

“C”

Initial Study/Negative Declaration

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

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated October 2016)

1. **Project Title:** Sleeping Lady Winery, Use Permit P15-00423
2. **Property Owner/Project Sponsor Name and Address:** Brian G. Wise, 396 London Way, Sonoma, CA 95476
3. **Representative Name and Address:** Donna B. Oldford; 2620 Pinot Way, St. Helena, CA 94574
4. **County Contact Person, Phone Number, and Email:** Emily Hedge; (707) 259-8227; emily.hedge@countyofnapa.org
5. **Project Location and APN:** The project is located on a 104 acre parcel on the west side of Solano Ave, approximately two miles north of the City of Napa. 5537 Solano Avenue, Napa, CA 94558. APN: 034-170-005
6. **General Plan Description:** Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space (AWOS) Designation and Agricultural Resource (AR) Designation.
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Watershed (AW) and Agricultural Preserve (AP).
8. **Background/Project History:**

The parcel is currently developed with a residence, second unit, and agricultural accessory building (the barn to be converted to the winery). Approximately 53 acres are planted in vineyards.

Permit P15-00165 – On October 2, 2015 an administrative permit was approved for a vineyard sign.

Permit W13-00190 – In August 2013 an application was submitted for a Certificate of Compliance to recognize two legal parcels. It was determined that only one legal lot of record exists and therefore the application was denied.
9. **Description of Project:** Approval of a use permit to allow the construction of a new 30,000 gallon winery with the following characteristics:
 - a) Phasing of production beginning at 10,000 gallons annually until the fermentation pad is constructed in Phase 2 at which time production may increase to a maximum of 30,000 gallons annually. Bottling to be handled by a mobile bottling service on an as needed basis;
 - b) Phase 1 - Restore and convert the approximately 3,600 square foot barn to an approximately 3,200 square foot winery building with an approximately 320 square foot tasting room, and an approximately 1,000 square foot uncovered mechanical area behind the winery building. Restoration will be completed in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings;
 - c) Phase 2 – construct an approximately 4,000 square foot covered outdoor fermentation and processing work area;
 - d) Installation of wastewater treatment systems (change in system type to coincide with Phase 2 production increase);
 - e) Temporary hold and haul system (alternative wastewater treatment option during Phase 1);
 - f) Outdoor hospitality area of 2,300 square feet with an arbor;
 - g) On-premises consumption of wines produced on site in the tasting room and outdoor hospitality area in accordance with Business and Professions Code Sections 23358, 23390 and 23396.5 (AB 2004-Evans Bill);
 - h) Seven (7) parking spaces;
 - i) Two (2) Water storage tanks (10,000 gallons);
 - j) Driveway improvements including widening on the northern side of the driveway;
 - k) Tours and tastings by appointment only for 20 persons per day;
 - l) Marketing plan - 10 events (30 persons per event) and two events (75 persons per event) per year;
 - m) Catering or pre-packaged food for events and tastings;
 - n) Two (2) full time and two (2) part time employees;
 - o) Hours of operation: production daily 6 AM to 6 PM and visitation daily 10 AM to 6 PM; and
 - p) Approximately 1,000 cubic yards of spoils generated through construction to be used on-site or hauled off-site to a location pre-approved by Napa County.

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

The 104 acre parcel is located on the west side of Solano Avenue, approximately two miles north of the City of Napa. The property is accessed off of a private driveway that only serves the property. Existing development on-site includes a residence, second unit, and agricultural accessory buildings including the barn to be converted to the winery. Approximately 53 acres are planted in vineyards.

The property is located in the Napa River watershed. A blue-line stream is located on the adjacent parcel to the south with a small portion mapped on the subject parcel. The mapped stream crosses to the center of the property, becoming a smaller drainage ditch that is no longer mapped as a blue line stream. The drainage runs along the driveway in an easterly direction and leaves the property via a box culvert at Solano Avenue. The drainage is ultimately a tributary to the Napa River. The drainage was evaluated against the County definition of a stream, which is defined as "any watercourse which has a well-defined channel with a depth greater than 4 feet and banks steeper than 3:1 and contains hydrophilic vegetation, riparian vegetation or wood vegetation including tree species greater than 10 feet in height" (County Code Section 18.108.025). The drainage has an average depth of approximately 2.5 to 3.5 feet and therefore does not meet the criteria for a "County definitional stream".

The property is relatively flat along the eastern portion of the property, ranging from 75 feet above mean sea level to approximately 145 feet at the site of the residential structures and barn (0-15% slope). The property then steadily rises in elevation to a peak of approximately 710 feet above mean sea level at the western edge of the property (15-30% or greater slopes). There is a small valley that runs down the hillside from west to east for approximately 1,000 feet above the second unit. The National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) shows an intermittent, temporarily flooded riverine wetland in the approximate location of the valley. The drainage is not mapped as a blue line stream and does not have a well-defined channel that meets the criteria for a "County definitional stream".

The property is made up of a combination of soils including clear lake clay drained, bale clay loam (2 to 5 percent slopes), and haire loam (2 to 9 percent slopes) on the eastern vineyard areas. The residential structures and barn are located on cortina very stony loam (0 to 5 percent slopes) with bressa-dibble complex (15 to 20 percent slopes) on the hillside behind the structures. The top of the hill is comprised of felton gravelly loam (30 to 50 percent slopes).

Surrounding land uses include rural residential properties, agriculture, vineyards, and wineries. Burgess Napa Cellars is located on the property south of the subject parcel. The nearest offsite residence is located on the hillside, approximately 750 feet to the north of the proposed winery location.

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

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

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

None Required.

Other Agencies Contacted

ABC, TTB

12. **Tribal Cultural Resources. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?**

Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1, invitation for tribal consultation was completed. One response was received from the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation dated July 21, 2016, declining any comment on the proposed project.

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

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.

Emily Hedge

11/15/16

Emily Hedge, Planner II
County of Napa Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department

Date

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

Discussion:

Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms, geological features, water, trees and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of a beautiful or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken in. As generally described in the **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses** section above, the surrounding land uses include rural residential, agriculture, vineyards, and wineries. The nearest offsite residence is located approximately 750 feet north of the proposed winery location.

The project site is currently developed with a residence, second unit, and agricultural accessory buildings, including the barn to be converted to the winery. Approximately 53 acres are planted in vineyards. The winery building would be set back approximately 2,800 feet from Solano Avenue and 3,000 feet from State Highway 29.

a-c. The project proposes converting the existing barn into the winery structure (Phase 1) with the addition of an outdoor fermentation and processing work area (Phase 2).

In April 2015, Juliana Inman, Architect, completed an architectural and historical evaluation of the existing late 19th century barn. The structures on the property have not been listed in a local inventory or on the California Register of Historic Places. The study was prepared to determine if the property meets the criteria for inclusion on the California Register, based on the eligibility criteria found in Title 14 CCR, Section 4852 and to evaluate whether alterations to the property affect its eligibility for listing in the California Register or in a local inventory.

After examining the site, studying the research and reports on this property, and researching the physical evidence on site, it was determined that the barn meets California Register Criterion 3 for inclusion on the California Register and retains adequate integrity to convey a sense of its significance and importance. The condition of the building is poor due to structural failure of the driveway retaining wall and pest damage. Alterations may be required to retrofit the building for continued use. Recommendations for compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards have been incorporated into the revised plans and described in the "Compliance and Recommendations" section of the report. The report concludes that the proposed project meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and therefore the project will not have a significant impact on an historic resource.

The two proposed water tanks would be located approximately 700 feet behind the winery building, on the western hillside with a slope of greater than 15%, making the tanks subject to the County's Viewshed Protection Program (County Code Chapter 18.106). Based on a site visit attended by staff, the applicant's representative, and project engineer on September 1, 2016, and information provided by the applicant's representative it has been determined that the tanks will not be visible from designated public roads (State Highway 29), because of the surrounding topography and existing vegetation. The tanks will be situated within a grove of existing trees. Minimal grading will be required for the water tank pad and no tree removal is required. Potential views from State Highway 29 would be obstructed by the trees on the hillside as well as the trees that line the western side of the highway. In compliance with County Code Section 18.106.040, prior to the issuance of a building permit, the property owner shall be required to execute and record in the county recorder's office a use restriction, in a form approved by county counsel, requiring the existing covering vegetation to be maintained, or replaced with equivalent vegetation, by the owner or the owner's successors, so as to prevent the project from being viewed from any designated public road.

In addition to maintaining the historic character of the structure, compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's standards will limit the changes in the exterior of the structure, resulting in minimal changes in views from Solano Avenue and State Highway 29. By complying

with the Secretary of the Interior's standards and requirements of the County's Viewshed Protection Program the proposed project would not damage any known scenic vista, scenic resources, trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings and the proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

- d. The winery would replace the existing barn and will remain a potential source of nighttime lighting. The winery hours of operations are 6 am to 6 pm (production) and 10 am to 6 pm (visitation); therefore nighttime lighting associated with the daily winery operations and visitation would be limited. Occasional evening marketing events (12 events per year) are proposed to occur between the hours of 6 pm and 10 pm.

Although the project is in an area that has a certain amount of existing nighttime lighting, the installation of new sources of lights, if they were to remain on past daylight hours, may affect nighttime views. Pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approval for wineries, outdoor lighting will be required to be shielded and directed downwards, with only low-level lighting allowed in parking areas. As designed, and as subject to the standard condition of approval, below, the project will not have a significant impact resulting from new sources of outside lighting.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

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
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:

The project site is split-zoned Agricultural Preserve (AP) and Agricultural Watershed (AW), which both allow wineries upon grant of a use permit. The 104 acre parcel includes a residence, second unit, and agricultural accessory buildings, including the barn to be converted to the winery. Approximately 53 acres are planted in vineyards.

a/b/e. The existing vineyards will not be affected by the development and site improvements associated with the winery. The vineyards have a mixed designation of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Unique Farmland (based on GIS layer FMMP Farmlands (2012)). The portion of the property containing the existing development and the hillside to the west are designated Grazing Land (based on GIS layer FMMP Farmlands (2012)). The proposed project would not 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.

The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use policies AG/LU-2 and AG/LU-13 recognize wineries, and any use consistent with the Winery Definition Ordinance and clearly accessory to a winery, as agriculture. The subject parcel is not currently under a Williamson Act contract. There are no other changes included in this proposal that would result in the conversion of Farmland.

c/d. The proposed project will not conflict with existing zoning for or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps (based on the following layers – Sensitive Biotic Oak Woodlands, Riparian Woodland Forest and Coniferous Forest, Vegetation-ICE) the hillside above the proposed winery contains oak woodlands. Oak woodlands are not identified on the portion of the site with the existing barn and the adjacent area proposed for the covered fermentation pad. Limited tree removal, including five magnolia and fruit trees, will be required for site improvements in this area. Oak woodlands are identified on the hillside area where the water tanks are proposed. The water tanks will be situated within existing trees. Minimal grading will be required for the water tank pad and no tree removal will occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a-c. 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. On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Board of Directors unanimously adopted thresholds of significance to assist in the review of projects under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The thresholds were designed to

establish the level at which the District believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA and were posted on the Air District's website and included in the Air District's May 2011 updated CEQA Guidelines.

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

For purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, a winery is considered comparable to a combination of a high quality restaurant (winery tasting room) and general light industrial (office, barrel storage, and production). The Air District's thresholds of significance provided in Table 3-1 of the Bay Area Air Quality Management Plan has determined that high quality restaurants that do not exceed a threshold of 47,000 square feet and/or general light industrial projects that do not exceed a threshold of 541,000 square feet for NO_x (oxides of nitrogen), will not significantly impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2010, page 3-1, 3-2 & 3-3).

Compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion the total project size of approximately 8,200 square feet, comprised of the approximately 3,200 square foot winery building which includes a 320 square foot tasting room and an approximately 4,000 square foot covered outdoor fermentation and processing work area (Phase 2) and a 1,000 square foot mechanical yard, the project would contribute a less-than-significant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan.

The Air District's 1999 CEQA Guidelines (p.24) states that projects that do not exceed a threshold of 2,000 vehicle trips per day will not impact air quality and do not require further study. The winery trip generation sheet included in the application calculates the proposed conditions for a typical weekday at approximately 26 total daily trips and 10 PM peak trips. Proposed conditions for a typical Saturday are calculated at 24 total trips and 14 PM peak trips and proposed conditions for a typical Saturday during crush are calculated at 18 total trips.

Vehicle trips generated are significantly below BAAQMD's recommended threshold of 2,000 vehicle trips/day for purposes of performing a detailed air quality analysis. Given the relatively small number of vehicle trips generated by this project, compared to the size of the air basin, project related vehicle trips would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan.

There are no projected or existing air quality violations in this area to which this project would contribute, nor would it result in any violations of any applicable air quality standards. As discussed above, the existing vehicle trips associated with the project are well below the thresholds of significance. The proposed project would not significantly increase vehicle trips from the existing levels and 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. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plan.

- d. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from earthmoving and construction activities required for project construction. Earthmoving and construction emissions would have a temporary effect; consisting mainly of dust generated during grading and other construction activities, exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles, and relatively minor emissions from paints and other architectural coatings. Site grading quantities are estimated at approximately up to 1,000 cubic yards to be disposed of on-site as fill within the parking area. Any excess will either be spread thinly (<6 inches) in the vineyard and winterized with vineyard farming practices or it will be hauled off-site to a location pre-approved by Napa County.

Based on an average commercial dump truck carrying approximately 10 to 14 cubic yards of dirt, the total of 1,000 cubic yards of spoils would result in approximately 70 to 100 trips over the construction period. However, these potential construction impacts would be temporary in nature and subject to standard conditions of approval from the Engineering and Conservation Division as part of the grading permit or building permit review process.

The Air District recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction impacts. If the proposed project adheres to these relevant best management practices identified by the Air District and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and are considered less than significant:

During all construction activities the permittee shall comply with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Basic Best Management Practices, as provided in Table 8, 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 (road) 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 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- h. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.

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

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

- e. While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. Construction-phase pollutants will be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. The nearest offsite residence is located on the hillside, approximately 750 feet to the north of the proposed winery location. The project will not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. The impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

The project site is split-zoned Agricultural Preserve (AP) and Agricultural Watershed (AW), which both allow wineries upon grant of a use permit. The 104 acre parcel includes a residence, second unit, and agricultural accessory buildings, including the barn to be converted to the winery. Approximately 53 acres are planted in vineyards.

The property is located in the Napa River watershed. A blue-line stream is located on the adjacent parcel to the south with a small portion mapped on the subject parcel. The mapped stream crosses to the center of the property, becoming a smaller drainage ditch that is no longer mapped as a blue line stream. The drainage runs along the driveway in an easterly direction and leaves the property via a box culvert at Solano Avenue. The drainage is ultimately a tributary to the Napa River. The drainage was evaluated against the County definition of a stream, which is defined as "any watercourse which has a well-defined channel with a depth greater than 4 feet and banks steeper than 3:1 and contains hydrophilic vegetation, riparian vegetation or wood vegetation including tree species greater than 10 feet in height" (County Code Section 18.108.025). The drainage has an average depth of approximately 2.5 to 3.5 feet and therefore does not meet the criteria for a "County definitional stream". According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps (based on the following layer – Streams & Fish Presence (RCD)), the drainage is mapped as Unknown (intermittent).

a/b. As noted in the Agricultural and Forest Resources section above, according to the Napa County Environmental resource maps (based on the following layer – Sensitive Biotic Oak Woodlands) the hillside above the proposed winery contains oak woodlands. No development is proposed in those areas. The Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) and US Fish and Wildlife Critical Habitat) does not show any potential candidate, sensitive, or special status species on the parcel.

Review of the Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Spotted Owl Habitat) shows potential habitat for spotted owls along the western hillside of the parcel. An assessment for Northern Spotted Owls (NSO) was conducted by Pamela Town, Consulting Wildlife Biologist, Forest Ecosystem Management, on May 2, 2016. The Project Area was described as being located on the edge of a large agricultural and residential area and mixed second-growth forest. The area where the construction will take place is open and no trees will be harvested.

To determine known NSO territories the biologist ran the California Department of Fish & Wildlife's spotted owl viewer and utilized the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (USFWS) 1.3 mile assessment area for a Take Avoidance of NSO within the California Interior (outside the redwood zone). There are no known NSO territories within 1.3 miles of the Project Area. The closest known NSO territory is located over 2 miles away. The assessment notes that attributes for northern spotted owl habitat includes a forest with dense, multi-layered canopy of several tree species; trees of varying sizes and ages; abundant logs, snags/cavity trees, and trees with broken tops or platform-like substrates; and open spaces among lower branches to allow flight under the canopy.

The location of the Project Area was determined to be unsuitable NSO habitat due to lack of mixed forest and large expanse of agricultural uses and residential housing in the area. The forest adjacent to the Project Area does meet USFWS definitions of suitable NSO habitat; however an examination of the landscape of the area, the biologist determined that the forested area is surrounded by unsuitable, open habitat that make the forested area too small and patchy to support a resident owl. The assessment concluded that there would be no change in NSO habitat due to the project and therefore no mitigation measures are required.

There are no site conditions, in the location of the proposed winery development area, which would be considered essential for the support of a species with limited distribution or considered to be a sensitive natural plant community. The proposed winery development area is already disturbed by the existing barn and second residence. The potential for this project to have an impact on special status species is less than significant.

c. A blue-line stream is located on the adjacent parcel to the south with a small portion mapped on the subject parcel. The mapped stream crosses to the center of the property, becoming a smaller drainage ditch that is no longer mapped as a blue line stream. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layer – wetlands (NWI)) the portion of the blue line stream that crosses into the southern part of the property is mapped as a riverine wetland, described as [R] Riverine, [4] Intermittent, [SB] Streambed, [A] Temporarily Flooded, and [x] Excavated. The drainage ditch runs along the existing driveway, which will be improved to meet County standards. All required improvements to the driveway will be completed on the side of the driveway opposite the drainage.

Approximately 1,000 feet above the second unit there is a small valley that runs down the center of the hillside from west to east. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layer – wetlands (NWI)) a riverine wetland, described as [R] Riverine, [4] Intermittent, [SB] Streambed, and [A] Temporarily Flooded, is mapped on the hillside in the valley. The drainage is not mapped as a blue line stream and does not meet the criteria for a “County definitional stream”. The proposed water tanks will be located on a relatively flat portion of the hillside north of the valley. The tanks would be accessed via an existing dirt access road also located on the hillside north of the valley. Minimal grading will be required for the water tank pad and no tree removal will occur.

According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layer – wetlands & vernal pools) there are no wetlands on neighboring properties that would be affected by this project. The potential for this project to have an impact on federally protected wetlands is less than significant.

- d. The Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) and US Fish and Wildlife Critical Habitat) does not show any potential candidate, sensitive, or special status species on the parcel. The 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. This project would not interfere with any ordinances protecting biological resources. There are no tree preservation ordinances in effect in the County. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans. The project does not conflict with any County ordinance or requirement to preserve existing trees, and therefore is considered as not having potential for a significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V.	CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-c. In April 2015, Juliana Inman, Architect, completed an architectural and historical evaluation of the existing late 19th century barn. The structures on the property have not been listed in a local inventory or on the California Register of Historic Places. The study was prepared to determine if the property meets the criteria for inclusion on the California Register, based on the eligibility criteria found in Title 14 CCR, Section 4852 and whether alterations to the property affect its eligibility for listing in the California Register or in a local inventory.

After examining the site, studying the research and reports on this property, and researching the physical evidence on site, it was determined that the barn meets California Register Criterion 3 for inclusion on the California Register and retains adequate integrity to convey a sense of its significance and importance. The condition of the building is poor due to structural failure of the driveway retaining wall and best damage. Alterations may be required to retrofit the building for continued use. Recommendations for compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings have been incorporated into the plans and described in the “Compliance and Recommendations” section of the report. The report concludes that the proposed project meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and therefore the project will not have a significant impact on an historic resource.

According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Cultural Resources: Historical sites, Historical Sites – Lines, Arch sensitive areas, Arch sites, Arch surveys) no historical or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features, or archaeological resources have been identified on the property.

The proposed winery is located on an area that has previously been disturbed by the construction of the barn and the adjacent area proposed for the covered fermentation pad, has been used for agricultural uses in conjunction with the barn. Therefore it is unlikely that cultural resources would be present at the proposed site. However, if resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval:

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

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

Compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's standards for rehabilitation and reuse and the above mentioned condition of approval, the project will have a less than significant impact on cultural resources.

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
	a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Existing development on site includes a residence, second unit, and agricultural accessory buildings (the barn to be converted to the winery). Approximately 53 acres are planted in vineyards. The property is relatively flat along the eastern portion of the property, ranging from 75 feet above mean sea level to approximately 145 feet at the site of the residential structures and barn. The property then steadily rises in elevation to a peak of approximately 710 feet above mean sea level at the western edge of the property.

a.

- i.) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – West Napa Fault lines and Faults) the eastern portion of the property is located within the approximate “Active Fault Zone Boundary” and there is an active fault described as “concealed, uncertain, or approximate location” on a small portion of the property near the drainage, approximately 1,000 feet from the proposed winery location. Active faults from the West Napa Fault Lines layer are shown on the adjacent property to the south. 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. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layer – Liquefaction) the property is in an area generally subject to a “very low” to “medium” tendency to liquefy. All proposed improvements to the existing barn and new construction will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction. Compliance with the latest editions of the California Building Code for seismic stability would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible, resulting in result in less than significant impacts.
- iv.) According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layer – Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) there are no landslide deposits on the property.

b.

The proposed winery would be located in the existing barn, which would result in minimal grading for the winery building. The adjacent area proposed for the covered fermentation pad is relatively flat with an average slope of 12%. Site grading quantities are estimated at approximately 1,000 cubic yards to be disposed of on-site as fill within the parking area. Any excess will either be spread thinly (<6 inches) in the vineyard and winterized with vineyard farming practices or it will be hauled off-site to a location pre-approved by Napa County. The proposed 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. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

c/d.

According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Surficial Deposits, Geology), the property is underlain by Holocene fan deposits on the flat, eastern portion of the property with Pre-Quaternary deposits and bedrock on the hillside. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (layer – liquefaction) the hillside of the property is in an area generally subject to a “very low” tendency to liquefy and the flat, eastern portion of the property is generally subject to a “medium” tendency to liquefy.

The property is made up of a combination of soils including clear lake clay drained, bale clay loam (2 to 5 percent slopes), and haire loam (2 to 9 percent slopes) on the eastern vineyard areas. The residential structures and barn are location on cortina very stony loam (0 to 5 percent slopes) with bressa-dibble complex (15 to 20 percent slopes) on the hillside behind the structures. The top of the hill is comprised of felton gravelly loam (30 to 50 percent slopes).

All proposed construction will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction. Compliance with the latest editions of the California Building Code for seismic stability would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible, resulting in less than significant impacts.

- e. Currently domestic wastewater from the main residence and second dwelling unit is collected into separate septic tanks and disposed of in two separate dispersal fields. The site currently has an estimated usage of 850 gallons per day (gpd) of sanitary waste, including approximately 600 gpd for the main residence and 240 gpd for the second dwelling unit.

Applied Civil Engineering prepared a wastewater disposal feasibility study, dated September 7, 2015, with a supplemental information submittal, dated October 28, 2016, to demonstrate the feasibility of installing onsite wastewater treatment systems. Based on the proposed site configuration, on-site soil conditions, estimated wastewater flows and winery production levels the study recommends phasing the installation of the systems to coincide with the phasing of the project development. The project includes a phased increase in production from a maximum of 10,000 gallons per year (gpy) in Phase 1 to a maximum of 30,000 gpy in Phase 2.

The study calculates the proposed winery sanitary wastewater flows at approximately 270 gpd during both phases. Winery process wastewater flow is calculated at 500 gpd for Phase 1 and 1,000 gpd for Phase 2. In Phase 1 the approximately 1,000 gpd for winery sanitary wastewater, process wastewater, and the second dwelling unit sanitary wastewater, can be handled in a combined system with a subsurface drip dispersal field. In Phase 2, the winery sanitary wastewater would continue to be disposed of via a subsurface drip dispersal field with the second dwelling unit sanitary wastewater. The process wastewater would be disposed of separately via a treatment and surface irrigation system.

The supplemental information proposed a second option for Phase 1 which would have the sanitary wastewater disposed of via subsurface drip dispersal fields (as proposed for Phase 2) and winery process wastewater would be collected separately, temporarily stored, and then hauled offsite for treatment and disposal by the Napa Sanitation District, East Bay Municipal Utility District, or a similar municipal wastewater treatment plant ("hold and haul"). It is intended that this option would be for a limited duration while the winery is operating at or below 10,000 gallons of annual production. The hold and haul tank would be located in the general vicinity of the proposed process waste treatment system tanks, east of the winery site. At peak usage, a truck would visit the site approximately 1 to 2 times per week; with a predicted annual trip calculation of 20 tank pumping events (Applied Civil Engineering, October 28, 2016). If the hold and haul option is implemented, the holding tank could be designed to work as part of the Phase 2 treatment and irrigation system to accommodate the increased flows.

The onsite wastewater systems for both options and phases will be designed for the peak winery process and sanitary wastewater flows and existing residential uses. The study concludes that the proposed winery sanitary and process wastewater disposal need for both phases can be accommodated onsite. The Napa County Environmental Health Division has reviewed the report and concurred with their conclusion. Full design calculations and construction plans will be prepared in accordance with Napa County standards at the time of building permit application submittal. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

Napa County has been working to develop a Climate Action Plan (CAP) for several years. In 2012 a Draft CAP² (March 2012) was recommended using the emissions checklist in the Draft CAP, on a trial basis, to determine potential greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with project development and operation. At the December 11, 2012, Napa County Board of Supervisors (BOS) hearing, the BOS considered adoption of the proposed CAP. In addition to reducing Napa County's GHG emissions, the proposed plan was intended

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

to address compliance with CEQA for projects reviewed by the County and to lay the foundation for development of a local offset program. While the BOS acknowledged the plan's objectives, the BOS requested that the CAP be revised to better address transportation-related greenhouse gas, to acknowledge and credit past accomplishments and voluntary efforts, and to allow more time for establishment of a cost-effective local offset program. The Board also requested that best management practices be applied and considered when reviewing projects until a revised CAP is adopted to ensure that projects address the County's policy goal related to reducing GHG emissions.

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

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

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

In 2011, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) released California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Project Screening Criteria (Table 3-1 – Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors & GHG Screening Level Sizes) and Significance of Thresholds [1,100 metric tons per year (MT) of carbon dioxide and carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e)]. This threshold of significance is appropriate for evaluating projects in Napa County.

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

For the purposes of this analysis potential GHG emissions associated with winery 'construction' and 'development' and with 'ongoing' winery operations have been discussed. GHGs are the atmospheric gases whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for the greenhouse effect, including carbon dioxide, methane, ozone, and the fluorocarbons, that contribute to climate change (a widely accepted theory/science explain human effects on the atmosphere). Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) gas, the principal greenhouse gas (GHG) being emitted by human activities, and whose concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity, also serves as the reference gas to compare other greenhouse gases. Agricultural sources of carbon emissions include forest clearing, land-use changes, biomass burning, and farm equipment and management activity emissions (http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/glossary/letter_c.html). Equivalent Carbon Dioxide (CO₂e) is the most commonly reported type of GHG emission and a way to get one number that approximates total emissions from all the different gasses that contribute to GHG (BAAMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2012). In this case, carbon dioxide (CO₂) is used as the reference atom/compound to obtain atmospheric carbon CO₂ effects of GHG. Carbon stocks are converted to carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e) by multiplying the carbon total by 44/12 (or 3.67), which is the ratio of the atomic mass of a carbon dioxide molecule to the atomic mass of a carbon atom (<http://www.ncias2.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

³ Supersedes February 2, 2016, version.

the winery, including vehicle trips associated with employee and visitor trips (hereinafter referred to as Operational Emissions). Operational Emissions from the proposed winery would be the primary source of emissions over the long-term when compared to one time construction emissions.

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 has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds Table 3-1 (Operational GHG Screening Level Sizes). Given the total project size of approximately 8,200 square feet, comprised of the approximately 3,200 square foot winery building which includes a 320 square foot tasting room and an approximately 4,000 square foot covered outdoor fermentation and processing work area (Phase 2) and a 1,000 square foot mechanical yard, compared to the BAAQMD's GHG screening criteria of 121,000 square feet for general industrial, and the tasting room and associated accessory space which is approximately 320 square feet within the winery 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/year GHG threshold of significance.

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 has indicated that the project will incorporate the following voluntary best management practices: generation of on-site renewable energy; vehicle miles traveled reduction plan including employee incentives, employee carpool or vanpool, bike riding incentives, and bus transportation for large marketing events; solar hot water heating; energy conserving lighting; installation of an energy star roof/living roof/cool roof; installation of energy conserving lighting; installation of water efficient fixtures; recycle 78% of all waste; compost 75% of food and garden material; implement a sustainable purchasing and shipping programs; limit the amount of grading and tree removal; and use of recycled materials. Additional items are included in the Voluntary Best Management Practices Checklist for Development Projects form included with the Use Permit Application.

Greenhouse Gas Emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the Cal Green Building Code, vehicle fuel efficiency standards, and the project-specific on-site programs identified above would combine to further reduce emissions below BAAQMD thresholds.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. 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 the 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. There are no foreseeable reasons the project would result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Given the quantities of hazardous materials and the limited duration, they will result in a less-than-significant impact.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site. No impacts would occur.
- d. The project site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites. No impacts would occur.
- e. The project site is not located within two miles of any public airport. No impacts would occur.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports. No impacts would occur.
- g. The proposed project will not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. No impacts would occur.
- h. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the layer – Fire hazard severity zones) the hillside portion of the parcel is denoted as a Moderate to High fire hazard severity. There is existing development on the property and in the surrounding area. The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. 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
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:

On January 14, 2014, Governor Jerry Brown declared a drought emergency in the state of California. That declaration was followed up on April 1, 2015, when the Governor directed the State Water Resources Control Board to implement mandatory water reductions in cities and town across California to reduce water usage by 25 percent. These water restrictions do not apply to agricultural users. At this time the County of Napa has not adopted or implemented any additional mandatory water use restrictions. The County requires all Use Permit applicants to complete necessary water analyses in order to document that sufficient water supplies are available for the proposed project.

On June 28, 2011, the Board of Supervisors approved creation of a Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee (GRAC). The GRAC's purpose was to assist County staff and technical consultants with recommendations regarding groundwater, including data collection, monitoring, well pump test protocols, management objectives, and community support. The County completed a county-wide assessment of groundwater resources (Napa County Groundwater Conditions and Groundwater Monitoring Recommendations Report (Feb. 2011) and developed a groundwater monitoring program (Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2013 (Jan. 2013). The County also completed a 2013 Updated Hydrogeologic Conceptualization and Characterization of Groundwater Conditions (Jan. 2013).

In general, recent studies have found that groundwater levels in the Napa Valley Floor exhibit stable long-term trends with a shallow depth to water. Historical trends in the Milliken-Sarco-Tuluca (MST) area, however, have shown increasing depths to groundwater, but recent stabilization in many locations. Groundwater availability, recharge, storage and yield is not consistent across the County. More is known about the resource where historical data have been collected. Less is known in areas with limited data or unknown geology. In order to fill existing data gaps and to provide a better understanding of groundwater resources in the County, the Napa County Groundwater

Monitoring Plan recommended 18 Areas of Interest for additional groundwater level and water quality monitoring. Through the well owner and public outreach efforts of the GRAC approximately 40 new wells have been added to the monitoring program within these areas. Groundwater Sustainability Objectives were recommended by the GRAC and adopted by the Board of Supervisors. The recommendations included the goal of developing sustainability objectives, provided a definition, explained the shared responsibility for Groundwater Sustainability and the important role monitoring as a means to achieving groundwater sustainability.

In 2009 Napa County began a comprehensive study of its groundwater resources to meet identified action items in the County's 2008 General Plan update. The study, by Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE), emphasized developing a sound understanding of groundwater conditions and implementing an expanded groundwater monitoring and data management program as a foundation for integrated water resources planning and dissemination of water resources information. The 2011 baseline study by LSCE, which included over 600 wells and data going back over 50 years, concluded that "the groundwater levels in Napa County are stable, except for portions of the MST district". Most wells elsewhere within the Napa Valley Floor with a sufficient record indicate that groundwater levels are more affected by climatic conditions, are within historical levels, and seem to recover from dry periods during subsequent wet or normal periods. The LSCE Study also concluded that, on a regional scale, there appear to be no current groundwater quality issues except north of Calistoga (mostly naturally occurring boron and trace metals) and in the Carneros region (mostly salinity).

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) and the studies prepared by LSCE. These reports are the result of water resources investigations performed by the USGS in cooperation with the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. Any project which reduces water usage or any water usage which is at or below the established threshold is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels.

According to the Groundwater Monitoring Plan the subject property is located at the boarder of the Western Mountains subarea and the Valley Floor subarea of Napa County. A Tier I Water Availability Analysis, dated September 7, 2015, was prepared by Applied Civil Engineering, to determine the estimated water use of the existing development and proposed project and the water availability. The analysis considered the eastern portion of the property, approximately 63 acres comprised of the vineyards, as Valley Floor and the approximately 40 acres of hillside as "All Other Areas", as described in the WAA. This designation was based on USGS soil types. Due to the unique location of the property, on the border between Valley Floor and hillside areas, the analysis considered the location of the well that would serve the winery. Since the groundwater extraction would be from a well located on the Valley Floor area, the Valley Floor screening criteria of 1 acre-foot of water per acre of land was used for the 63 acres of vineyards; generating a water use availability of 63 acre-feet per year. In order to be conservative the analysis did not take into account the water availability of the 40 acres of hillside.

- a. The proposed project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Applied Civil Engineering prepared a wastewater disposal feasibility study, dated September 7, 2015, to demonstrate the feasibility of installing onsite wastewater treatment systems. The study concludes that the proposed winery sanitary and process wastewater disposal needs for both phases can be accommodated onsite. The Napa County Environmental Health Division has reviewed the report and concurred with their conclusion. Full design calculations and construction plans will be prepared in accordance with Napa County standards at the time of building permit application submittal. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality. Any earth disturbing activities will be subject to the County's Stormwater Ordinance which complies with State requirements, would include measures to prevent erosion, sediment, and waste materials from entering waterways both during and after any construction activities. By following the above mentioned measures the project does not have the potential to significantly impact water quality and discharge standards. Potential impacts would be less than significant.
- b. For this project a Tier I Water Availability Analysis, dated September 7, 2015, was prepared by Applied Civil Engineering, to determine the estimated water use of the existing development and proposed project and the water availability. Currently domestic water for the residential structures is supplied from an existing City of Napa water service and groundwater is used for irrigation of vineyards and landscaping. Groundwater will continue to be used for landscape and vineyard irrigation as well as for the proposed winery facility. There are three groundwater wells on the property. According to the property owner the newest well in the northeast corner of the property is the primary source of all groundwater used on the property.

Tier 1 Analysis

According to the analysis, the winery would create an increase in annual water demand, from 28.6 acre feet per year to 29.3 acre feet per year, totaling an approximate increase of 0.7 acre feet per year.

Existing Property Water Demand		
Use	Existing Acre feet per Year	Proposed Acre feet per Year
Residential (pool)*	0.10	0.10
Landscaping	1.96	1.96
Vineyard	26.5	26.5
Winery process	-	0.645
Winery employees	-	0.067
Winery visitation	-	0.067
Winery marketing	-	0.009
Total	28.6	29.3
*Domestic water for the main residence and the second unit is supplied by the City of Napa.		

Since the proposed water use of 29.3 acre-feet per year is less than the calculated availability of 63 acre-feet per year, the project complies with the Napa County Water Availability Analysis requirements. A Tier 2 and Tier 3 analysis are not required.

Consistent with current County practices, the project would be subject to the standard condition of approval limiting water use to the levels requested and analyzed with the use permit application (and accompanying CEQA document), and requiring well monitoring with the potential to modify or alter permitted used on site should groundwater resources become insufficient to supply the use.

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

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

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

The proposed project would not result in a substantial increase the demand of ground water supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge or lowering of the local groundwater level. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Water Deficient Areas/Storage Areas*), the project site is not located within a water deficient area and the County is not aware of, nor has it received any reports of groundwater deficiencies in the area. Potential impacts from the project would be less than significant.

- c-e. The project proposal will not substantially alter any drainage patterns on site or cause an increase in erosion on or off site. The proposed winery would be located in the existing barn, which would result in minimal grading for the winery building. The adjacent area proposed for the covered fermentation pad is relatively flat with an average slope of 12%. Site grading quantities are estimated at approximately 1,000 cubic yards to be disposed of on-site as fill within the parking area. Any excess will either be spread thinly (<6 inches) in the vineyard and winterized with vineyard farming practices or it will be hauled off-site to a location pre-approved by Napa County.

A blue-line stream is located on the parcel to the south of the property with a small portion mapped on the subject parcel. The mapped stream crosses to the center of the property, becoming a smaller drainage ditch that runs along the driveway in an easterly direction and leaves the property via a box culvert at Solano Avenue. The existing driveway, which will be improved to meet County standards, will be used as access for the winery. All required improvements to the driveway will be completed on the side of the driveway opposite the drainage.

Any earth disturbing activities will 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. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

f. The proposed project would implement standard stormwater quality treatment controls to treat runoff prior to discharge from the project site. The incorporation of these features into the project would ensure that the proposed project would not create substantial sources of polluted runoff. As discussed above, the Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the application and determined that the proposed sanitary wastewater systems are adequate to serve the facility's septic needs. In addition, the proposed project does not have any unusual characteristics that create sources of pollution that would degrade water quality. Impacts would be less than significant.

g-i. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layer – Flood Zones) a small portion of the eastern side of the property is located within a flood hazard area and the eastern portion of the property is within a dam levee inundation area (based on the following layer – Dam Levee Inundation). No development associated with the proposed winery would be located on this area of the property. The winery development would not impede or redirect flood flows or expose structures or people to flooding. Potential impacts from the project would be less than significant.

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).

The lowest portion of the property is situated at approximately 75 feet above mean sea level. There is no known history of landslides or mud flow on the property. The project will not subject people or structures to a significant risk of inundation by tsunamis, seiche, or mudflows.

Mitigation Measures: None.

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

Discussion:

a. The proposed winery is located in an area dominated by agricultural, rural residences, and wineries. The project is in support of the ongoing agricultural use in the area. This project will not divide an established community. No impacts would occur.

b/c. The project site is split-zoned Agricultural Preserve (AP) and Agricultural Watershed (AW), which both allow wineries upon grant of a use permit. 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 proposed project is compliant with the use limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance.

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Discussion:

a/b. The project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during limited project construction. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. The project would not result in potentially significant temporary construction noise impacts or operational impacts. The nearest offsite residence is located on the hillside, approximately 750 feet to the north of the proposed winery location. Given the proximity to the residential neighbors, there is a relatively low potential for impacts related to construction noise to result in a significant impact. Furthermore, construction activities would generally occur during the period of 7 AM to 7 PM on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity. All construction activities will be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). The proposed project will not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts. 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 and 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. Community noise is commonly described in terms of the “ambient” noise level which is defined as the all-encompassing noise level associated with a given noise environment. The Napa County General Plan EIR indicates the average, or equivalent, sound level (Leq) for winery activities is 51dBA in the morning and 41dBA in the afternoon. Audibility of a new noise source and/or increase in noise levels within recognized acceptable limits are not usually considered to be significant noise impacts, but these concerns should be addressed and considered in the planning and environmental review processes.

The area surrounding the subject property primarily features properties containing vineyards, rural residences, and wineries. Wineries are the predominant non-residential land uses within the County. There will be a change in the ambient noise level due to the change in use from a barn to a winery. Noise from winery operations is generally limited and intermittent, meaning the sound level can vary during the day and over the course of the year, depending on the activities at the winery. The primary noise-generating activities are equipment associated with wineries including refrigeration equipment, bottling equipment, barrel washing, de-stemmers and press activities occurring during the harvest crush season, delivery trucks, and other vehicles. 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.

The outdoor mechanical yard is located to the west, behind the winery building. The winery building would be located between equipment in the mechanical yard and the nearest residence approximately 750 feet to the north of the proposed outdoor fermentation and processing work area (Phase 2) and the winery building. There is an existing grove of trees located between the Phase 2 outdoor work area and the closest residence.

The proposed winery will utilize a mobile bottling truck which will result in a temporary increase in the ambient noise levels during short term bottling activities. The mobile bottling activities would be located within the winery (Phase 1) or under the covered fermentation and processing work area (Phase 2). 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 24 decibels lower at a distance 750 feet away (\pm 41 dba). This is in conformance with the acceptable limits identified in the General Plan EIR.

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 of 20 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.

Marketing events may include up to 10 events for 30 people and two events for 75 people per year. Events make take place in the winery building or on the outdoor hospitality area. The outdoor area, adjacent to the parking lot next to the Phase 2 outdoor work area, is approximately 700 feet from the closest residence. Events would conclude by 10 PM and be subject to the standard noise condition. Given the small size of events, the limited time duration, and the distance to the closest receptor, the generation of significant levels of noise would not be expected.

The existing grove of trees between the winery development and the closest residence will serve as an acoustical buffer, further dissipating the sound between the winery activities and the closest residence. Continuing enforcement of Napa County's Noise Ordinance by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff would further ensure that winery activities do not create a significant noise impact. The proposed project would not result in long-term significant permanent noise impacts. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

e/f. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a. The Association of Bay Area Governments' *Projections 2003* figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase some 23 percent by the year 2030 (*Napa County Baseline Data Report*, November 30, 2005). Additionally, the County's *Baseline Data Report* indicates that total housing units currently programmed in county and municipal housing elements exceed ABAG growth projections by approximately 15 percent. The project proposes two full-time and two part-time employees. 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. The existing residence and second dwelling unit onsite will not be impacted by the proposed winery. This project 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. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b. The project would not significantly increase the use of recreational facilities, nor does the project include recreational facilities that may have a significant adverse effect on the environment. No impact would occur.

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

The project site is located at 5537 Solano Avenue, approximately 2 miles north of the City of Napa. Site access to the project would be via a private driveway that only serves the property. A Traffic Analysis, dated August 3, 2016, was prepared by Whitlock & Weinberger Transportation, Inc. (W-TRANS). The study looked at existing and proposed trip generation rates, trip distribution, roadway segment operations, cumulative conditions, impacts to State Highway 29 intersections, and the County left-turn lane warrant.

a/b. The analysis utilized the County's winery trip generation sheet to calculate the proposed conditions for a peak weekday. Proposed conditions for a peak weekday were calculated at 26 total daily trips and 10 PM peak trips. Proposed conditions for a peak Saturday were calculated at 24 total trips and 14 PM peak trips and proposed conditions for a typical Saturday during crush are calculated at 18 total trips. The traffic counts conducted for the analysis identified the weekday peak period from 3:45 to 4:45 PM and the Saturday peak period was from 3:15 to 4:15 PM (Dalene Whitlock, email 11/14/16).

Roadway segment level of service: Under existing conditions the roadway operates at an acceptable LOS A during both peak periods in either direction. The roadway is expected to continue to operate at LOS A upon the addition of project added traffic.

To review cumulative conditions, the study added trips that will be generated by other approved and pending projects on the segment of Solano Avenue in the vicinity of Sleeping Lady Winery. The study segment is expected to continue operating acceptably at LOS A during both peak periods upon the addition of traffic associated with the project as well as other approved and pending projects.

Segment volumes for the horizon year of 2030 were obtained from the County's gravity demand model. There is no information for Solano Avenue in the vicinity of the project site, so a growth factor of 1.37 was calculated based on 2010 and 2030 model volumes for SR 29 and

applied to existing volumes to arrive at Future volumes. The study segment is expected to continue operating acceptable at LOS A in both directions during both peak periods with project traffic added to potential Future volumes.

Project impacts to SR 29 Intersections: Using Napa County's Guidelines for Interpretation of General Plan Circulation Policies on Significance Criteria (Fehr & Peers, December 2015), the analysis determined that the project is expected to add trips only to movements that have little to no delay and no trips to the critical left-turn movements. The impact on operations of State Highway 29 intersections is expected to be less-than-significant. Additionally, the project contributes less than one-half of one percent of the difference between existing and future volumes, and therefore has a less-than-significant impact under the criteria applied.

Left-Turn Lane Warrants: The need for a left-turn lane on Solano Avenue at the project driveway was evaluated based on criteria contained in the Napa County Road and Street Standards (2011). Using the County's criteria, a left-turn lane is not currently warranted on Solano Avenue at the driveway serving the project site. Future projected traffic volumes were estimated using the growth factor of 1.37. Under the projected future volumes, a left-turn lane would not be warranted on Solano Avenue at the project driveway.

- c. No air traffic is proposed and there are no new structures proposed for this project that would interfere with or require alteration of air traffic patterns. No impact would occur.
- d-e. The site is currently accessed via a private driveway off of Solano Avenue. There are no changes proposed to the location or design of the driveway. The project will not result in any increased hazards or in inadequate emergency access. The Fire Department and Engineering Services Division have reviewed the application and recommend approval, as conditioned.
- f. The project is proposing 7 parking spaces. Staff believes this number of parking spaces is commensurate with the proposed number of employees and visitation. The proposed parking will meet the anticipated parking demand and will avoid providing excess parking, and will therefore have no impact.
- g. There is no aspect of this proposed project that would conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. The applicant has indicated that the project will incorporate bicycle incentives and providing priority parking for efficient transportation as part of their voluntary best management practices:

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<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 – Cultural Resources: Historical sites, Historical Sites – Lines, Arch sensitive areas, Arch sites, Arch surveys) no archaeological or tribal resources have been identified on the property. Invitation for tribal consultation was completed pursuant to AB 52 and one response was received from the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation dated July 21, 2016, declining any comment on the proposed project. No impact would occur.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-b. Wastewater disposal would be accommodated on-site in compliance with State and County regulations. The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and will not result in a significant impact. The project will not require construction of any new water treatment facilities that will result in a significant impact to the environment. Water will be provided through an existing well. Potential impacts would be less than significant.
- c. The project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, which would cause a significant impact to the environment. The preliminary grading and drainage plan and storm water control plan have been reviewed by the Engineering Division. As conditioned, impacts would be less than significant.
- d. As discussed in the Hydrology and Water Quality section, according to the water analysis, the proposed water use (inclusive of the residential pool, landscaping, vineyard irrigation, and winery uses) is approximately 29.3 acre feet per year. Utilizing the Valley Floor screening criteria of 1 acre-foot of water per acre of land, the 63 acres of vineyards and developed area would have a water use availability of 63 acre-feet per year. Since the proposed water use of 29.3 acre-feet per year is less than the calculated availability of 63 acre-feet per year, the project would not require new or expanded entitlements and the project will have a less than significant impact on groundwater supply and recharge rates.
- e. Wastewater will be treated on-site and will not require a wastewater treatment provider. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- f. According to the Napa County Baseline Data Report, all of the solid waste landfills where Napa County's waste is disposed have more than sufficient capacity related to the current waste generation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- g. The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. 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
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

XIX. 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. As discussed in Section IV above, the project site has previously been disturbed with residential development, agricultural uses, and vineyards, and does not contain any known listed plant species. Possible spotted owl habitat is denoted on the western portion of the property. An assessment for Northern Spotted Owls (NSO) was conducted and it was determined that the project area and the forest adjacent to the project area is unsuitable NSO habitat. The project will not remove any trees on the hillside, and therefore will not alter any potential NSO habitat. As identified in Section V above, a Cultural Resource Evaluation was prepared for the site and the barn has been determined to be historic. The conversion will be completed in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings. No historic or prehistoric resources are anticipated to be affected by the proposed project nor will the proposed project eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. In the event archaeological artifacts are found, a standard condition of approval would be incorporated into the project. Impacts would be less than significant.
- 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 analysis determined that all potential impacts were less than significant and would not contribute significantly to cumulative impacts.

The potential impact from an increase in air pollution and greenhouse gases are being addressed as discussed in the project's Greenhouse Gas Voluntary Best Management Practices including but not limited to generation of on-site renewable energy; vehicle miles traveled reduction plan including employee incentives, employee carpool or vanpool, bike riding incentives, and bus transportation for large marketing events; solar hot water heating; energy conserving lighting; and use of recycled materials. Additional items are included in the Voluntary Best Management Practices Checklist for Development Projects form included with the Use Permit Application.

Traffic generation was calculated from winery operations, where the calculated trips reflect on-site employees, visitation, and wine production. Under the Napa County General Plan, traffic volumes are projected to increase and will be caused by a combination of locally generated traffic as well as general regional growth. The General Plan EIR indicates that much of the forecasted increase in traffic on the arterial roadway network will result from traffic generated outside of the County; however the project will contribute a small amount toward the general overall increase. General Plan Policy CIR-16 states that "The County will seek to maintain an arterial Level of Service D or better on all County roadways, except where the level of Service already exceeds this standard and where increased intersection capacity is not feasible without substantial additional right of way." A Traffic Analysis, dated August 3, 2016, was prepared by Whitlock & Weinberger Transportation, Inc. (W-TRANS). To review cumulative conditions, the study added trips that will be generated by other approved and pending projects on the segment of Solano Avenue in the vicinity of Sleeping Lady Winery. The study segment is expected to continue operating acceptable at LOS A during both peak periods upon the addition of traffic associated with the project as well as other approved and pending projects.

The project does not propose new development that would have a significant impact on the environment or substantially change the existing conditions. With the imposition of standard and project specific conditions of approval, the project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

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

Mitigation Measures: None Required.