

“D”

Initial Study/Negative Declaration

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

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated October 2016)

1. **Project Title:** Hendry Winery, Use Permit Major Modification Application No. P15-00173
2. **Property Owner:** George Hendry
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Dana Ayers, Planner III, (707) 253-4388, dana.ayers@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel No. (APN):** 3104 Redwood Road (nearest cross street Browns Valley Road), unincorporated Napa County, California 94558; APN 035-120-031
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Jeff Miller, Hendry Winery, 3104 Redwood Road, Napa, California 94558
6. **General Plan description:** Agricultural Resource (AR) and Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space (AWOS)
7. **Zoning:** AP (Agricultural Preserve) District

8. **Background/Project History:**

The property that is the subject of this application is a 60.68-acre parcel located on the east side of Redwood Road, in an unincorporated area just outside the municipal boundary of northwest Napa city. Members of the Hendry family have owned the subject property and three adjoining parcels since 1939. Although the current property owner planted much of the property in vineyards following his family's purchase of it, the applicant reports that the property had grapevines as early as the 19th century.

On September 2, 1998, the property owner obtained from the Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Commission, use permit approval to operate a winery on the property (Use Permit No. 97506-UP). The use permit allowed the winery an annual production limit of 59,000 gallons of wine per year; 21,000 square feet of building area to house wine production and barrel storage facilities; and a 6,880 square foot covered crush pad and outdoor work area. The Commission approved weekly visitation, by appointment, for one to two groups of four to eight general public visitors per group, plus one group of one to four visitors from the wine trade, for a total of 20 visitors per week. Use Permit No. 97506-UP was later modified by approval of Use Permit Major Modification Nos. 99408-MOD and 00343-MOD, which resulted in: 1) shifting the location of the winery building 400 feet northward, further away from the existing on-site residence; 2) an increase in winery building area from 21,000 to 23,000 square feet, which included an approximately 500 square foot room for conducting wine tours and tastings; 3) addition of a marketing program to winery operations, consisting of up to two, 30-person events per year; and 4) an increase in the allotment of annual production available to custom crush producers, from 2,300 gallons to 35,400 gallons of the winery's 59,000 gallon annual production limit.

While the property owner removed some of the vineyard in 2000-2001 to accommodate construction of the existing winery building and production areas, there are still approximately 25 acres of grape vines planted on-site.

On February 2, 2015, staff of the Napa County Code Enforcement Division sent the Hendry Winery a Notice of Violation. The notice referenced the 2013 Wine Audit, during which staff became aware that the winery was exceeding its permitted visitation levels. The applicant submitted this Use Permit Major Modification application in response to the violation.

9. **Description of Project.**

The project proponent requests approval to modify the previously-approved Use Permit (97506-UP) to recognize the following three currently noncompliant winery activities: 1) an increase in the permitted number of visitors to the winery, from 20 guests per week to a maximum of 20 guests per day (or 140 guests per week) in approximately 450 additional square feet adjacent to the existing 500 square foot tasting room; 2) an increase in on-site parking from six permitted stalls to

10 existing stalls; and 3) a change in the number of winery employees from three full-time and two part-time to four (full-time or part-time).

The request also includes recognition of the winery's expansion of its previously-permitted marketing program, to consist of up to 12 events per year for up to 50 guests, plus one event per year for up to 150 guests, with catered food and portable restrooms. Proposed improvements associated with the request include plans to install an additional of 100 feet of leach line in the existing on-site wastewater treatment system leachfield located in an undeveloped field south of the existing residence on-site, to correspond to the requested changes in winery visitation and employment. Adopted conditions of approval of Use Permit 97506-UP are also proposed to be modified to remove custom crush limitations and to add an allowance for visitors to consume wine purchased on-site (Business and Professions Code Sections 23358, 23390 and 23396.5) in the tasting rooms, on the porch adjoining the tasting room, and in a covered area adjoining the barrel rooms on the east side of the building.

Water to the winery is currently provided from an off-site well located on a parcel (Assessor's Parcel No. 035-120-030) owned by a relative of the winery owner; however, with the approval of the requested use permit modification, the applicant intends to drill a new well on-site and abandon use of the off-site well.

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

The Hendry Winery property is located on the east side of Redwood Road, in a pocket of unincorporated lands bordered on the south, north and east by the city of Napa municipal boundary. The property is currently developed with an approximately 23,000 square foot winery building with a 900 square foot attached porch; approximately 6,150 square feet of covered outdoor work areas; and 10 winery employee and visitor parking stalls. Also on-site but outside the scope of this use permit modification are approximately 25 acres of vineyard, an irrigation pond, three agricultural and utility buildings, and the single-family residence of the winery operator and property owner. Redwood Creek extends north to south through the property. Access to the property is directly from Redwood Road, with a 20-foot wide asphalt-paved driveway from Redwood Road providing access to the residential and winery buildings on-site.

The subject property on which the road is proposed to be built is located within a Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone of the West Napa Fault, as designated by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology; however, no new building construction is proposed with the project. The property is underlain with Pleasanton loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes, a well-drained soil formed from alluvial deposits.

North: The city of Napa's 155-acre Alston Park, within the Napa municipal boundary, borders the Hendry property to the north. The Hendry property also shares its northern property line with a smaller, 6.24-acre parcel that is unincorporated and on which operates the Brookside Inn & Vineyards, a bed and breakfast inn. The smaller, unincorporated parcel is zoned AW (Agricultural Watershed) and has a General Plan land use designation of AWOS.

East: Alston Park shares roughly one-third of the length of the eastern property line of the project site. The southern two-thirds of the eastern property line is shared with a 42-acre parcel that is also owned by the applicant and substantially planted with vineyards; the parcel is zoned AP and has a General Plan land use designation of AR.

South: To the south of the Hendry Winery property are two parcels of 22.1 and 18.8 acres in size. Both parcels are owned by the applicant, and both parcels are predominantly planted with vineyards. The larger of the two parcels includes an irrigation pond. Both parcels are zoned AP and have a General Plan land use designation of AR. Along the property line shared between the subject site and the adjoining two parcels is an access stem providing access from Redwood Road to Alston Park to the north and east.

West: The right-of-way of Redwood Road, a county collector facility, borders the property to the west. Across Redwood Road from the winery site is an undeveloped 35.3-acre parcel owned by Michael Hendry, a relative of the applicant; the parcel is zoned AW and has General Plan land use designations of AR and AWOS.

11. **Other agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).
None.

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?

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

On May 1, 2018, county staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to the three Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who, as of that date, had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. On May 30, 2018, members of the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation sent a response letter requesting additional information about the project. Staff responded to the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation request on June 27, 2018. After replying to the information request, county staff concluded consultation proceedings by letter of August 15, 2018, following 45 days of no additional correspondence or requests from tribal representatives for additional project information.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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



Signature

Name, Title: Dana Ayers, Planner III

August 27, 2018

Date

Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services
(PBES) Department

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

I. **AESTHETICS.** Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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:

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

The existing winery and vineyards are on lands that are gently sloping. During a visit to the property, Planning staff observed no significant scenic resources such as rock outcroppings on the site. No trees or structures would be removed from the property as a result of the project, which consists primarily of operational changes associated with the previously permitted winery. The existing winery building would remain unchanged, and the existing restored residence on the property would be maintained as a residential use.

The closest state highway, State Route 29, is over 1.4 miles east of the winery site. The buildings on the property are not situated on a hillside or knoll so as to be visually prominent from several perspectives; rather, the property lies on the valley floor, at the base of the hillsides that create the western boundary of the Napa Valley, and the buildings have been constructed on low-lying areas of the site. As no mature landscaping, planted grapevines, or buildings would be removed with the project, and no buildings would be constructed or expanded with the project, there would be no significant change in the appearance of the property as viewed from the limited perspective of Redwood Road.

With no construction proposed on any part of the property that exceeds 15 percent, the proposed project is not subject to the requirements of Napa County Code Chapter 18.106 (Viewshed Protection Program).

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

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/e. The California Department of Conservation maps the approximately 60-acre project site with a combination of designations that include Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance and Farmland of Local Importance. Prime Farmland is assigned as a designation for those lands with an optimal combination of physical and chemical features, microclimate and water supply to produce high crop yields. Farmlands of Statewide and Local Importance are also valued for their crop production qualities, though they may lack irrigation or have other minor shortcomings such as greater slopes or lower soil moisture retention.

The requested use permit modification would not result in conversion of any mapped farmland to a non-agricultural use such as a residential or commercial complex of buildings. (For purposes of the Napa County General Plan, Policy AG/LU-2 defines wineries as agricultural uses.) No grapevines are proposed to be removed with the project.

b. The County's zoning of the property is AP (Agricultural Preserve) District, and the Napa County General Plan assigns the property with land use designations of Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space (AWOS) and Agricultural Resource (AR). The zoning assignment of the property allows agriculture (vineyard) and single-family residences as permitted uses of property, and it allows wineries with associated accessory uses (such as winery tours and tastings and marketing events) as conditionally permitted uses. Crops, residences and wineries are also consistent with the intents of the AWOS and AR General Plan land use designations (County Code sections 18.16.020 and 18.16.030 and General Plan Policies AG/LU-20 and AG/LU-21). There is no Williamson Act contract applicable to the subject property.

c/d. As previously noted, the parcel on which the winery operates is currently developed and zoned for agricultural land uses. Much of the area is planted with vineyards, and no new building construction is proposed with the project. There are no forest resources on the site that would be affected by the project proposal.

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"/>

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

Discussion:

On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) Board of Directors unanimously adopted Thresholds of Significance (Thresholds) to assist local agencies in the nine-county Bay Area in the review of projects' potential environmental impacts pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Thresholds were designed to establish the level at which the BAAQMD believed air pollution emissions would cause significant air quality and climate impacts in the region; were posted on the BAAQMD website; and were incorporated into the BAAQMD's updated CEQA Guidelines (updated May 2012). The Thresholds are advisory, and local agencies may follow them at the agencies' 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 Threshold Options and 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.

The requested entitlement consists of various operational changes to the existing winery, including changes to winery staffing, an increase in its permitted number of visitors, and expansion of its marketing program. No new structures are proposed, although on-site grading would occur for installation of 100 additional feet of wastewater treatment system leachfield lines on a vacant area south of the winery and on-site residence.

a-d. Over the long term, sources of emissions from the winery consist primarily of mobile sources, including customer vehicles, employee vehicles, vineyard equipment and delivery vehicles, with secondary stationary sources that include emissions from energy use, well pumping and wastewater treatment. As the vineyard maintenance, grape processing, and some winery marketing operations currently exist, this initial study considers the requested changes to the currently permitted condition, with consideration limited to: 1) the increase in vehicle trips related to the recognition of a visitation program conducted in an approximately 950 square foot area inside of the winery building; and 2) expansion of the winery's marketing program to include more and larger events; and 3) grading associated with installation of the addition to the wastewater treatment system leachfield. The project scope also includes a change in the number of employees from three full-time and two part-time to four (full-time or part-time), though this operational change would reasonably result in a decrease in daily employee trips.

The BAAQMD's screening criteria (2017) includes a variety of land uses and corresponding square footages for which a project would be anticipated to have a significant impact, based on the BAAQMD's thresholds. There is not a land use in the BAAQMD's guidance that directly correlates to the combination of production, administration and visitation uses typically programmed in a winery in Napa; similar land use categories to the winery office and wine tasting components of the winery include "general office building" and "quality restaurant," respectively. Of these similar land use categories, "quality restaurant" has the lower screening criteria of 47,000 square feet, and so it is applied as a conservative guideline for determining potential air quality impacts of the proposed project. Applying this criterion, the guidelines suggest that a potentially significant air quality impact would occur if the winery's hospitality facility consisted of 47,000 or more square feet (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2017, pages 3-2 & 3-3). The area requested to be used for wine tasting consists of three rooms with a combined floor area of 950 square feet; associated restroom, catering kitchen and storage/office spaces add another, approximately 550 square feet of floor area, for a combined, approximately 1,500 square feet of total tasting facility space. Given the size of the winery's tasting facility space (approximately 1,500 square feet compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47,000 square feet), the requested use permit modification and its associated ongoing operations and customer and employee vehicle trips, would not contribute a significant amount of air pollution to the region and thus, would not have a significant air quality impact. It is further noted that the area requested to be recognized for the winery's expanded visitation program is within existing conditioned spaces inside of the existing, previously-entitled wine production building, and that construction-related emissions that might otherwise result from building tenant improvements (e.g., contractor vehicle trips) would not occur with the project.

In 2017, the BAAQMD adopted an updated Clean Air Plan that outlines a regional program and a set of measures to reduce the transmission of ozone and ozone precursors, particulate matter, toxic air contaminants, greenhouse gases, and other sources of air pollution. As noted in the Clean Air Plan, the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area as a region is in non-attainment status for achievement of state and federal standards for ozone. Primary sources of ozone in the Bay Area are motor vehicles and industrial land uses.

The project proponent identified in the use permit application measures listed in the 2017 Clean Air Plan with which the existing winery operations are consistent, including a practice of not burning pruned vineyard material, limiting grading and tree removal, and use of cover crops to reduce erosion and soil tilling needs (Napa County Greenhouse Gas Checklist, Best Management Practices 35, 31 and 32); these measures are consistent with the Clean Air Plan's Stationary Source Sector measure SS-34 and Agricultural Sector measure AG-1. While certain components of the winery's current operations are consistent with elements of the Clean Air Plan, other measures would not be implemented as they are more generally applicable to heavy industrial rather than winery and hospitality uses. As such, the proposed modification would not obstruct implementation of the applicable Clean Air Plan for the San Francisco region.

The small area of disturbance, short duration of work and compliance with standard conditions would not cause a substantial increase in particulate matter and therefore, would result in a less than significant construction impact related to particulate matter. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from earthmoving and construction activities required for drilling of the well and installation of the additional 100 feet of wastewater treatment system leachlines within a two-foot wide by two-foot deep trench on the property. Although there are no schools or healthcare facilities within one mile of the proposed winery, there are existing residences within a half-mile of the site of leachfield construction and within 600 feet of the proposed well site. Earthmoving and construction emissions would be short-term, consisting mainly of dust generated during grading activities and exhaust emissions from construction-related equipment and vehicles during the estimated two to four days of site work.

The area of disturbance for the leachfield expansion would be smaller than 500 square feet and would involve movement of fewer than 20 cubic yards of soil. Applying the heavy- and light-duty construction equipment exhaust emission factors of the BAAQMD (see 1999 CEQA Guidelines, table 7) to this area and duration of ground disturbance, the emissions from vehicles used in construction related to the project are as follows. For information and comparison, the table includes the thresholds of significance for construction and operations emissions from a project (see 2017 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, table 2-1) in the summary below. Average daily emissions in pounds are converted to kilograms (where one pound equals 0.45 kilograms), for consistency in the units across the table:

Contaminant	Emission Factor (grams/yard ³)	Total Estimated Project Emissions (kilograms, kg)	Estimated Project Emissions per Day of Construction (kg)	Daily Emissions, Threshold of Significance
Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)	9.2	0.2	0.1	24.5 kg (54 pounds)
Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx)	42.4	0.8	0.4	24.5 kg (54 pounds)
Coarse Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	2.2	0.04	0.02	37.2 kg (82 pounds)

In addition to the PM₁₀ estimated to be generated from construction vehicle emissions, dust would be generated from site grading activities. With fewer than 20 cubic yards of estimated earthwork, however, the project falls below the screening criteria (10,000 cubic yards) for construction projects, as explained in section 3.5.1 of the 2017 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines. As noted above, no demolition of structures or new land uses are associated with the project.

The BAAQMD recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction-related air quality impacts, and with application of these measures, indicates that air pollutant emissions from construction activities would be considered a less than significant impact. These measures are incorporated into the County's standard conditions of project approval and include the following:

7.1.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:

- A. 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.*
- B. Water all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) two times per day.*
- C. Cover all haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site.*
- D. Remove all visible mud or dirt tracked onto adjacent public roads by using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.*
- E. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour.*
- F. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.*
- G. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes (as required State Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.*
- H. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator. 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/perpfaq_04-16-15.pdf or the PERP website <http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/portable.htm>.*

Furthermore, while earthmoving and construction on the site would 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.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 miles per hour.

With the small area of work, temporary duration of construction, and the project proponent's adherence to these relevant best management practices identified by the BAAQMD and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related air quality impacts of the project are considered to be less than significant.

- e. The BAAQMD defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact. However, land uses that are more commonly known generators of offensive odors typically include landfills and transfer stations, wastewater treatment plants, refineries, and heavy industrial and manufacturing plants. Production of wine and storage of wine barrels are not land uses that are typically associated with generation of offensive odors comparable to these types of industrial uses. Consistent with General Plan Policy AG/LU-15, odors that are associated with production of wine and other food and beverage production facilities are considered acceptable elements of the County and its agricultural development goals.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a-f. The project site is an existing developed vineyard and winery. There is no wildlife nursery or wetland located on the site. Redwood Creek spans the property from north to south, generally within the eastern third of the parcel; Napa County geographic information system (GIS) data indicate that Redwood Creek and its banks are riparian woodland and that the stream provides habitat for steelhead trout. County GIS data also indicate owl habitat north of the winery, and the undeveloped property west of the site, across Redwood Road, is a combination of undeveloped grassland and oak woodland forest. While there is acreage west of the property that remains in a predominantly undisturbed, forested state, and Redwood Creek appears to have retained its natural and unmodified alignment, the remainder of the property has been significantly modified in prior decades for purposes of planting vineyards and constructing a residence, winery, agricultural outbuildings, and access roads.

With the exception of an additional 100 linear feet of new wastewater treatment system leachlines in the existing leachfield in a fenced and graded area south of the winery and residence, the scope of the use permit modification is limited to operational changes to the winery that include changes to winery marketing, visitation and staffing. Although wells and wastewater treatment system leachfields are exempt from the County's Conservation Regulations (Napa County Code section 18.108.050.F), it is noted that the leachfield is over 100 feet away from the top of bank of Redwood Creek and well outside of the 55-foot creek setback that might otherwise be required under the County's Conservation Regulations. Other than the leachfield expansion, no physical changes are proposed that would remove existing trees, demolish abandoned structures (that could have become roosting spots for birds or bats), or add impervious surface area causing increased surface discharge to the creek. As the proposed project would not construct a barrier nor remove existing native habitat in an undisturbed area, it would not impede movement within an existing terrestrial wildlife habitat corridor.

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a-f. The property is generally flat with some knolls and gentle undulations in the terrain, and it is predominantly developed with a vineyard. During a visit to the site in February 2018, Planning staff observed no unique geological features such as rock outcroppings.

County GIS data indicates previous archaeological finds southeast of the site but no such finds on-site of the winery. It is further noted that the property has already experienced significant ground disturbance as would occur to remove native vegetation and grade the site for installation of the existing vineyard.

As noted in section IV, Biological Resources, of this initial study, the scope of the use permit modification is primarily limited to operational changes to the winery that include changes to winery marketing and staffing, with new construction limited to the addition of 100 linear feet of new wastewater treatment system leachlines in the existing leachfield south of the winery and residence. Excavation for the leachfield expansion would not require demolition of any existing buildings but would involve earthwork and two-foot deep trenches to install the subsurface leachlines.

Although there is no known presence of archaeological resources in the vicinity of the leachfield, and ground disturbance associated with the project is limited to construction within the vicinity of the previously-installed leachfield, ground disturbance to install the lines could uncover previously undocumented archaeological resources. If any resources not previously uncovered during prior site disturbance are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the proposed project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist must be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the County's standard condition of approval, which reads as follows:

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: None required.

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

Discussion:

a-c. The property is in the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone of the West Napa Fault, as designated by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, in January 2018. The site is also generally located within a region of active fault zones, including those of the Berryessa, Calaveras, Concord/Green Valley, Great Valley, Mayacama, North Hayward, Rodgers Creek and San Andreas faults. Movement along any of these faults is anticipated to result in Modified Mercalli Scale intensities of VI to VII at the project site; these “moderate” to “very strong” intensities would be felt by most people and are likely to result in negligible or slight damage to well-built structures. Due to its proximity to the winery building, movement along the West Napa Fault could generate more “severe” intensities at the project site (Modified Mercalli Scale VIII), which could result in slight damage to well-designed buildings (<https://earthquake.usgs.gov/learn/topics/mercalli.php>). The project winery building represents relatively new construction that commenced after 2000 and that was completed by 2004, well after adoption of several iterations of mandatory seismic building code standards. During a County staff visit to the site on February 2018, the winery’s representative reported that the winery building experienced no significant structural damage as a result of the August 2014 quake along the West Napa Fault, with damage primarily consisting of cosmetic cracks in sheetrock wall surfaces and items fallen or displaced from walls and furniture. Based on the young age of the building and the observations made after the recent West Napa earthquake, damage as a result of earth movement is not anticipated to expose people to substantial hazards related to ground shaking during an earthquake. Although the site is located within a designated fault zone, no physical changes to the existing winery building are proposed with this project, so the proposal is exempt from the regulations of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (Public Resources Code Section 2617.7[b] and 2617.7[c])

With location of the property in a seismically-active region and on-site soils considered to have “low susceptibility” to liquefaction (excluding the Redwood Creek banks, based on regional mapping), structural damage to the existing winery structure on-site as a result of liquefaction is not likely to occur following an earthquake. It is again noted that the winery’s representative reports that the winery building on-site did not experience any significant damage during the recent 2014 West Napa earthquake.

That portion of the property on which the winery has been built and the additional leachlines are proposed lacks any steep slopes and is underlain by Pleasanton loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes. The soil is characterized as well-drained and formed from alluvium. As described in the *Soil Survey of Napa County, California (1978)*, this soil series generally has low to moderate shrink-swell potential and low erosion potential. Runoff from this soil type is slow. With only minimal disturbance to the ground surface to install new wastewater treatment system leachlines within a generally flat area, and with no introduced surface water source (such as an irrigation system) to exacerbate natural stormwater runoff toward Redwood Creek, and with characteristically slow surface runoff from the on-site soils, the potential for substantial adverse soil movement effects resulting from the proposed project is considered to be less than significant.

- d. As mentioned above, the Pleasanton loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes, soil type that underlies the winery improvements has a low potential for shrinking and swelling near the ground surface and moderate shrink-swell potential at depths of one or more feet below the ground surface. Also as noted above, no new buildings or structures for human occupancy are proposed to be constructed with the proposed modification.
- e. Napa County Environmental Health regulations require a minimum of three feet of vertical clearance between leachlines and the limiting layer (e.g., heavy clay, rock or groundwater) in a septic system. Three feet has been determined to be the minimum clearance necessary to treat water that has received primary treatment in a septic tank. The *Soil Survey* indicates that Pleasanton loam, 2 to 5 percent, soil in the vicinity of the new leachline generally has severe limitations for septic systems, due primarily to slow percolation rates. However, site-specific evaluation and analysis of the soils in the location of the leachfield indicate acceptable soil content for leachfields, to a depth of 72 inches below ground surface, in excess of the County minimum standard (leachlines would be installed 24 inches below ground surface). Inspection of the existing septic system by the applicant's engineer did not reveal any evidence that the existing leachfield was failing or being overtaxed by existing uses, and the engineer concluded that the system was functioning properly.

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:

Greenhouse gases (GHGs) are the atmospheric gases, including carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and synthetic fluorinated gases, whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for global warming and that contribute to climate change, a widely accepted explanation of human effects on the atmosphere. Carbon dioxide (CO₂) is the principal GHG being emitted by human activities, and whose concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity. Agricultural sources of carbon emissions include forest clearing, land use changes, and burning of fossil fuels related to goods movement and gas and diesel-powered vehicles and farm equipment (<https://www3.epa.gov/climatechange/science/causes.html>). CO₂ also serves as the reference gas against which other greenhouse gases are compared. The effect that each unit of the other GHGs (methane, nitrous oxide and synthetic fluorinated gases) has on causing the global warming effect is exponentially greater than the impact of a unit of CO₂, to the degrees of tens to tens of thousands of times. Thus, GHG emissions are measured in "carbon dioxide equivalents." Carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) is a unit of measurement of GHG emissions that uses carbon dioxide as a common denominator, and is a way to get one number that approximates the effects from all the different gases that contribute to GHG emissions (BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2012). CO₂e are measured in units of metric tons, equal to approximately 2,204 pounds.

Napa County has been working to develop a Climate Action Plan (CAP) for several years. In 2012, a Draft CAP² (March 2012) was recommended using the emissions checklist in the Draft CAP, on a trial basis, to determine potential GHG emissions associated with project development and operation. At the December 11, 2012, Napa County Board of Supervisors (BOS) hearing, the BOS considered adoption of the proposed CAP. In addition to reducing Napa County's GHG emissions, the proposed plan was intended to address compliance with CEQA for projects reviewed by the County and to lay the foundation for development of a local offset program. While the BOS acknowledged the plan's objectives, the BOS requested that the CAP be revised to better address transportation-related GHG, to acknowledge and credit past accomplishments and voluntary efforts, and to allow more time for establishment of a cost-effective local offset program. The Board also requested that best management practices be applied and considered when reviewing projects until a revised CAP was 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: 1) account for present day conditions and modeling assumptions (such as but not limited to methods, emission factors, and data sources); 2) address the concerns with the previous CAP effort as outlined above; 3) meet applicable State requirements; and 4) result in a functional and legally defensible CAP. On April 13, 2016, the County, as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP, released Final Technical Memorandum No. 1: *2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016*³. This initial phase included updating the unincorporated County's community-wide GHG emissions inventory to 2014 and preparing new GHG emissions forecasts for the 2020, 2030, and 2050 horizon years. Table 1 of the Technical Memorandum indicates that two percent of the County's GHG emissions in 2014 were a result of land use change.

The final draft of the CAP was released on June 5, 2017, for public review and for considerations of recommendation by the Planning Commission and adoption by the Board of Supervisors. Additional information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or online at <https://www.countyofnapa.org/592/Climate-Action-Plan>.

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

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

As referenced in the Air Quality section of this Initial Study, the BAAQMD incorporated into its 2017 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors & GHG Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, including GHG emissions. The BAAQMD's threshold of significance for proposed projects' potential GHG emissions was set at 1,100 metric tons of CO₂e (MTCO₂e) per year. Agencies may choose to use the threshold or other available data source as best available information. For this analysis, the GHG threshold of 1,100 MTCO₂e, based on the analysis in the BAAQMD's "Threshold Options and Justifications Report," is considered the best available information and is considered an appropriate threshold against which to measure the potential GHG impacts of the proposed project.

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

For the purposes of this analysis, potential GHG emissions associated with winery "construction" and with "operational" winery activities are discussed. One-time construction emissions associated with the winery development project include: i) the carbon stocks that are lost (or released) when soil is disturbed in preparation for new winery wastewater treatment system improvements; and ii) emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area for the proposed improvements, including construction equipment and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as "equipment emissions"). In addition to the one-time construction emissions, operational emissions of the winery are also considered and include ongoing emissions from the energy used to maintain and operate the winery, including vehicle trips associated with employee and visitor trips. (See Section XVI,

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

³ Supersedes February 2, 2016, version.

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.

Air quality and GHG emission impacts associated with vineyard maintenance and winery operations previously allowed under 97506-UP are activities that are permitted continue, regardless of whether the current use permit request is approved.

The proposed project would include an overall decrease in the winery's permitted number of employees, from five to four; and would recognize an increase in visitation from 20 visitors per week to 20 visitors per day. No expansions of winery buildings are proposed, and no new conditioned spaces would be created with the project, as hospitality spaces are identified inside of the existing winery building. Minor site construction consisting of expansion of the existing wastewater treatment dispersal field is proposed with the project; this improvement would be outdoors and also would not result in any new conditioned spaces on the property. Thus, the primary sources of operational GHG emissions that would result from approval of the request are primarily attributed to the 120-person increase in permitted weekly visitation, which is expected to occur within the approximately 1,500 square foot winery accessory use area of the winery building.

Applying the "quality restaurant" land use as a best fit category, as explained in additional detail in the Air Quality discussion of this initial study, a project with 9,000 square feet of hospitality area would potentially generate more than 1,100 MTCO_{2e} annually from operations and associated vehicle trips, and would be considered to have a potentially significant impact on the environment. The approximately 1,500 square feet inside of the winery building that is accessory use space (inclusive of offices, catering kitchen, restrooms, storage, and the expanded 950 square foot wine tasting area requested to be recognized as visitation space) falls below this screening criterion, and thus, no significant GHG impact is anticipated from the proposed project.

During well drilling and construction of the leachfield expansion, the combustion process of engines in heavy duty vehicles would be a source of air pollutants, including particulate matter, carbon dioxide and nitrogen dioxide. Emissions from heavy duty off-road vehicles (e.g., construction equipment) would increase as a result of those vehicles' use in earthwork associated with the construction. Although the use of these vehicles would increase emissions in the vicinity of the site, the 2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan notes that emissions from heavy duty and industrial vehicles are regulated by standards of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and California Air Resources Board, and that as those standards have intensified, emissions (particularly nitrogen oxides and particulate matter) from these types of vehicles have and will continue to decrease (3-29, 3-30). U.S. Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics data demonstrates this downward trend in heavy duty vehicle emissions since 1990. It is again noted that use of these vehicles would be temporary, generating GHG in the property vicinity for the estimated two to four days of construction but not thereafter.

- b. The County of Napa does not have an adopted climate action plan. Other measures that the applicant implements, and that have the effect of reducing the winery's emissions of GHGs, include composting of garden material (rather than burning); implementation of a recycling program; and utilization of energy-efficient lighting fixtures.

The increase in emissions anticipated as a result of approval of the project is estimated to be less than significant, and elements of the current winery operations align with the County's efforts to reduce GHG emissions, further as described above. Accordingly, the proposed project's GHG impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project				
	a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. The proposed project involves the use and transport of those hazardous materials typically used in agricultural maintenance and winery operations. The project proponent and winery operator is required to file a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) with the Napa County Environmental Health Division, and the facility is subject to periodic inspection by County staff every three years or more frequently as needed to confirm ongoing compliance with State regulations for management of hazardous materials. The Hendry Winery facility was most recently inspected in 2016. The property has no outstanding violations of its HMBP, and its next inspection will occur in 2019.
- c. The winery and proposed modifications thereto would not affect schools within one-quarter mile. The school closest to the subject property is St. John's Lutheran School, which is over one mile east of the Hendry Winery parcel.
- d. The Hendry Winery property is not on any State agency list of identified hazardous materials sites (Government Code Section 65962.5).
- e/f. The winery is neither within the boundaries of an airport land use compatibility planning area nor within two miles of any public or private airport or airstrip. The St. Helena Hospital private heliport and Angwin Airport/Parrett Field (a public use airport owned by Pacific Union College) are over 18 miles northeast of the winery, and the Napa County Airport (public use airport managed by Napa County) is over seven miles southeast of the winery property.
- g. The Napa County Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) outlines procedures, including establishing leadership roles and responsibilities of various agency staff, that guide local preparedness, response, recovery and resource management efforts associated with occurrence of a natural disaster, significant emergency, or other threat to public safety. Water and wastewater treatment system improvements proposed by the project proponent would occur entirely on the winery property. No component of the winery operational changes would result in permanent closure or obstruction of adjacent public rights-of-way, and no component of the implementation of the EOP would otherwise be impaired by the proposed modification of the winery use permit.
- h. Development on the property is low in intensity, with buildings limited to the winery building, a single-family residence, and an agricultural/utility building. There are small areas of undeveloped woodlands along the vegetated banks of Redwood Creek, which spans the property from north to south, along the western portion of the site. These native vegetated areas are separated from the existing winery and residential buildings by an asphalt-paved roadway and vineyards, which cover over 25 acres of the approximately 60-acre parcel. With the low intensity of development on the property, coupled with the large acreage of irrigated, proximate vineyards, the project site is considered to have moderate potential for damage of wildland fires, as depicted on General Plan Figure SAF-2. In the event of a fire emergency, evacuation of the property could be achieved using the property's exclusive private drive from the winery and residence to Redwood Road.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

a/c/d/e/f.

The requested modification includes no increase in the quantity of wine currently permitted to be produced at the site, and it includes no increase in the existing area of impervious surfaces. Physical modifications proposed for the site would not change the flow or alignment of Redwood Creek and instead would be limited to addition of wastewater treatment system leachlines in a previously disturbed area on the property within a former animal paddock. The winery's outdoor work areas are currently covered by roofs so as to minimize discharge of potentially contaminating fluids and process wastewater to the storm drain system.

b. 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 towns across California to reduce water usage by 25 percent. These water restrictions do not apply to agricultural users. On April 7, 2017, Governor 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 nor 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.

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

Groundwater Sustainability Objectives were recommended by the GRAC and adopted by the Board of Supervisors. These objectives acknowledged the important role of monitoring as a means to achieving groundwater sustainability and the principles underlying the sustainability objectives. In 2009, Napa County began a comprehensive study of its groundwater resources to meet identified action items in the County's 2008 General Plan update. The study, conducted by LSCE, emphasized developing a sound understanding of groundwater conditions and implementing an expanded groundwater monitoring and data management program as a foundation for integrated water resources planning and dissemination of water resources information. The 2011 baseline study by LSCE, which included over 600 wells and data going back over 50 years, concluded that the groundwater levels in Napa County are stable, except for portions of the MST (Milliken Sarco Tulocay) district. Most wells elsewhere within the Napa Valley Floor with a sufficient record indicate that groundwater levels are more affected by climatic conditions, are within historical levels, and seem to recover from dry periods during subsequent wet or normal periods. The LSCE study also concluded that, on a regional scale, there appear to be no current groundwater quality issues except north of Calistoga (mostly naturally occurring boron and trace metals) and in the Carneros region (mostly salinity). LSCE prepared the 2014 Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report, presented to the Napa County Board of Supervisors on March 3, 2015, with the most recent follow-up reports presented to the Board on April 18, 2017, and March 20, 2018.

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

Concurrently with submittal of the use permit major modification application, the project proponent submitted a water demand analysis that includes estimates of anticipated groundwater demands of the proposed project and estimated groundwater recharge capacity of the parcel on which the off-site well is located, but that is proposed to be abandoned from winery use. The Hendry Winery currently produces wine on the property and is entitled to produce up to 59,000 gallons per year and to host up to 20 visitors per week. Water to the winery operations is currently provided by a well located on the parcel immediately west of the project site (Assessor's Parcel No. 035-120-030) and owned by a relative of the Hendry Winery site. Groundwater (GW) demand estimated for the winery, as currently entitled, is summarized below:

Winery Groundwater Demand – Current Entitlement

Winery Activity	Quantity	Demand Factor	Estimated Annual GW Demand
Wine Production	59,000 gallons/year	6 gallons per gallon of wine	295,000 gallons
Employees (Full-time)	3 persons/day	15 gallons per person per day	16,425 gallons
Employees (Part-time)	2 persons/day	8 gallons per person per day	5,840 gallons
Tasting Room Visitors	1,040 persons/year	3 gallons per person	3,120 gallons
Marketing Event Visitors	60 persons/year	5 gallons per person	300
TOTAL			320,685 gallons = 0.99 acre-feet

The proposed modification, if approved, would not increase wine production but would allow increased visitation from 20 to 140 visitors per week; would change permitted winery staffing from three full-time and two part-time to four (full-time or part-time); and would augment the existing marketing program from two annual events for 30 people per event, to up to 12 annual events for up to 50 people per event each, plus one annual event for up to 150 people. Groundwater (GW) demand estimated for the property includes these requested modifications and is summarized below. (Note: The 0.01 difference between the acre-feet reported in the table below and in the applicant's WAA is a result of independent rounding.):

Winery Groundwater Demand – Requested Entitlement

Winery Activity	Quantity	Demand Factor	Estimated Annual GW Demand
Wine Production	59,000 gallons/year	6 gallons per gallon of wine	295,000 gallons
Employees (Full-time assumed)	4 persons/day	15 gallons per person per day	21,900 gallons
Tasting Room Visitors	7,300 persons/year	3 gallons per person	21,900 gallons
Marketing Event Visitors	750 persons/year	5 gallons per person	3,750 gallons
TOTAL			342,550 gallons = 1.05 acre-feet

Winery water demand is added to existing, permitted residential and agricultural activities that are not within the scope of the permit but are mentioned here to provide a complete description of groundwater demands of the property. Note that the existing single-family residence on the property currently receives water from the city of Napa.

Groundwater Demand – Permitted Uses Outside Scope of Use Permit Request

Activity/Land Use	Quantity	Demand Factor	Estimated Annual GW Demand
Vineyard Irrigation	26.26 acres	0.2 acre-feet per acre	5.25 acre-feet
Single-family Residence	<i>(domestic water supplied from the city of Napa)</i>		0
TOTAL			5.25 acre-feet

With the requested modification, and including permitted uses, total groundwater use for the property is estimated to increase from 6.24 to approximately 6.31 acre-feet per year. Thus, the requested use permit modification represents an increase in groundwater demand of an estimated 0.07 acre-feet per year compared to existing entitlements.

The winery currently draws water from a well located on a separate parcel located west of the winery and Redwood Road. With the requested modification, the applicant intends to abandon use of that well for the winery and to drill a new well on the same parcel as the winery. The winery parcel is located on the Valley Floor, where, as noted above, one acre-foot per parcel acre per year is considered an acceptable threshold for measurement of potential groundwater impacts. The estimated annual groundwater demand of 6.31 acre-feet associated with the proposed project coupled with existing permitted agricultural uses would fall below that threshold (60 acre-feet per year for the approximately 60-acre parcel).

- g-i. No new residences and no new structures are proposed with this modification. According to Napa County's environmental resource mapping (Floodplain and Dam Levee Inundation layers), that portion of the property where the existing winery structure has been built is outside of the 100-year floodplain of Redwood Creek, as well as, dam failure inundation areas. While some planted grapevines and a portion of the access driveway on the parcel might incur damage as a result of flooding of Redwood Creek, the winery's production and accessory use spaces in the winery building are outside of 100- and 500-year floodplains, would not be damaged, and would not, therefore, have the potential to impede, redirect or otherwise alter flooding potential in the general vicinity.
- j. In coming years, higher global temperatures are purported 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 National Research Council and California Coastal Commission estimate that the sea level along the central and southern California coast will rise between one and six feet between the year 2000 and 2100.

The subject property is located well inland of the Pacific Ocean coast and the shores of the San Pablo Bay where risk of inundation by seiche or tsunami in the Bay Area is greatest. The property is also approximately 200 feet above mean sea level and as such, is not anticipated to be affected by projected rises in sea level. Thus, the parcel has minimal risk for damages or injuries related to seiches or tsunamis.

As noted in the discussion of Geology and Soils, above, that portion of the property upon which the existing winery facilities have been built is underlain by Pleasanton loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes, which is a well-drained soil formed from alluvial deposits that has low erosion potential and slow runoff. Existing slopes and vegetation would be retained with the project, with grading limited to the

fenced area where the wastewater treatment system leachfield is located, where an additional 100 feet of leachline is proposed to be installed. With only minimal disturbance to the ground surface, no disturbance to the Redwood Creek banks, and no introduced surface water source (such as an irrigation system) to exacerbate natural stormwater runoff on the property, the potential for substantial adverse soil movement effects resulting from the proposed project is considered to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would integrate with the property's surroundings rather than divide an existing, established community. The site is currently developed with vineyards and residential and agricultural structures (not a part of the project), and a winery, an agricultural use as defined in the Napa County General Plan (Policy AG/LU-2). Surrounding land uses, as described in Section 10 of this initial study, are also predominantly agricultural and rural residential and would not be physically modified (as by demolition of an existing structure or division of land). As such, the existing vineyard, winery and residential uses are consistent with the development pattern of the properties surrounding the site. The proposed project would permit modifications to the operation of the existing winery, facilitating the winery's ongoing operations but not introducing any new, non-agricultural use to the property.
- b. By continuing to facilitate use of the property for agricultural use, inclusive of agricultural product processing (winemaking from grapes) and related, accessory uses, the requested use permit modification is generally consistent with the uses envisioned and as described in General Plan Goal AG/LU-1 and Policies AG/LU-1, AG/LU-2. The proposed project is also consistent with General Plan Policy AG/LU-9, which was specifically adopted by the Board of Supervisors as a mitigation measure of the General Plan environmental impact report (EIR), and is intended to prioritize preservation of farmland in the County. Napa County Code section 18.16.030 also identifies wineries as conditionally permitted uses within the AP District in which the site is located.

Additional water demand generated by the proposed permit modification would be in line with General Plan goals supporting prioritization of groundwater for agricultural purposes (Goal CON-11). Both existing and projected water use would serve an agricultural use on the property and are anticipated to be within the one acre-foot per parcel acre per year that the County has determined to be a sustainable level of groundwater use for properties located on the valley floor.

- c. Not applicable. There is no HCP or NCCP that has been adopted or is being implemented in unincorporated Napa County.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<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. There are no impacts anticipated to occur with respect to mineral resources as a result of the proposed modification of the winery on the subject site. As described in Chapter 2 of the Napa County Baseline Data Report (BDR; 2005), mineral resources mostly occur in the southern and northern areas of the County, generally at higher elevations than the valley floor where the subject site is located. BDR Figure 2.2 identifies no mineral mining resources on or in the vicinity of the winery site.

The proposed use permit modification would continue the agricultural use of the site, including agricultural product processing (winery) and expanded accessory uses (increased number of daily visitors and annual marketing events), and it would not result in permanent, full conversion of the agricultural property to urban development and land uses. Thus, the proposed project would have no impact on known mineral resources.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<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 proposed project would cause a temporary increase in noise levels as a result of installation of the construction of the additional wastewater treatment system leachlines. Examples of construction equipment that would be associated with the leachfield improvements include graders and excavators, along with some smaller-scale equipment. Noise levels generated from such equipment has been measured as high as 90 decibels at 50 feet from the source (https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/handbook/handbook09.cfm). With a six-decibel reduction in noise levels per doubling of distance from the source, and with the County's noise threshold of 75 A-weighted decibels (dBA, a measurement of sound that mimics human hearing by de-emphasizing low- and very-high frequency sound) during daytime hours

for construction noise effects on residential uses (County Code Section 8.16.080), a residence located within 400 feet of the location of construction activities could potentially be affected by construction noise generated by grading or construction activities associated with the project. The closest noise receptor is a single-family residence, on property also owned by the project proponent, that is over 600 feet southwest of where grading would occur for the proposed leachfield expansion; another residential property is over 600 feet north of the proposed well. Thus, construction-related noise impacts of the project are within County Code limits and considered less than significant. Nonetheless, the project would be subject to standard conditions of development in Napa County that are intended to reduce to acceptable levels the potential impacts of construction-related noise on neighboring uses, by requiring mufflers on construction equipment, prohibiting operation of noise-disturbing construction tools or equipment between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., and limiting construction noise levels measured at property lines to 75 dBA between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m.:

7.2 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 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

- c/d. The application includes a request to allow some of the winery's marketing events to occur outdoors, on the east side of the winery building, either under a projecting canopy off of the barrel storage room or in a tent. Events are proposed to host as many as 150 people and to occur during normal winery operating hours between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

The proposed project involves changes to the winery's operation that have the potential to generate higher noise levels as a result of the proposed occurrence of winery accessory activities outdoors. 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 Hendry Winery parcel are predominantly agricultural (vineyard) and rural residential uses on large parcels of five or more acres. Based on the standards in County Code Section 8.16.070, noise levels may not exceed 50 decibels during daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) or 45 decibels during nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) at the exterior of a residential structure or residential use on a portion of a larger property. Given the predominant land uses around the winery parcel, noise impacts of a proposed project would be considered bothersome and potentially significant if sound generated by it had the effect of creating volume exceedances more than 50 percent of the time (i.e., 30 minutes in any hour).

The nearest residence to the winery's proposed outdoor activities belongs to the applicant and is over 1,200 feet southwest of that outdoor area adjacent to the winery where tented marketing events are proposed to occur. Noise sampling performed under County authority, as part of the analysis for the Bell Winery use permit modification (P13-00055), measured sound from an 85-person event with amplified music, using a meter placed 123 feet from the sound source (marketing event). Measurements taken from that sound meter indicated that noise levels from the event exceeded 56 decibels 50 percent of the time, while equivalent (average) noise level was 60 decibels. It is noted that the size of the largest marketing event proposed to occur at the Hendry Winery (150 people) is approximately twice the size of the 85-person event monitored at Bell Winery. Applying: 1) a six-decibel reduction per doubling of distance from the noise source; and 2) a three-decibel increase per doubling of noise sources (number of marketing event guests) as described in that noise study, it is projected that exterior noise experienced at the nearest residence approximately 1,200 feet southwest of the winery would be at 40 decibels for half of the event duration, and an average of 45 decibels for the duration of the event. These estimated noise levels would not exceed the County Code standard of 50 decibels during 50 percent of daytime hours. Events would not occur during nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. until 7:00 a.m.) Additionally, all events would be subject to the following standard condition with respect to amplified sound:

4.10 AMPLIFIED MUSIC

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

- e/f. The winery and proposed modifications thereto would not expose people to excessive noise levels associated with air traffic. No private landing facility is proposed with the requested modification, and the winery is neither within the boundaries of an airport land use compatibility planning area nor within two miles of any public or private airport or airstrip. The St. Helena Hospital private heliport, Angwin Airport/Parrett Field (a public use airport owned by Pacific Union College), and the Napa County Airport (public use airport managed by Napa County) are all more than eight miles north or south of the winery property. There are no permitted private use airports within two miles of the winery property.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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-c. The proposed use permit modification would facilitate ongoing operation of an existing winery. Other than modification of the on-site wastewater treatment system that serves exclusively the winery's operations, no new infrastructure is proposed that might induce growth by extending service outside of the boundaries of any of the winery owner's properties. The existing, property owner-occupied, single-family residence on the property is not within the scope of the modification request and would be retained with or without the project. Thus, no residents would be displaced as a result of the proposed use permit modification.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a. The property is located within the service areas of both the Napa County Sheriff's Department (Beat 4) as well as the Napa County Fire Department (BDR, figure 13-3 and page 13-7). If approved, the requested use permit modification would facilitate the

continued operation and expansion of an existing winery on-site of an existing vineyard. The proposed project scope does not include construction of any new winery buildings, and it does not include any new residential units nor accompanying introduction of new residents that would utilize existing parks or potentially increase student enrollment in schools located in the area of the winery. No new parks or other public recreational amenities or institutions are proposed to be built with the proposed use permit. Also see discussion under Section XV, below.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. RECREATION. Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. The proposed project is a request for modification to the existing Use Permit allowing operation of the Hendry Winery. If approved as proposed, the modification would allow operational changes that include expansion of the currently permitted hospitality program, expansion of the winery's program of marketing events, a change in the permitted winery staffing, and addition of 100 linear feet to the property's existing wastewater treatment system leachfield. While the existing, property owner-occupied, single-family residence on the winery property would be retained, the proposed project includes no new residential units nor accompanying introduction of new residents that would utilize existing parks in the area, potentially accelerating those recreational facilities' deterioration. The proposal would increase the number of employees on and visitors to the property, some of whom might visit recreational facilities in the area during breaks, before or after work, or on the way to or from other wineries. However, given that the purpose of employees' and guests' trips are to and from the winery as the primary destination, such visits to area recreational facilities are anticipated to be infrequent and would not drastically accelerate the deterioration of those public park amenities. No new parks or other public recreational amenities are proposed to be built with the proposed winery.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system and/or conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-16, which seeks to maintain an adequate Level of Service (LOS) at signalized and unsignalized intersections, or reduce the effectiveness of existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities?	<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 Valley Transportation Authority 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-23, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b Level of service standards for roads in the unincorporated areas have been established by the County in its General Plan (2008). As described on page CIR-15 of the General Plan, “[l]evel of service (LOS) is a measure of how well an intersection or roadway is able to carry traffic. LOS is usually designated with a letter grade A-F, where ‘A’ is best and ‘F’ is worst.” General Plan policy CIR-16 establishes the County’s desired LOS on all County roadways as LOS D, measured during the weekday peak hour. LOS D represents “[t]he level where traffic nears an unstable flow. Intersections still function, but short queues develop and cars may have to wait through one cycle during short peaks” (CIR-15). A proposed project would thus potentially have a significant traffic impact if it added enough vehicle trips during a weekday peak hour to cause a proximate road’s or intersection’s performance to fall below LOS D.

The winery operators are currently operating the facility’s tasting room out of compliance with its current zoning approvals, as described in the use permit modification request, with up to 20 visitors coming to the winery daily. Thus, the daily traffic associated with the requested modification is already part of background traffic utilizing the road network, and approval of the use permit modification request would not have the effect of changing the current condition with respect to peak hour trips and would not result in newly observed traffic impacts. It is further noted that the current entitlements for the winery allow a maximum of 20 industry and non-industry visitors to the winery each week, and with no limitation on the number of daily visitors to the site, it is permissible for all 20 visitors to come to the winery on one day (provided, that visitation would not occur on any other day within that same week). With the request to increase the hospitality program of the winery to allow up to 20 visitors per day, the number of trips potentially occurring during a given weekday peak hour of traffic would not change between the approved and requested visitation entitlements.

Applying the trip generation factors on page 15 of the County’s use permit application, the addition of one full-time employee to the winery staff, as requested to be recognized under the modification, adds an estimated three to four daily vehicle trips to the road network compared to the current entitlement; of these trips, one occurs during the weekday evening peak hour. These new trips proposed to be recognized with the modification represent a less than significant number that is not anticipated to have noticeable impacts to the street system in the vicinity of the project site. (By comparison, a single-family residence can generate 10-20 trips per day depending on size, a farm labor dwelling could add as many as 12 trips per day, and a small family day care home could add as many as 32 trips per day, and such uses could be established without any discretionary action needed from the County.)

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

d/e. In 1971, Napa County adopted its initial iteration of the Napa County Road and Street Standards (RSS). The intent of the RSS was to establish a uniform set of standards for public and private roads that strive to preserve the natural landscape and water quality, minimize impacts to environmentally sensitive areas and native habitats, and provide adequate safety and service in the interest of protecting public health and welfare. As further described in the RSS Objectives, the RSS “attempt to meet the related interests of several other agencies, including the Resource Conservation District, Cal Fire, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department, and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife” (5). The RSS has since been amended to reflect changes in the best practices and regulations of the respective agencies, with the most recent amendment occurring in September 2017.

The winery would continue to be accessed by garbage collection trucks, emergency response trucks, and delivery and box trucks, as well as passenger vehicles driven by employees of and visitors to the winery. As described in the introductory sections of this

initial study, the project site currently has direct access to and from Redwood Road via an existing, 20-foot wide, asphalt-paved private access road that extends from Redwood Road to the winery building and parking lot. This same private road also provides access to the existing agricultural outbuildings and single-family residence and can currently accommodate movement of large vehicles around the winery facilities. The proposed project access road currently meets the standards of the RSS, and the applicant has requested no exception to the RSS with this project; additionally, no off-site circulation changes are proposed with the requested use permit modification.

If the use permit modification is approved, it would be subject to standard conditions of approval that requires the access road to be maintained in good working condition and in accordance with the RSS indefinitely while development exists on the parcel.

- f. The major modification request includes a request for the County to recognize an increase in the number of permitted parking stalls on-site, from six permitted parking stalls to 10 existing stalls. The requested increase in parking corresponds with the increase in employee and visitor presence on the property but is still lower than the demand that would be generated by the total number of employees and visitors that could be on-site at any given time.

The requested increase in the number of parking stalls would not have environmental impacts to water or water quality. The additional four stalls proposed to be recognized have been striped in a work area, on existing impervious surfaces located behind the winery building, and would provide marked spaces for the winery's requested four employees. Although the proposed parking additions would not have significant environmental effects, the Planning Commission will be asked to determine whether the increase requested with the modification is consistent with General Plan policy CIR-23, which discourages permit applicants from providing unnecessary or excessive quantities of parking stalls for their uses, as part of the Commission's evaluation of the merits of the proposed use permit modification.

- g. There is currently no bus service on Redwood Road and no known long-term plans to provide such service. The Napa Countywide Bicycle Plan adopted by the Napa County Board of Supervisors in June 2012 identifies Redwood Road at the property frontage as a proposed Class III bike facility, an on-street route for bicyclists that is identified by signage but not striping for a separate lane exclusively for bicyclists' use. As no road narrowing at the property frontage is proposed with this project, the proposed project would not modify nor have any impacts on bicycle facilities.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a/b. There are no historic resources on the property that are known to have been uncovered during prior ground disturbance associated with the winery building's construction. Although it is noted that the winery building is fewer than 20 years old, no changes to it or any other existing structure are proposed as part of this use permit modification. There are records of resources uncovered on properties in the vicinity of the site, though the County has no record of other known cultural resources on the site, and the property has a history of disturbance related to agricultural (vineyard) and residential development. Invitations to representatives of local Native American tribes who have a cultural interest in the area in accordance with Public Resources Code

Section 21080.3.1 did not result in identification of any previously unknown resources on the site, in the proposed area of disturbance associated with the expanded leachfield (see Section 12 of in the introductory pages of this initial study). New ground disturbance associated with this project would be limited to installation of a well and additional leachlines in a former animal paddock. As discussed in section V of this initial study, if any resources not previously uncovered during this prior disturbance are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the proposed project, and specifically, expansion of the wastewater treatment system leachfield, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist must be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard County conditions of approval.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b/e. As described in the Hydrology and Water Quality section of this initial study, the requested modification includes a change in the staffing of the winery (from three full-time and two part-time to four full- or part-time) and an increase in the number of visitors annually to the winery. The request excludes any increase in the quantity of wine currently permitted to be produced at the site, and although the total annual number of visitors would increase with the modification, from 20 maximum per week to 20 maximum per day, the number of visitors that could come to the winery on a given day could be as high as 20 under permitted conditions, provided that the winery hosted no other visitors for the rest of that week. Thus, while the quantity of process-related wastewater would remain unchanged, and the peak flows generated from up to 20 visitors in a day would remain unchanged, the quantity of domestic wastewater would change due to personnel changes at the winery. With an estimated 15 gallons of wastewater per full-time employee per day, and an estimated eight gallons of wastewater generated per part-time employee per day, the personnel change at the winery would not result in a significant change to the total daily wastewater generated, with estimated effluent quantity decreasing by an estimated one gallon per day (assuming one additional full-time employee). Peak process and domestic wastewater flows estimated with the proposed project scope are a combined 1,595 gallons per day.

The existing wastewater treatment system serving the winery consists of septic tanks, sump tanks, and approximately 1,500 linear feet of leachlines located in a former animal paddock located south of the on-site residence. The system has a total treatment capacity of up to 1,500 gallons of wastewater per day. It is unknown to the current project engineer why the existing system was undersized for the currently permitted peak effluent flow of 1,596 gallons per day. Although the existing system has appeared to function adequately, based on the project engineer's recommendation, the proposed project scope includes installation of an

additional 100 linear feet of leachlines adjacent to the existing leachfield, in a previously-disturbed, graded and fenced area on the property.

Because the property utilizes and would continue to utilize facilities for on-site treatment of wastewater, no determination of service or will-serve letters from the wastewater treatment provider is necessary for the proposed project. Permitting of any modifications to the on-site septic system would be conducted by the County Environmental Health Division and not the State Regional Water Quality Control Board. The volume of wastewater generated by the requested uses would not exceed limits that would trigger permitting of the wastewater treatment system by the State Regional Water Quality Control Board.

- c/d. The winery building was previously built with a covered area for grape crushing that serves to minimize risk of contamination to the storm drain system. No new impervious surfaces and no increase in wine production that would increase process wastewater generation or runoff is proposed with the project. Thus, no significant stormwater quality impacts are anticipated to occur as a result of the project. As noted in the Project Description and in Section IX, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this initial study, the applicant intends to drill a new well on-site to provide water to the winery, as a replacement of the existing off-site well located west of the winery property. The requested modification plus existing permitted uses on-site are estimated to increase groundwater demand from 6.24 to 6.31 acre-feet per year and would fall below the one acre-foot per parcel acre per year threshold of significance for the subject winery and other parcels located on the Valley Floor. (See also Section VI, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this initial study, and Section III, Air Quality, for discussion of potential environmental impacts and standard conditions related to project construction.)
- f/g. Non-recyclable and non-organic waste generated by winery operations is and will continue to be collected by the Napa Recycling and Waste Services (NRWS) and ultimately deposited at the Keller Canyon Landfill located in eastern Contra Costa County. According to information on the state CalRecycle website (<http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/07-AA-0032/Detail/>) Keller Canyon Landfill had reached roughly 15 percent of its capacity in the first 12 years of its approximated 50 years of operation (which began in 1992). Extrapolating that same rate of material to date, the landfill has adequate capacity remaining to accommodate any non-recyclable and non-organic waste generated from the proposed winery. Beginning in 2016, all establishments that would generate organic waste (such as food waste from wine/food pairings or food service at the winery's tasting or marketing events) are required to participate in NRWS's food composting program, as a means to support efforts to achieve State mandates for reductions of greenhouse gas emissions generated from decomposition of material deposited into landfills. The requested modification would not result in additional waste generated from wine production, as permitted wine production is not proposed to be increased with this project.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. The Hendry Winery property has been previously developed and disturbed with winery buildings, residential and accessory structures, and vineyards. Other than the drilling of a new well and installation of 100 linear feet of wastewater treatment system leachline within the footprint of previously graded and disturbed areas on the winery property, no new development on the property

is proposed, and the scope of the permit modification is primarily limited to recognition of changes in personnel, hospitality and marketing programs of the winery's operation. As previously described, no element of the proposed project scope would trigger earth-disturbing activities within a creek setbacks nor be likely to disturb any sensitive species, as no building demolition or native tree or habitat removal is associated with the project.

- b. The proposed project would have the effect of increasing water usage of the winery by an estimated 0.07 acre-feet per year. Estimated water usage would continue to support winery accessory activities and the overall continued use of the property for agricultural purposes, and at under one acre-foot per parcel acre per year (60 acre-feet per year for the approximately 60-acre parcel), the estimated 6.31-acre-feet of water demand estimated with the requested permit modification is not anticipated to exceed groundwater recharge rates for the approximately 60-acre valley floor property. As explained further in section XVI (Transportation/Traffic) of this initial study, peak hour trip generation potential would remain unchanged between the permitted condition and existing noncompliant/requested permit modification condition, as the winery tasting room is currently operating at the requested levels, and current entitlement establishes no limitation on the number of daily visitors to the site, making it is permissible for all 20 visitors to come to the winery on one day provided that visitation would not occur on any other day within that same week. Noise and air quality impacts associated with grading for and installation of utilities improvements (leachlines, well) would be temporary in nature, and so would also be less than significant. Operational noise and air quality impacts are also anticipated to be less than significant due to the limited scope of new on-site construction, the distance to the closest sensitive receptors (off-site single-family residences), and the small size of the winery's hospitality facilities.
- c. There are no schools, hospitals or residences housing potentially sensitive receptors within a half-mile of any of the proposed improvements (leachfield expansion, well) associated with the winery's requested modification. Noise from construction that would occur with drilling the new well or installation of the proposed wastewater treatment system improvements would be temporary, lasting approximately less than a week; would be limited to day time hours, in accordance with standard County conditions of approval; and would be subject to best management practices intended to limit fugitive dust and protect stormwater quality, also in accordance with standard conditions. Ongoing operations of the winery and its events are also anticipated to have less than significant noise impacts on nearby residences, due to distance between those residences and the proposed outdoor marketing event areas and with compliance with project-specific and standard County conditions of approval imposing restrictions on design and utilization of exterior lighting. (See Sections I and VII of this initial study.)

Mitigation Measures: None required.
