“C”

Initial Study/Negative Declaration

Sam Jasper Winery, P15-00077 - UP
Planning Commission Hearing, January 18, 2017

COUNTY OF NAPA
PLANNING, BUILDING AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT
1195 THIRD STEET, SUITE 210
NAPA, CA 94559
(707) 253-4417

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated February 2015)

1. Project Title: Sam Jasper Winery (Use Permit Application P15-00077 – UP)

2. Property Owner: San Bernabe Vineyards, LLC

3. County Contact Person, Phone Number and Email Address: Dana Ayers, (707) 253-4388, dana.ayers@countyofnapa.org

4. Project Location and Assessor's Parcel No. (APN): 4059 Silverado Trail (nearest cross street Petra Drive), northwest of the City of Napa municipal boundary in unincorporated Napa County, APN 039-390-023

5. Project Proponent's Name and Address: Chris Indelicato, San Bernabe Vineyards, LLC, 455 Devlin Road, Suite 201, Napa, California 94558

6. Project Proponent's Representative: Rob Anglin, Holman Teague Roche Anglin, LLP, 1455 1st Street, Suite 217, Napa California 94559

7. General Plan Land Use Designation: Agricultural Resource

8. Zoning: AP (Agricultural Preserve) District

9. Background: The proposed project is a request for a use permit to allow a new wine production and retail sales facility on a 10.23-acre property located at 4059 Silverado Trail. Historic aerial photographs of the property indicate that the site has been in agricultural use, as vineyard or as orchard, since as early as the mid-20th century. A detached garage and a barn that had been associated with the property's agricultural use were demolished by the property owner in 2013 (Napa County Permit No. B12-01506). The site is currently developed with a single-family residence and 7.25 acres of wine grape vineyards.

10. Description of Project: On March 9, 2015, the property owner submitted a use permit application (P15-00077 – UP) requesting to construct and operate a winery on the 10.23-acre site. As proposed, the winery would:
    A. Have an annual production capacity of up to 20,000 gallons, with bottling of wine to be performed off-site or on-site by a mobile bottling service in a covered and partially enclosed work area attached to the winery building;
    B. Employ up to two full-time and two part-time employees, plus two part-time seasonal employees during the harvest season;
    C. Operate daily between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., with an appointment-only tasting room open between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m.;
    D. Offer daily tours and tastings for up to 25 people per day, up to a maximum of 160 people per week;
    E. Annually host 23 marketing events, consisting of 10 events annually for up to 15 guests, 10 events annually for up to 25 guests and three events annually for up to 50 guests with catered food, with all events to occur in the winery's tasting room and adjoining outdoor patio between the hours of 11:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m.; and
    F. Offer on-premise consumption of wine purchased on the property, consistent with Business & Professions Code Sections 23358, 23390 and 23396.5, inside of the proposed winery building and on the adjoining outdoor patio area on the west side of the building.

    Establishment of the new winery would involve construction of various on- and off-site improvements that include:
    A. An approximately 17,600 square foot structure housing tasting rooms, administrative offices, barrel storage and fermentation rooms, and including partially enclosed and covered work and hospitality areas on the property;

B. A 16-stall, on-site parking lot with landscaping;
C. Improvements to the existing storm drainage on the property that include subsurface pipes for stormwater conveyance and bioretention areas for stormwater quality;
D. A 20-foot wide, on-site access road to the winery building from Silverado Trail;
E. Installation of new on-site utilities that include a wastewater treatment system consisting of seven treatment and holding tanks (five of which would be underground) ranging in size from 750 to 10,000 gallons, as well as a system of subsurface drip lines to allow discharge of treated wastewater into the soil below the vineyard rows east of the existing residence;
F. Installation of six, 13- to 16-foot tall water storage tanks (one 50,000-gallon fire suppression water storage tank, two 10,000-gallon treated process wastewater holding tanks installed as components of the wastewater treatment system described above, and two 5,000-gallon tanks for storage of process water and domestic water), with each of the tanks installed aboveground near the western edge of the vineyard rows; and
G. Grading and asphalt paving within the right-of-way of Silverado Trail, opposite the property frontage, and re-striping of the paved surface in order to extend the two-way left turn lane on Silverado Trail at the property frontage.

Of the existing 7.25 acres of vineyards on the property currently, 2.39 acres would be removed to accommodate construction of the proposed winery and associated facilities. The existing single-family residence recently renovated by the property owner would be retained on-site and would continue to be used for residential purposes.

11. Environmental setting and surrounding land uses: The property at 4059 Silverado Trail is not located within any Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone designated by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. The property is generally flat, with grades across the property not exceeding five percent, and it is underlain with Coombs gravelly loam, a mixture of course sand, silt and fine clay soils. As explained above, the 10.23-acre property is currently developed with a single-family residence and 7.25 acres of vineyards.

Like the subject site, surrounding adjacent properties are zoned AP District and have a General Plan land use designation of Agricultural Resource. Land uses on properties in the immediate and general vicinity of the site are also primarily agricultural and include residential and limited commercial uses, as described below:

North: Three parcels border the site to the north, including a 17.34-acre parcel, an 11.28-acre parcel and a 2.12-acre parcel. The two larger parcels are developed with vineyards and single-family residence (17.34-acre parcel), and the Black Stallion Winery and vineyards (11.28-acre parcel), and both of these parcels are owned by the project proponent. The third parcel (2.12 acres) is developed with a single-family residence and vineyards. The residences on the adjoining parcels are over 300 feet away from the part of the proposed winery building to which each is closest.

South: Three rural parcels border the site to the south: 1) a 5.27-acre, privately-owned vacant parcel; 2) a 5.12-acre privately-owned parcel developed with one single-family residence and vineyards; and 3) a 7.96-acre parcel developed with vineyards, a single-family residence and winery structures (formerly occupied by Van der Heyden Winery, currently approved to be re-established as Beau Vigne Estate Winery). Beyond these three parcels is a small subdivision of single-family residences and a delicatessen (Soda Canyon Store).

West: The Napa River borders the site to the west. Beyond the river is a 24.42-acre parcel developed with a single-family residence and vineyards.

East: Silverado Trail borders the site to the west. Beyond Silverado Trail are two parcels, 3.37 acres and 19.24 acres. The smaller of the two parcels is developed with a single-family residence, while the larger parcel is developed with three single-family detached houses and vineyards.

12. Other agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): The project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County, including but not limited to grading permits and waste disposal permits. Permit revisions may also be required by the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms.

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies	Other Agencies Contacted
None required.	Taxation Trade Bureau California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control

13. 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?

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.

On February 2, 2016, county staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. Within 30 days of receiving the invitation to consult, members of the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation requested additional information about the project and potential mitigations. After replying to the information requests on May 31 and June 28, 2016, County staff concluded consultation proceedings by letter of November 16, 2016, following 120 days of no additional correspondence or requests from tribal representatives for additional information.

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.

D.Ayers

December 27, 2016

Dana Ayers, Planner III
Napa County Planning, Building & 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
	b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☒	☐
	c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☒	☐
	d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:
The proposed project, if approved, would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista nor substantially damage scenic resources or the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings.

a/b. The site is mostly flat, without significant scenic resources such as rock outcroppings, and the vegetation that would be removed in order to accommodate the proposed winery would consist of non-native, planted grape vines. No additional structures would be removed from the property for winery construction. There is no State highway proximate to the site, although the property does have an approximately 175-foot long frontage on Silverado Trail, a County-maintained public road and rural throughway. With the exception of the new access driveway from Silverado Trail and a portion of the existing residence, the front (easternmost) 600 feet of the property would remain planted with grape vines, and the appearance of the property as seen from the public right-of-way of Silverado Trail would not change significantly. A low "crest" (elevation 75 feet) on the property, in the vineyards between the existing residence and Silverado Trail, would also serve to lessen visibility of the new winery building, which would have a finished floor of 69 feet and a height of 25 feet at the easternmost fermenting and work areas of the proposed building. Other aboveground tanks for storage of water and process waste water would be as tall as 16 feet above grade but would be near the westernmost edge of the site, behind the existing and proposed buildings on-site and over 1,500 feet away from Silverado Trail, so that they would not be noticeable from the road right-of-way.

c. As noted above, the site has been in documented agricultural use and planted with crops for several decades. Of the 10.23 acres on-site, approximately 71 percent (7.25 acres) is currently planted with wine grapevines; the remainder features a single-family residence (proposed to be maintained as a residence with operation of the winery) vacant land on which the recently-demolished barn and garage once sat, and natural vegetation along the banks of the Napa River on the western end of the site. Construction of the proposed winery building and associated site improvements would result in the removal of 2.39 acres of the existing vineyards. However, the majority of the vineyards to be removed would be in the western (rear) two-thirds of the property, with the existing single-family residence and vineyards remaining in place east of the winery building, between the proposed winery facilities and Silverado Trail. Thus, the appearance of the property as viewed from Silverado Trail would not change substantially with implementation of the proposed project.

The proposed winery building would be constructed outside of the 600-foot winery building setback established by Napa County Code section 18.104.230.A.1. The site is also substantially flat, with slopes generally five percent or shallower, and it is located on the valley floor, so that the proposed new construction is not subject to the requirements of Napa County Code Chapter 18.106 (Viewshed Protection Program).

d. Hours of operation of the winery are proposed to be 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. (excluding harvest season), so that late, nighttime lighting (after 6:00 p.m.) would not occur for most months of the year. The proposed winery use, if approved, would be subject to the County's standard condition of approval for wineries that limits the amount of outdoor lighting to the minimum necessary for operational and security needs. Up-lighting of buildings and landscaping is prohibited. The winery operators must keep lighting as low to the ground as possible and include shields to deflect the light downward. Avoidance of highly reflective

surfaces would be required, as well, by the standard County condition. This condition would apply to all winery activities (excluding harvest), including any events that would occur outdoors:

> *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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:

a/e The California Department of Conservation maps the 10.23-acre parcel as Prime Farmland, a designation that identifies those lands with an optimal combination of physical and chemical features, micro-climate and water supply to produce high crop yields. The applicant indicates that, currently, 7.25 acres of the 10.23-acre parcel is in agricultural use, planted with vineyards. Construction of the proposed winery would reduce the on-site vineyard acreage to 4.86 acres—a loss of 2.39 acres compared to the existing condition, as a result of construction of the winery building and related site improvements. Consistent with the General Plan definition of "agriculture" (Policy AG/LU-2), processing of agricultural products (in this case, grapes into wine) and related, accessory uses (such as sales and marketing of agricultural products) are agricultural uses of land. Thus, loss of

[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.

vineyard to accommodate winery facilities, as is the case with the proposed project, would not result in a significant impact with respect to conversion of farmland.

b. The County's zoning of the property is AP (Agricultural Preserve) District, and the General Plan land use designation is Agricultural Resource. The proposed winery is consistent with the property's zoning, as Napa County Code Section 18.16.030 lists wineries and related, accessory uses as conditionally permitted in the AP District. General Plan Policy AG/LU-21 also identifies processing of agricultural products (grape crushing/winemaking) as a use that is consistent with the Agricultural Resource designation. There is no Williamson Act contract applicable to this property.

c/d. As previously noted, the site has been in agricultural use for several decades and is currently planted with vineyards. There are no forest resources on the site.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
	b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
	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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
	d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
	e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:
On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) Board of Directors adopted updated thresholds of significance to assist local agencies in the nine-county Bay Area in the review of projects' potential environmental impacts pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The thresholds were designed to establish the level at which the BAAQMD believed air pollution emissions would cause significant air quality and climate impacts in the region; were posted on the BAAQMD website; and were incorporated into the BAAQMD's updated 2011 CEQA Guidelines. The thresholds were subsequently challenged, and in March 2012, the Alameda County Superior Court issued a judgment finding that the BAAQMD had failed to comply with CEQA when it adopted the thresholds. The court did not determine whether the thresholds were valid on their merits but instead found that the adoption of the thresholds was a project under CEQA. The BAAQMD subsequently appealed the Alameda County Superior Court's decision, and the matter is currently pending final decision by the California Supreme Court. Based on the Court's direction, the BAAQMD cannot recommend that local agencies use the 2010 thresholds to analyze the potential environmental impacts of proposed projects, and thus, the BAAQMD has removed the 2010 thresholds from their most current CEQA guidelines (2012). However, agencies may choose to use the thresholds identified in the BAAQMD's 2011 CEQA Guidelines, or other data sources available through the BAAQMD, in order to analyze the potential environmental impacts of projects; thus, as the best available information, the BAAQMD's 2011 CEQA Guidelines are applicable for evaluating projects in Napa County.

The proposed project consists of establishment of a new winery, inclusive of construction of an approximately 17,600 square foot building and associated on-site and off-site improvements, on a 10.23-acre site. The winery would have an annual production of

20,000 gallons of wine; would employ up to two full-time, two part-time and two seasonal harves employees; would offer winery tours and tastings for up to 160 guests per week; and would host marketing events at the winery for a total annual attendance of 550 guests for all 23 events combined. Just under half (4.86 acres) of the 10.23-acre site would remain planted with wine grape vines. The operation of the winery would generate approximately 50 vehicle trips per day (25 inbound and 25 outbound trips) for employees, visitors/guests, and deliveries and distribution of wine and winemaking products. (See Section XVI, Transportation/Traffic, for a more detailed description of these trips).

a-d. Over the long term, emission sources for the proposed project consist primarily of mobile sources, including vehicles going to and from the site. The BAAQMD's screening criteria suggest that similar projects such as a high quality restaurant of up to 47,000 square feet, and a general light industrial use of up to 541,000 square feet, would not significantly impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2011, pages 3-2 & 3-3). Given the size of the proposed winery's indoor and outdoor hospitality spaces (approximately 4,000 square feet compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47,000 square feet) and production/barrel storage and ancillary use areas (approximately 13,500 square feet compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 541,000 square feet), the project and its associated trips would not contribute a significant amount of air pollution to the region and thus would not have a significant air quality impact. (Note: A high quality restaurant is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollution 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.)

In 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) adopted an updated Clean Air Plan (2010), which outlines a regional program and a set of measures to reduce ozone, ozone precursors, particulate matter, greenhouse gas emissions, and other sources of air pollution. At the time of adoption of the Clean Air Plan, the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area as a region was in non-attainment for ozone and particulate matter (PM), and the region as a whole remains in non-attainment for those two air pollutants. Sources of ozone and PM include combustion (e.g., burning of fossil fuels or vegetation), fugitive dust from earth-moving activities, and vehicle use (including engine combustion and tire and brake pad wear).

The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Wineries in general are not producers of air pollution in quantities substantial enough to result in an air quality plan conflict. The project site lies within the Napa Valley, which forms one of the climatologically distinct sub-regions (Napa County Sub region) within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The topographical and meteorological features of the Valley create a relatively high potential for air pollution. Over the long term, emissions resulting from the proposed use permit would consist primarily of mobile sources, including vehicle emissions from employees, visitors and production-related deliveries to and from the site.

As noted above, the combustion process of engines in passenger and heavy duty vehicles is a source of air pollutants, including particulate matter as well as carbon dioxide and nitrogen dioxide, two precursors to formulation of ozone. The requested use permit would add employees and visitors to the site; these employee and visitor trips would constitute the majority of the estimated 50 new daily trips to the site that would occur with the establishment of the winery. Emissions from heavy duty off-road vehicles (farm and industrial equipment) would decrease in correlation with the 2.39-acre decrease in vineyard area on-site. Emissions from heavy duty on-road vehicles would increase as a result of import of 150 tons of grapes to the site to produce the requested 20,000 gallons of wine. Deducting trips associated with the existing condition (7.25 acres of vines, or approximately 30 tons of vineyard fruit, that would either be removed for the winery or retained on-site for processing at the proposed winery), and assuming each truck trip transports four tons of grapes, the proposed winery would generate roughly 30 net new truck trips per year to deliver grapes to the site. Another, estimated 45-50 annual truck trips associated with deliveries of materials/supplies and case goods, and distribution of wine made on-site, would also occur with the proposed winery. (Also see Section XVI, Transportation/Traffic of this Initial Study). Although these trips and equipment would increase emissions, the 2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan notes that emissions from these heavy duty vehicles are regulated by standards of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and California Air Resources Board (CARB), and that as those standards have intensified, emissions (particularly nitrogen oxides and particulate matter) from these types of vehicles have and will continue to decrease (3-29, 3-30). U.S. Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics data demonstrates this downward trend in heavy duty vehicle emissions since 1990.

The winery operators, in the use permit application, identified other measures listed in the 2010 Clean Air Plan with which the winery's proposed operations would be consistent. These measures include installation of photovoltaic panels on-site for generation of solar power to the winery (Napa County Greenhouse Gas [GHG] checklist, Best Management Practice [BMP] 1), which is consistent with the Clean Air Plan's Stationary Source Measure (SSM) 15 and Energy and Climate Measure (ECM) 2. In addition, the applicant's GHG checklist indicates that the proposed winery building would have a light colored "cool roof" to reduce the heat island effect (BMP 10) consistent with the Clean Air Plan's ECM 3. While certain components of the winery's

operation implement elements of the Clean Air Plan, other measures would not be implemented as they are generally more applicable to industrial than agricultural operations. As such, the proposed project would not obstruct implementation of the applicable Clean Air Plan for the San Francisco region.

In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from earthmoving and construction activities required for project construction. Although there are no schools or healthcare facilities in the immediate vicinity of the proposed winery, there are existing residences along Silverado Trail and along Petra Drive (south of the subject site) that are within one-quarter of a mile of the subject site. Earthmoving and construction emissions would have a temporary effect, consisting mainly of dust generated during grading and other construction activities and exhaust emissions from construction-related equipment and vehicles during the estimated four months of site grading (approximately three months of rough grading and one month of fine grading). The temporary duration of the work would not cause a substantial increase in particulate matter, and compliance with standard conditions would reduce to less than significant the proposed project's significant construction impact related to the region's current non-attainment status for this criteria pollutant.

The BAAQMD recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction-related air quality impacts. These measures are incorporated into the County's standard conditions of project approval and include the following:

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

A. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible.
B. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
C. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
D. All visible mud or dirt tracked out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
E. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour.
F. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
G. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 14, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations). 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.

If the project proponent adheres to these relevant best management practices identified by the BAAQMD and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts are considered to be less than significant.

d/e. The closest off-site sensitive receptor to the proposed winery building is the residence to the northeast of the site; that residence is approximately 300 feet from the northeastern corner of the proposed winery building. While the BAAQMD defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known to be operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative odor impacts to sensitive receptors. Additionally, the smells associated with wine-making, agriculture and agricultural processes are considered to be an acceptable part of the County's character and are not considered to be undesirable (General Plan, Policy CC-51).

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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

b/c/e. The property is generally flat, having a slope of less than five percent. County geographic information system (GIS) data indicate no wetlands on the parcel. The Napa River borders the property to the west. Construction of the proposed winery buildings and surface improvements would occur over 800 feet east of the top of bank of the river, and the proposed aboveground utilities tanks would be installed over 200 feet east of the top of bank. Soda Creek is also in the vicinity of the property but is over 800 feet southeast of the site, with several agricultural and residential parcels between the creek and the proposed project site. The proposed ground disturbance associated with the proposed winery and its related improvements would not directly modify either Napa River or Soda Creek, would be well outside of the required 45-foot minimum setback established under the water quality and riparian area Conservation Regulations identified in County Code Chapter 18.108, and would have no direct impacts to either waterway. The proposed project includes stormwater quality preservation measures that include landscaping and bioretention areas that are incorporated into the project improvements in order to treat runoff from the property and reduce pollution of storm drainage facilities, consistent with the requirements of Chapter 16.28 (Stormwater Management and Discharge Control) of Napa County Code.

a/d. County GIS data do not indicate presence of any sensitive species on the property. The property has been in agricultural use for several decades, and with the exception of the river setback area on the west side of the property, native vegetation – and the native species habitat that would have been fostered by that vegetation – has long been removed from the property in order to introduce wine grape vines and previously, orchards. Additionally, there are no vacant structures on the property within which colonies of sensitive species (such as birds or bats) might have established, and the demolition of which would consequently have an impact on those species. As described further in Environmental Setting, above, the site is bound on two sides by similarly disturbed parcels planted with grapevines, and the third side opposite the Napa River adjoins the right-of-way of Silverado Trail, an arterial roadway. As the proposed project would not construct a barrier nor remove existing native habitat in an undisturbed area, the proposed development would not impede movement within an existing terrestrial habitat corridor.

f. There is no habitat conservation plan (HCP) or natural community conservation plan (NCCP) that has been adopted or is being implemented in unincorporated Napa County.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:

a-d. There are no historic structures or other architectural resources on the property that would be affected by the construction and operation of the proposed winery. Prior to submitting this use permit application, the property owner demolished a garage and barn that previously served the agricultural use on-site, under Napa County Permit No. B12-01506. The property currently has a single-family residence that appears to be older than 50 years but that has recently been renovated and would be retained as a residence with construction of the proposed winery.

Construction of the proposed winery would involve ground disturbance as necessary to remove existing grape vines; grade the site for parking stalls, driveways and building foundations; and excavate in order to install underground utility and pipe lines. The property is predominantly flat and developed with a vineyard, lacking any unique geological features such as rock outcroppings, mounds or other landforms. Although there are no known archaeological or paleontological resources on the property, the low (valley floor) elevation and proximity of the property to the Napa River would suggest that the property's general vicinity might have attracted indigenous peoples and animals. Still, the property has already experienced significant ground disturbance as would occur to remove native vegetation and grade the site for installation of the existing vineyard and prior orchard. If any resources not previously uncovered during this prior disturbance are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the proposed project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist must be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the County's standard condition of approval, which reads as follows:

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.

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.	☐	☐	☒	☐
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
	iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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.	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:

a-c. The property is not located within any Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone designated by the State Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. Although no fault zone underlies the property, the site is generally located within a region of active fault zones, including those of the West Napa, Concord, Great Valley, North Hayward, Hunting Creek-Berryessa, Mayacama and San Andreas faults. Movement along any of these faults is anticipated to result in intensities of VII and VIII on the Modified Mercalli Scale at the project site; these "very strong" to "severe" intensities would be felt by most people and are likely to result in some damage to well-built structures. Due to the requirement for new structures to comply with the seismic standards of the California Building Code and Occupational Health and Safety Administration regulations (i.e., bracing of barrel storage racks), damage to any newly-built structures on the property is anticipated to be minor and would not expose people to substantial hazards related to ground shaking during an earthquake. Some structural damage to the existing residence to remain could also occur, though it is noted that the residence has recently been remodeled, and the property owner reports that the residence experienced no such significant damage during the recent 2014 West Napa earthquake.

The property is generally flat, with slopes of under five percent. Given that the site is predominantly flat, underlain with a mixture of course sand, silt and fine clay soils (Coombs gravelly loam) and located on the valley floor, soil movement and erosion potential is anticipated to be low (by contrast, higher erosion potential is anticipated in areas of steep slopes or more moderate slopes with loose, sandy soils). The property also has a "very low" landslide potential, as identified on landslide risk maps produced by the California Department of Conservation and Association of Bay Area Governments. Regional maps of liquefaction risk indicate that the property is within an area of low to moderate liquefaction potential; the highest liquefaction potential on the property occurs in the vicinity of the Napa River banks on the western end of the site, where water and process wastewater storage tanks have been proposed but no occupied structures are proposed to be placed.

d/e. The Coombs gravelly loam that underlays the proposed development portion of the site generally has a low erosion potential, moderate shrink-swell potential and severe limitations in use for septic system absorption fields; these soil limitations, however, can be overcome with proper design, such as reinforced building foundations and expansion of the septic system leachfield.

The proposed project plans indicate a primary on-site leachfield of 1,925 square feet in the vineyard area to the east of the proposed winery building, with a 3,850 square foot reserve area. These distribution areas have been derived from projected wastewater generated by the proposed winery's employment and visitation numbers (two full-time, two part-time and two harvest employees, plus 25 visitors per day and up to 50 visitors at a marketing event), and they are based on a percolation rate of 0.6 gallons her square foot per day. The proposed sanitary wastewater treatment system has been accordingly designed to be consistent with Napa County standards that recognize the relatively slower percolation rate of sandy clay loam soils and thus require appropriately-sized dispersal areas for pre-treated effluent.

The expansive soils on-site could also pose the potential for cracks in or damage to the foundation of the proposed building, as a result of shrinking and swelling of the soil from moisture absorption and evaporation. As with the septic system, building foundations can be designed in such a manner as to minimize potential for building damage from expansive soils; such designs could include elevation of the building foundation or utilization of a reinforced slab on grade concrete foundation. If the use permit is approved, and concurrently with issuance of an application for a building permit to construct the new winery building, the permittee would be required to submit a geotechnical report with recommendations for design of the building foundation that minimizes the potential for such damage from the expansive nature of the underlying soil.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

GHGs are the atmospheric gases, including carbon dioxide, methane, nitrogen dioxide, and synthetic fluorinated gases, whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for global warming and that contribute to climate change, a widely accepted theory/science explaining human effects on the atmosphere. Carbon dioxide (CO_2) is the principal GHG being emitted by human activities, and whose concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity. Commercial and industrial sources of GHG include space conditioning and other metal and chemical production processes. Agricultural sources of carbon emissions include forest clearing, land use changes, and burning of fossil fuels related to goods movement and gas and diesel-powered vehicles and farm equipment (https://www3.epa.gov/climatechange/science/causes.html). CO_2 also serves as the reference gas to which to compare other greenhouse gases. The effect that each unit of the other GHGs (methane, nitrogen dioxide and synthetic fluorinated gases) has on causing the global warming effect is exponentially greater than the impact of a unit of CO_2, to the degrees of tens to tens of thousands of times. Thus, GHG emissions are measured in "carbon dioxide equivalents." Carbon dioxide equivalents (CO_2e) is a unit of measurement of GHG emissions that uses carbon dioxide as a common denominator, and it is a way to get one number that approximates total emissions from all the different gases that contribute to GHG emissions (BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2012). CO_2e are measured in units of metric tons, equal to approximately 2,204 pounds.

Napa County has been working to develop a Climate Action Plan (CAP) for several years. In 2012, a Draft CAP[2] (March 2012) was recommended using the emissions checklist in the Draft CAP, on a trial basis, to determine potential GHG emissions associated with project development and operation. At the December 11, 2012, Napa County Board of Supervisors (BOS) hearing, the BOS considered

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

adoption of the proposed CAP. In addition to reducing Napa County's GHG emissions, the proposed plan was intended to address compliance with CEQA for projects reviewed by the County and to lay the foundation for development of a local offset program. While the BOS acknowledged the plan's objectives, the BOS requested that the CAP be revised to better address transportation-related GHG, 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, in order to ensure that projects address the County's goal related to reducing GHG emissions.

In July 2015, the County re-commenced preparation of the CAP to: 1) account for present day conditions and modeling assumptions (such as but not limited to methods, emission factors, and data sources); 2) address the concerns with the previous CAP effort as outlined above; 3) meet applicable State requirements; and 4) 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 No. 1: *2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016*[3]. This initial phase included updating the unincorporated County's community-wide GHG emissions inventory to 2014 and preparing new GHG emissions forecasts for the 2020, 2030, and 2050 horizon years. Table 1 of the Technical Memorandum indicates that two percent of the County's GHG emissions in 2014 were a result of land use change.

Additional information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or online at http://www.countyofnapa.org/CAP/.

a. Overall increases in GHG emissions in Napa County were assessed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the Napa County General Plan Update and certified by the Napa County Board of Supervisors 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.

   As discussed in the Air Quality section of this Initial Study, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors & GHG Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, including GHG emissions. The BAAQMD's threshold of significance for proposed projects' potential GHG emissions was set at 1,100 metric tons of CO_2e ($MTCO_2e$) per year. Though the BAAQMD cannot endorse the use of the 1,100 $MTCO_2e$ threshold due to court decision, agencies may choose to use the threshold as best available information; thus, the 1,100 $MTCO_2e$ threshold 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 with "ongoing" winery operations are discussed. One-time construction emissions associated with the winery development project include 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 existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed. In addition to the one-time construction emissions, operational emissions of the winery are also considered and include: i) any reduction in the amount of carbon sequestered by existing vegetation that is removed as part of the project compared to a "no project" scenario (hereinafter referred to as operational sequestration emissions); and ii) ongoing emissions from the energy used to maintain and operate the winery, including vehicle trips associated with employee and visitor trips (hereinafter referred to as operational emissions). See Section XVI, Transportation/Traffic, for anticipated number of operational trips. Operational emissions from the proposed winery would be the primary source of emissions over the long-term when compared to one-time construction emissions.

[3] Supersedes February 2, 2016, version.

The proposed project consists of construction and operation of a new winery on a portion of a site, the majority of which is currently developed with a vineyard. Using comparable land use categories as described in the Air Quality discussion, a project with 9,000 square feet of hospitality area or 121,000 square feet of barrel storage/production area would potentially generate more than 1,100 $MTCO_2e$ annually and would be considered to have a potentially significant impact on the environment; the recently-built winery is smaller than those screening criteria. More specifically, given the size of the proposed winery's indoor and outdoor hospitality spaces (approximately 4,000 square feet compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 9,000 square feet) and production/barrel storage and ancillary use areas (approximately 13,500 square feet compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 121,000 square feet), the proposed winery and its associated trips would not contribute a significant amount of air pollution to the region and thus would not have a significant air quality impact.

The proposal includes removal of approximately 2.39 acres of vineyard for construction of the winery facilities. While removal of the vegetation would release sequestered carbon, the reduction in vineyard area would correspondingly reduce emissions generated from vineyard management, particularly emissions from agricultural equipment currently used to maintain this same area. As referenced in the Air Quality section of this initial study, the applicant intends to install water-efficient and recycled water tolerant landscaping, a "cool roof" and roof-mounted solar panels, which in combination would serve to reduce the winery's energy demands related to space conditioning and groundwater extraction, as well as increasing its capability to generate energy on-site from a renewable resource. These efforts would also have the effect of reducing the proposed winery's operational GHG emissions resulting from fossil fuels burned to create electricity to serve the winery over the long-term.

b. The County of Napa does not have an adopted climate action plan, though the applicant's intent to install a roof-mounted photovoltaic array, as indicated in the Greenhouse Gas Best Management Practices Checklist attached to the use permit application, is consistent with adopted General Plan goals (CON-68, CON-70) that encourage the County and permittees to pursue use of renewable energy sources.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:

a/b. The proposed project would involve the use and transport of hazardous materials typically used in agricultural maintenance and winemaking operations. The project proponent/winery operator would be required to file a Hazardous Materials Business Plan with the Environmental Health Division should the amount of hazardous materials reach reportable levels. During construction of the project, some hazardous materials (such as building coatings and adhesives would be utilized); however, given that use of these types of substances on the property would be limited to the nine- to 10-month duration of construction, they would not create significant environmental impact.

c. The proposed winery would not affect schools within one-quarter mile. The school closest to the winery site is Sunrise Montessori School, which is over a mile southwest of the subject property.

d. The property is not on the California Environmental Protection Agency's list of hazardous sites (Government Code Section 65962.5).

e/f. The winery would not cause an unsafe condition within two miles of an airport or airstrip, as the winery site is not within two miles of any public or private airport or airstrip. Napa County Airport, the closest airport to the site, is over 10 miles south of the site, and the property is outside of the boundaries of the land use compatibility plan for that airport. There are no permitted private landing facilities in the vicinity of the property, and a pending request for a private use heliport, if approved by the County, would be just over four miles southeast of the subject site.

g. The Napa County Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) outlines procedures, including establishing leadership roles and responsibilities of various agency staff, that guide local preparedness, response, recovery and resource management efforts associated with occurrence of a natural disaster, significant emergency, or other threat to public safety. The requested winery use permit would not result in permanent closure or obstruction of adjacent public rights-of-way; during construction of the proposed two-way left turn lane, the applicant's contractor would be required to maintain adequate traffic control measures to allow vehicles to continue to use Silverado Trail in front of the property. No component of the implementation of the EOP would otherwise be impaired by proposed winery use permit.

h. With the exception of the native and non-native plant growth along the riverbanks on the western end of the parcel, the property is substantially landscaped with vineyards and surrounded by other properties planted with vineyards, and thus is not considered high risk for damage from wildland fires. All four sides of the proposed winery structure would be bounded by asphaltic concrete access drives and parking.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
	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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
	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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
	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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
j)	Expose people or structures to significant risk of loss or injury as a result of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:
The proposed production of wine on-site would result in conversion of 2.39 acres of irrigated vineyard to partially landscaped winery area, which would correspond to a decrease in the demand for water for the vines. However, establishment of a winery on the subject would create an increased demand for water, as well as generation of process wastewater, as a result of the production of wine from the on-site and off-site fruit.

a/e/f. The proposed project improvements have been designed in accordance with the County-applicable, Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association (BASMAA) Post-Construction Manual. The guidance in this manual is intended to ensure that stormwater runoff generated from a development is treated prior to entering a storm drain system, and that the quantity of post-construction stormwater runoff does not exceed the quantity of runoff generated by the pre-construction condition of a site.

As designed, the stormwater treatment system consists of six drainage sub-areas. Two of the six subareas are substantially pervious (vineyards east and west of the proposed winery building) and would accommodate infiltration of rainfall and stormwater runoff into the soil within the respective subarea. The remaining four subareas contain impervious surfaces that include building foundations, asphalt and cement concrete walkways, and paved vehicle parking and drive aisles. The four subareas with substantial impervious surfaces would each be graded to drain into four bioretention basins (one per subarea). Stormwater would be temporarily held in each basin in order to allow the water to percolate back into the soil, where pollutants would be naturally filtered out through landscaping and layers of engineered soil that is specially designed for stormwater treatment. Thus, the proposed system is designed to manage both the quantity and quality of stormwater runoff. Three of the basins would be underlain with perforated pipe that would collect the filtered runoff and convey it through the on-site drainage system to a rock outfall, from which water would ultimately overland flow into the vineyard rows, consistent with pre-construction conditions; runoff from the fourth basin would be conveyed by underground pipe to a pre-existing stormwater detention pond near the western boundary of the site.

Other permanent control measures have also been proposed by the applicant and are also intended to reduce the potential for pollutants to enter the storm drain system. Such permanent control measures include appropriate plant selection and other structural pest management measures; labeling of storm drain inlets to advise against dumping; plumbing of non-storm discharges such as fire sprinkler test water and untreated process wastewater to the sanitary wastewater treatment system; and paving and covering of refuse storage and crush pad areas. If the proposed project is approved, and prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the winery building, the property owner would be required to execute an agreement ensuring that he and subsequent property owners would maintain the on-site stormwater system and stormwater quality measures in perpetuity.

In addition to stormwater runoff, wastewater potentially generated from the winery operation would include sanitary wastewater and process wastewater generated from the winemaking process. Wastewater is proposed to be treated on-site through a series of septic holding and treatment tanks, and once treated, would be discharged into the vineyard rows as irrigation.

The project applicant has indicated that bottling of product would occur either on-site, using a mobile bottling truck parked under cover of the proposed eastern work area, or at an off-site bottling facility. Use of mobile bottling services can pose a potential for stormwater contamination from product spillage during the wine bottling process; however, as described, bottling would occur under the roof of the work area on the east side of the building. This work area would incorporate a drain inlet for process wastewater that would be plumbed via underground pipelines to a 5,000-gallon process wastewater tank proposed to be installed west of the vineyards. This design allows for separation of stormwater from process wastewater, significantly reducing the potential for process wastewater to contaminate stormwater.

b. On January 14, 2014, Governor Jerry Brown declared a drought emergency in the state of California. The declaration stopped short of imposing mandatory conservation measures statewide. Mandatory water restrictions are being left to individual jurisdictions. On April 1, 2015, Governor Brown issued Executive Order B-29-15 imposing restrictions to achieve a statewide 25 percent reduction in potable urban water usage through February 28, 2016. However, such restrictions were not placed on private well users in rural areas. At this time, Napa County has not adopted or implemented mandatory water use restrictions. The County requires all use permit applicants to complete necessary water analyses in order to document that sufficient water supplies are available for their proposed projects.

To better understand groundwater resources, on June 28, 2011, the Napa County Board of Supervisors approved creation of a Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee (GRAC). The GRAC's purpose was to assist County staff and technical consultants with recommendations regarding groundwater, including data collection, monitoring, well pump test protocols, management objectives, and community support. The County retained Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE), who completed a County-wide assessment of groundwater resources (Napa County Groundwater Conditions and Groundwater Monitoring Recommendations Report, February 2011); developed a groundwater monitoring program (Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2013, January 2013) and also completed a 2013 Updated Hydrogeologic Conceptualization and Characterization of Groundwater Conditions (January 2013).

Groundwater Sustainability Objectives were recommended by the GRAC and adopted by the Board of Supervisors. These objectives acknowledged the important role of monitoring as a means to achieving groundwater sustainability and the principles underlying the sustainability objectives. 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, conducted by 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 (Milliken Sarco Tulocay) 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). LSCE prepared the 2014 Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report, presented to the Napa County Board of Supervisors on March 3, 2015.

Thresholds for water use have been established by the Napa County Department of Public Works, using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS), the GRAC recommendations, and the LSCE reports. These reports are the result of water resources investigations performed by the USGS in cooperation with the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District and LSCE. The County has concluded that the annual one acre-foot of water per parcel acre criteria on the Valley Floor has proven to be both scientifically and operationally adequate. Any project that reduces water usage or any water usage that is at or below the established threshold is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels.

The proposed addition of wine production to the property would reduce water demands of the site compared to the existing condition, due to the reduction in vineyard area from 7.25 to 4.86 acres to accommodate construction of winery facilities. Water for the existing and proposed uses on-site is generated from a groundwater well. Concurrently with the submittal of the use permit application, the applicant's engineer submitted an estimate of water use associated with the proposed winery. The report was prepared using default water use factors found in the Napa County Water Availability Analysis Guidelines (May 2015) and indicated that with the proposed removal of vines and introduction of wine production to the site, estimated water use at the site would be 4.14 acre-feet per year, would be less than estimates of current water use (4.38 acre-feet per year), and would be within the maximum 10.23 acre-feet per year (one acre-foot per acre on the property) that the County has established as a sustainable level of water use for properties located on the valley floor. It is further noted that the 4.14 acre-feet per year is considered to be a conservative estimate of water use, as it does not account for reductions in groundwater draws anticipated to result from 0.43 acre-

feet per year of recycled process wastewater that the property owner intends to use for vineyard irrigation, nor does it account for the applicant's actual grapevine irrigation factor of 0.446 acre-feet of water per acre of vineyard during non-drought years (the County's default irrigation factor is 0.5 acre-feet of water per acre of vineyard). Applying the applicant's anticipated use of recycled process wastewater and his actual non-drought grapevine irrigation factor would further reduce the project's estimated groundwater demand in normal years, compared to its estimated use of 4.14 acre-feet of water per year.

c/d. The property is generally flat, having a slope of less than five percent overall. The Napa River borders the property to the west; however, construction of the winery buildings and associated improvements is proposed to be approximately 800 feet east of the top of bank of the river and well outside of the required 45-foot minimum setback established under the water quality and riparian area Conservation Regulations identified in County Code Chapter 18.108.

The proposed project would add a new structure and paved surfaces for vehicular movement on the property, resulting in just under 64,000 square feet of new impervious surfaces on the site. The addition of impervious surfaces to the site would increase the volume of stormwater runoff as compared to the existing condition of the site (primarily vineyards). However, as described in the paragraphs above, the proposed project has been designed in accordance BASMAA standards that require no net increase in the quanitity of runoff generated between the pre-construction and post-construction conditions of a development.

g-i. The proposed winery buildings and related site improvements (excluding water storage tanks) would be constructed outside of the 100-year as well as the 500-year floodplains, where vineyard plantings are proposed to be maintained with the proposed winery. While vines and tanks might incur damage as a result of flooding of the Napa River, as might occur with extended duration rainstorms, the winery's occupied structures (such as offices, employee work and break rooms and hospitality areas within the storage and production buildings) would not be damaged. The existing residence to be maintained east of the proposed winery is also outside of 100- and 500-year floodplains.

The property is potentially subject to damage as a result of failure of the Rector Creek or Conn Creek dams located approximately seven and 10 miles (respectively) north of the site; however, damage is anticipated to be limited to vineyards and minor physical damage as a result of shallow flooding of buildings. Both Rector and Coon creek are tributaries to the Napa River, and Napa County GIS maps indicate that failure of either dam would result in flooding to those portions of the site closest to the riverbanks, at elevations of 65 feet or lower. With a finished floor of 64 feet in the hospitality and barrel storage areas, the occupied areas of the proposed winery would experience inundation of water approximately one foot deep; the existing residence to be maintained east of the proposed winery building would be above the elevation of potential dam failure flood areas. Water and process wastewater storage tanks near the western boundary of the parcel would be within the 100-year floodplain, as well as the floodplains of the two dams herein referenced, and could be inundated by up to 10 feet of water in the event of dam failure; however, these structures would be unoccupied and would be anchored to a concrete foundation to prevent flotation during inundation, such that there would be a less than significant risk to life in the event of a flood.

j. The property is located well inland of the Pacific Ocean coast and the shores of the San Pablo Bay where risk of inundation by seiche or tsunami tends to occur; thus, the site is subject to minimal risk of damage or injury related to seiches or tsunamis. The site is also predominantly flat, with slopes of zero to five percent (the western boundary of the site, along the banks of the Napa River, does have steeper slopes, but no structures or vineyards are proposed in that portion of the property); therefore, the proposed project is not likely to subject persons or structures to risk of damage as a result of landslide or mudflow.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X.	LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
	a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☒	☐
	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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan (HCP) or natural community conservation plan (NCCP)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

a. The proposed project site is currently developed with 7.25 acres of vineyard and a residential structure. Surrounding land uses are also predominantly agricultural and rural residential and would not be physically modified (as by demolition of an existing structure or division of land), such that the vineyard and winery uses would integrate with the property's surroundings rather than divide an existing, established community.

b. By continuing to foster use of the property for agricultural use, inclusive of agricultural product processing (winemaking from grapes), the proposed winery is consistent with the uses envisioned and as described in General Plan Goal AG/LU-1 and Policies AG/LU-1 and AG/LU-2. Napa County Code Section 18.16.030 also identifies wineries as conditionally permitted uses within the AP District where the site is located. Water demand generated by the proposed winery would be in line with General Plan goals supporting sustainable water use and prioritization of groundwater for agricultural purposes (Goal CON-10 and Con-11). More specifically, with construction of the winery and corresponding elimination of 2.39 acres of vineyard on the property, estimated water use at the site is anticipated to decrease, from 4.38 acre-feet per year to approximately 4.14 acre-feet per year (without taking deductions for vineyard irrigation using process water – see Hydrology and Water Quality section of this initial study). Both existing and projected water demands would serve an agricultural use on the property and would be below the one acre-foot per parcel-acre per year threshold identified in the County's Water Availability Analysis Guidelines as a sustainable water use level in non-deficient groundwater areas on the Valley Floor. It is further noted that the applicant's intent to install a roof-mounted photovoltaic array, as indicated in the Greenhouse Gas Best Management Practices Checklist attached to the use permit modification application, is consistent with adopted General Plan goals (CON-68, CON-70) that encourage the County and permittees to pursue use of renewable energy sources as a means to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

   As indicated in previous sections of this document, the proposed winery development on-site would be outside of designated waterway setbacks. The proposed winery would therefore be consistent with adopted policies and zoning regulations intended to preserve water quality and water resources, such as those contained in Napa County Code Chapter 18.108 and referenced in General Plan Policy CON-4, which prohibit new development within 35 feet of the riverbank (also see section IV above) and aim to preserve watersheds in support of the County's agricultural goals.

c. There is no HCP or NCCP that has been adopted or is being implemented in unincorporated Napa County.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

a/b. There are no impacts anticipated to occur with respect to mineral resources as a result of the proposed construction of a winery on the subject site. As described in Chapter 2 of the Napa County Baseline Data Report (BDR; 2005), mineral resources mostly occur in the southern and northern areas of the County, generally at higher elevations than the valley floor where the subject site is located. BDR Figure 2.2 identifies no mineral mining resources on or in the vicinity of the proposed winery site.

The proposed use permit would continue the agricultural use of the site, adding a complementary agricultural product processing operation (winery), and would not result in permanent, full conversion of the agricultural property to urban development and land uses. Thus, the proposed project would have no impact on known mineral resources.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
	b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
	c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

a/b/d. The proposed project would cause a temporary increase in noise levels as a result of construction of the winery building and site modifications. Construction of the buildings and site facilities would require excavation of soil for installation of paving and building foundations but would not require driving of piles or similar construction methods that would cause excessive ground vibration. Standard conditions of development in Napa County are intended to reduce to acceptable levels the potential impacts of construction-related noise on neighboring uses by requiring mufflers on construction equipment and prohibiting off-site project equipment staging between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m.:

> *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 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. 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.*

c. The use permit application includes a request to offer 23 marketing events per year: 10 events per year with up to 15 guests each, 10 events per year with up to 25 guests each, and three events per year with up to 50 guests each. Each event would occur for approximately four hours, with the earliest events starting at 11:00 a.m. and the latest events ending by 10:00 p.m. The applicant proposes to conduct events inside of the winery or on the patio located adjacent to the tasting room, on the western end of the proposed winery building.

The proposed project involves a marketing program that has the potential to generate higher noise levels, compared to existing conditions, as a result of the proposed occurrence of marketing events outdoors and wine production and bottling in the covered and partially enclosed area on the east side of the proposed winery building.

Additional regulations contained within County Code Chapter 8.16 establish exterior noise criteria for various land uses in the County. As described in Project Setting, above, land uses that surround the proposed Sam Jasper Winery parcel are predominantly agricultural (vineyard and winery) but include low density residential and limited commercial uses; of these land uses, the residential land use is considered the most sensitive to noise. Based on the standards in County Code section 8.16.070, noise levels, measured at the exterior of a residential structure or residential use on a portion of a larger property, may not exceed 50 decibels for more than half of any hour in the window of daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) within which the applicant proposes to conduct events. Noise impacts of the proposed project would be considered bothersome and potentially significant if sound generated by it had the effect of exceeding the standards in County Code more than 50 percent of the time (i.e., more than 50 decibels for more than 30 minutes in an hour for a residential use).

The nearest off-site residence to the proposed winery is approximately 290 feet northeast of the eastern edge of the proposed winery building. (The on-site residence is the applicant's, and so it is not considered in the evaluation of potential noise impacts of the proposed project. The nearest off-site residence is also the applicant's, but because it is on a different parcel and could change ownership upon transfer of the parcel to another entity, it is included in this evaluation as the nearest sensitive receptor to the winery parcel.) Under the proposed project, the largest outdoor event that would occur on the parcel would have an attendance of no more than 50 people, and all events would end by 10:00 p.m., with up to one hour after the end of the event for clean-up. Winery operations would occur between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. (excluding harvest).

Noise sampling performed under County authority, as part of the analysis for the Bell Winery use permit modification (P13-00055), measured sound from an 85-person event using a meter placed 123 feet from the sound source (event). Measurements taken from that sound meter indicated that sound from the event exceeded 56 decibels 50 percent of the time. This studied event was over 2/3 larger than the largest, 50-person event proposed by the applicant, and so the noise level measured from the Bell Winery event is adjusted downward by two decibels (to an estimated 54 decibels exceeded 50 percent of the time) to estimate the noise level from the largest marketing event of the proposed Sam Jasper Winery project. (Even with adjustment, these levels are considered to be conservative given that the Bell Winery event had a live music act included in its event, and the operator for Sam Jasper Winery proposes no outdoor amplified sound.) Thus, using the Bell Winery study as a model, and applying a six-decibel reduction per doubling of distance from the noise source, it is anticipated that exterior noise experienced at the nearest residence 290 feet to the northwest of the proposed winery patio (estimated 48 decibels for half of the event duration) would not exceed the County Code standard of 50 decibels during 50 percent of daytime hours. At approximately 550 feet northeast of the proposed patio, the nearest off-site residence not under the control of the applicant is located even further from the outdoor patio than the residence to the northwest, and so noise impacts on this residence from proposed winery marketing events are anticipated to be even further reduced.

As also indicated in the applicant's project statement, winery operations are proposed to occur between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. (excluding harvest). Winemaking also has the potential to generate noise from grape crushing and bottling activities. Observations noted in the Bell Winery study did not suggest that grape crushing generated significant noise above ambient levels (which were documented in that study to be as low as 40 decibels). However, that study and other noise studies for other winery projects noted that mobile bottling activities could be a noticeable noise source, with noise levels referenced among the various studies suggesting that bottling trucks could generate 65 decibels for more than 30 minutes in an hour (measured at 50 feet from the noise source). Measured from the partially enclosed production area on the eastern end of the proposed winery building, the closest off-site residence is located approximately 380 feet northeast of the structure. As sound levels decrease by six decibels per doubling of distance, noise generated from mobile bottling activities occurring with the proposed winery would be fewer than 35 decibels 50 percent of the time at that residence and would also be within acceptable noise levels.

e/f. The proposed winery site is not within two miles of any public or private airport or airstrip. Napa County Airport, the closest airport to the site, is over 10 miles south of the site, and the property at 4059 Silverado Trail is outside of the boundaries of the land use compatibility plan for that airport.

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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

a. Other than on-site access roads and water and wastewater facilities to serve exclusively the winery's operations, no new infrastructure is proposed that might induce growth by extending service outside of the property boundaries. Off-site, the applicant proposes to widen Silverado Trail in order to accommodate extension of a two-way left-turn lane in the center of the roadway; however, this improvement is intended to facilitate safe vehicular movement onto and off of the property, and it does not serve to extend the roadway nor increase its capacity along the entirety of the roadway's length.

The proposed project includes a modest number of winery employees (two full-time, two part-time, and two part-time seasonal). The Association of Bay Area Governments' *Projections 2003* figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase an estimated 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 additional four, year-round employee positions that are part of this project could lead to some population growth in Napa County. However, relative to the County's projected low to moderate growth rate and overall adequate programmed housing supply, that population growth does not rise to a level of environmental significance. In addition, the project would be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to assist the County in meeting local housing needs.

b/c. The AP District zoning of the parcel allows one single-family residence per legal lot. The 10.23-acre parcel currently has one residence that is proposed to be maintained with the operation of the winery, consistent with the property's zoning. No additional residences or residential structures are proposed to be added to the site. Thus, no residents would be displaced and no residences would be lost as a result of the proposed use permit.

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 listed below:				
i)	Fire protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii)	Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iii) Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv) Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
v) Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:

a. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact on public services. The property and its existing residence are located within the service areas of both the Napa County Sheriff's Department (Beat 4) as well as the Napa County Fire Department. Throughout the construction process, the proposed winery building and improvements, if approved, would be inspected by County building inspectors and fire officials in order to ensure the structures and vehicle access ways are built in accordance with current Building and Fire Codes. Proposed improvements include installation of a 50,000-gallon water storage tank to ensure adequate flows during response to a fire emergency.

If approved, the requested use permit would allow the construction, establishment and operation of a grape-processing facility (winery) on-site of an existing vineyard. The proposal would reduce existing on-site vineyard acreage by 2.39 acres, from 7.25 to 4.86 acres. School impact mitigation fees, which assist local school districts with capacity building measures, would be levied at building permit submittal. The proposed project would have little to no impact on public parks. The addition of a winery to the site does not include any new residential units nor accompanying introduction of new residents that would utilize existing parks. County revenue resulting from any building permit fees, property tax increases, and taxes from the sale of wine help meet the costs of providing public services to the property. No new parks or other public recreational amenities or institutions are proposed to be built with the requested use permit. Also see discussion under Section XV, below.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

a/b. The proposed project would establish an agricultural product processing facility (winery) on an existing, 10.23-acre property that is currently developed with a vineyard and single-family residence. With the proposed winery, approximately two-thirds of the existing vineyard area would be retained, and the single-family residence would be retained for residential use. The proposed project includes no residential units nor accompanying introduction of new residents who would utilize existing parks in the area and potentially accelerate those recreational facilities' deterioration. The proposal would increase the number of people the property, consisting of winery employees (up to six during harvest season, up to four at other times of year) and guests (up to 25 per day, with a maximum of 160 per week), some of whom might visit recreational facilities in the area outside of work or before

or after visits. However, given that the purpose of those individuals' trips are related to the winery as the primary destination, such visits to area recreational facilities are anticipated to be infrequent and would not drastically accelerate the deterioration of the park amenities. No new parks or other public recreational amenities are proposed to be built with the proposed winery.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:

The proposed winery would have its sole access to the County road network via a driveway at Silverado Trail north of Soda Canyon Road. Silverado Trail is a two-lane, County-managed, north-south roadway that extends the length of the east side of the Napa Valley. The roadway has eight-foot wide, striped bicycle lanes on either side. In addition to on-site improvements that include a new driveway and parking areas, off-site improvements proposed with the construction of the winery include widening at the property frontage and construction of a two-way left-turn lane in the Silverado Trail right-of-way, in order to provide sheltered left-turn vehicle movements into and out of the subject property.

a/b. Level of service standards for roads in the unincorporated areas have been established by the County in its General Plan (2008). As described on page CIR-15 of the General Plan, "Level of service (LOS) is a measure of how well an intersection or roadway is able to carry traffic. LOS is usually designated with a letter grade A-F, where 'A' is best and 'F' is worst." General Plan policy CIR-16 establishes the County's desired LOS on all County roadways as LOS D, which represents "[t]he level where traffic nears an unstable flow. Intersections still function, but short queues develop and cars may have to wait through one cycle during short peaks" (CIR-15).

The applicant submitted a traffic impact study, prepared by W-Trans Traffic Engineering, with the winery use permit application submittal. W-Trans collected vehicle counts for the traffic analysis between April 8 and April 12, 2015. In addition to the criterion of analysis utilized in the traffic study, staff referenced the peak hour roadway capacities listed in table 5 of the Napa County General Plan Update Technical Memorandum, in order to determine applicable level of service of the studied segments.

The analysis in the traffic study indicated that, under existing conditions without the project, Silverado Trail in the vicinity of the proposed project site operates acceptably (LOS D) during the weekend midday peak period. Northbound traffic also experiences acceptable LOS C in the weekday evening peak period. However, southbound traffic on the roadway experiences unacceptable LOS E during the weekday evening peak hour (4:30 – 5:30 p.m.)

In the near term scenario of existing conditions with the project, the southbound lane of Silverado Trail would continue to operate unacceptably at LOS E during the weekday evening peak hour. Northbound traffic on Silverado Trail during the weekday evening peak period, as well as weekend traffic (northbound and southbound) on the roadway would experience acceptable LOS C or D. Roadway levels of service would be the same in the near-term scenario (reasonably foreseeable projects plus proposed project).

In the cumulative scenario (2030) of General Plan buildout with the project, the southbound lane of Silverado Trail would again continue operate unacceptably at LOS E during the weekday evening peak hour, and the northbound lane of Silverado Trail would deteriorate to an unacceptable LOS E during the weekend midday peak.

Under current County policy, if a road segment is already impacted (LOS E or F) during the peak hour of traffic, a proposed project would be considered to have a significant impact requiring mitigation if the project would, in the peak hour, result in an increase of one or more percent to the existing volumes of an unsignalized intersection or road segment. For intersections or road segments that operate at acceptable levels (LOS A, B, C or D) during peak hours under existing conditions, a proposed project proponent would be required to mitigate his project's impacts if the project would have the effect of deteriorating the LOS of the intersection or road segment to an unacceptable level (LOS E or F) or would trigger peak hour warrants for installation of a traffic signal. Under cumulative conditions (i.e., General Plan buildout), a project would require traffic mitigation if it would contribute five or more percent of the traffic volumes projected to occur in the long-term horizon.

As previously noted, the proposed project includes establishment of a winery with employees, visitors, and up to 23 marketing events per year. The proposed project also includes construction of a two-way left-hand turn lane on Silverado Trail at the property frontage.

The requested use permit is not anticipated to have a significant impact to the transportation network in the vicinity of the site. The analysis submitted by the applicant's engineer suggests that the proposed project would have the effect of adding nine, peak hour, southbound trips to the 987 vehicles traveling southbound on Silverado Trail during the weekday evening peak, where drivers currently experience LOS E. Since the tasting room is proposed to operate and be staffed between 10:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., these nine new winery trips would presumably be associated primarily with early shift employees leaving work and visitors arriving for and departing from tasting appointments during the 4:30 to 5:30 p.m. weekday peak hour. This increase in project-related trips correlates to an increase of 0.9 percent during the weekday evening peak period of traffic. In the cumulative (General Plan buildout) scenario, level of service in the northbound lane of Silverado Trail would deteriorate to LOS E during the weekend midday peak period; however, as background traffic would continue to increase to an estimated 1,180 vehicles on this segment of roadway, the project's contribution of nine new vehicle trips would be less than one percent of project traffic volumes. (Note, again, that under the cumulative scenario, a project's impact is considered significant if it would contribute five or more percent to projected traffic volumes.) No mitigation necessary for level of service impacts is therefore required for the proposed project.

c. The proposed project includes no tall structures, uplighting, or air travel component that would affect air traffic.

d/e. In 1971, Napa County adopted its initial iteration of the Napa County Road and Street Standards (RSS). The intent of the RSS was to establish a uniform set of standards for public and private roads that strive to preserve the natural landscape and water quality, minimize impacts to environmentally sensitive areas and native habitats, and provide adequate safety and service in the interest of protecting public health and welfare. As further described in the RSS Objectives, the RSS "attempt to meet the related interests of several other agencies, including the Resource Conservation District, Cal Fire, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department, and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife" (5). The RSS has since been amended to reflect changes in the best practices and regulations of the respective agencies, with the most recent amendment occurring in November 2016.

As referenced in prior sections of this initial study, the proposed project site has its direct access to and from Silverado Trail. The proposed project includes both off-site and on-site changes to the existing vehicular circulation pattern, consisting of a new, two-way left-hand turn lane on Silverado Trail; a 20-foot wide, paved, private driveway with two hammerheads to accommodate large vehicle turnaround movements, extending from Silverado Trail westward to the existing residence and proposed winery building; and 16 parking spaces.

The winery would be accessed by garbage collections trucks, emergency response trucks, and delivery and box trucks, as well as passenger vehicles driven by employees and visitors to the winery. The proposed on-site improvements, including driveways and parking stalls, were designed in accordance with the RSS. In accordance with standard conditions of approval, "All road improvements on private property required per Engineering Services shall be maintained in good working condition and in accordance with the Napa County Roads and Streets Standards."

The traffic study prepared for the proposed project also evaluated safety of the proposed winery access from Silverado Trail. Given posted and observed speeds along the relatively flat roadways, the study concluded that stopping sight distance at the proposed project driveway would be adequate to meet minimum Caltrans criteria for vehicles entering and exiting the property.

f. The proposed project includes 16 new parking stalls on-site, inclusive of one handicapped accessible stall. The proposed parking would serve the existing residence (two stalls typically required by zoning standards), and would be sufficient to provide off-street parking for the four staff members proposed to be employed at the winery. The remaining 10 stalls would provide parking for daily visitors to the winery, as well as for the two smaller marketing events (20 per year), without oversizing the parking areas to provide extraneous parking for the largest, less frequent, 50-person events (three per year).

g. There is currently no bus service on Silverado Trail; the proposed project would therefore not impair use of public transit facilities in its vicinity. The Napa Countywide Bicycle Plan, adopted by the Board of Supervisors in June 2012, identifies Silverado Trail as an existing Class II bicycle facility (on-street bike lane); currently the road includes eight-foot wide, striped and paved lanes on both sides of the roadway. Proposed off-street improvements to widen the roadway for installation of the two-way left-turn lane at the property frontage would retain the Class II facility. The proposed project would therefore maintain existing bicycle facilities in its vicinity.

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	☐	☐	☒	☐
	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.	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:

a/b. As discussed in section V of this initial study, there are no existing structures on the parcel that are listed in a local, state or federal register of historic resources. The residential structure that is on the property that appears to be over 50 years old, and although there is no indication that the residence has historic significance, it is noted that the building would be retained with construction of the proposed winery improvements. The County has no record of known cultural resources on the site, and the property has a history of disturbance related to prior agricultural activities and residential and agricultural accessory structures. Consultation with representatives of local Native American tribes who have a cultural interest in the area in accordance with Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1 did not conclude in the identification of any previously unknown resources on the site or in the immediate area of the proposed project site. As discussed in Section V of this initial study, if any resources not previously uncovered during this prior disturbance are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the proposed project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist must be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the standard county conditions of approval.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII.	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:

a/d/e. The proposed winery operations are estimated to demand 4.14 acre-feet of water per year and thus, are not anticipated to require extraction of groundwater at a quantity over one acre-foot per year per acre of the site, a quantity that the County has determined to be a sustainable level of groundwater extraction in the low-lying valley areas. The property owner uses and would continue to use an existing on-site well for water for the residence and proposed winery. Similarly, all of the wastewater generated by the winery (process wastewater and sanitary wastewater) would be treated on-site using treatment systems, with the treated effluent ultimately returned to the vineyard soil. With water and wastewater treatment facilities provided on-site, the proposed project requires no determination of service or will-serve letters from water or wastewater treatment service providers.

b/c. As noted in the discussion of Hydrology and Water Quality (Section IX) above, the winery is proposed to include self-treating and self-retaining areas, as well as bioretention areas and an existing detention basin that in combination would serve as both stormwater quality and runoff management measures. Work areas of the proposed winery would be covered with a roof and plumbed to discharge runoff into the on-site wastewater treatment system, also with the intent to preserve stormwater quality. Proposed wastewater treatment system improvements include installation of seven treatment and holding tanks (five of which would be underground, and two of which would be aboveground near the western edge of the vineyard rows) ranging in size from 750 to 10,000 gallons, as well as a system of subsurface drip lines to allow discharge of treated wastewater into the soil below the vineyard rows east of the existing residence. Grading for construction of the four bioretention basins, storm drain pipelines and wastewater treatment system improvements would occur on roughly a half-acre combined area on-site and would occur concurrently with site grading associated with the winery construction, which would be subject to the dust suppression measures listed in section III, Air Quality, of this initial study.

f/g. Non-recyclable and non-organic waste generated on the property is collected by Napa Recycling and Waste Services (NRWS) and ultimately deposited at the Keller Canyon Landfill (located in unincorporated eastern Contra Costa County), which, having reached roughly 15 percent of its capacity in the first 12 years of its approximated 50 years of operation (which began in 1992), and extrapolating that same rate of material to date, has adequate capacity remaining to accommodate any non-recyclable and non-organic waste generated from the proposed winery. Beginning in 2016, all establishments that would generate organic waste (such as food waste from wine/food pairings or food service at the proposed winery's marketing events) are required to

participate in NRWS's food composting program, as a means to support efforts to achieve State mandates for reductions of greenhouse gas emissions generated from decomposition of material deposited into landfills.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a. The proposed project consists of construction of a new winery building, with utility and surface improvements such as wastewater treatment equipment and vehicle access roads, and operation of a winery with visitation and marketing programs. An existing residence on-site would be retained for use as a residence by the property owner. The proposed project site has been previously developed and disturbed as a result of construction and/or demolition of the residence, accessory residential and agricultural structures, and vineyards or orchard

   Proposed site improvements would include a covered trash enclosure and stormwater bioretention areas that would serve to treat runoff from proposed new impervious surfaces, including the parking lot and buildings, and proposed site modifications would occur outside of sensitive riparian areas and minimum creek setbacks of the zoning code. Additionally, as noted above, the property has been in agricultural use for several decades, and with the exception of the river setback area on the west side of the property, native vegetation – and the native species habitat that would have been fostered by that vegetation – has long been removed from the property to introduce wine grape vines and previously, orchards. The property is predominantly flat and lacking any unique geological features such as rock outcroppings, mounds or other landforms. There are no known archaeological or paleontological resources on the property, and the property has a lengthy history of ground disturbance. However, if any resources not previously uncovered during this prior disturbance are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the proposed project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist must be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard County conditions of development.

b. As described in the sections above, noise and air quality impacts associated with installation of proposed winery building and site improvements would be temporary in nature, and so would be less than significant. Operational noise and air quality impacts are also anticipated to be less than significant due to the small size of the structures and distance to the closest sensitive receptors (off-site single-family residences). Groundwater extraction associated with the proposed project would decrease compared to existing conditions due to removal of vines to accommodate the new winery building. Vehicle trips associated with the proposed winery would increase compared to the existing condition and would contribute to existing and projected, unacceptable weekday evening and weekend midday peak hour levels of service along the studied segment of Silverado Trail. However, the proposed project's near-term and cumulative contribution to those unacceptable levels of service would be less than one percent and would fall below County thresholds of significance. The applicant proposes to construct a left-turn lane at the property frontage, in order to provide safer left-turn movements into and out of the winery compared to existing conditions. With widening of the roadway and construction of the left-turn lane, the existing Class II bicycle facility on Silverado Trail would be kept to maintain non-automobile access along the roadway.

c. There are no schools or hospitals housing sensitive receptors within a quarter-mile of the winery site. Noise from construction that would occur with construction and installation of the proposed site improvements would be temporary, lasting approximately nine to 10 months, would be limited to day time hours, and would be subject to best management practices intended to limit fugitive dust and protect stormwater quality. Ongoing operations of the winery are also anticipated to have less than significant noise impacts on nearby residences due to distance between those residences and the proposed tasting room patio and partially enclosed work area.

Mitigation Measures: None required.
