

“C”

Mitigated Negative Declaration
and
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting
Program (MMRP)

Shed Creek Winery Use Permit P16-00327 and
Use Permit Exception to the Conservation Regulations P17-00178
Planning Commission Hearing November 15, 2017

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

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated October 2016)

1. **Project Title:** Shed Creek Winery, Use Permit P14-00346, Use Permit Exception to the Conservation Regulations P17-00178, and request for an exception to the Napa County Road and Street Standards.
2. **Property Owner/Project Sponsor Name and Address:** William Morgan, 80 Grapevine Lane, Napa, CA 94558
3. **Representative Name and Address:** Cameron Pridmore, CMP Civil Engineering & Land Surveying, 1607 Capell Valley Road, Napa, CA 94558
4. **County Contact Person, Phone Number, and Email:** Emily Hedge; (707) 259-8226; emily.hedge@countyofnapa.org
5. **Project Location and APN:** The project is located on an approximately 287-acre parcel at the end of Grapevine Lane in Gordon Valley, 80 Grapevine Lane, Napa, CA 94558. APN: 033-170-002
6. **General Plan Description:** Split-zoned Agricultural Resource (AR) Designation and Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space (AWOS).
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Watershed (AW).
8. **Background/Project History:**

The parcel is currently developed with a main residence, second residence, garage, two barns (southern barn to be converted to winery), workshop, and two sheds. Approximately 38 acres are planted in vineyards and 0.15 acres in orchards.

There are two reservoirs with water rights permits #17436 and #19307. These water supplies will not be used by the winery.

In December 1994 an agricultural contract (94185-AGK – Type H) was entered into. The contract was for 260 acres of grazing land, 20 acres of walnuts, and 30 head of beef cattle.

9. **Description of Project:** Approval of a use permit for a new 5,000 gallon per year winery to allow:
 - a) Conversion of an existing, approximately 700 square foot barn into the winery building, including approximately 250 square feet for a tasting room;
 - b) Addition of approximately 100 square feet of new building, including restroom and cleaning room (to be built on existing gravel pad);
 - c) Approximately 1,800 square foot covered crush pad (existing paved area around barn);
 - d) Tours and tastings by appointment only with a maximum of 15 people per day;
 - e) An annual marketing program of 10 events for a maximum of 30 people and one event for a maximum of 100 people;
 - f) Two (2) full-time and two (2) part time employees;
 - g) Hours of operation daily, Monday – Sunday, 9 am to 5 pm (production) and 10 am to 5 pm (visitation);
 - h) Seven (7) parking spaces for visitors and employees;
 - i) Septic systems for process waste and domestic waste;
 - j) Two water storage tanks; and
 - k) Improvements to Grapevine Lane to meet current Road and Street Standards as proposed in the request for an exception to the Napa County Road and Streets Standards (RSS).

The project includes a Use Permit Exception to the Conservation Regulations (County Code section 18.108.040). Grapevine Lane is located adjacent to Gordon Valley Creek, with the first 0.25 mile directly adjacent to the creek and within the creek setback. The remaining 0.55 mile portion of the road used to access the winery is relatively straight along the eastern side of the creek, with the creek coming in close proximity at two locations. Roadway improvements are required along areas of the road that are within the creek setback, necessitating a request for an exception to the Conservation Regulations.

The project also includes a request for an exception to the Napa County Road and Streets Standards (RSS). The request is due to the environmental constraints of the location of the existing road adjacent to the creek. The request would assist in minimizing grading in a

creek setback, on creek bank slopes, and to preserve mature native trees that would otherwise have to be removed. As described in the letter from CMP Civil Engineering, dated April 13, 2017, the request proposes an exception to the minimum commercial driveway width (22 feet) in three locations and an exception to the 22-foot minimum bridge width at the northern, existing bridge. All sections of the common driveway and private driveway not requesting a road exception will meet the Napa County Road and Street Standards. See exception request in the project file for additional detail.

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

The 287-acre parcel is located at the end of Grapevine Lane in Gordon Valley. Grapevine Lane is located adjacent to Gordon Valley Creek, with the first 0.25 mile directly adjacent to the creek and within the creek setback. The remaining 0.55 mile portion of the road used to access the winery is relatively straight along the eastern side of the creek, with the creek coming in close proximity at two locations.

The parcel is currently developed with a main residence, second residence, garage, two barns (southern barn to be converted to winery), workshop, and two sheds. Approximately 38 acres are planted in vineyards and 0.15 acres in orchards.

The property is located in the Suisun Creek watershed. Gordon Valley Creek runs northeasterly along Grapevine Lane and onto the property. On the property, the creek runs on the western side of the existing barn proposed to be converted to the winery. The barn is within 45 feet from the top of bank of the creek.

The portion of the property on the east side of Gordon Valley Creek is relatively flat (0-5% slope) with elevations ranging from approximately 310 to 320 feet above mean sea level. The flat portions of the property contain the existing residential development and are planted in vineyards. The portion of the property on the western side of Gordon Valley Creek consists of a number of hillsides with elevations ranging from 350 to 910 feet above mean sea level. There are two reservoirs east of the creek and two vineyard blocks in the northeastern portion of the property. The reservoirs are not proposed to be used for the winery.

Surrounding land uses include rural residential properties, agriculture, and vineyards. The nearest offsite residence is located approximately 500 feet to the south of the existing barn proposed to be converted to the winery.

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

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

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

None Required.

Other Agencies Contacted

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

Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1, invitation for tribal consultation was completed. A response was received from Middletown Rancheria (Tribe), dated October 19, 2017. No comments were provided, but the Tribe requested contact if new information or evidence of human habitation is found. A condition of approval has been included to require the permittee to contact the Middletown Rancheria Tribal Historic Preservation Department for consultation in the instance that evidence of archeological artifacts or human remains are found. The consultation is closed.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Emily Hedge

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

10/23/17

Date

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

Discussion:

Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms, geological features, water, trees and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of visually appealing or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken in.

As generally described in the **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses** section above, the surrounding land uses include rural residential, agriculture, and vineyards. The nearest offsite residence is located approximately 500 feet to the south of the proposed winery. The 287-acre parcel is located at the end of Grapevine Lane in Gordon Valley. The parcel is currently developed with a main residence, second residence, garage, two barns (southern barn to be converted to winery), workshop, and two sheds. Approximately 38 acres are planted in vineyards and 0.15 acres in orchards.

The proposed physical improvements on the site include enclosing a portion of an existing gravel pad on the east side of the barn, paving one parking stall, installing two water storage tanks on the south side of the existing barn, and installing a new wastewater system. The project also requires improvements to the existing road, including widening of the driveway to the edge of the existing shoulder and resurfacing with gravel or asphalt concrete, where not constrained by environmental factors.

- a-c. The proposed improvements are minor and would not substantially change the existing appearance of the site or the road. The project does not propose to remove any trees adjacent to the east side of the barn. Trees would remain between the proposed winery location and the closest offsite residence. The winery is located on Grapevine Lane, approximately 0.8 miles north of the intersection with Gordon Valley Road. The site is not potentially visible from Viewshed roads, therefore, the project is not subject to the County's Viewshed Protection Program (County Code Chapter 18.106). The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, substantially damage scenic resources, or substantially degrade the visual quality of the site or its surroundings. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d. The winery would replace the existing barn and will remain a potential source of nighttime lighting. The winery hours of operation are proposed from 9 am to 5 pm (production, non-harvest) and 10 am to 5 pm (visitation); therefore nighttime lighting associated with the winery would be limited. Although the project is in an area that has a certain amount of existing nighttime lighting, the installation of new sources of lights, if they were to remain on past daylight hours, may affect nighttime views.

The proposed project would permit a total of 11 marketing events throughout the year. The events would be subject to a Napa County standard condition of approval, requiring all events to end by 10 pm with one hour quiet cleanup. The events would represent a limited number of times lighting would be kept on past 5 pm.

Pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approval for wineries, outdoor lighting must 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.

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.

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.

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:

The project site is zoned Agricultural Watershed (AW) which allows a winery upon grant of a use permit. General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use policies AG/LU-2 and AG/LU-13 recognize wineries, and any use consistent with the Winery Definition Ordinance and clearly accessory to a winery, as agriculture.

a. The property has a mixed designation of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Local Importance, and Grazing Land (based on GIS layer FMMP Farmlands (2012)). The proposed project is recognized as an agricultural use, therefore the project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to a non-agricultural use. No impacts would occur.

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.

- b. There is currently an agricultural contract on the property (Type H), which allows all uses that would be permitted in the zoning district. As stated above, the zoning district Agricultural Watershed (AW) allows a winery upon grant of a use permit. The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses or an agricultural contract. No impacts would occur.
- c/d. The property is zoned for agricultural and not forest or timberland use. The proposed project will not conflict with existing zoning for or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No impacts would occur.
- e. There are no other changes included in this proposal that would result in the conversion of Farmland. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) 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 BAAQMD believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA and were posted on BAAQMD's website and included in BAAQMD's updated CEQA Guidelines (updated May 2012). The Thresholds are advisory and may be followed by local agencies at their own discretion.

The Thresholds were challenged in court. Following litigation in the trial court, the court of appeal, and the California Supreme Court, all of the Thresholds were upheld. However, in an opinion issued on December 17, 2015, the California Supreme Court held that CEQA does not generally require an analysis of the impacts of locating development in areas subject to environmental hazards unless the project would exacerbate existing environmental hazards. The Supreme Court also found that CEQA requires the analysis of exposing people to environmental hazards in specific circumstances, including the location of development near airports, schools near sources of toxic contamination, and certain exemptions for infill and workforce housing. The Supreme Court also held that public agencies remain free to conduct this analysis regardless of whether it is required by CEQA.

In view of the Supreme Court's opinion, local agencies may rely on thresholds designed to reflect the impact of locating development near areas of toxic air contamination where such an analysis is required by CEQA or where the agency has determined that such an analysis would assist in making a decision about the project. However, the thresholds are not mandatory and agencies should apply them only after determining that they reflect an appropriate measure of a project's impacts. These Guidelines may inform environmental review for development projects in the Bay Area, but do not commit local governments or BAAQMD to any specific course of regulatory action.

BAAQMD published a new version of the Guidelines dated May 2017, which includes revisions made to address the Supreme Court's opinion. The May 2017 Guidelines update does not address outdated references, links, analytical methodologies or other technical information that may be in the Guidelines or Thresholds Justification Report. The Air District is currently working to revise any outdated information in the Guidelines as part of its update to the CEQA Guidelines and thresholds of significance.

a-c. The mountains bordering Napa Valley block much of the prevailing northwesterly winds throughout the year. Sunshine is plentiful in Napa County, and summertime can be very warm in the valley, particularly in the northern end. Winters are usually mild, with cool temperatures overnight and mild-to-moderate temperatures during the day. Wintertime temperatures tend to be slightly cooler in the northern end of the valley. Winds are generally calm throughout the county. Annual precipitation averages range from about 24 inches in low elevations to more than 40 inches in the mountains.

Ozone and fine particle pollution, or PM2.5, are the major regional air pollutants of concern in the San Francisco Bay Area. Ozone is primarily a problem in the summer, and fine particle pollution in the winter. In Napa County, ozone rarely exceeds health standards, but PM2.5 occasionally does reach unhealthy concentrations. There are multiple reasons for PM2.5 exceedances in Napa County. First, much of the county is wind-sheltered, which tends to trap PM2.5 within the Napa Valley. Second, much of the area is well north of the moderating temperatures of San Pablo Bay and, as a result, Napa County experiences some of the coldest nights in the Bay Area. This leads to greater fireplace use and, in turn, higher PM2.5 levels. Finally, in the winter easterly winds often move fine-particle-laden air from the Central Valley to the Carquinez Strait and then into western Solano and southern Napa County (BAAQMD, *In Your Community: Napa County*, April 2016).

The impacts associated with implementation of the Project were evaluated consistent with guidance provided by BAAQMD. Ambient air quality standards have been established by state and federal environmental agencies for specific air pollutants most pervasive in urban environments. These pollutants are referred to as criteria air pollutants because the standards established for them were developed to meet specific health and welfare criteria set forth in the enabling legislation. The criteria air pollutants emitted by development, traffic and other activities anticipated under the proposed development include ozone, ozone precursors oxides of nitrogen and reactive organic gases (NOx and ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO2), and suspended particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5). Other criteria pollutants, such as lead and sulfur dioxide (SO2), would not be substantially emitted by the proposed development or traffic, and air quality standards for them are being met throughout the Bay Area.

BAAQMD has not officially recommended the use of its thresholds in CEQA analyses and CEQA ultimately allows lead agencies the discretion to determine whether a particular environmental impact would be considered significant, as evidenced by scientific or other factual data. BAAQMD also states that lead agencies need to determine appropriate air quality thresholds to use for each project they review based on substantial evidence that they include in the administrative record of the CEQA document. One resource BAAQMD provides as a reference for determining appropriate thresholds is the *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines* developed by its staff in 2010 and as updated through May 2017. These guidelines outline substantial evidence supporting a variety of thresholds of significance.

As mentioned above, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Operational-Related Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursors Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. The proposed winery building is approximately 800 square feet of floor area inclusive of an approximately 250 square foot tasting room. When compared to the BAAQMD's operational criteria pollutant screening size of 541,000 square feet for general light industrial, and compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47,000 square feet for a high quality restaurant, the project would not significantly impact air quality and does not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2017 Pages 3-2 & 3-3.). Given the size of the entire project, which is approximately 2,600 square feet of floor area including an 800 square foot winery inclusive of a 250 square foot tasting room and approximately 1,800 square foot covered crush pad, compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47,000 (high quality restaurant) and 541,000 (general light industry) for NOx (oxides of nitrogen), the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. (Please note: a high quality restaurant is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, but grossly overstates emissions associated with other portions of a winery, such as office, barrel storage and production, which generate fewer vehicle trips. Therefore, a general light industry comparison has also been used for other such uses.)

The project falls well below the screening criteria as noted above, and consequently will not significantly affect air quality individually or contribute considerably to any cumulative air quality impacts.

d. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from earthmoving and construction activities required for site improvements. Earthmoving and construction emissions would have a temporary effect; consisting mainly of dust generated during grading activities and exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles. Grading spoils will be disposed of on-site as fill within the vineyards. The Air District recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction impacts. If the proposed project adheres to these relevant best management practices identified by the Air District and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and are considered less than significant:

7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS
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:

7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

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. Surrounding land uses include rural residential properties, agriculture, and vineyards. The nearest offsite residence is located approximately 500 feet to the south of the proposed winery. 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. 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
IV.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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:

Napa County Code section 18.108.025 establishes minimum setbacks from the top of bank of intermittent and perennial streams, prohibiting structures, earthmoving activity, grading, removal of vegetation and certain agricultural uses of land within the specified setbacks. The required minimum setback is as little as 35 feet from top of bank, with the setback distance increasing as the slope at top of bank becomes steeper, up to as much as 150 feet where the slope is or exceeds 60 percent. In the proposed winery area, the minimum stream setback from top of bank was determined to be 45 feet.

The existing development that will be used for the winery, including the barn, a portion of the covered concrete patio, and the gravel pad, are located within the 45 foot creek setback. Improvements to these areas would be limited to the existing development footprint. Proposed improvements that require new ground disturbing activity, including placement of water tanks, installation of the wastewater system equipment, and paving of an accessible parking space, will take place to the east of the existing barn, outside of the minimum creek setback. These proposed improvements would take place outside of the creek setback and will not impact the riparian area around the creek.

Grapevine Lane is located adjacent to Gordon Valley Creek. The first 0.25 mile is directly adjacent to the creek and is within the creek setback. The remaining 0.55 mile of the road is relatively straight along the eastern side of the creek, with the creek coming in close proximity at two locations. Roadway widening and improvements are required along areas of the road that are within the creek setback, necessitating a request for an exception to the Conservation Regulations (County Code section 18.108.040). Staff has reviewed the Use Permit Exception application and determined that the proposed improvements are necessary to improve access and safety for emergency responders and the general public.

In order to minimize the work adjacent to the creek, the project includes a request for an exception to the Napa County Road and Street Standards (RSS). The request is due to the environmental constraints of the location of the existing road adjacent to the creek. The request would assist in avoiding grading in a creek setback and on creek bank slopes, and to preserve mature native trees that would otherwise have to be removed. As described in the letter from CMP Civil Engineering, dated April 13, 2017, the request proposes an exception to the minimum commercial driveway width (22 feet) in three locations and an exception to the 22-foot minimum bridge width at the northern, existing bridge. In those areas where the full 22 feet cannot be achieved, the request proposes widening of the driveway to the edge of the existing shoulder and resurfacing with gravel. No tree removal is proposed, but tree and vegetation trimming and maintenance is proposed in order to improve site distance and emergency equipment clearance. Approval of the exception to the RSS would help support the Use Permit Exception.

a./d. As noted in the discussion, physical improvements on the site would be limited to areas previously disturbed by construction, residential development, and vineyard planting. The road work would be limited to improvements to the existing road within the existing road shoulders.

According to GIS, there are no species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species on the property or along the access road. Therefore, the proposed project will not disturb natural habitat or have a substantial adverse effect on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The proposed improvements would not interfere 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. The potential for this project to have an impact on special status species is less than significant.

b. As detailed in the Exception to the RSS and the Use Permit Exception application, the proposed improvements along the creek have been designed to be minimal in order to reduce potential impacts. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers Biological Resources – Vegetation–ICE) vegetation along Gordon Valley Creek includes Riparian forest comprised of Valley Oaks. Road work in this area is limited to the existing road shoulders. In order to prevent the inadvertent encroachment on the creek banks and associated riparian habitat a condition of approval has been included requiring installation of temporary construction fencing

along the boundary of the extent of the road improvements. The precise locations of said fences shall be inspected and approved by the Planning Division prior to any earthmoving and/or development activities.

The Permittee has not proposed any tree removal or work on the creek banks. If during project construction, tree or vegetation removal or planting is determined to be necessary, a condition of approval has been included requiring the Permittee to submit a restoration plan, prepared by a qualified biologist, restoration ecologist, or other qualified professional, to the Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department Director for review and authorization prior to the commencement of restoration.

The proposed project will require incorporation of best management practices and will be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance, which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable. Incorporating best management practices and complying with the ordinance will reduce any potential impacts.

The project as proposed will not 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. The inclusion of conditions of approval will further efforts to prevent potential impacts. Potential impacts on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community is less than significant.

- c. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – wetlands (NWI) and wetlands & vernal pools) there are two freshwater ponds (reservoirs) on the property and one freshwater pond on the neighboring property to the east. No improvements are proposed in close proximity to the reservoirs. The reservoirs would not be affected by this project. No other wetlands are identified on the property or adjacent properties. The potential for this project to have an impact on federally protected wetlands is less than significant.
- e/f. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans. The project does not conflict with any County ordinance or requirement to preserve existing trees, and therefore is considered as not having potential for a significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. In May 2015, a historical resource analysis was prepared by Juliana Inman, licensed architect meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in Architecture and Historic Architecture (listed in CHRIS). The analysis was done on the barn that is proposed to be converted to the winery structure. The barn was originally a wood framed drying shed, open on three sides. Due to physical evidence, this reviewer estimates the age of the building at about 60 years.

The California Register for historic resources regulations define "integrity" as "the authenticity of an historic resource's physical identity, evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource's period of significance" (State Office of Historic Preservation, 1997). These regulations specify that integrity is a quality that applies to historic resources in seven ways: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. A property must retain most of these qualities to possess integrity. The drying shed has been altered significantly. Virtually none of the original wood siding, framing or roofing is visible, and most of the original fabric of the building has been removed or covered over with new metal siding or roofing.

The drying shed retains two aspects of "integrity" – location and setting. Since the use of the property is now vineyard and winery and both the use of the building and its appearance have been altered, the feeling and association have been lost. Due to complete alteration of the building, the materials, design and workmanship is also lost. Building alterations include wood siding replaced with metal siding, roofing replaced with metal siding, some framing replaced with metal framing, and enclosure of exterior sheds with shade cloth sidewall material.

The drying shed does not have architectural significance due to its recent date of construction and the extensive alterations to the original design of the building. No mitigation is recommended for conversion of the building to another use. The building is no longer qualified for use of the California Historical Buildings Code.

- b-d. Archaeological Resource Service prepared a cultural resources evaluation, dated October 21, 2015, for the location of the winery site and wastewater system improvements. The areas were examined in a pedestrian survey. No obsidian flakes, discolored soil, burned rocks, shell fragments, or other indicators of the presence of a Native American settlement were observed. The evaluation found no indications of the presence of prehistoric or historic era archaeological resources within the examined area. The alluvial soils of the examined area have a small potential to contain buried cultural deposits, but this potential exists in all Holocene alluvium in the county and was not identified as any higher than normal. In light of the negative finding, no further archaeological evaluation was recommended.

Prior to performing the fieldwork, the author conducted a literature search to assess the archaeological sensitivity of the project area. The literature search was conducted using information on file at Archaeological Resource Service, the results of a previous literature check at the California Historical Resources Inventory Systems office located in Rohnert Park, CA, and a current check. The literature check indicates that several areas in the immediate vicinity of the project have been examined previously.

Due to the fact that cultural resources have previously been identified in close proximity to the access road that is proposed to be improved, a mitigation measure has been incorporated to require a cultural monitor to be onsite during construction/earth disturbing activities. See CUL-1.

With the incorporation of the mitigation measure and the inclusion of the County's standard condition, potential impacts on any historical resource, archaeological resource, paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature will be less than significant.

7.2 ARCHEOLOGICAL 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.

Mitigation Measures:

- MM CUL-1: In order to prevent potential impacts to cultural resources, the permittee shall have an archaeological monitor on site during all earth disturbing activities. Prior to commencement of project improvements on the Shed Creek Winery parcel or road improvements to Grapevine Lane, the permittee shall coordinate with a qualified archaeological monitor. If cultural resources are identified, construction shall cease until the Native American Heritage Commission is contacted and representatives of the California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area (pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1) are offered the opportunity to participate in the monitoring.

Pre-construction coordination shall, at a minimum, include the following:

- a. Submittal of copies of grading plans to the archaeological monitor, concurrently with submittal of the grading permit application to the Napa County Planning, Building & Environmental Services (PBES) Department;
- b. Execution of a Standard Monitoring Agreement with the archaeological monitor;
- c. Training of construction field crews, by an archaeological monitor, of the potential for presence of Native American resources on the property, the potential types of resources that could be found on-site, and the procedures to follow in the event of discovery of such resources; and
- d. Presence of an archaeological monitor on-site during survey/markings and initial rough grading of improvements (road improvements, installation of water storage tanks, and septic system installation).

Monitoring: Concurrently with submittal of the grading application for Shed Creek Winery parcel and road improvements to the Engineering and Building staff of PBES, the permittee shall submit confirmation of submittal of the grading plans to the

archaeological monitor previously identified. If the permittee neglects to submit such confirmation to PBES, then Planning staff of PBES will convey a copy of the plans to the archaeological monitor upon receipt of the grading permit application.

Prior to issuance of the grading permit, the permittee shall submit to Planning staff of PBES confirmation of pre-construction training of construction field crews about potential presence of archaeological or cultural resources on the project site and the correct procedures to follow in the event of discovery of such resources. Confirmation shall be in the form of a written letter or certification from the archaeological monitor conducting the training.

No fewer than 10 days prior to commencement of grading, the permittee shall concurrently contact the archaeological monitor and Planning staff of PBES in writing, receipt confirmed, to advise of the start date of project grading and to invite the archaeological monitor and staff member to be present during survey of and initial rough grading of the site improvements.

		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. The areas of the winery site to be disturbed for the improvements are generally flat and under five percent. Given that the area of disturbance is predominantly flat, soil movement and erosion potential is anticipated to be low (by contrast, higher erosion potential is anticipated in areas of steep slopes or more moderate slopes with loose, sandy soils). The property also has a low landslide potential, as identified on landslide risk maps produced by the California Department of Conservation and Association of Bay Area Governments.

The property is not located within any Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone designated by the State Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. Although no fault zone underlies the property, the site is generally located within a region of active fault zones, including those of the Berryessa, Concord, Great Valley, North Hayward, Mayacama, Rodgers Creek, San Andreas and West Napa faults. Movement along any of these faults is anticipated to result in intensities of VII and VIII on the Modified Mercalli Scale at the project site; these "very strong" to "severe" intensities would be felt by most people and are likely to result in some damage to well-built structures.

Improvements to the existing barn, construction of the new bathroom, and installation of the water storage tanks will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code. Compliance with the latest editions of the California

Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts. The proposed changes to the winery site would not expose people or structures to increased potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death.

According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layer – Geology and Soils – Liquefaction) portions of the property along the creek are indicated an area of “high” liquefaction potential, with areas in the hillsides denoted as “very low” liquefaction potential. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Landslides – line; Landslides – polygon; Landslide Geology) there is evidence of one large landslide deposit approximately 1,000 feet northwest of and across the creek from the proposed winery location. Additionally multiple small landslide deposits have been identified on the lower hillsides on the northern portion of the property. All proposed improvements will be reviewed by the appropriate County divisions to ensure compliance with County and State regulations, including the latest editions of the California Building Code. Compliance with the latest editions of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts and the project will not subject people or structures to a significant risk of inundation by tsunamis, seiche, or mudflows.

- b. The proposed project will require incorporation of best management practices and will be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance, which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable. Incorporating best management practices and complying with the ordinance will reduce any potential impacts to less than significant.
- c/d. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (layers – Soil types, Surficial Deposits, Geology) the property is made up of a combination of soils and deposits. The flat areas containing the existing development and vineyards have yolo loam (0 to 2 percent slopes) soil and is underlain by quaternary Holocene alluvium-undifferentiated deposits. The hillside areas have Bressa-Dibble complex (30 to 50 percent slopes) soil and is underlain by Pre-Quaternary deposits and bedrock. As discussed above, portions of the property along the creek are indicated an area of “high” liquefaction potential, with areas in the hillsides denoted as “very low” liquefaction potential. Additionally, there is evidence of one large landslide deposit and multiple small landslide deposits on the lower hillsides on the northern portion of the property. All proposed improvements will be reviewed by the appropriate County divisions to ensure compliance with County and State regulations, including the latest editions of the California Building Code, that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- e. There is a septic system installed on site that serves the existing residences. No changes are proposed to the existing system. CMP Civil Engineering prepared wastewater system calculations and plans, dated May 26, 2016, to evaluate the feasibility of treating wastewater flows generated by the winery. New septic systems will be installed to accommodate the winery process waste and the domestic waste. The Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the application materials and determined that the proposed system is adequate to serve the winery. The process waste system will be monitored by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. Full design calculations and construction plans will be prepared in accordance with Napa County standards at the time of building permit application submittal. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

Napa County has been working to develop a Climate Action Plan (CAP) for several years. In 2012, a Draft CAP (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. This initial phase included: i) updating the unincorporated County's community-wide GHG emissions inventory to 2014, and ii) preparing new GHG emissions forecasts for the 2020, 2030, and 2050 horizons. Additional information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or <http://www.countyofnapa.org/CAP/>.

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

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

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

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

GHGs are the atmospheric gases whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for the greenhouse effect, including carbon dioxide, methane, ozone, and the fluorocarbons, that contribute to climate change (a widely accepted theory/science explain human effects on the atmosphere). Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) gas, the principal greenhouse gas (GHG) being emitted by human activities, and whose concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity, also serves as the reference gas to compare other greenhouse gases. Agricultural sources of carbon emissions include forest clearing, land-use changes, biomass burning, and farm equipment and management activity emissions (http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/glossary/letter_c.html). Equivalent Carbon Dioxide (CO₂e) is the most commonly reported type of GHG emission and a way to get one number that approximates total emissions from all the different gasses that contribute to GHG (BAAMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2017). 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 a winery development project include: i) the carbon stocks that are lost (or released) when existing vegetation is removed and soil is ripped in preparation for a new winery structure and associated infrastructure; and ii) emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area and construct a 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 any existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed.

In addition to the one time Construction Emissions, "Operational Emissions" of the winery are also considered and include: i) any reduction in the amount of carbon sequestered by existing vegetation that is removed as part of the project compared to a "no project" scenario (hereinafter referred to as Operational Sequestration Emissions); and ii) ongoing emissions from the energy used to maintain and operate the winery, including vehicle trips associated with employee and visitor trips (hereinafter referred to as Operational Emissions). See Section XVI, Transportation/Traffic, for anticipated number of operational trips. Operational Emissions from the proposed winery would be the primary source of emissions over the long-term when compared to one time construction emissions.

As discussed in the Air Quality section of this Initial Study, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors & GHG Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, including GHG emissions, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. The proposed winery building is approximately 800 square feet of floor area inclusive of an approximately 250 square foot tasting room. When compared to the BAAQMD's GHG screening criteria of 121,000 square feet for general industrial, and compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 9,000 square feet for high quality restaurant, the project was determined not to exceed the 1,100 MT of CO₂e/yr GHG threshold of significance.

Furthermore, the applicant has indicated that the project will incorporate the following voluntary best management practices: limited grading and tree removal; energy conserving lighting; water efficient fixtures; retaining and reusing biomass on site; composting 75% of food and garden material; water efficient landscaping; and generation of on-site renewable energy (future). Additional items are included in the Voluntary Best Management Practices Checklist for Development Projects form included with the Use Permit Application.

The proposed project has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds and determined that the project would not exceed the 1,100 MT/yr of CO₂e. Greenhouse Gas Emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the Cal Green Building Code, vehicle fuel efficiency standards, and the project-specific on-site programs identified above would combine to further reduce emissions below BAAQMD thresholds.

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

The increase in emissions expected as a result of the project would be relatively modest and the project is in compliance with the County's efforts to reduce emissions as described above. For these reasons, project impacts related to GHG emissions are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. The proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts normally used in winery operations. A Business Plan will be filed with the Environmental Health Division should the amount of hazardous materials reach reportable levels. However, in the event that the proposed use or a future use involves the use, storage, or transportation of greater the 55 gallons or 500 pounds of hazardous materials, a use permit and subsequent environmental assessment would be required in accordance with the Napa County Zoning Ordinance prior to the establishment of the use. There are no foreseeable reasons the project would result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Given the quantities of hazardous materials and the limited duration, they will result in a less-than-significant impact.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site. No impacts would occur.
- d. The project site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites. No impacts would occur.
- e-f. The project site is not located within two miles of any public airport or within the vicinity of any private airports. No impacts would occur.
- g. The proposed project will not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. No impacts would occur.
- h. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps the project is located in the wildland urban interface, with a Moderate fire hazard severity rating. The property and surrounding areas are developed with residential, agricultural uses, and vineyards. The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. The Fire Marshal has reviewed the proposed exception to the Napa County Road and Street Standards and is in support as conditioned. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

On January 14, 2014, Governor Jerry Brown declared a drought emergency in the state of California. That declaration was followed up on April 1, 2015, when the Governor directed the State Water Resources Control Board to implement mandatory water reductions in cities and town across California to reduce water usage by 25 percent. These water restrictions do not apply to agricultural users. However, on April 7, 2017, Governor Jerry Brown signed an executive order lifting California's drought emergency in all but four counties (Fresno, Kings, Tulare and Tuolumne). The County of Napa had not adopted or implemented any additional mandatory water use restrictions. The County requires all Use Permit applicants to complete necessary water analyses in order to document that sufficient water supplies are available for the proposed project and to implement water saving measures to prepare for periods of limited water supply and to conserve limited groundwater resources.

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

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

Minimum thresholds for water use have been established by the Napa County Department of Public Works, using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS) and the studies prepared by LSCE. These reports are the result of water resources investigations performed by the USGS in cooperation with the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. Any project which reduces water usage or any water usage which is at or below the established threshold is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels.

- a. The proposed project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. There is a septic system installed on site that serves the existing residences. No changes are proposed to the existing system. CMP Civil Engineering prepared wastewater system calculations and plans, dated May 26, 2016, to evaluate the feasibility of treating wastewater flows generated by the

winery. New septic systems will be installed to accommodate the winery process waste and the domestic waste. The Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the application materials and determined that the proposed system is adequate to serve the winery. The process waste system will be monitored by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Full design calculations and construction plans will be prepared in accordance with Napa County standards at the time of building permit application submittal. The proposed project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Any earth disturbing activities will be subject to the County's Stormwater Ordinance which complies with State requirements, would include measures to prevent erosion, sediment, and waste materials from entering waterways both during and after any construction activities. By following the above mentioned measures the project does not have the potential to significantly impact water quality and discharge standards. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

- b. The project is located in an area denoted as "All Other Areas" as described in the Napa County Water Availability Analysis, requiring a Tier 1 and Tier 2 analysis. For this project CMP Civil Engineering prepared a Water Availability Analysis (November 2, 2015; revised May 27, 2016) to determine the estimated water use of the existing development and proposed project and a Ground Water Recharge Calculations analysis (May 27, 2016).

Tier 1 Analysis

Existing water usage consists of a main residence, second dwelling, 38 acres of vineyards, and an 0.15 acre orchard, and was estimated at 27.90 acre-feet of water per year. Residential uses on the property, estimated at 0.70 acre-feet of water per year, will not change as a result of the proposed project. The water use associated with agricultural uses (vineyard and orchard), estimated at 27.2 acre-feet of water per year, is expected to be reduced by approximately 0.16 acre-feet of per year with the removal of approximately 0.04 acre of orchard.

The proposed winery is estimated to use approximately 0.23 acre-feet of water per year, inclusive of 0.08 acre-feet of water per year for processing and 0.15 acre-feet of water per year for domestic and landscaping. The analysis estimates approximately 0.08 acre-feet of water per year to be available as recycled process wastewater.

As shown in the table below, the removal of some orchard area and the re-use of recycled water will balance out the new water use associated with the winery. Since there would be no net increase in water use associated with the winery, the project complies with the Napa County Water Availability Analysis requirements.

Usage Type	Existing Acre feet per Year	Proposed Acre feet per Year
Residential	0.70	0.70
Agricultural	27.20	27.04
Winery process	0	0.08
Winery domestic	0	0.15
Recycled waste water	0	(-0.08)
Total	27.90	27.89

Tier 2 Analysis

The analysis also prepared a groundwater recharge calculation based on the local precipitation, local evaporation transpiration, and runoff. Total annual ground water recharge for the 287 acre parcel was calculated at 173.77 acre-feet per year.

Although there is a near balance in the proposed water use, the new water use that would be associated with the winery 0.23 acre feet per year and the total proposed water use of 27.89 acre-feet of water per year, is less than the calculated 173.77 acre feet per year recharge. Therefore the project further complies with the Napa County Water Availability Analysis requirements. There are no wells located within 500 feet of the project well; therefore a Tier 3 analysis is not required. The proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in the demand of ground water supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge or lowering of the local groundwater level. Potential impacts from the project would be less than significant.

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

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

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

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

c-e. Gordon Valley Creek runs through the property in a southerly direction, along Grapevine Lane to the intersection with Gordon Valley Road. As discussed in the Biological Resources section, in the proposed winery area, the minimum stream setback from top of bank was determined to be 45 feet. The existing development that will be used for the winery (barn, portion of concrete patio, and gravel pad) are located within the 45-foot creek setback. Improvements to these areas will take place within the existing development footprint. Proposed improvements that require new ground disturbing activity, including placement of water tanks, wastewater system equipment, and paving of an accessible parking space, will take place outside of the minimum creek setback.

The access road is located adjacent to Gordon Valley Creek. The first 0.25 mile is directly adjacent to the creek and is within the stream setback. The remaining 0.55 mile of the road is relatively straight along the eastern side of the creek, with the creek coming in close proximity at two locations. Roadway widening and improvements are required along areas of the road that are within the creek setback, necessitating a request for an exception to the Conservation Regulations (County Code section 18.108.040). In order to minimize the work adjacent to the creek, the project includes a request for an exception to the Napa County Road and Street Standards (RSS). The request is due to the environmental constraints of the location of the existing road adjacent to the creek. The request proposes an exception to the minimum commercial driveway width (22 feet) in three locations and an exception to the 22-foot minimum bridge width at the northern, existing bridge. In those areas where the full 22 feet cannot be achieved, the request proposes widening of the driveway to the edge of the existing shoulder and resurfacing with gravel. No tree removal is proposed, but tree and vegetation trimming and maintenance is proposed in order to improve site distance and emergency equipment clearance.

The project proposal will not substantially alter any drainage patterns on site or cause an increase in erosion on or off site. All earth disturbing activities will be subject to the County's Stormwater Ordinance which would include measures to prevent erosion, sediment, and waste materials from entering waterways both during and after any construction activities. Given the County's Best Management Practices, which comply with RWQCB requirements, the project does not have the potential to significantly impact water quality and discharge standards. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

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

g-i. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layer – Flood Zones) portions of the parcel, including the existing barn proposed to be converted to the winery and segments of the access road, are located within the 100-year flood zone. The winery project would not place new housing within a flood zone. The existing structures used for the winery development and the construction of the new bathroom on the southwest side of the existing barn, away from the creek, would not impede or redirect flood flows or expose structures or people to flooding. The parcel is not within a dam levee inundation area (based on the following layer – Dam Levee Inundation). Potential impacts from the project would be less than significant.

j. In coming years, higher global temperatures are expected to raise sea level by expanding ocean water, melting mountain glaciers and small ice caps, and causing portions of Greenland and the Antarctic ice sheets to melt. The Intergovernmental panel on Climate change estimates that the global average sea level will rise between 0.6 and 2 feet over the next century (IPCC, 2007). The winery development would be located at approximately 310 feet above mean sea level.

According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Landslides – line; Landslides – polygon; Landslide Geology) there is evidence of one large landslide deposit approximately 1,000 feet northwest of and across the creek from the proposed winery location. Additionally multiple small landslide deposits have been identified on the lower hillsides on the northern portion of the property. The project will not subject people or structures to a significant risk of inundation by tsunamis, seiche, or mudflows. Impacts would be less than significant.

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 287-acre parcel is located at the end of Grapevine Lane in Gordon Valley. The project is in support of the ongoing agricultural use in the area. The proposed winery will not divide an established community. No impacts would occur.
- b. The parcel General Plan land use designations of AR (Agricultural Resource) and AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space) allow "agriculture, processing of agricultural products, and single-family dwellings." General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-2 recognize wineries and other agricultural processing facilities, and any use clearly accessory to those facilities, as agriculture. The project site is zoned Agricultural Watershed, which allows wineries upon grant of a use permit. The County has adopted the Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO) to protect agriculture and open space and to regulate winery development and expansion in a manner that avoids potential negative environmental effects. The proposed project is compliant with the use limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance. Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Goal AG/LU-1 of the 2008 General Plan states that the County shall, "preserve existing agricultural land uses and plan for agriculture and related activities as the primary land uses in Napa County." The project is consistent with the Napa County General Plan. No impacts would occur.
- c. There are no applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the property. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a/b. Historically, the two most valuable mineral commodities in Napa County in economic terms have been mercury and mineral water. More recently, building stone and aggregate have become economically valuable. Mines and Mineral Deposits mapping included in the Napa

County Baseline Data Report (*Mines and Mineral Deposits*, BDR Figure 2-2) indicates that there are no known mineral resources nor any locally important mineral resource recovery sites located on or near the project site. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b. The project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during limited project construction. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. The project would not result in potentially significant temporary construction noise impacts or operational impacts.

The nearest offsite residence is located approximately 500 feet to the south of the existing barn to be converted to the winery. Given the proximity to the residential neighbors, there is a relatively low potential for impacts related to winery construction noise to result in a significant impact. There are four residences served by Grapevine Lane, which would be subject to construction noise during proposed road improvements. Construction activities would generally occur during the period of 7 AM to 7 PM on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity, and all construction activities will be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). The proposed project will not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts. Conditions of approval identified below would require construction activities to be limited to daylight hours, vehicles to be muffled, and backup alarms adjusted to the lowest allowable levels. Impacts would be less than significant.

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.

c/d. Additional regulations contained within County Code Chapter 8.16 establish exterior noise criteria for various land uses in the County. As described in Project Setting, above, land uses that surround the proposed parcel are predominantly agricultural (vineyard and winery) but include low density residential; of these land uses, the residential land use is considered the most sensitive to noise. Based on the standards in County Code section 8.16.070, noise levels, measured at the exterior of a residential structure or residential use on a portion of a larger property, may not exceed 50 decibels for more than half of any hour in the window of daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.)

within which the applicant proposes to conduct events. Noise impacts of the proposed project would be considered bothersome and potentially significant if sound generated by it had the effect of exceeding the standards in County Code more than 50 percent of the time (i.e., more than 50 decibels for more than 30 minutes in an hour for a residential use).

Noise from winery operations is generally limited and intermittent, meaning the sound level can vary during the day and over the course of the year, depending on the activities at the winery. The primary noise-generating activities are equipment associated with wineries including refrigeration equipment, bottling equipment, barrel washing, de-stemmers and press activities occurring during the harvest crush season, delivery trucks, and other vehicles. The Napa County General Plan EIR indicates the average, or equivalent, sound level (Leq) for winery activities is 51dBA in the morning and 41dBA in the afternoon. Audibility of a new noise source and/or increase in noise levels within recognized acceptable limits are not usually considered to be significant noise impacts, but these concerns should be addressed and considered in the planning and environmental review processes.

Winery operations would occur between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. (excluding harvest). The nearest offsite residences are located approximately 500 feet to the south of the existing barn to be converted to the winery. The tasting area is proposed on the covered patio on the northern side of the winery building. This area would be separated from the closest offsite residence by the winery building. Any outdoor equipment would be subject to the following standard conditions requiring that any exterior winery equipment be enclosed or muffled and maintained so as not to create a noise disturbance.

6.6 OUTDOOR STORAGE/SCREENING/UTILITIES

c. Exterior winery equipment shall be located, enclosed or muffled so as not to exceed noise thresholds in the County Code.

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

b. All landscaping and outdoor screening, storage, and utility structures shall be permanently maintained in accordance with the landscaping and building plans approved by the County. No stored items shall exceed the height of the screening. Exterior winery equipment shall be maintained so as to not create a noise disturbance or exceed noise thresholds in the County Code.

All events would end by 10:00 p.m., with up to one hour after the end of the event for clean-up. Amplified music or sound systems would not be permitted for outdoor events as identified in standard Condition of Approval 4.10 below.

4.10 AMPLIFIED MUSIC

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

Continuing enforcement of Napa County's Noise Ordinance by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff, including the prohibition against amplified music, should further ensure that marketing events and other winery activities do not create a significant noise impact. Temporary events would be subject to County Code Chapter 5.36 which regulates proposed temporary events. The proposed project would not result in long-term significant permanent noise impacts.

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. The Association of Bay Area Governments' *Projections 2003* figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase some 23 percent by the year 2030 (*Napa County Baseline Data Report*, November 30, 2005). Additionally, the County's *Baseline Data Report* indicates that total housing units currently programmed in county and municipal housing elements exceed ABAG growth projections by approximately 15 percent. The project proposes up 2 full-time and 2 part-time employees. Any improvements requiring building permits will be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs.

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

- b/c. The existing residence and second unit onsite will not be impacted by the proposed winery. This project will not displace a substantial volume of existing housing or a substantial number of people and will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b. Winery Traffic Information/Trip Generation was prepared by CMP Civil Engineering (date: November 2, 2015, revised: May 27, 2016). The trip generation calculated traffic for a typical weekday (numbers rounded to the nearest whole number), consisting of trips from one full-time employee and six visitors, as eight total trips with three PM peak trips. Traffic during a typical Saturday was calculated, consisting of trips from one full-time and one part-time employee and eight visitors, as 11 total trips with five PM peak trips. Traffic during a Crush Saturday was calculated, consisting of trips from two full-time and two part-time employee and fifteen visitors, as 21 total trips. Excluding traffic during Crush, the estimated trips are close to the number of trips generally associated with a single family residence (10 daily trips).

Under the Napa County General Plan, traffic volumes are projected to increase and will be caused by a combination of locally generated traffic as well as general regional growth. The General Plan EIR indicates that much of the forecasted increase in traffic on the arterial roadway network will result from traffic generated outside of the County; however the project will contribute a small amount toward the general overall increase. General Plan Policy CIR-16 states that "The County will seek to maintain an arterial Level of Service D or better on all County roadways, except where the level of Service already exceeds this standard and where increased intersection capacity is not feasible without substantial additional right of way."

County of Napa Public Works staff reviewed the project and determined that based on the expected trip generation, trip distribution, and the location of the project, a traffic study was not needed. Available sight distance was shown for the project driveway, and based on roadway design speed and expected average daily traffic (ADT) the sight distance available is expected to be adequate. Upon review of the project description, typical trip generation, expected trip distribution, available sight distance, and ADT for nearby roadways, staff concluded that the project is not expected to create any significant impacts related to transportation.

Due to the limited increase in traffic, the proposed project would not cause a substantial increase in traffic or conflict with an applicable congestion management program. The impact would be less than significant.

c. No air traffic is proposed and there are no new structures proposed for this project that would interfere with or require alteration of air traffic patterns. No impact would occur.

d-e. The winery would be accessed on Grapevine Lane at the intersection with Gordon Valley Road. There are no changes proposed to the location or overall design of the road. As detailed in the exception to the Napa County Road and Street Standards, the request proposes an exception to the minimum commercial driveway width (22 feet) in three locations and an exception to the 22-foot minimum bridge width at the northern, existing bridge. In those areas where the full 22 feet cannot be achieved, the request proposes widening of the driveway to the edge of the existing shoulder and resurfacing with gravel. No tree removal is proposed, but tree and vegetation trimming and maintenance is proposed in order to improve site distance and emergency equipment clearance.

Sight distance at the intersection of Grapevine Lane and Gordon Valley road was reviewed by Public Works staff. Based on roadway design speed and expected average daily traffic (ADT) the sight distance available is expected to be adequate.

The project will not result in any increased hazards or in inadequate emergency access. The Fire Department, Engineering Services Division, and Public Works Department have reviewed the application and recommend approval, as conditioned.

f. The project is proposing seven parking spaces inclusive of one accessible parking stall. Staff believes this number of parking spaces is commensurate with the proposed number of employees and visitation. The proposed parking will meet the anticipated parking demand and will avoid providing excess parking, and will therefore have no impact. The parking area is located outside of the 45-foot stream setback.

g. There is no aspect of this proposed project that would conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. No impact would occur.

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

California Native American tribe.

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

Discussion:

- a. As discussed in the Cultural Resources section, in May 2015, a historical resource analysis was prepared by Juliana Inman, licensed architect meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in Architecture and Historic Architecture (listed in CHRIS). The analysis was done on the barn that is proposed to be converted to the winery structure. The barn (originally a drying shed) does not have architectural significance due to its recent date of construction and the extensive alterations to the original design of the building. The building is no longer qualified for use of the California Historical Buildings Code. No mitigation is recommended for conversion of the building to another use.
- b. Archaeological Resource Service prepared a cultural resources evaluation, dated October 21, 2015, for the location of the winery site and wastewater system improvements. The evaluation found no indications of the presence of prehistoric or historic era archaeological resources within the examined area. In light of the negative finding, no further archaeological evaluation was recommended.

The author conducted a literature search to assess the archaeological sensitivity of the project area. The literature search was conducted using information on file at Archaeological Resource Service, the results of a previous literature check at the California Historical Resources Inventory Systems office located in Rohnert Park, CA, and a current check. The literature check indicates that several areas in the immediate vicinity of the project have been examined previously.

Due to the fact that cultural resources have previously been identified in close proximity to the access road that is proposed to be improved, a mitigation measure has been incorporated to require a cultural monitor to be onsite during construction/earth disturbing activities. See CUL-1.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1, invitation for tribal consultation was sent on October 5, 2017. The letter informed the tribal representatives that although no cultural resources were identified onsite, previous studies had found areas within the vicinity, and as a result, a Mitigated Negative Declaration was being prepared.

Mitigation Measures: See mitigation measure CUL-1.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a, b, e. As discussed in Section IX. Hydrology and Water Quality, the proposed project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. There is a septic system installed on site that serves the existing residences. No changes are proposed to the existing system. CMP Civil Engineering prepared wastewater system calculations and plans, dated May 26, 2016, to evaluate the feasibility of treating wastewater flows generated by the winery. New septic systems will be installed to accommodate the winery process waste and the domestic waste. The Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the application materials and determined that the proposed system is adequate to serve the winery. The process waste system will be monitored by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Full design calculations and construction plans will be prepared in accordance with Napa County standards at the time of building permit application submittal. Wastewater disposal would be accommodated on-site in compliance with State and County regulations and will not require construction of any new water treatment facilities that will result in a significant impact to the environment. The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and will not result in a significant impact.

Any earth disturbing activities will be subject to the County's Stormwater Ordinance which complies with State requirements, would include measures to prevent erosion, sediment, and waste materials from entering waterways both during and after any construction activities. By following the above mentioned measures the project does not have the potential to significantly impact water quality and discharge standards. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

c. The project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, which would cause a significant impact to the environment. No impact would occur.

d. As discussed in Section IX. Hydrology and Water Quality, according to the water analysis, the proposed water use associated with the winery is 0.23 acre acre-feet per year. The removal of some orchard area and the re-use of recycled water will balance out the new water use associated with the winery and there will be no net increase in water use. The analysis also prepared a groundwater recharge calculation based on the local precipitation, local evaporation transpiration, and run-off. Total annual ground water recharge for the 287-acre parcel was calculated at 173.77 acre-feet per year. Although there is a balance in the proposed water use, the new water use that would be associated with the winery (0.23 acre-feet per year) and the total proposed water use on the parcel (residential, agricultural, and winery) of 27.89 acre-feet of water per year, is less than the calculated 173.77 acre feet per year recharge. The project would not require new or expanded entitlements and the project will have a less than significant impact on groundwater supply and recharge rates.

f. According to the Napa County Baseline Data Report, all of the solid waste landfills where Napa County's waste is disposed have more than sufficient capacity related to the current waste generation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

g. The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 proposed physical improvements on the site include enclosing a portion of an existing gravel pad on the east side of the barn, paving one parking stall, installing two water storage tanks, and installing a new wastewater system. The project also requires improvements to the existing road, including widening of the driveway to the edge of the existing shoulder and resurfacing with gravel or asphalt concrete, where not constrained by environmental factors. The request for an exception to the RSS would assist in minimizing grading in the creek setback of Gordon Valley Creek. Potential impacts to the quality of the environment, habitat, wildlife, or a plant community are less than significant. There are no historic structures located on site. As discussed in Section V. Cultural Resources, due to the fact that cultural resources have previously been identified in close proximity to the access road that is proposed to be improved, a mitigation measure has been incorporated to require a cultural monitor to be onsite during construction/earth disturbing activities. See CUL-1. Potential impacts would be less than significant with incorporation of the proposed mitigation measure.
- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality and greenhouse gas emissions are discussed in the respective sections above. The analysis determined that all potential impacts were less than significant and would not contribute significantly to cumulative impacts. The potential impact from an increase in air pollution and greenhouse gases are being addressed as discussed in the project's Greenhouse Gas Voluntary Best Management Practices including but not limited to: limited grading and tree removal; energy conserving lighting; water efficient fixtures; retaining and reusing biomass on site; composting 75% of food and garden material; water efficient landscaping; and generation of on-site renewable energy (future). Additional items are included in the Voluntary Best Management Practices Checklist for Development Projects form included with the Use Permit Application. As noted in Section X. Land Use and Planning, the project is consistent with the General Plan and General Plan Final EIR which anticipated new and expanded wineries as a component of growth in the County. With the imposition of standard and project specific conditions of approval, the project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- c. All impacts identified in this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration are less than significant or would be less than significant following the incorporation of the proposed mitigation measure. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in environmental effects that cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: See CUL-1.

**Shed Creek Winery Use Permit P14-00346 and P17-00178
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Potential Environmental Impact	Adopted Mitigation Measure	Monitoring and Reporting Actions and Schedule	Implementation	Monitoring	Reporting & Date of Compliance/Completion
<p>Impact CULT-1: Cultural Resources. The proposed project has the potential to impact cultural or archaeological resources.</p>	<p>MM CULT-1: In order to prevent potential impacts to cultural resources, the permittee shall have an archaeological monitor on site during all earth disturbing activities. Prior to commencement of project improvements on the Shed Creek Winery parcel or road improvements to Grapevine Lane, the permittee shall coordinate with a qualified archaeological monitor. If cultural resources are identified, construction shall cease until the Native American Heritage Commission is contacted and representatives of the California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area (pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1) are offered the opportunity to participate in the monitoring.</p> <p>Pre-construction coordination shall, at a minimum, include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Submittal of copies of grading plans to the archaeological monitor, concurrently with submittal of the grading permit application to the Napa County Planning, Building & Environmental Services (PBES) Department; Execution of a Standard Monitoring Agreement with the archaeological monitor; Training of construction field crews, by an archaeological monitor, of the potential for presence of Native American resources on the property, the potential types of resources that could be found on-site, and the procedures to follow in the event of discovery of such resources; and Presence of an archaeological monitor on-site during survey/markings and initial rough grading of improvements (road improvements, installation of water storage tanks, and septic system installation). 	<p>Monitoring: Concurrently with submittal of the grading application for Shed Creek Winery parcel and road improvements to the Engineering and Building staff of PBES, the permittee shall submit confirmation of submittal of the grading plans to the archaeological monitor previously identified. If the permittee neglects to submit such confirmation to PBES, then Planning staff of PBES will convey a copy of the plans to the archaeological monitor upon receipt of the grading permit application.</p> <p>Prior to issuance of the grading permit, the permittee shall submit to Planning staff of PBES confirmation of pre-construction training of construction field crews about potential presence of archaeological or cultural resources on the project site and the correct procedures to follow in the event of discovery of such resources. Confirmation shall be in the form of a written letter or certification from the archaeological monitor conducting the training.</p> <p>No fewer than 10 days prior to commencement of grading, the permittee shall concurrently contact the archaeological monitor and Planning staff of PBES in writing, receipt confirmed, to advise of the start date of project grading and to invite the archaeological monitor and staff member to be present during survey of and initial rough grading of the site improvements.</p>	P	PD	<p>PC</p> <p>___/___/___</p>

Notes: P = Permittee, PD = Planning Division, BD = Building Division, AC = Agricultural Commissioner, DFW = Dept of Fish & Wildlife, CT = CALTRANS, EH = Environmental Health, PW = Public Works Dept, PE/G = Project Engineer/Geologist
PC = Prior to Project Commencement CPI = Construction Period Inspections FI = Final Inspection OG = Ongoing

PROJECT REVISION STATEMENT

Shed Creek Winery Use Permit P14-00346 and Use Permit Exception to the Conservation Regulations P17-00178

I hereby revise Shed Creek Use Permit No. P14-00346 and P17-00178 for the approval of a use permit to operate a 5,000 gallon per year winery (Assessor's Parcel No.:033-170-002) located at 80 Grapevine Lane, Gordon Valley, California, to include the one (1) mitigation measure specified below:

MM CULT-1: In order to prevent potential impacts to cultural resources, the permittee shall have an archaeological monitor on site during all earth disturbing activities. Prior to commencement of project improvements on the Shed Creek Winery parcel or road improvements to Grapevine Lane, the permittee shall coordinate with a qualified archaeological monitor. If cultural resources are identified, construction shall cease until the Native American Heritage Commission is contacted and representatives of the California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area (pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1) are offered the opportunity to participate in the monitoring.

Pre-construction coordination shall, at a minimum, include the following:

- a. Submittal of copies of grading plans to the archaeological monitor, concurrently with submittal of the grading permit application to the Napa County Planning, Building & Environmental Services (PBES) Department;
- b. Execution of a Standard Monitoring Agreement with the archaeological monitor;
- c. Training of construction field crews, by an archaeological monitor, of the potential for presence of Native American resources on the property, the potential types of resources that could be found on-site, and the procedures to follow in the event of discovery of such resources; and
- d. Presence of an archaeological monitor on-site during survey/markings and initial rough grading of improvements (road improvements, installation of water storage tanks, and septic system installation).


Monitoring: Concurrently with submittal of the grading application for Shed Creek Winery parcel and road improvements to the Engineering and Building staff of PBES, the permittee shall submit confirmation of submittal of the grading plans to the archaeological monitor previously identified. If the permittee neglects to submit such confirmation to PBES, then Planning staff of PBES will convey a copy of the plans to the archaeological monitor upon receipt of the grading permit application.

Prior to issuance of the grading permit, the permittee shall submit to Planning staff of PBES confirmation of pre-construction training of construction field crews about potential presence of archaeological or cultural resources on the project site and the correct procedures to follow in the event of discovery of such resources. Confirmation shall be in the form of a written letter or certification from the archaeological monitor conducting the training.

No fewer than 10 days prior to commencement of grading, the permittee shall concurrently contact the archaeological monitor and Planning staff of PBES in writing, receipt confirmed, to advise of the start date of project grading and to invite the archaeological monitor and staff member to be present during survey of and initial rough grading of the site improvements.

William Morgan further commit themselves and successors-in-interest to (a) inform any future purchasers of the property of the above commitments; (b) include in all property leases a provision that informs the lessee of these restrictions and binds them to adhere to them, and (c) inform in writing all persons doing work on this property of these limitations.

William Morgan understands and explicitly agrees that with regards to all California Environmental Quality Act and Permit Streamlining Act (Government Code Sections 63920-63962) deadlines, this revised application will be treated as a new project. The new date on which said application will be considered complete is the date on which an executed copy of this project revision statement is received by the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services.



William Morgan
(Owner)

Date 11-7-2017