

“D”

Initial Study/Negative Declaration

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

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated October 2016)

1. **Project Title:** Robert Biale Vineyards Permit Modification #P16-00396
2. **Property Owner:** Vigneron Partners, 4038 Big Ranch Road, Napa, CA 94558
3. **Applicant:** Chris Dearden, 4038 Bid Ranch Road, Napa, 94558; (707) 257-7555; chris@biale.com
4. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Jeff Redding, 2423 Renfrew St. Napa, CA 94558; (707) 255-7375; jreddingaicp@comcast.net
5. **Project Location and APN:** A 10.84 acre parcel on northeast side of Big Ranch Road, at its intersection with Salvador Ave. Napa, 94558; 4038 Big Ranch Road, Napa; APN:036-190-007.
6. **General Plan description:** Agricultural Resource (AR)
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Preserve (AP)
8. **Background/Project History:**

On May 2, 2001, the Planning Commission approved Use Permit #00271-UP and Variance #00272-VAR to establish a 40,000 gallon winery. The variance approval allowed the proposed 15,412 sq. ft. winery building with a 10,749 sq. ft., covered work area, be located within the required 300 foot setback from a private road aligned along the property's southerly property line. Retail sales, tours and tasting are allowed by appointment only, and the conditions approved a marketing plan for two private promotional tastings/meals/year for a maximum of 100 persons; and 10 parking spaces were required. The hours of winery operation would occur 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM and operations include four (4) full-time employees, three (3) part-time employees, four (4) visitors per day expected, and a maximum of two deliveries on the busiest day. The existing residence was constructed circa 1930's, prior to the time when building permits were required.

The original use permit was not "used" prior to the expiration date and the applicant filed a new use permit, #03088-UP which was approved by the Planning Commission on May 21, 2003. This application also included a request to construct a 5,849 sq. ft. covered work area and a 10,000 gallon water tank. Furthermore, this permit allowed tours and tasting by appointment only with an expected total maximum of four (4) visitors per day (not including marketing), an average of 10 per week with four (4) full-time and three (3) part-time employees.

Use Permit Modification #03447-MOD was administrative approved on December 18, 2003 for a reduction of enclosed floor area to 10,120 sq. ft. and an increase in outdoor work areas to 9,586 sq. ft. Total winery building, including crush pad resulted in a 18,420 sq. ft. wine production facility.

Modification #P04-0260 was administratively approved for permission to allow custom crush for 15,000 gallons of the winery's 40,000 gallon production capacity, no more than four custom producers. No change in production capacity, plot plans, floor plans, or building elevations; and, no additional employees or increase in marketing activities were approved.

Current levels of activity are outline in the project request, in addition to the proposed modifications. Use Permit #03088-UP allowed tours and tastings by appointment only but did not establish a maximum total. The marketing events were limited to two per year. The application indicated an "anticipated" four (4) visitors per day; 10 per week. The initial study prepared for that project states that the project would generate 16 average daily trips. The application submitted indicates that current visitation levels are 21 visitors per day on the weekdays with 45 visitors per day on weekends. The trip generation characteristics submitted indicate that the winery currently generates a total average of 18 PM peak weekday trips and 23 PM peak trips on Saturday.
9. **Description of Project.**

Use permit modification of an existing winery located on the east side of Big Ranch Road at its intersection with Salvador Ave., to allow the following:

 - 1) an increase in the winery production capacity from 40,000 to 60,000 gallons;
 - 2) an increase days of operation from five (5) to seven (7) days per week;
 - 3) an increase employment from the approved seven to a total 18 employees;

- 4) an increase in the expected by-appointment visitation from 4 to a maximum 21 weekdays and 45 visitors weekends;
- 5) the repurpose of three existing structures (2,151 sq. ft. residence; 1,897 sq. ft. barn; 728 sq. ft. storage building) into winery use;
- 6) the addition of a food service kitchen for employees and caterers;
- 7) a modification of the marketing program to add events: 2/month (max. 25 persons); 2/year (max. 15 persons); 4/year (max. 50 persons); 2/year (max. 250 persons) for a total of 34 marketing events per year. No tours/tastings will be scheduled during larger marketing events (100 or more) and no marketing events to be scheduled to avoid arrival or departure during PM peak hours;
- 8) the use of portable toilets for events for over 100 persons;
- 9) on-premises consumption of wine in the tasting room and in the existing seating area outside the tasting room accordance with Business and Professions Code Sections 23358, 23390 and 2.3396.5 (AB 2004-Evans Bill)
- 10) a revision of on-site circulation and the construction of a new driveway access to Big Ranch Rd., with additional 18 parking spaces, for a total 30 improved parking spaces;
- 11) the construction of a paved outdoor patio on east side of existing winery; and,
- 12) installation of improvements to water supply, wastewater, and fire suppression facilities.

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

The property is fairly level (slopes typically 0-2% at elevation 55 ft. MSL, approximately ¾ miles east of the City of Napa limits, and approximately ½ mile west of the Napa River. Foundation materials consist of Quaternary, early or mid-Pleistocene alluvial fan or terrace deposits (Qoa), with latest Holocene alluvial deposits on the easterly portion of the parcel, overlain by Class III soil of the Coombs gravelly loam series. Runoff is slow and the hazard for erosion is slight. The risk of liquefaction is very low (VL) over the majority of the property, the northeastern most corner of the property has a very high risk of liquefaction; however the project site is not located within this area. The most easterly portion of the project site lies within the designated 100 and 500 year flood zone hazard areas of the Napa River; however, the existing winery is located outside as well as the river setback requirements. Vegetative cover is primarily vineyards (the western vineyard is currently fallow), with some domestic landscaping adjacent to the existing residence and winery. The existing land improvements include the winery building, residence, barn, storage building, waste disposal system and well. Adjacent land uses include agriculture and single family residences. The closest residence to the winery is ±350 feet to the south.

11. **Other agencies whose approval is required:** California Department of Alcohol Beverage Control and TTB.

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

Federal Trade and Taxation Bureau
Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control

12. **Tribal Cultural Resources.** Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2. If so, has consultation begun? Notifications of Proposed Project Pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 (Gatto) were forwarded to the tribes on January 31, 2017. There was no request for consultation made.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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



Signature

3/24/2017

Date

Name: _____
Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department

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

Discussion:

- a-c. The project site is not located within view of a scenic vista or designated Viewshed road. There are no new structures proposed as part of this project that could have the potential to significantly affect the aesthetics of the site.
- d. The proposed project would not introduce any additional source of lights that could significantly impact daytime or nighttime views of the area. The increase in visitors and events will not create substantial glare either during the day or nighttime. Existing marketing events already occur. The additional marketing event requested will not introduce additional light sources above what currently exists. Pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approval for wineries, outdoor lighting will be required to be shielded and directed downwards, with only low level lighting allowed in parking areas. As designed, and as subject to the standard condition of approval, below, the project will not have a significant impact resulting from new sources of outside lighting.

4.16 GENERAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE – LIGHTING, LANDSCAPING, PAINTING, OUTDOOR EQUIPMENT STORAGE, AND TRASH ENCLOSURE AREAS

- a. All lighting shall be permanently maintained in accordance with the lighting and building plans approved by the County. Lighting utilized during harvest activities is exempt from this requirement.

6.3 LIGHTING – PLAN SUBMITTAL

- a. *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 CBC.*

- b. *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; on timers; and shall incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. All lighting shall be shielded or placed such that it does not shine directly on adjacent properties or impact vehicles on adjacent streets. 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 exempt from this requirement.*

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

¹ "Forest land" is defined by the State as "land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits." (Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) The Napa County General Plan anticipates and does not preclude conversion of some "forest land" to agricultural use, and the program-level EIR for the 2008 General Plan Update analyzed the impacts of up to 12,500 acres of vineyard development between 2005 and 2030, with the assumption that some of this development would occur on "forest land." In that analysis specifically, and in the County's view generally, the conversion of forest land to agricultural use would constitute a potentially significant impact only if there were resulting significant impacts to sensitive species, biodiversity, wildlife movement, sensitive biotic communities listed by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, water quality, or other environmental resources addressed in this checklist.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-c. On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Board of Directors unanimously adopted thresholds of significance to assist in the review of projects under the California Environmental Quality Act. These Thresholds are designed to establish the level at which the District believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA and were posted on the Air District's website and included in the Air District's updated CEQA Guidelines (updated May 2012).

On March 5, 2012 the Alameda County Superior Court issued a judgment finding that the Air District had failed to comply with CEQA when it adopted the Thresholds. The court did not determine whether the Thresholds were valid on the merits, but found that the adoption of the Thresholds was a project under CEQA. The court issued a writ of mandate ordering the District to set aside the Thresholds and cease dissemination of them until the Air District had complied with CEQA. The Air District has appealed the Alameda County Superior Court's decision. The Court of Appeal of the State of California, First Appellate District, reversed the trial court's decision. The Court of Appeal's decision was appealed to the California Supreme Court, which granted limited review, and the matter is currently pending there.

In view of the trial court's order which remains in place pending final resolution of the case, the Air District is no longer recommending that the Thresholds be used as a generally applicable measure of a project's significant air quality impacts. Lead agencies will need to determine appropriate air quality thresholds of significance based on substantial evidence in the record. Although lead agencies may rely on the Air District's updated CEQA Guidelines (updated May 2012) for assistance in calculating air pollution emissions, obtaining information regarding the health impacts of air pollutants, and identifying potential mitigation measures, the Air District has been ordered to set aside the Thresholds and is no longer recommending that these Thresholds be used as a general measure of project's significant air quality impacts. Lead agencies may continue to rely on the Air District's 1999 Thresholds of Significance and they may continue to make determinations regarding the significance of an individual project's air quality impacts based on the substantial evidence in the record for that project.

The proposed project includes: an increase of 11 employees (eight (8) full-time and three (3) part-time); an increase of 56 visitors on the busiest-day tours; an increase of 20,000 gallons for a total 60,000 gallons of production; meaning that this project would account for 54 maximum daily trips on a typical weekday and 55 trips on harvest-season day with no marketing events. The subject application also proposes marketing events, with up to 250 people at the largest event; at 2.8 persons per car that would add up to 179 additional trips on the day of a large marketing event.

Over the long term, emission sources for the proposed project will consist primarily of mobile sources including vehicles visiting the site. The Air District's threshold of significance provided in Table 3-1 has determined that similar projects such as a quality restaurant that do not exceed a threshold of 47 ksf will not significantly impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2011 Pages 3-2 & 3-3). Given the total size of the project is 23,804 sq. ft. (Hospitality area- 5,487 sq. ft., Wine Production area - 18,515 sq. ft.), compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47ksf NOX (high quality restaurant) and 541ksf (general light industry), the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of any applicable air quality plan. (Please note: a high quality restaurant is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, but grossly overstates emissions associated with other portions of a winery, such as office, barrel storage and production, which generate fewer vehicle trips. Therefore, a general light industry comparison has also been used for other such uses.

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

- d. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from limited earthmoving activities for the access driveway. Earthmoving and construction emissions would have a temporary effect; consisting mainly of dust generated during grading and other construction activities, exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles. The activities would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, since the closest receptor is ± 350 feet from any construction activities. To address the emissions, the Air District recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction impacts. If the proposed project adhere to these relevant best management practices identified by the Air District and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts are considered less than significant:

7.0 Project Construction

"c. AIR QUALITY

During all construction activities the permittee shall comply with the most current version of BAAQMD Basic Construction Best Management Practices including but not limited to the following, as applicable:

1. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. The BAAQMD's phone number shall also be visible.
2. Water all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) two times per day.
3. Cover all haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site.
4. Remove all visible mud or dirt traced onto adjacent public roads by using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
5. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
6. 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.
7. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting off equipment when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five (5) minutes (as required by State Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
8. 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. Any portable engines greater than 50 horsepower or associated equipment operated within the BAAQMD's jurisdiction shall have either a California Air Resources Board (ARB) registration Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) or a BAAQMD permit. For general information regarding the certified visible emissions evaluator or the registration program, visit the ARB FAQ: http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/perp/perpfact_04-16-15.pdf or the PERP website: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/portable.htm>."

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:

"7.0 Project Construction

b. DUST CONTROL

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

- e. While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. Construction-phase pollutants will be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. The project will not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. The closest receptor is over 1,000 feet from the project site.

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 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers - plants CNPS points & polygons, plant surveys, red legged frog core area and critical habitat, vernal pools & vernal pool species, Spotted Owl Habitat – 1.5 mile buffer and known fish presence) no known candidate, sensitive, or special status species have been identified as occurring within the project boundaries. The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any special status species, or species of particular concern. As discussed in the section I above, the proposal and associated construction are minimal with no significant grading or tree removal required. Furthermore, there were no species or site conditions which would be considered essential for the support of a species with limited distribution or be considered to be a sensitive natural plant community. The potential for this project to have a significant impact on special status species is not very probable.

c/d. There are no wetlands on the property or on neighboring properties that would be affected by this project. Therefore, project activities will not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with their corridors or nursery sites, because no sensitive natural communities have been identified on the property. Therefore, the project as proposed would have no impact to biological resources.

f. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans or other similar plans in effect for this area that would be affected by this project.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a-c. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology surveys, sites, sensitive areas, and flags) no historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified on the property. Based on the proposed project plans, there would be no impact to cultural resources. However, if resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval:

"7.2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL FINDING

"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 project development, all work in the vicinity must be 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 permittee shall comply with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 5097.98."

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a.
 - i) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.
 - ii) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
 - iii) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Compliance with the latest editions of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.
 - iv) According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) there are no landslide deposits in the proposed development area.

- b. The proposed development is minimal and will occur on slopes ranging from 1% to 5%, with an average slope of 2%. Based upon the Soil Survey of Napa County, prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the soils on site are comprised of the Class III soil of the Coombs gravelly loam series. Runoff is slow and the hazard of erosion is slight. The project will require incorporation of best management practices and will be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable.

- c/d. According to preliminary geologic mapping of the Napa Quadrangle performed by the California Geologic Survey (CGS-2004), the property is underlain by Quaternary older alluvia fan deposits. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer), the project site has a very low for risk for liquefaction, except the easternmost part of the property where there are no structures. Development will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible.

- e. An expansion of the existing septic system is proposed as part of the project. The system will be designed by a licensed engineer and will be reviewed and approved by the Department of Environmental Management. There does not appear to be any limitation on this parcel's ability to support an on-site septic system which will be able to support the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

In July 2015, the County re-commenced preparation of the CAP to: i) account for present day conditions and modeling assumptions (such as but not limited to methods, emission factors, and data sources), ii) address the concerns with the previous CAP effort as outlined above, iii) meet applicable State requirements, and iv) result in a functional and legally defensible CAP. On April 13, 2016 the County, as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP, released Final Technical Memorandum #1: 2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016.³ This initial phase included: i) updating the unincorporated County's community-wide GHG emissions inventory to 2014, and ii) preparing new GHG emissions forecasts for the 2020, 2030, and 2050 horizons. Additional information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or <http://www.countyofnapa.org/CAP/>.

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

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

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

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

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

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

In addition to the one time Construction Emissions, "Operational Emissions" of the winery are also considered and include: i) any reduction in the amount of carbon sequestered by existing vegetation that is removed as part of the project compared to a "no project" scenario (hereinafter referred to as Operational Sequestration Emissions); and ii) ongoing emissions from the energy used to maintain and operate the winery, including vehicle trips associated with employee and visitor trips (hereinafter referred to as Operational Emissions). Operational Emissions from the proposed winery would be the primary source of emissions over the long-term when compared to one time construction emissions. The proposed project has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds Table 3-1 (Operational GHG Screening Level Sizes). A high quality restaurant is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, but grossly overstates emissions associated with other portions of a winery, such as office, barrel storage and production, which generate fewer vehicle trips. Therefore, a general light industry comparison has also been used for other such uses. Given the total size of the project, 4,776 square feet repurpose of existing structures to a 2,750 sq. ft. hospitality space and a 1,897 sq. ft. storage space, compared to the BAAQMD's GHG screening criteria of 121,000 square feet for general industrial and 9,000 square feet for high quality restaurant, the project was determined not to exceed the 1,100 MT of CO₂e/year GHG threshold of significance established by the District, and further analysis (and quantification) of GHG emissions is not warranted.

Furthermore, the applicant has indicated that the project will incorporate the following voluntary best management practices: offer employees incentives to carpool, bike or use transit, telecommute or have alternative work schedules, energy conserving lighting; cool roof installation when replacement to be made; install water efficient fixtures when replacement is necessary; continue low impact development, water efficient landscape; and limit the amount of grading and tree removal with the specific intent to save all existing trees; materials with high recycled content to be utilized for new driveway construction and building remodels; continue education to staff and visitors on sustainable practices; continue using 70-80% cover crops; and, retain biomass removed via pruning and thinning by chipping and reuse rather than burning on-site. The applicant has proposed to repurpose an existing residence, for hospitality services. By repurposing this structure, harvesting and transporting of construction materials is eliminated and will allow the retention of this structure, one of the original structures on the property. Also, there will be no need to construct additional structures on the property by

repurposing the existing barn and storage building. The reuse of the buildings provides the applicant with an economic incentive to preserve and upgrade the existing structures. Additional items are included in the Voluntary Best Management Practices Checklist for Development Projects within the Use Permit Application.

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts normally used in winery operations. A Business Plan will be filed with the Environmental Health Division should the amount of hazardous materials reach reportable levels. However, in the event that the proposed use or a future use involves the use, storage or transportation of greater than 55 gallons or 500 pounds of hazardous materials, a use permit and subsequent environmental assessment would be required in accordance with the Napa County Zoning Ordinance prior to the establishment of the use. During construction activities of the project some hazardous materials, such as building coatings/ adhesives/ etc., will be utilized. However, given the quantities of hazardous materials and the limited duration, they will result in a less-than-significant impact.
- b. As noted above, the project will not involve the transportation of hazardous materials in quantities that would not result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site.
- d. The proposed site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.
- e. The project site is not located within two miles of any public airport or private airstrip.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.
- g. The proposed project will not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. The project will include improvements to the sight distances on the road which will improve road safety, improving emergency access and evacuation routes.
- h. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Fire Hazard Severity) the project is located within the Non-wildland/Non-urban area designation, and the project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. The project has been reviewed by the Napa County Fire Marshall who recommended approval of the project subject to applicable conditions related to fire sprinklers; water storage with sufficient fire flow, fire pumps, fire service mains, fire hydrants, adequate access and access road, and defensible space (10' along roads and 100' around structures). Application of the conditions of approval presented by the fire will serve to reduce potential significant adverse fire impacts to an insignificant level.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
	a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not violate any known water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. No new on-site domestic and process wastewater systems are being proposed to accommodate the increase in production and visitation. Four (4) events per year will include 100 or more persons, where at that time, portable toilets will be used. The Napa County Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the proposed domestic and process wastewater systems and recommends approval as conditioned. If the system is found to be inadequate the system would be expanded into the existing reserve area and thus no significant adverse impact would result. Additionally, any earth disturbing activities would be subject to the County's Stormwater Ordinance which would include measures to prevent erosion, sediment, and waste materials from entering waterways both during and after any construction activities. Given the County's Best Management Practices, which comply with RWQCB requirements, the project does not have the potential to significantly impact water quality and discharge standards.
- b. In 2009 Napa County began a comprehensive study of its groundwater resources to meet identified action items in the County's 2008 General Plan update. The study, by Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE), emphasized developing a sound understanding of groundwater conditions and implementing an expanded groundwater monitoring and data management program as a foundation for integrated water resources planning and dissemination of water resources information. The 2011 baseline study by LSCE, which included over 600 wells and data going back over 50 years, concluded that "the groundwater levels in Napa County are stable, except for portions of the MST district".

To better understand groundwater resources, on June 28, 2011 the Board of Supervisors approved creation of a Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee (GRAC). The GRAC's purpose was to assist County staff and technical consultants with recommendations regarding groundwater, including data collection, monitoring, well pump test protocols, management objectives, and community support. The County retained Luhdorff and Scalmanini who completed a county-wide assessment of groundwater resources (Napa County Groundwater Conditions and Groundwater Monitoring Recommendations Report (Feb. 2011) and developed a groundwater monitoring program (Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2013 (Jan. 2013) and also completed a 2013 Updated Hydrogeologic Conceptualization and Characterization of Groundwater Conditions (Jan. 2013). The 2011 baseline study by LSCE, which included over 600 wells and data going back over 50 years, concluded that "the groundwater levels in Napa County are stable, except for portions of the MST district". Most wells elsewhere within the Napa Valley floor with a sufficient record indicate that groundwater levels are more affected by climatic conditions, are within historical levels, and seem to recover from dry periods during subsequent wet or normal periods. The LSCE Study also concluded that, on a regional scale, there appear to be no current groundwater quality issues except north of Calistoga (mostly naturally occurring boron and trace metals) and in the Carneros region (mostly salinity).

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

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

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

Minimum thresholds for water use have been established by the Department of Public Works using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS). These reports are the result of water resources investigations performed by the USGS in cooperation with the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, and LSCE. LSCE concluded that the 1.0 acre feet/year (AF/YR) criteria on the Valley Floor have proven to be both scientifically and operationally adequate. Any project which reduces water usage or any water usage which is at or below the established threshold is assumed to have no significant effect on groundwater levels. (In the MST Groundwater Deficient Area, a .0.3 AF/YR criterion would be an adequate threshold).

The project is located on a 10.84 acre parcel on the valley floor in an area that has an established acceptable water use criteria of 1.0 acre foot per acre per year. Water Availability Analysis-Tier One Study was prepared for the subject parcel (APN: 036-190-007) by Nichols, Melburg and Rossetto Architects/Engineers (dated November 14, 2016), which states that the Napa County Allowable Water Allotment for the property is **10.84 AF/YR**, determined by multiplying the acreage of the parcel by the one (1) AF/YR fair share water use factor.

The analysis indicates that the existing total water demand is **6.18 AF/YR**, specifically:

EXISTING BIALE WINERY WATER DEMAND	
	Acre feet per year
Existing Residence	0.50
Winery Processing –43,090 gallons in 2015	0.83
Existing Employees	0.17
Existing Tasting Visitors	0.09
Existing Event Visitors	0.01
Domestic landscaping irrigation	0.30
7.11 acres Vineyard – Irrigation (no heat or frost) protection)	4.20
Water used not entering Wastewater System	0.07
TOTAL	6.18

The analysis concluded that the projected water demand for the project is **5.95 AF/YR**, specifically:

PROPOSED BIALE WINERY WATER DEMAND	
	Acre feet per year
Winery Processing – 60,000 gallons	1.16
Employees	0.17
Tasting Visitors	0.09
Domestic landscaping irrigation	0.30
Event Visitors	0.01
6.86 acres Vineyard – Irrigation (no heat or frost) protection)	4.05
Kitchen/tastings (2 events/mo. with 100 gal/event)	0.03
Water used not entering Wastewater System	0.07
TOTAL	5.89

The estimated water demand of 5.89 AF/YR is below the 10.84 AF/YR threshold established for this parcel. The re-purposing of the residence into a winery accessory use and the reduction in the vineyard acreage by .25 acres for the relocated driveway help to reduce the overall groundwater demand by 0.29 AF/YR. According to the study, there is no proposed increase in the existing number of employees and the existing number of by appointment visitors. No further analysis is required.

- c/d. The project proposal will not alter any drainage patterns on site or cause an increase in erosion on or off site. The project would be required to incorporate an erosion control plan to manage onsite surface drainage and erosion of onsite soils during construction and winter months (October to April). By incorporating a Standard Measures erosion control plan, this project would have a less than significant impact on drainage and siltation.
- e. There is an existing on-site stormwater drainage system approved for the winery and no modification required. The approved stormwater management system will not adversely affect the capacity of existing or planned off-site stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.
- f. There is nothing included in this proposal that would otherwise substantially degrade water quality. As discussed in greater detail at, "a.," above, the Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the sanitary wastewater proposal and has found the proposed system adequate to meet the facility's septic needs as conditioned. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality.

- g-i. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layer: flood zones, dam levee inundation), a portion of the project property is located within a flood hazard area, however, the project site is not located within a flood hazard area, and would not impede or redirect flood flows or expose structures or people to flooding. The project site is not located within a dam or levee failure inundation zone. The project does not include the development of housing.
- j. In coming years, higher global temperatures are expected to raise sea level by expanding ocean water, melting mountain glaciers and small ice caps, and causing portions of Greenland and the Antarctic ice sheets to melt. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change estimates that the global average sea level will rise between 0.6 and 2 feet over the next century (IPCC, 2007). However, the project area is located at approximately ±60-ft. MSL and there is no known history of mud flow in the vicinity. The project will not subject people or structures to a significant risk of inundation from tsunami, seiche, or mudflow.

Mitigation Measures: None.

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

Discussion:

- a) The project is an existing winery, located within an area dominated by agriculture and large lot residential uses. The proposed use and the improvements proposed, however, are in support of the ongoing agricultural use in the area.
- b) The subject parcel is located in the AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning district, which allows wineries and uses accessory to wineries subject to use permit approval. The proposed project is compliant with the physical limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance. The County has adopted the Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO) to protect agriculture and open space and to regulate winery development and expansion in a manner that avoids potential negative environmental effects.

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

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None.

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

Discussion:

a/b. Historically, the two most valuable mineral commodities in Napa County in economic terms have been mercury and mineral water. More recently, building stone and aggregate have become economically valuable. Mines and Mineral Deposits mapping included in the Napa County Baseline Data Report (*Mines and Mineral Deposits*, BDR Figure 2-2) indicates that there are no known mineral resources nor any locally important mineral resource recovery sites located on or near the project site. The Conservation and Open Space Elements of the Napa County General Plan does not indicate the presence of valuable or locally important mineral resources on the project site. Therefore, the project would not result in a loss of a mineral resource of any value.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. The project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during the grading activities associated with construction of the driveway and the remodeling of the existing structures. However, noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours, occurring during the period of 7:00 am- 7:00 pm on weekdays, normal hours of human activity, using properly muffled vehicles. All construction activities shall be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). All construction activities shall be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16), reducing the potential adverse impact to a less than significant level. There are no complaints received on the winery operations to date. The standard noise condition of approval applied to use permits to address the construction noise is as follows:

"7.3 CONSTRUCTION NOISE

Construction noise shall be minimized to the greatest extent practical and feasible under State and local safety laws, consistent with construction noise levels permitted by the General Plan Community Character Element and the County Noise

Ordinance. Construction equipment muffling and hours of operation shall be in compliance with the County Code. Equipment shall be shut down when not in use. Construction equipment shall normally be staged, loaded, and unloaded on the project site, if at all practicable. 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 daily between the hours of 8 am to 5 pm."

The standard condition also addresses noisy winery equipment which requires such machinery be enclosed or muffled and maintained so as not to create a noise disturbance and must comply with the County Code. Since the project proposes visitation and marketing events, potential noise from loud music is addressed by the following condition which prohibits the use of amplified sound systems or amplified music outdoors.

"4.10 AMPLIFIED MUSIC

There shall be no amplified sound system or amplified music utilized outside of approved, enclosed, winery buildings."

The proposed construction grading should not result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibrations or ground born noise levels greater than those created by general farm plowing activities. By addressing the potential adverse impacts indicated above, the proposed project will not result in a significant adverse noise impact.

- c/d. Although substantial amounts of temporary noise may be generated during project construction that noise will cease. A substantial permanent, temporary, or periodic increase in ambient noise levels would not be expected. The anticipated level of noise to occur following the completion of construction would be reduced with conditions addressing noisy equipment, limits to hours of operation where periodic loud activities such as bottling would occur during the day; and the proposed marketing events would be required to cease prior to 10:00 pm. The closest residence is ±350 feet to the south. The standard conditions of approval as described under Sections a and b above would require construction activities be limited to daylight hours, vehicles be muffled, and backup alarms adjusted to the lowest allowable levels. Enforcement of Napa County's Exterior Noise Ordinance is and will be provided the Napa County Sheriff address noise related issues including, but not limited to, prohibiting outdoor-amplified sounds; mechanical equipment be required to be kept indoors or inside acoustical enclosures, and events lasting beyond the approved hours.
- e/f. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. There is a modest increase in overall employment by the winery by eleven employees (8 full-time; 3 part-time) for a total of 18. The Association of Bay Area Governments' *Projections 2003* figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase some 23% by the year 2030 (*Napa County Baseline Data Report*, November 30, 2005). Additionally, the County's *Baseline Data Report* indicates that total housing units currently programmed in county and municipal housing elements exceed ABAG growth projections by approximately 15%. The additional 9 and one half employee positions which are part of this project will most likely lead to some population growth in Napa County. However, relative to the County's projected low to moderate growth rate and overall adequate programmed housing supply, that population growth does not rise to a level of environmental significance. In addition, the project will be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs.

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

identified in the General Plan Housing Element function, in combination with the County's housing impact mitigation fee, to ensure adequate cumulative volume and diversity of housing. Cumulative impacts on the local and regional population and housing balance will be less than significant.

b/c. This application will not displace a substantial volume of existing housing or a substantial number of people and will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The project would result in the conversion of one residential unit to commercial use; however, the zoning would allow the construction of a new residence in addition to a farm labor dwelling on the property. Thus the impact from the repurposing of the existing house would have a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a. Public services are currently provided to the project area, and as the winery has been in full operation, the additional demand placed on existing services would be marginal. Fire protection measures are required as part of the development pursuant to Napa County Fire Marshall conditions and there will be no foreseeable impact to emergency response times with the adoption of standard conditions of approval. The Fire Department and the Engineering Services Division have reviewed the application and recommend approval as conditioned. School impact mitigation fees, which assist local school districts with capacity building measures, will be levied pursuant to building permit submittal. The proposed project will not generate a need for outdoor recreation and thus will have little to no impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from any building permit fees, property tax increases, and taxes from the sale of wine will help meet the costs of providing public services to the property. The proposed project will have a less than significant impact on public services.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b. The project would not place a demand on the existing recreational facilities or result in a significantly increase the use of recreational facilities. The project does not include recreational facilities, and would therefore not have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b. The peak hour traffic generated by the project on a typical day is calculated to be 18 PM peak hour trips. On a typical Saturday, the PM peak hour trips are calculated to be a slight increase to 23 trips. The application maintains that there is no increase requested in the number of visitors or employees and the numbers presented in the Traffic Generation sheet are the existing traffic levels. The only increase in visitation is in the number of marketing events, where the largest (250 guests) would generate 179 two-way trips. The application indicates that marketing events will be scheduled to avoid arrival and departure during PM Peak hours (4:00 PM – 6:00 PM) and no tours and tasting appointments to be made during events over 100 attendees.

Access to the winery is from Big Ranch Road, at its intersection with Salvador Ave, located off where the Level of Service has a "C" rating in the Napa County 2008 General Plan EIR, which is the most recent county-wide traffic study. Traffic conditions on roads and at intersections are generally characterized by their "level of service" or LOS. LOS is a convenient way to express the ratio between volume and capacity on a given link or at a given intersection, and is expressed as a letter grade ranging from LOS A through LOS F. Each level of service is generally described as follows:

LOS A- Free-flowing travel with an excellent level of comfort and convenience and freedom to maneuver.

LOS B- Stable operating conditions, but the presence of other road users causes a noticeable, though slight, reduction in comfort, convenience, and maneuvering freedom.

LOS C- Stable operating conditions, but the operation of individual users is substantially affected by the interaction with others in the traffic stream.

LOS D- High-density, but stable flow. Users experience severe restrictions in speed and freedom to maneuver, with poor levels of comfort and convenience.

LOS E- Operating conditions at or near capacity. Speeds are reduced to a low but relatively uniform value. Freedom to maneuver is difficult with users experiencing frustration and poor comfort and convenience. Unstable operation is frequent, and minor disturbances in traffic flow can cause breakdown conditions.

LOS F- Forced or breakdown conditions. This condition exists wherever the volume of traffic exceeds the capacity of the roadway. Long queues can form behind these bottleneck points with queued traffic traveling in a stop-and-go fashion. (2000 Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board)

The project proposes to change the internal loop circulation of the winery, creating a new exit located approximately 15 feet north of the entrance, reducing the ingress and egress traffic at the entrance on the Big Ranch Road and Salvador Ave. intersection. The applicant has submitted traffic data which identifies that the proposed winery hours (production: 8:00 am– 4:30 pm; visitation 10:00 am–4:00 pm) Sunday-Saturday, the number of employees (18); the winery's Tours/Tastings Plan (60 persons maximum per day); and the Marketing Plan with food prepared at the winery or catered food (2-25 person events/per month; 2-15 person events/year; 4-50 person events/year 2-250 person events/year; and 2-100 person events/year) will contribute ± 55 weekday daily trips and ± 19 daily PM peak trips in Big Ranch Road's overall traffic. On a typical Saturday, the project will generate 23 PM peak hour trips.

The Department of Public Works has reviewed this data and recommends approval of the project on the basis that the traffic volumes are below the threshold that would impact Big Ranch Road. This roadway segment is designated a Rural Collector in the Napa County General Plan and is not expected to reach an unacceptable Level of Service. The project is forecast to generate a net increase of 14 ADT on weekdays, a figure which is comparable to that for a single family residence. This increase is based on the proposed increase in production in combination with the conversion of an existing residence into a winery tasting area. No increase in existing visitation is proposed and thus does not account for any of the net increase in traffic. The project may be considered to have a less than significant increase in traffic on this route due the forecast figures and the forecasted Level of Service. There will be no residual individually or cumulatively significant traffic impacts associated with this project as regards traffic congestion and levels of service.

- c. This project will not result in the construction of structures or facilities tall enough or bright enough which would interfere with air traffic. Therefore, the project would not result in any change to air traffic patterns.
- d/e The project has frontage access from Big Ranch Road, and does not include any design features that will impact the existing traffic. The Department of Public Works has reviewed project access and recommends approval of the project as proposed with a condition that an encroachment permit be obtained for the second driveway. The Napa County Fire Marshall has reviewed this application and has identified no significant impacts related to emergency vehicle access provided that standard conditions of approval are incorporated. Project impacts related to traffic hazards and emergency access are expected to be less than significant. Based on the forecast of traffic to be generated by the proposed project (54 ADT), and the volume on Big Ranch road (1,900 ADT), this project will not require the installation of a left turn lane at the location of the project access driveway.
- f. There is currently sufficient parking for the existing residential uses and winery provided on site. The previous project approval authorized ten (10) parking spaces for the 40,000 gallon per year winery. There are currently five (5) existing spaces on the paved area adjacent to the southerly side of the building for employee use, seven (7) adjacent to the westerly side of the building for visitor use and the project proposes 18 new spaces to the northerly side of the hospitality center (existing house). There will be a resulting total of 30 spaces available. Therefore, the current number of parking spaces is sufficient to accommodate parking needs during normal business days for employees, visitors and the smaller events. Additional parking will be required during larger marketing events which will be satisfied by guest parking along the vineyard drives or on the paved loading work area adjacent to the south side of the building. Five (5) employee parking spaces are located on this paved area, but additional parking can be provided under the trees located between the winery pavement and the neighboring access road. No parking will be permitted within the right-of-way of Big Ranch Road or Salvador Ave. The project will not conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-23 so as to cause potentially significant environmental impacts.
- g. There is no aspect of this project that would conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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. 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 was not requested by the three tribes who have requested notice. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facility or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a) The project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and would not result in a

significant impact on the environment relative to wastewater discharge. Wastewater disposal would be accommodated on-site and in compliance with State and County regulations. According to the Onsite Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study prepared by Haling & Associates on September 15, 2016, the project site and proposed system has adequate disposal capacity to serve the proposed expanded facility. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings.

- b. The project will not require construction of any new water treatment facilities that will result in a significant impact to the environment. Water will be provided by an existing well. An expanded septic system will be constructed on site. The system will be designed by a licensed engineer and will be reviewed and approved by the Division of Environmental Health
- c. The project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, which will cause a significant impact to the environment.
- d. The project has sufficient water supplies to serve projected needs. The projected water use for the project is 5.95 AF/YR. Napa County has established a threshold 10.84 AF/YR for this parcel; therefore the estimated water demand of 5.95 AF/YR is below the threshold established for the parcel. No further analysis is required.
- e. Wastewater will be treated on-site and will not require a wastewater treatment provider.
- f. The project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the projects demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the project.
- g. Conditions of approval require compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. The project as proposed will not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. The project proposes the re-use of existing structures, relocation of an existing driveway through an unplanted portion of an existing vineyard, and an expansion of a the patio, using impervious materials. No removal of trees is proposed.
- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and traffic impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. Groundwater extraction associated with the proposed project would be well below the established threshold for the property. The project would also increase the demands for public services to a limited extent, increase traffic and air pollution, all of which contribute to cumulative effects when future development in Napa Valley is considered. Cumulative impacts of these issues are discussed in previous sections of this Initial Study, wherein the impact from an increase in air pollution is being addressed as discussed in the project's Greenhouse Gas Voluntary Best Management Practices including but not limited to: energy conserving lighting; cool roofing products; water efficient fixtures; re-purposing of existing structures;

water efficient landscaping and no tree removal; limited grading; recycled materials use; 70%-80% cover crop use; and to retain biomass pruning materials by chipping and reuse rather than burning. 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 on major roads in Napa County. 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.

- c. This project would not have any environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. All environmental effects from this project have been mitigated to a level of insignificance. No other environmental effects have been identified that would cause, either directly or indirectly, adverse effects on human beings.

Mitigation Measures: None Required.