Planning Services, 2423 Renfew St., Napa, CA 94558, 707 255-7375, jreddingaicp@comcast.net.
5. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Wyntriss Balcher; (707) 299-1351; wyntriss.balcher@countyofnapa.org
6. **Project Location and APN:** The project is located on a ±7.96-acre parcel and on the west side of Silverado Trail approximately 190 feet north of its intersection with Petra Lane and approximately 625 feet north of its intersection with Soda Canyon Road, within the Agricultural Preserve (AP) zoning district; 4057 Silverado Trail, Napa; APN: 039-390-016.
7. **General Plan description:** Agricultural Resource (AR)
8. **Zoning:** Agricultural Preserve (AP)
9. **Background/Project History:** On July 24, 1984, the Board of Supervisors approved an Indemnification Agreement (Contract #2159) permitting the applicant to commence operation of a winery within an existing barn under consideration (Use Permit application # U-708384) in advance of approval of the use permit by the Planning Commission. The use permit conditions included three mitigation measures: 1) noisy equipment was to be placed away from neighbors and included a requirement for acoustical shielding around noisy equipment; 2) shields on outdoor lighting directing light downward; and 3) installation of plantings, preferably Napa Valley natives, around the parking areas and all storage areas of sufficient height and density to screen these areas from view of the adjoining residences. On September 19, 1984 the Planning Commission approved the Use Permit U-708384 to establish an 8,000 gallon winery with the conversion of the existing barn, no public tours and tasting, one employee, and 2 parking spaces. The project did not comply with the Small Winery Use Permit Exemption criteria because the winery would be located less than 2,000 feet from another approved winery (Altamura, Use Permit #U-707879). Although the parcel is less than 10 acres in area, the current minimum lot size for a winery had not been adopted.

Minor Modification Use Permit #P07-00823 was approved on January 16, 2008, for the demolition of an existing 2,750 sq.ft.(sf.) uncovered crush pad between the winery and the tasting room and the construction of a new 2,440 sf. uncovered crush pad 3 feet north of the winery building. The original crush pad area was replaced with a pervious surface. The existing six (6) 1,620 gallon and the six (6) 3,000 gallon wine storage tanks were relocated from the original crush pad to the new crush pad with native vegetation planted to provide adequate screening for the new crush pad as required by a previous Use Permit mitigation measures.

On November 20, 2014, the original owners of the property requested a determination whether tours and tasting were permitted at the winery (Permit Determination Request #P14-00373). Based on research of all County records, it was determined that the conditions of the prior use permits did not authorize public tours and tasting. Therefore, Use Permit P15-00200 was submitted on June 10, 2015.
10. **Description of Project:** The Use Permit modification application proposes approval to modify Use Permit # U-708384 as follows:
 - a. Increase annual production capacity from 8,000 to 14,000 gallons;
 - b. Demolition of the existing winery building, crush pad, residence, and outbuildings;
 - c. Construction of a new 5,807 sf. winery production building include:
 1. Construction of a 2,673 sf. covered crush pad and a 1,133 sf. receiving area;
 2. Construction of a 4,473 sf. outdoor pallet storage area (also temporary location of mobile bottling truck);

- d. Construction of a new 1,773 sf. office/hospitality building to include:
 - 1. 1916 sf. covered porch, breezeway, and terrace;
- e. Construction of 11 visitor and three (3) employee parking spaces, total 14 parking spaces;
- f. Increase employment to three (3) full time employees and one (1) part-time employee;
- g. Add daily visitation of 10 visitors per weekday; 15 on weekends, maximum 85/week;
- h. Change days of operation to 7 days; no change in the hours of operation which are: 8:00 am to 8:00 pm;
- i. Add a Marketing Program for one (1) event/month for 25 guests, and two (2) per year for 30 guests, where all food will be catered, all event activities will occur within the office/hospitality building, and will be scheduled between 11:00AM -4:00 PM or 2:00PM -10:00 PM;
- j. On-premise consumption of wines produced on-site within the proposed hospitality building and outdoor courtyard area, consistent with the Business and Professions Code §23356, §23390, and §23396.5;
- k. Installation of one 61,000 gallon water storage tank (27' diameter and 17' high) for fire protection;
- l. Construction of new driveway to county winery standards to improve the internal circulation on the property;
- m. Construction of a left turn lane on Silverado Trail;
- n. Removal of approximately 0.6 acres of vineyard;
- o. Construction of new well, installation of new water, wastewater and fire suppression systems; and,
- p. Installation of site landscaping.

11. **Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses.** The project site is located on the Napa, California USGS Quad. Development on the property includes a single family residence, a winery building, a wine storage building, and outbuildings, served by an existing paved ±725 foot driveway. A second residence (modular) located on the property was removed in 2015. The relatively flat (1-2% slopes) ±7.92 acre parcel is located at the ±74 ft. MSL elevation, on the west side of Silverado Trail, approximately 190 feet north of its intersection with Petra Drive.

The Napa County Environmental Sensitivity maps (archaeology) indicate that the corner of the parcel where the existing winery development is located is within an environmentally sensitive area for archaeology. The Napa County Environmental Sensitivity maps (natural diversity database, biology, fish, and geology) indicate this parcel is not located within an environmentally sensitive area for plants, fish, geology, or biology. Foundation materials consist of Quaternary surficial deposits from early or mid-Pleistocene fans or terrace deposits, overlain by Coombs gravelly loam (2% to 5% slopes) soil series, well drained, on gently sloping old terraces and alluvial fans, runoff slow, hazard for erosion is slight. Vegetative cover is primarily vineyard, domestic-introduced landscaping, with some wild grasses. There is a large cedar tree adjacent to the residence which will be protected and retained. The parcel is developed with ±5.93 acres of vineyards.

The surrounding land uses include: five residences located along the southeast boundary where the closest house is approximately 195 feet southeast from the existing project site residence (proposed administration/hospitality building site); two properties to the north and northeast are developed in vineyards and a single family residence; the property to the southwest is developed with vineyards and a residence, where the residence is approximately 200 ft. from the existing winery building (proposed new winery production building site); and the parcel to the northwest has a single family residence, vineyards and a proposal for a new winery. The northerly residence is approximately 325 ft. from the existing project site residence (proposed administration/hospitality building site) and ±350 feet from existing winery building). The use permit establishing the winery was approved under a mitigated negative declaration, which imposed mitigation measures regarding noise and the placement of equipment; and, aesthetics (nighttime lighting and visual screening).

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

The project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County, including but not limited to building permits, grading permits, and waste disposal permits, in addition to Cal Fire.

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

None Required.

Other Agencies Contacted

Federal Trade and Taxation Bureau
 Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control
 Native American Tribes

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature: 

Name: Wynntress Batchelor

Date: 8/16/2016

Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services
Department

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

Discussion:

- a-c Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms, geological features, water, trees and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of a beautiful or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken-in. The project site is located within view of a Silverado Trail, a designated Viewshed road, however, the project does not sit on a major ridgeline and is set back from the road over 600 feet. The design of the proposed structures is similar in the style of other wineries in the area with a "Napa Field Stone" veneer façades to minimize the industrial form. The winery production building is ±30 feet in height with two 6.5 ft. tall ventilation cupolas on the roofline; wooden braces; awnings over entrance bays; and window treatments. The design of the office/hospitality building (±22 feet in height) will utilize many wood materials: on the doorway lintels, fascia, roof brackets features and patio trellis. There will be a 27' diameter (61,000 gallon) water storage tank, 17 ft. tall, on the northeastern side of the winery development area. This tank will be over 700 feet from the road, with vineyards between, reducing its potential visual impact to a less than significant level. There are no rock outcroppings or other designated scenic features on the parcel with the exception of a prominent cedar tree slated to be retained and incorporated into the landscape of the facility. The proposed new structures will be located substantially in the same layout as the existing winery and residence with a slight circulation change, which will not substantially alter the existing view of the property.
- d The proposed project would not introduce any additional source of lights that could significantly impact daytime or nighttime views of the area. The addition of visitors and events will not create substantial glare either during the day or nighttime. Marketing social events will be limited to 10 p.m. and will occur solely within the administration/hospitality building. Pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approval for wineries, outdoor lighting will be required to be shielded and directed downwards, with only low level lighting allowed in parking areas. As designed, and as subject to the standard condition of approval, below, the project will not have a significant impact resulting from new sources of outside lighting.

"All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward, shall be located as low to the ground as possible, and shall be the minimum necessary for security, safety, or operations 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 California Building Code."

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b/e. The project would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Important as shown on the Napa County Important Farmland Map 2002 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The .06 acre partial conversion of the vineyard for use of the winery supports the economic viability of agriculture and the General Plan definition of agriculture. The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. There is no Williamson Act contract associated with the parcel. There are no changes included in this proposal that would result in the conversion of Farmland beyond the immediate project site.

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

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

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
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

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

The proposed project includes up to: three (3) full-time employees, one (1) part-time employee, fifteen (15) busiest-day tours/tastings, and an additional 6,000 gallons of production; meaning that this project would account for 13 maximum daily trips on a typical weekday and 23 trips on harvest-season day with no marketing events. The subject application also proposes marketing events, with up to 30 people at the largest event; at 2.8 persons per car that would add up to 21 additional visitor trips on the day of a large marketing event plus 10 market event staff trips.

Over the long term, emission sources for the proposed project will consist primarily of mobile sources including vehicles visiting the site. The Air District's threshold of significance provided in Table 3-1 has determined that similar projects such as a quality restaurant that do not exceed a threshold of 47 ksf will not significantly impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2011 Pages 3-2 & 3-3.). Given the size of the project is 7,580 (Hospitality Building – 1,773 sf.; Wine Production Building 5,807 sf.) compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47ksf (NOX) (high quality restaurant) and 541ksf (general light industry), the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. (Please note: a high quality restaurant is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, but grossly overstates emissions associated with other portions of a winery, such as office, barrel storage and production, which generate fewer vehicle trips. Therefore, a general light industry comparison has also been used for other such uses.)

The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plan. Wineries as proposed here are not producers of air pollution in volumes substantial enough to result in an air quality plan conflict. The project site lies within the Napa Valley, which forms one of the climatologically distinct sub-regions (Napa County Sub region) within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The topographical and meteorological features of the Valley create a relatively high potential for air pollution. Over the long term, emissions resulting from the proposed project would consist primarily of mobile sources, including production-related deliveries and visitor and employee vehicles traveling to and from the winery. The resulting busiest day plus marketing total is well below the threshold of significance. The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	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 Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers - plants CNPS points & polygons, plant surveys, red legged frog core area and critical habitat, vernal pools & vernal pool species, Spotted Owl Habitat – 1.5 mile buffer and known fish presence), no known candidate, sensitive, or special status species have been identified as occurring within the project boundaries. As discussed in the section I above, the proposal and associated construction are minimal with no significant grading or tree removal required. Furthermore, there are no species or site conditions which would be considered essential for the support of a species with limited distribution or be considered to be a sensitive natural plant community. The potential for this project to have a significant impact on special status species or species of particular concern is not very probable.
- c/d. There are no wetlands on the property or on neighboring properties that would be affected by this project, and the property is not located adjacent to the streams in the vicinity. Therefore, project activities will not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with their corridors or nursery sites, because no sensitive natural communities have been identified on the property. Therefore, the project as proposed would have no impact to biological resources.
- e/f. No biological resource protection policies, ordinances, adopted Habitat Conservation Plans or other similar plans are in effect for this area and, therefore, there would be no adverse impact by this project.

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

Discussion:

- a-c. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology surveys, sites, sensitive areas, and flags) the project is located adjacent to an area delineated as sensitive for archaeological or paleontological resources. A Tribal representative requested to conduct a field survey of the property (conducted April 22, 2016) and requested a record search with Sonoma State (NWIC) affiliated with the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) be performed to notify our agency of any known archaeological sites within the project site or near it. Pursuant to the request, a CHRIS records search was conducted and a review was made of the pertinent NWIC base maps that reference cultural resources records and reports, historic-period maps, and literature for Napa County. The report, dated May 5, 2016 by Mark Castro, stated that there are no recorded archeological resources on the project site. Further, the report indicates that there are no Native American resources in or immediately adjacent to the proposed project area referenced in the ethnographic literature. The report indicated that there is a moderate potential for unrecorded historic-period archaeological resources. As requested, the report was forwarded to the Tribal representatives on June 2, 2016.

The proposed project includes the placement of new winery structures within the area of development of the existing winery buildings, residence, associated paved areas, plus an additional .06 acres of cultivated vineyard area. Although the project will be located on

historically disturbed land, its potential impact to archaeological resources will be reduced to a less than significant level with the application of the following standard condition of approval:

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

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

The CHRIS report also noted unrecorded structures existing on the property greater than 45 years in age and thus met the Office of Historic Preservation's minimum age standards that buildings, structures and objects 45 years or older may be of historic value. To address this concern, the architect of record, James Jeffrey submitted a report (dated June 15, 2016), regarding the winery building tasting room/storage building and the residence located on the property. A search of the records were made and found that the winery and storage building were constructed circa 1930; the estimated date of the residence was 1958. The conditions of all buildings reflect both age and deferred maintenance; in significant disrepair both interior and exterior. All buildings lack distinctive characteristics of a distinctive architectural style or period or exemplify a distinctive method of construction. Workmanship in each building is remarkable as are materials used in construction. Based upon the physical condition, the former winery and storage building have no structural value and demolition is recommended. The main dwelling is in significant disrepair, with substandard construction; its architectural style and vocabulary is not distinctive, nor did an architect of local, statue or national prominence design the building; and there is no evidence that a person of local or statewide prominence occupy the residence. A review of the Van der Hayden Winery (former winery) promotional materials, the winery buildings were not included and not considered important features. Since the structures have no historical value, their removal would have no effect on historical resources.

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a.
 - i.) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.
 - ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
 - iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Compliance with the latest editions of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.
 - iv.) According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) there are no landslide deposits in the proposed development area.
- b. The majority of proposed development is located within the development area of the existing winery and residence and will occur on slopes ranging from 1% to 2%. Based upon the Soil Survey of Napa County, prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the soils on site are comprised of the Coombs Gravelly Loam (2% to 5% slopes) soil series. The project will require incorporation of best management practices and will be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable.
- c/d. According to preliminary geologic mapping of the Napa, CA Quadrangle performed by the California Geologic Survey (CGS-2004), the property is underlain by Quaternary surficial deposits and with Late and Early Pleistocene alluvium. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the project site has a very low risk for liquefaction. Development will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible.
- e. An expansion of the existing septic system is proposed as part of the project. The system will be designed by a licensed engineer and will be reviewed and approved by the Division of Environmental Health. A Wastewater Feasibility Study was prepared by Always Engineering, Inc. (date June 3, 2015), which found that with the installation of the proposed new sanitary management system and the installation of additional leach lines, the site is capable of supporting the proposed 947.5 gallons/day total sanitary sewage and winery processed waste water loads. Therefore, there does not appear to be any limitation on this parcel's ability to support an on-site septic system which will be able to support the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

- VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:
- a) Generate a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions in excess of applicable thresholds adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District or the California Air Resources Board which may have a significant impact on the environment?
 - 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?

Discussion:

a/b. 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/>.

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 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.

² County of Napa, March 2012, Napa County Draft Climate Action Plan, Prepared by ICF International. Sacramento, CA
³ Supersedes February 2, 2016, version.

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 5,807 sq. ft. of wine production building compared to the BAAQMD's GHG screening criteria of 121,000 sq. ft. for general industrial, and 1,773 sq. ft. of hospitality 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. By comparison 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 floor area is below the screening levels for similar uses in the District's Guidelines, therefore the proposed use would not generate GHG above the significance threshold established by the District, and further analysis (and quantification) of GHG emissions is not warranted.

Furthermore, the applicant proposes to incorporate GHG reduction methods including: design of the roof to accommodate photovoltaic/solar system; exceed Title 24 energy efficiency standards; build to CALGREEN TIER 2 standards; energy conserving lighting; use of energy star cool roof; installation of bicycle racks; located adjacent to the existing class II bike trail; install water efficient fixtures; the majority of all improvements will occur on previously disturbed area and storm water discharge will be controlled and water routed to the existing vineyards to the greatest extent feasible; install water efficient landscaping; recycling 75% of all waste; composting 75% food and garden waste; planting of shade trees within 40 feet of the south side of the building; install an electrical charging station; orientation of hospitality building, roof overhangs and tree plantings to provide passive heating and cooling; constructing on previously disturbed land to minimize grading and any tree removal will be ornamental trees planted by prior owner; a prominent old cedar tree will be retained; utilization of recycled materials; strategically placed and labeled recycling bins and bi-weekly meetings to educate the public and staff regarding sustainable practices; using 70% to 80% cover crop; retain biomass removed via pruning and thinning and no burning; and are already participating in the BMP's at their vineyards on Soda Canyon. The proposed project has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds and determined that the project would not exceed the 1,100 MT/yr of CO₂e.

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

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts normally used in winery operations. A Business Plan will be filed with the Environmental Health Division should the amount of hazardous materials reach reportable levels. However, in the event that the proposed use or a future use involves the use, storage or transportation of greater than 55 gallons or 500 pounds of hazardous materials, a use permit and subsequent environmental assessment would be required in accordance with the Napa County Zoning Ordinance prior to the establishment of the use. During construction of the project some hazardous materials, such as building coatings/ adhesives/ etc., will be utilized. However, given the quantities of hazardous materials and the limited duration, they will result in a less-than-significant impact.
- b. The proposed project will not involve the use of hazardous materials other than those amounts normally used in winery operations. Therefore, the project would not result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site.
- d. Based on a search of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control Database and the Napa County Environmental Resource Map (hazardous facilities (Cortese List), the project site does not contain any known EPA National Priority List sites, State response sites, voluntary cleanup sites. No impact would occur as the project site is not on any known list of hazardous materials.
- e. The project site is not located within two miles of any public airport.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.

- g. Since the proposed project is an improvement of an existing facility, it will utilize the existing access road and will be required to install a left turn lane on Silverado Trail. Therefore, the project will not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan.
- h. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. The project is not located within the Cal Fire High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.

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

Discussion:

- a. The project is not expected to violate any water quality standards, waste discharge requirements, nor substantially deplete local groundwater supplies. An expanded on-site domestic septic system and a process wastewater system are proposed to accommodate the increase in production and visitation. The Napa County Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the proposed domestic and process wastewater systems and recommends approval as conditioned. Additionally, any earth disturbing activities would be subject to the County's Stormwater Ordinance which would include measures to prevent erosion, sediment, and waste materials from entering waterways both during and after any construction activities. Given the County's Best Management Practices, which comply with RWQCB requirements, the project does not have the potential to significantly impact water quality and discharge standards.
- b. 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.

To better understand groundwater resources, 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, well pump test protocols, management objectives, and community support. The County retained Luhdorff and Scalmanini who 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) and also completed a 2013 Updated Hydrogeologic Conceptualization and Characterization of Groundwater Conditions (Jan. 2013). 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).

On January 14, 2014 Governor Jerry Brown declared a drought emergency in the state of California. The declaration stopped short of imposing mandatory conservation measures statewide. Mandatory water restrictions are being left to individual jurisdictions. On April 1, 2015, Governor Brown issued Executive Order B-29-15 imposing restrictions to achieve a wide 25% reduction in potable urban water usage through February 28, 2016. However, such restrictions were not placed on private well users in rural areas. At this time the County of Napa has not adopted or implemented 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.

At the May 12, 2015 Board of Supervisors hearing, the Board heard and adopted an update to the Water Availability Analysis (WAA) policy. The WAA was first put in place in the early 1990's for any discretionary project that may utilize groundwater or will increase the intensity of groundwater use of any parcel through an existing, improved, or new water supply system (Napa County Groundwater Conservation Ordinance, Section 13.15.010). The WAA has been used since that time, with periodic revisions, as a tool for analyzing groundwater impacts resulting from discretionary projects such as wineries, new vineyards on slopes over 5%, restaurants, hotels and other discretionary uses located in the unincorporated area of the County that propose to use groundwater. Following the work of the Groundwater Advisory Committee (GRAC), policy direction from the Board of Supervisors, information provided by consultant reports and the County's experience over the last 20 plus years using the existing procedure, various changes to the WAA were adopted.

In general, recent studies have found that groundwater levels in the Napa Valley Floor exhibit stable long-term trends with a shallow depth to water. Historical trends in the Milliken-Sarco-Tuluca (MST) area, however, have shown increasing depths to groundwater, but recent stabilization in many locations. Groundwater availability, recharge, storage and yield are not consistent across the County. More is known about the resource where historical data have been collected. Less is known in areas with limited data or unknown geology. In order to fill existing data gaps and to provide a better understand of groundwater resources in the County, the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan recommended 18 Areas of Interest (AOIs) for additional groundwater level and water quality monitoring. Through the well owner and public outreach efforts of the (GRAC) approximately 40 new wells have been added to the monitoring program within these areas.

Minimum thresholds for water use have been established by the Napa County Department of Public Works, using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS), the GRAC recommendations, and the LSCE reports. 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 and LSCE. LSCE concluded that the 1.0 acre-ft/acre/year criteria on the Valley Floor has proven to be both scientifically and operationally adequate. 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. In the MST Groundwater Deficient Area, a 0.3 af/acre/year criteria would be an adequate threshold.

In December 2, 2015, the Department of Public Works identified concerns regarding the Northeastern Corner of the Napa Subarea. In the 2014 Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report, it reported that in this area, there has been "a 10 to 30 foot decline in [Seasonal groundwater elevations] over the past 15 years." The Report further discusses the possibility that this area may be hydraulically connected to the MST. There are two wells that have been monitored by the County in this area for several decades, both of which show a history of groundwater level decline during the early 2000s until about 2009. Since that time, spring and fall groundwater levels have fluctuated seasonally, but the overall trend appears to be stabilized. The 2015 spring and fall groundwater level data continue to exhibit a more stable trend, though the overall concern remains. At the time the 2014 Annual Report was issued, the recommendation was simply to continue to monitor the area. The Department has notified staff of an ongoing level of concern and will continue investigating the current wells on Petra Drive which are located in the area of concern. On July 19, 2016, the Board approved and authorized an amendment to the LSCE scope of work to include a special study of groundwater conditions in the northeast Napa Groundwater Subarea

to better understand groundwater conditions and to determine if this area is in fact an extension of the MST and controls similar to those implemented in the MST are warranted.

The subject project is located in the Napa Valley Floor-Napa Subarea. A Water Availability Analysis-Phase One Study was prepared for the subject ±7.96 acre parcel (APN: 039-390-016) by EBA Engineering (dated March 15, 2016), which states that the Allowable Water Allotment for the property is 7.96 acre-feet per year (af/yr). This allotment was determined by multiplying the acreage of the parcel by the one af/yr/acre fair share water use factor. The report indicates that the existing total water demand on the property is 2.87 af/yr, specifically, however, the calculations failed to include the one employee allowed by the original use permit. However, with the one employee included, the total demand would not significantly change as indicated below:

EXISTING BEAU VIGNE WINERY WATER DEMAND	
	Acre feet per year
Winery Processing 8,000 gallons (2.15af/yr per 100,000 gal)	.17
One employee 1 x 15 gallons/day x 365	[.017]
Residence	.62
±5.93 acres Vineyard – Irrigation only (no heat or frost protection)	2.08
TOTAL [added employee calculation]	2.87 [2.88]

The report states that the proposed total groundwater demand by the project on the property will be 2.34, specifically:

PROPOSED BEAU VIGNE WINERY WATER DEMAND	
	Acre feet per year
Winery Processing – 14,000 gallons	.30
Employees (3 full-time; 1 part-time; 2 part-time harvest)	.06
Tasting Visitors (10/weekday; 15/weekend day)	.04
Event visitors (25 guests x 12 and 30 guests x 2)	.01
Domestic landscaping irrigation	.07
±5.3 acres Vineyard – Irrigation (no heat or frost protection)	1.86
TOTAL	2.34

As indicated above, the calculated existing water demand is 2.87 af/yr, with the estimated proposed water demand from the proposed winery project to be 2.34 af/yr. Therefore, a water .53 af/yr demand reduction will result. The project proposes a 6,000 gallon per year production increase, new visitation, and marketing activities which will result in an increase in water demand. However, the project also proposes the removal of ±.06 acres of vineyard with the construction of the new access driveway, and the removal of the residence, with no replacement proposed, thereby reducing the water demand. Although a residence is a permitted use, the construction of a new residence on the property would be speculative and is not considered as a part of this project. Typically, a residence would utilize .75 af/yr which would still be below the Allowable Water Allotment.

The Allowable Water Allotment for this property is 7.96 af/yr. The estimated water demand of 2.34 af/yr is below the threshold established for the parcel. As discussed above, the project site is located within the area suspected as possibility being hydraulically connected to the MST. If this project were located in the MST subarea, the Allowable Water Allotment would be 2.39 af/yr or no net increase. Again, the project water demand would be below the MST threshold and there would be no net increase in water demand by the project. Therefore, since the project reduces water usage and the water usage is below the established thresholds, is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels.

- c/d. The project proposal will not alter any drainage patterns on site or cause an increase in erosion on or off site. The project would be required to incorporate an erosion control plan to manage onsite surface drainage and erosion of onsite soils during construction and winter months (October to April). By incorporating a Standard Measures erosion control plan, this project would have a less than significant impact on drainage and siltation.
- e. The proposed project will not substantially alter the drainage pattern on the site nor cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off site. There are no existing or planned stormwater systems that would be affected by this project. If the project disturbs more than one acre of land, the permittee will be required to comply with the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board addressing stormwater pollution during construction activities. The project site includes vineyards, landscaping and other pervious areas that have the capacity to absorb runoff.
- f. There is nothing included in this proposal that would otherwise substantially degrade water quality. As discussed in greater detail at, "a.," above, the Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the sanitary wastewater proposal and has found the proposed system adequate to meet the facility's septic needs as conditioned. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality.

- g-i. The project site is not located within a flood hazard area, nor would it impede or redirect flood flows or expose structures or people to flooding. The project site is not located within a dam or levee failure inundation zone.
- j. In coming years, higher global temperatures are expected to raise sea level by expanding ocean water, melting mountain glaciers and small ice caps, and causing portions of Greenland and the Antarctic ice sheets to melt. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change estimates that the global average sea level will rise between 0.6 and 2 feet over the next century (IPCC, 2007). However, the project area is located at approximately 74 ft. above mean sea level and there is no known history of mud flow in the vicinity. The project will not subject people or structures to a significant risk of inundation from tsunami, seiche, or mudflow.

Mitigation Measures: None.

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

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project is located in an area dominated by agriculture and a mixture of large lot residential, but is bordered on the east by a developed, small-lot subdivision on Petra Drive. The proposed use and the improvements proposed, however, are in support of the ongoing agricultural uses located from the south to the north sides of the project site. There are no other small-lot subdivisions located in this area, thus the project will not divide an established community.
- b. The subject parcel is located in the AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning district, which allows wineries and uses accessory to wineries subject to use permit approval. The proposed project is compliant with the physical limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance. The County has adopted the Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO) to protect agriculture and open space and to regulate winery development and expansion in a manner that avoids potential negative environmental effects.

The 2008 Napa County General Plan ensures that every important land use decision will be scrutinized and assessed for its potential to affect the quality of life, the environment we live in, the ability to farm, process agricultural products, and get those products to market. The Agricultural Land Use Goal AG/LU-1 is to preserve existing agricultural land uses and plan for agriculture and related activities as the primary land use; and Land Use Goal AG/LU-3 is to support the economic viability of agriculture, including grape growing, winemaking, other types of agriculture, and supporting industries to ensure the preservation of agricultural lands. The project would allow for the continuation of agriculture as a dominant land use within the county and is fully consistent with the Napa County General Plan.

Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU 1 of the 2008 General Plan states "agriculture and related activities are the primary land uses in Napa County" and Land Use Policy AG-LU-2 states that: "'agriculture" is defined as the raising of crops, trees, and livestock; the production and processing of agricultural products; and the related marketing, sales, and other accessory uses..." The property's General Plan land use designation is AR (Agricultural Resource), which allows "agriculture, processing of agricultural products, and single-family dwellings." The proposed use of the property to establish a winery for the "fermenting and processing of grape juice into wine" (NCC §18.08.640) utilizing the existing grapes grown on the project parcel and other Napa County grapes owned by the applicant supports the continuation of agriculture as a dominant land use within the County. Further, the project supports the economic viability of agriculture consistent with the General Plan Economic Development Policy E-1, "The County's economic development will focus on ensuring the continued viability of agriculture in Napa County."

The 2008 General Plan includes two complimentary policies requiring that new wineries, "...be designed to convey their permanence and attractiveness." (General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-10 and General Plan Community Character Policy CC-2). The proposed the proposed new winery production building office/hospitality building and office/hospitality building are generally of a high architectural quality and will utilize wood and stone materials, and landscaping, conveying the required permanence of the buildings and improving the building's overall attractiveness.

- c. There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans that are applicable to the property.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b. The Conservation and Open Space Elements of the Napa County General Plan does not indicate the presence of valuable or locally important mineral resources on the project site. The project would not result in a loss of a mineral resource of any value.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during the grading activities associated with construction of the driveway improvements. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours, occurring during the period of 7:00 am – 7:00 pm on weekdays, normal hours of human activity, using properly muffled vehicles. All construction activities will be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). Therefore, the noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. The standard noise condition of approval applied to use permits is as follows:

“Construction noise shall be minimized to the greatest extent practical and allowable under State and local safety laws. Construction equipment muffling and hours of operation shall be in compliance with County Code Chapter 8.16. Equipment shall be shut down when not in use. Construction equipment shall normally be staged, loaded, and unloaded on the project site. If project terrain or access road conditions require construction equipment to be staged, loaded, or unloaded off the project site (such as on a neighboring road or at the base of a hill), such activities shall only occur between the hours of 8 AM to 5 PM. Exterior winery equipment shall be enclosed or muffled and maintained so as not to create a noise disturbance in accordance with the County Code. There shall be no amplified sound system or amplified music utilized outside of approved, enclosed, winery buildings.”

The proposed construction grading should not result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibrations or ground born noise levels greater than those created by general farm plowing activities. The proposed project will not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts.

c/d. Although substantial amounts of noise may be generated during project construction, after completion of the project, the ambient noise level at the replacement winery would not be significantly increased with the 6,000 gallons per year production increase, the additional visitors (10/weekday; 15/weekend), and the 14 events per year. The subject property is located northwest of a small-lot (less than 1½ acres) subdivision of approximately 30 lots. The original use permit identified the winery as having potentially significant noise impact from stationary equipment, and a mitigation measure was incorporated into the project that any noisy stationary equipment such as refrigeration, and air conditioning pumps and compressors be located away from residentially developed areas offsite and/or provide acoustical shielding around such equipment. Since the proposed project does not reduce or eliminate that potential impact, the mitigation measure is still valid and remain in effect. However, the standard noise use permit condition (stated above) requires that any exterior winery equipment be enclosed or muffled and maintained so as not to create a noise disturbance. According to the preliminary building floor plans, there is no proposed placement of noisy equipment outside the westerly wall of the wine production building. The closest receptor is located to the west, approximately 240 feet away. The standard condition requires the placement of noisy equipment either within the winery building, within an enclosure, or muffled to reduce the potential equipment noise impact to a less than significant level.

The original winery utilized a mobile bottling truck, located in the driveway area between the winery building, tasting room and residences. The proposed project will re-locate the bottling activities to the north side of the winery building in the covered "Pallet/Bin Storage" area. The bottling activities are proposed to occur 6 days per year, in spring and in June/July, during the hours of 9:00 am-4:00 pm, Monday-Friday. This will result in a temporary increase in the ambient noise levels during the short term bottling activities. With the changes in the winery development area layout and removal of the second residence, there will be a change in the ambient noise levels. This will remove the temporary bottling activities further away from the residences to the south. Although the operations would only occur during the daylight hours, it may be possible for noise levels to exceed the 30 minute 50 dBA exterior daytime rural noise limit.

With the location of the closest receptor residence ±240 feet away from the covered area where the temporary bottling area will occur, potential noise impacts from the periodic bottling activities (mobile bottling line) may have a temporary significant impact on the ambient noise level at the closest receptor. Recent noise studies of mobile bottling activities identified noise measured 50 feet from the bottling activity itself to be 65 dBA. ("Environmental Noise Impact Report For: Bell Wine Cellars Use Permit Modification, RGD Acoustics, November 16, 2015). The noise study further states that such point source sound levels are reduced with distance in accordance with the "inverse square law", which yields a six (6) dB sound reduction for each doubling of the distance from the source. The measurement of 65 dBA at 50 feet would measure approximately 12 decibels lower at a distance 240 feet away (± 51 dba). Should the bottling activities exceed 30 minutes at the 65 dBA, then the daytime noise limit at an exterior residential use outlined in the County Code (50 dBA) would be exceeded.

The orientation of the bottling truck bottling activity areas to the northern side of the work area will create an extra 35 feet between the work area and the sensitive receptor. This increase in distance would reduce the sound measurement to the maximum 50 dba, thereby reducing the potential noise impact to an insignificant level. A typical bottling truck is about 40-48 feet in length and the temporary bottling area has a depth of 60 feet. Therefore, there is adequate space to attain the 35' distance. Other sound attenuation measures, such as requiring planting of tall shrubs or trees along the southwesterly side of the work area and limiting bottling hours to daytime hours (9:00 am – 4:00 pm), would further reduce the potential noise impact.

Given the proximity to the neighbors, the closest of whom is located ±200 ft. from the office/hospitality building, there could be a potential for impacts related to noise from any exterior activities, specifically the two proposed 30-person event. However, the project proposes that the marketing events would occur only within the office/hospitality building, reducing the potential noise impact from a large gathering of people to a level of insignificance. The application requests outdoor consumption of wines produced on-site, in accordance with Business and Professions Code Sections 23358, 23390 and 23396.5 and the PBES Director's July 17, 2008 memo, "Assembly Bill 2004 (Evans) and the Sale of Wine for Consumption On-Premises," to occur within the tasting rooms and the outdoor courtyard area. The use of said outdoor area is limited to the maximum daily visitation (10-15 visitors) during visitation hours (10:00 am to 6:00 pm), and given the low level of visitation and the distance to the closest receptor, the generation of significant levels of noise would not be expected. Enforcement of Napa County's Exterior Noise Ordinance, is and will be provided by the Napa County Sheriff, which address any noise related issues including, but not limited to, prohibiting outdoor-amplified sounds, as stated in the standard noise use permit condition outlined above.

Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation Measure XII-1-To reduce the potential temporary bottling noise impact to the closest receptor, the applicant shall:

1) Prior to the issuance of any building permits implementing the construction of the new winery building authorized by this use permit modification, the applicant shall submit an operation plan for the mobile bottling activity area in the "bin/pallet storage area", which shall require that the bottling activity area be at least 35 feet from the southern side of the bin/pallet storage area, or at least 275 feet from the residence located southwest of the bottling area identified as a potential sensitive noise receptor. The bottling operations shall occur only between the hours of 9:00 am and 4:00 pm.

Method of Monitoring:

This mitigation measure requires submission of the operations plan prior to issuance of the building permit for review and approval by the Planning Director.

Responsible Agency: Planning, Building and Environmental Services, Planning Division.

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

Discussion:

a. The project proposes a modest increase in overall employment by the winery from one (1) to a total of four (3 full-time, 1 part-time) employees. The Association of Bay Area Governments' *Projections 2003* figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase some 23% by the year 2030 (*Napa County Baseline Data Report*, November 30, 2005). Additionally, the County's *Baseline Data Report* indicates that total housing units currently programmed in county and municipal housing elements exceed ABAG growth projections by approximately 15%. The additional 3½ employee positions which are part of this project will most likely lead to some population growth in Napa County. However, relative to the County's projected low to moderate growth rate and overall adequate programmed housing supply, that population growth does not rise to a level of environmental significance. In addition, the project will be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs.

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

b/c. This application will not displace a substantial volume of existing housing or a substantial number of people and will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. There was previously a farm labor dwelling located on the parcel, but its removal was not related to the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a/b. This application proposes to add an increase in tours and tastings by prior appointment and marketing events. No portion of this project, nor any foreseeable result thereof, would significantly increase the use of existing recreational facilities. This project does not include recreational facilities that would have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b. The project proposes a modification of the existing winery with an increase in the number of existing employees from 1 full-time (weekdays/weekends) to a total of four (4) weekday employees (three (3) full-time/one (1) part-time); on weekends, 2 employees (one full-time and one part time). In addition, the project will add tours and tastings (maximum 10 daily weekday visitors; 15 daily weekend visitors) and a Marketing Plan (one (1), 25-person event per month and two (2) 30-persons events per year).

A "Focused Traffic Impact Study for the Beau Vigne Winery" was prepared by Sam Lam and Dalene Whitlock (W-Trans), dated September 28, 2015. The project was reviewed by the Department of Public Works. The property has frontage on Silverado Trail and access to the winery is from an existing driveway, which will require improvements at the intersection with the road. The traffic engineer has analyzed the details of the project and concludes that the proposed winery modification's increase in employees, addition of tours and tasting, and the addition of marketing events will increase the daily traffic trip: weekdays, an additional 13 trips for a total of 19 daily trips; weekends and an additional 10 daily trips for a total of 16 daily trips. The PM peak hour trips will be increased by the project from 2 to a total of 7 daily weekday PM peak trips and weekend PM daily peak hour trips will increase from 3 weekend to a total of 9 trips. The traffic study indicated that the proposed marketing events would be scheduled to begin and end outside of normal traffic peak periods on weekdays and weekends (11:00AM -4:00 PM or 2:00PM -10:00 PM), and as a result, no significant event-related traffic impacts would be expected during the weekday PM peak period or Saturday midday peak period.

The report estimates that two-thirds of project trips would be outbound during weekday PM peak hour since most of the trips would be associated with employees and customers leaving at closure of the winery. For the weekend midday peak hour, it was assumed that inbound and outbound trips would be evenly split. The Average Daily Trips (ADT) generated by the project would be a total of 19 trips. The Napa County Left Turn Lane Warrant Graph is used to determine if a development project would warrant the installation of a left turn lane. Traffic counts obtained on Silverado Trail in 2015 indicate that the roadway is carrying approximately 13,000 vehicles per weekday, and based on the engineer's estimate of fewer than 20 trips, a left turn lane would not be warranted. However, based on the figures presented and the conditions of the proposed project site being located on the portion of Silverado Trail with the highest volumes and speeds, the Department of Public Works recommended the installation of the left turn lane. There is adequate pavement width to provide this safety improvement with a simple re-striping project--no roadway widening will be required.

The report evaluated the sight distance along Silverado Trail at the project driveway, based upon the sight distance criteria contained in the *Highway Design Manual* published by Caltrans. The recommended sight distance for a driveway is based on stopping sight distance. The posted speed on Silverado Trail is 55 mph, which requires a minimum stopping sight distance of 500 feet. The available sight distance from the project driveway is greater than or equal to 500 feet looking both directions. Similarly, drivers on Silverado Trail have in excess of 500 feet of visibility to a vehicle they are following that might slow or stop before turning left into the driveway. Therefore, the sight distance at the project driveway is adequate.

Silverado Trail has a Level of Service (LOS) rating of "C" (2008 Napa County General Plan). 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 report analyzed the cumulative traffic scenario of the General Plan buildout at an estimated time horizon of the year 2030. Future projected traffic volumes were obtained from the Solano Transportation Authority (STA) who maintains the joint Napa County/Solano County 2010-2030 Travel Demand Forecasting Model. Because of the difference in the existing traffic volumes counted and the model's projected 2010 volume, a growth rate was calculated to develop Cumulative 2030 volumes based on projected PM peak hour growth on Silverado Trail near Soda Canyon Rd., which was found to be 2.15, or approximately eight percent of growth per year. The model does not include forecasts for the weekend midday peak hours; therefore the weekday PM peak hour growth rate was applied to the weekend midday peak to analyze future operations. The report states that the relatively high increase in traffic growth expected in the PM peak hour is due to the assumed increase in congestion at the intersection of SR 29/SR12-SR 121. Since Silverado Trail is well-situated for bypassing this congestion, and, as such, the high increase in traffic is only expected during the hours of peak traffic demand in the region, and not throughout the entire day. The report concludes that the expected daily volume growth rate on Silverado Trail is much lower than the projected 2.15. The Napa County 2008 General Plan Update documents Silverado Trail operating at LOS C or better under both 2003 conditions and projected 2030 conditions. Under the Standards of Significance included in the 2008 General Plan Update EIR, incorporated by reference, which were listed for purposes of the impact analysis, "a transportation impact would be considered significant if it would cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system, exceeding a level of service standard as follows: 1) If roadways operate at LOS D or better with the General Plan Update, the impacts are considered less than significant..." The report concludes that the LOS on Silverado Trail, with the project, will result in a LOS C or better and that the impacts from the project would be less than significant.

- c. This project would not result in any change to air traffic patterns.
- d/e. Access to the site is by way of Silverado Trail and the traffic analysis concluded that there is a substantially clear line of sight and the sight distance at the project driveway is adequate. The Engineering Division has reviewed project access and recommends approval of the project as proposed with the conditions outlined in their memo. The Napa County Fire Marshall has reviewed this application and has identified no significant impacts related to emergency vehicle access provided that standard conditions of approval are incorporated. Therefore, project impacts related to traffic hazards and emergency access are expected to be less than significant.
- f. The proposed modification to add additional employees and visitation will result in a need for more than the 2 parking spaces required by the original use permit. The project proposes 14 parking spaces and one (1) loading space, which will adequately address the 4 employees and the 10 daily visitors. Temporary overflow parking for the marketing events can be accommodated in the vineyard roads on the property. Therefore, adequate parking can be met on-site and shared driving is expected. No parking will be permitted within the right-of-way of Silverado Trail or Petra Drive and the winery setback from the road would be expected to discourage such parking. Therefore, the project will not conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-23 so as to cause potentially significant environmental impacts.
- g. There is no aspect of this project that would conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The wastewater disposal can be accommodated on-site in compliance with State and County regulations and since there is sufficient water on the site to support the system, the proposed project would not be expected to result in a significant impact to the environment. The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and will not result in a significant impact on the environment relative to wastewater discharge. Wastewater disposal will be accommodated on-site and in compliance with State and County regulations.
- b. The project will not require construction of any new water or wastewater treatment facilities that will result in a significant impact to the environment. There are existing treatment facilities in place which will be upgraded. Water will be provided by a new well and an expansion to the existing septic system will be necessary. All improvements will occur within the existing winery development area; the expanded leachfield will be located within the existing vineyards. The system will be designed by a licensed engineer and will be reviewed and approved by the Division of Environmental Health.
- c. The project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, which will cause a significant impact to the environment.
- d. The project has sufficient water supplies to serve projected needs. As discussed above (IX Hydrology and Water Quality), the calculated existing water demand is 2.87 af/yr; with the estimated proposed water use for the winery to be 2.34 af/yr, there will be a water demand reduction of .53 af/yr. Napa County has established a threshold 7.96 af/yr for this parcel; therefore the estimated water demand of 2.34 af/yr is below the threshold established for the parcel. The reduction in water demand results from the project proposal for the removal of residential use on the property, and the reduction of ±.06 acres of vineyard, required for the access driveway improvements. No further analysis is required.
- e. Wastewater will be treated on-site and will not require a wastewater treatment provider.

- f. The project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the projects demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the project.
- g. The project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. The project as proposed will not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. As discussed above, According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps no known candidate, sensitive, or special status species have been identified as occurring within the project boundaries. The project is located predominately within the existing development area of the winery.
- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, 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 pollution, 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.
- c. This project would not have any environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. All environmental effects from this project have been mitigated to a level of insignificance. No other environmental effects have been identified that would cause, either directly or indirectly, adverse effects on human beings.

Mitigation Measures: None Required.

PROJECT REVISION STATEMENT

Beau Vigne Family Winery Use Permit Modification #P15-00200
4057 Silverado Trail, Napa; APN: 039-390-016

County of Napa

Environmental Review

I hereby revise my request to include the measures specified below:

Section XII.Noise:

Mitigation Measure XII-1-To reduce the potential temporary bottling noise impact to the closest receptor, the applicant shall:

- 1) Prior to the issuance of any building permits implementing the construction of the new winery building authorized by this use permit modification, the applicant shall submit an operation plan for the mobile bottling activity area in the "bin/pallet storage area", which shall require that the bottling activity area be at least 35 feet from the southern side of the bin/pallet storage area, or at least 275 feet from the residence located southwest of the bottling area identified as a potential sensitive noise receptor. The bottling operations shall occur only between the hours of 9:00 am and 4:00 pm.

Method of Monitoring:

This mitigation measure requires submission of the operations plan prior to issuance of the building permit for review and approval by the Planning Director.

Responsible Agency: Planning, Building and Environmental Services, Planning Division.

I understand and explicitly agree that with regards to all California Environmental Quality Act, Permit Streamlining Act, and Subdivision Map Act processing deadlines, this revised application will be treated as a new project, filed on the date this project revision statement is received by the Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department. For purposes of Section 69543 of the Permit Streamlining Act, the date of application completeness shall remain the date this project was originally found complete.



EDWARD SNIDER

8/16/2016

Signature of Property Owner(s)

Print Name

Interest

Date

Signature of Property Owner(s)

Print Name

Interest

Date

Beau Vigne Winery

**Use Permit Modification (P15-00200),
APN: 039-390-016**

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring/Reporting Action and Schedule	Monitoring Compliance Complete (Name / Date)
NOISE (Section XII)			
<p>Mitigation Measure XII-1-To reduce the potential temporary bottling noise impact to the closest receptor, the applicant shall:</p> <p>1) Prior to the issuance of any building permits implementing the construction of the new winery building authorized by this use permit modification, the applicant shall submit an operation plan for the mobile bottling activity area in the "bin/pallet storage area", which shall require that the bottling activity area be at least 35 feet from the southern side of the bin/pallet storage area, or at least 275 feet from the residence located southwest of the bottling area identified as a potential sensitive noise receptor. The bottling operations shall occur only between the hours of 9:00 am and 4:00 pm.</p>	<p>Responsible Agency: Planning, Building and Environmental Services, Planning Division.</p>	<p>Method of Monitoring: This mitigation measure requires submission of the operations plan prior to issuance of the building permit for review and approval by the Planning Director.</p>	