“C”

Mitigated Negative Declaration
and
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Kenefick Winery Use Permit P16-00021-UP
Planning Commission Hearing March 6, 2019

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

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated October 2016)

1. Project Title: Kenefick Ranch Winery, Use Permit #P16-00021-UP

2. Property Owner: Thomas Kenefick, 2200 Pickett Road, Calistoga, CA 94515; phone 707-952-6159; or email tom@kenefickranch.com

3. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Thomas Kenefick, 2200 Pickett Road, Calistoga, CA 94515; phone 707-952-6159; or email tom@kenefickranch.com

4. Representative: Lester Hardy; P.O. Box 667 St. Helena, CA 94574; phone 707-967-9610; or email lester@lfhardy.com

5. County Contact Person, Phone Number and email: Emily Hedge, Planner III; phone 707-259-8226; Emily.Hedge@countyofnapa.org

6. Project Location and APN: The project is located on an approximately 44.28 acre site with a split zoning designation of AW (Agricultural Watershed) and (AP) Agricultural Preserve at 2200 Pickett Road, Calistoga, CA 94515; APN: 020-340-007

7. General Plan Description: AR (Agricultural Resource) District

8. Zoning: AW (Agricultural Watershed) and (AP) Agricultural Preserve

9. Background/Project History:

The parcel is approximately 44 acres in size with approximately 23 acres of producing vineyard, and is part of the Kenefick Ranch, which consists of multiple contiguous parcels totaling approximately 250 acres, of which about 125 are planted in vineyards. The parcel is currently developed with (a) a storage building that will be demolished and replaced by the proposed winery structure, (b) two fallen-down sheds that will be removed, (c) a half-buried barn, (d) two work sheds, (e) a storage building, (g) a tractor shed, (h) a vineyard office, (i) a working barn with attached lean-to shed, (j) a chicken coop, (k) the main house, (l) a two-bedroom farmworker mobile home, and (m) a two-bedroom farmworker residence. All of these structures will remain, with the exception of the two fallen-down sheds and the agricultural storage building that will be demolished to make way for the proposed winery. The property owners have a Home Occupancy Permit for wholesale wine sales. The applicant previously applied for a Use Permit in 2011, but did not complete the application process. The applicant submitted the current application in January 2016.

10. Project Description: Approval of a Use Permit for a new 20,000 gallon per year winery to allow the following:
    a) Construct a 3,840 square foot two-story winery structure with a 900 square foot covered crush pad. The first floor would include a fermentation and storage room, tasting room, and restroom, with an office and lab on the second floor. The winery building will replace an existing agricultural storage building;
    b) Maximum annual permitted maximum production of 20,000 gallons;
    c) Hours of operation seven days a week: 7:00 AM to 5:00 PM (production hours, except during harvest) and 10:00 AM to 5:00 PM (visitation hours);
    d) Employment of: four employees (three full time and one part time) non harvest;
    e) Tours and tastings by appointment only for 12 visitors per day; weekly maximum of 84 visitors;
    f) Annual marketing plan – 10 events (maximum of 30 guests per event) and one event (maximum of 50 persons), catered food may be served at events;
    g) Construction of six parking spaces;
    h) Connect the winery to the existing septic system;
    i) Utilize an existing well;
    j) Improvement of the existing on site driveway (widening to 20 feet) to meet County Road and Street Standards; and
    k) Installation of one 20,000 gallon water storage tank.

11. Environmental setting and surrounding land uses:
The 44.28 acre project site is located within an area the AW and AP zoning districts at 2200 Pickett Road, approximately 0.6 of a mile off Silverado Trail, near the City of Calistoga. The project site is currently developed with a number of structures comprising the "ranch center" and approximately 23 acres of vineyards. The ranch center development includes (a) a storage building that will be demolished and replaced

by the winery structure, (b) two fallen-down sheds that will be removed, (c) a half-buried barn, (d) two work sheds, (e) a storage building, (g) a tractor shed, (h) the vineyard office, (i) a working barn with attached lean-to shed, (j) a chicken coop, (k) the main house, (l) a two-bedroom farmworker mobile home, and (m) a two-bedroom farmworker residence. All of these structures will remain, with the exception of the two fallen-down sheds and the agricultural storage building that will be demolished to make way for the winery. The proposed winery building would feature a metal roof, wood siding, and exposed concrete and/or stucco siding intended to match light and dark gray, tan, and gold paint colors.

The hillside along the northern edge of the property has a small area of blue oak woodland with a wild oats grassland understory. The woodland area is dominated by blue oak trees and includes some coast live oak, foothill pine and bay trees. Site topography ranges from slopes of less than five percent in the vineyard area, less than 15 percent in the developed area at the base of the hillside, to slopes in excess of 30 percent on the hillside. Soil types include Pleasanton loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, Cortina very gravelly loam, 0 to 5 percent slopes, and Hambright rock-Outcrop complex, 30 to 75 percent slopes. The site lies outside the boundaries of the 100 and 500 year flood hazard boundaries of the blue line stream that is located on the properties to the east. The hillside area is designated as Moderate and High Fire Hazard Severity.

The project lies in a small canyon, at the base of the hillside along the northern property line. According to the Cultural Resources Evaluation it appears that the entire canyon mouth area has been excavated and reformed in the past to accommodate the current group of structures and uses. The small seasonal creek that drains the canyon has been diverted around the easterly side of the canyon in a small ditch. This diversion appears to have been in place since the barn was constructed. This appears to have occurred several decades ago.

The property is surrounded by rural residential use, agricultural (vineyards) use, and wineries. The nearest neighboring residences, located across Pickett Road, are approximately 950 feet and 1,050 to the east of the proposed winery building. Nearby wineries include Kelly Fleming Wines, Eisele Vineyard (formerly Araujo Estates Winery), Venge Vineyards, and two wineries within the City of Calistoga.

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

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies	Other Agencies Contacted
California Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW)	Federal Trade and Taxation Bureau
	Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control

13. Tribal Cultural Resources. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

On October 19, 2018, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1. Two responses were received from the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation and Middletown Rancheria. Neither tribe had comments on the proposed project.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Emily Hedge

Emily Hedge, Planner III
Napa County Planning, Building, and Environmental Services

1/16/19

Date

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

Discussion:

a-c. Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms, geological features, water, trees and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of a beautiful or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken-in. As generally described in the Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses section, above, this area is defined by rural residential use, agricultural (vineyards) use, and wineries. The nearest neighboring residences, located across Pickett Road, are approximately 950 feet and 1,050 to the east of the proposed winery building. Nearby wineries include Kelly Fleming Wines, Eisele Vineyard, Venge Vineyards, and two wineries within the City of Calistoga.

The proposed winery includes a two-story, approximately 3,840 square foot structure and a 900 square foot covered crush pad. The winery site is proposed to replace an existing agricultural storage building located at the base of the hillside at the northern end of the existing development. A utility area with a 20,000 gallon water storage tank is proposed at the end of the driveway. The project site is currently developed with a number of structures comprising the "ranch center" and approximately 23 acres of vineyards. The ranch center development includes (a) a storage building that will be demolished and replaced by the winery structure, (b) two fallen-down sheds that will be removed, (c) a half-buried barn, (d) two work sheds, (e) a storage building, (g) a tractor shed, (h) a vineyard office, (i) the working barn with attached lean-to shed, (j) a chicken coop, (k) the main house, (l) a two-bedroom farmworker mobile home, and (m) a two-bedroom farmworker residence. All of these structures will remain, with the exception of the two fallen-down sheds and the agricultural storage building that will be demolished to make way for the winery. The proposed winery building would feature a metal roof, wood siding, and exposed concrete and/or stucco siding intended to match light and dark gray, tan, and gold paint colors.

There are no rock outcroppings visible from the road or other designated scenic resources on the property. The project will remove seven oak trees and one pine tree. The habitat assessment, prepared by Wildlife Research Associates, July 28, 2015, recommends planting 14 oak trees to provide a 2:1 ratio of compensation to loss. This recommendation is included as mitigation measure BIO-4. The trees proposed to be removed are to the east and north of the building and will not increase visibility of the structure.

Silverado Trail is identified as a Viewshed Road. However, the County's Viewshed Protection Program is not applicable to the proposed project as no construction is proposed on slopes in excess of 15 percent. The proposed winery structure would be approximately 0.7 miles back from Silverado Trail and visibility would be restricted due to existing vegetation, site topography, and existing development.

The project would not result in a substantial damage to scenic resources or substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Because there is minimal visual impact from the road, there is a less than significant impact to a scenic vista.

d. The installation of lighting on the proposed winery structure may have the potential to impact nighttime views. Pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approval for wineries, outdoor lighting would be required to be shielded and directed downwards, with only low level lighting allowed in parking areas. As subject to the standard conditions of approval, below, the project would not have a significant impact resulting from new sources of outside lighting.

6.3 LIGHTING – PLAN SUBMITTAL

a. Two (2) copies of a detailed lighting plan showing the location and specifications for all lighting fixtures to be installed on the property shall be submitted for Planning Division review and approval. All lighting shall comply with the CBC.

b. All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward, shall be located as low to the ground as possible, shall be the minimum necessary for security, safety, or operations; on timers; and shall

incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. All lighting shall be shielded or placed such that it does not shine directly on adjacent properties or impact vehicles on adjacent streets. No flood-lighting or sodium lighting of the building is permitted, including architectural highlighting and spotting. Low-level lighting shall be utilized in parking areas as opposed to elevated high-intensity light standards. Lighting utilized during harvest activities is exempt from this requirement.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b/e. The portion of the project site planted with vineyards is designated as "Prime Farmland" and "Farmland of Statewide Importance". However, the proposed improvements would occur within the portion of the site designated as "Other Land." Accordingly, implementation of the project would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Important as shown on the Napa County Important Farmland Map 2002 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. There is no existing agricultural contract on the property. There are no other changes included in this proposal that would result in the conversion of Farmland. General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use policies AG/LU-2 and AG/LU-13 recognize wineries, and any use consistent with the Winery Definition Ordinance and clearly accessory to a winery, as agriculture. As a result, this application would not result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use.

c/d. The winery parcel is split zoned, with the boundary between AW and AP running more or less east/west through the ranch center. The proposed winery site is located on the AW portion of the parcel. The AW zoning designation allow wineries upon grant of a use permit.

[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.

According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps (based on the following layers – Sensitive Biotic Oak Woodlands, Riparian Woodland Forest and Coniferous Forest) the project site contains no sensitive woodland or forested areas. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As mentioned above, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Operational-Related Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursors Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. The proposed 3,840 square foot winery building, when compared to the BAAQMD's operational criteria pollutant screening size of 541,000 square feet for general light industrial, and compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47,000 square feet for a high quality restaurant, would not significantly impact air quality and does not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2017 Pages 3-2 & 3-3.). Given the size of the entire project, the proposed 3,840 square foot winery building, compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47,000 square feet (high quality restaurant) and 541,000 square feet (general light industry) for NO_X (oxides of nitrogen), the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. (Please note: a high quality restaurant is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, but grossly overstates emissions associated with other portions of a winery, such as office, barrel storage and production, which generate fewer vehicle trips. Therefore, a general light industry comparison has also been used for other such uses.) The project falls well below the screening criteria as noted above, and consequently will not significantly affect air quality individually or contribute considerably to any cumulative air quality impacts.

d. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from earthmoving and construction activities required for project construction related to the winery building and access driveway improvements. Earthmoving and construction emissions would have a temporary effect; consisting mainly of dust generated during grading and other construction activities, exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles, and relatively minor emissions from paints and other architectural coatings. The Air District recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction impacts. If the proposed project adhere to these relevant best management practices identified by the Air District and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts are considered less than significant:

7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

c. AIR QUALITY

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

1. *Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. The BAAQMD's phone number shall also be visible.*
2. *Water all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) two times per day.*
3. *Cover all haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site.*
4. *Remove all visible mud or dirt traced onto adjacent public roads by using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.*
5. *All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.*

6. *All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.*
7. *Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting off equipment when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five (5) minutes (as required by State Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.*
8. *All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator. Any portable engines greater than 50 horsepower or associated equipment operated within the BAAQMD's jurisdiction shall have either a California Air Resources Board (ARB) registration Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) or a BAAQMD permit. For general information regarding the certified visible emissions evaluator or the registration program, visit the ARB FAQ http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/perp/perpfact_04-16-15.pdf or the PERP website http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/portable.htm.*

Furthermore, while earthmoving and construction on the site 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 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

b. DUST CONTROL

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

e. While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. The nearest neighboring residences, located across Pickett Road, are approximately 950 feet and 1,050 to the east of the proposed winery building. Construction-phase pollutants would be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. The project would not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

A Habitat Assessment of the site was prepared by Wildlife Research Associates and Jane Valerius Environmental Consulting, July 28, 2015. The report includes the findings of the review of scientific literature and reports detailing previous studies conducted in the area, and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife's (CDFW) Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB) for reported occurrences of special-status vegetation communities, plants and animals. As part of this Habitat Assessment, a site visit was conducted on July 15, 2015, of all habitats on the site to evaluate the potential for occurrence of 26 special-status plant species, and 19 special-status wildlife species. The survey was conducted outside of the flowering period for some special status plant species, most of which would not occur due to lack of potential or suitable habitat on site. Vegetation communities present in the study area were recorded and evaluated for their potential to support any special status plants that have the potential to occur in the area. All vegetation and structures were assessed for potentially suitable bird and bat habitat, although no surveys for occupancy were conducted. Based on the literature review, presence of drainages on site, seasonal periods of bird nesting and bat maternity roosting activity, and limitations of the surveys conducted, the assessment mitigation measures will reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

a/b. Two vegetation communities occur within the project study area: Quercus douglasii woodland alliance or blue oak woodland and Avena (barbata, fatua) semi-natural herbaceous stands or wild oats grassland (Sawyer et. al 2009). Some landscape plants occur near the adjacent buildings and include species such as birch, olive, walnut and rosemary (Rosmarinus officinalis). Vegetation within the project study area is primarily non-native and highly disturbed as the proposed development site occurs within areas that currently have old and dilapidated buildings. No special status vegetation communities as defined by CDFW and the CNDDB occur on the project site.

The project has been designed to incorporate the proposed new winery building and related site improvements into the existing ranch center development. The proposed location was selected in order to utilize an already disturbed area and minimize grading and other site disturbances. The project proposes the removal of seven oak trees and one pine, located directly adjacent to the existing agricultural barn in the proposed winery development area. In order to address the Napa County General Plan Policy Con-24, which requires preservation of existing woodlands or replacement at a 2:1 ratio, the habitat assessment recommends that at least 14 oak trees should be planted to compensate for the removal of the seven oak trees. See section e. below.

A total of 26 special-status plant species have been reported occurring on the Calistoga 7.5-minute USGS topographic quadrangles (CNDDB 2015). Please refer to Appendix B for a list of these species and their potential for occurrence. Many species were considered to have no potential to occur either because these species are restricted to areas with serpentinite, rhyolitic, sandy or clay soils and these substrates are lacking within the study area, or the species occurs in habitats not present within the study area such as chaparral, lower montane coniferous forest, closed-cone coniferous forest, North Coast coniferous forest, coastal bluff scrub, marshes and swamps, meadows and seeps, and vernal pools. No special status plants were observed during the July 15, 2015 site visit and none are expected to occur due to the highly disturbed nature of the grassland, dominance by non-native plants and lack of native herbaceous species. Impacts would be less than significant.

A total of 19 special-status animal species are identified as potentially occurring in the vicinity of the project area, including a 3-mile radius (CNDDB 2015). Several additional species were evaluated for their potential to occur within the study area, based on: 1) review of the CNDDB, 2) the "Special Animals" list (CDFW 2015) that includes those wildlife species whose breeding populations are in serious decline, and 3) the habitat present on site. The assessment does not address impacts to species that may occur in the region but for which no habitat occurs on site.

Passerines and raptors have potential to nest within the proposed project area. The proposed project is located within the Bird Conservation Region 32, Coastal California (USFWS 2008) which lists 27 upland and riparian species of concern potentially occurring in the region, with another 20 pelagic or coastal marsh birds. No nesting bird surveys were conducted as part of this habitat assessment. One nest was observed from a previous year but was unoccupied at the time of the July survey. Disturbance during the nesting season (February 15- August 15) may result in the potential nest abandonment and mortality of young, which is considered a "take" of an individual. Impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measure BIO-1.

Roosting bats, including Townsend's big-eared bat, pallid bat, and western red bat, have potential to roost within the vacant buildings and trees located in the proposed project area. Demolition of buildings may cause direct mortality of roosting bats that use the structures, if the

structures are removed during seasonal periods of inactivity (maternity season or winter), or without first conducting humane bat eviction or partial dismantling under supervision of a qualified bat biologist experienced with bats using man-made roosts. Removal of trees containing suitable bat roosting habitat comprised of cavities, crevices, and/or exfoliating bark, may cause direct mortality of roosting bats if removed during maternity season prior to self-sufficient volancy of pups, or in winter during torpor or hibernation. Removal of larger mature trees has the potential of causing direct mortality of solitary tree-roosting species such as western red bat or hoary bat. The reconnaissance level site visit did not have the trees proposed for removal. As a result, the condition of the trees to be removed needs to be assessed. See mitigation measure below for avoidance measures of roosting bats. Impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measure BIO-2 and BIO-3.

c. Archaeological Resource Service conducted a site examination for the preparation of the Cultural Resource Evaluation (October 30, 2018), and stated that it appears that the entire canyon mouth area has been excavated and reformed in the past to accommodate the current group of structures and uses. The small seasonal creek that drains the canyon has been diverted around the easterly side of the canyon in a small ditch. This diversion appears to have occurred several decades ago. The creek does not directly connect to any blue line streams in the vicinity of the project site; the closest of which is approximately a quarter of a mile to the east. There are no wetlands located at the project site. The project includes the development on a previously disturbed area. Accordingly, the project, would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands. No impact would occur.

d. The project location is considered to be within the southern portion of the North Coast Ecoregion of the California Essential Habitat Connectivity Project (Spencer, et al. 2010). No Natural Landscape Blocks (i.e., large, relatively natural habitat blocks that support native biodiversity), or Essential Connectivity Areas (i.e., areas essential for ecological connectivity between Natural Landscape Blocks) are identified in this portion of Napa County (Spencer, et al. 2010). Although the Napa River is identified as a Riparian Connection that provides both terrestrial and aquatic connectivity (Spencer, et al. 2010), the 2200 Pickett Road project site is not hydrologically connected to the river. Wildlife connectivity of this site to other open lands in the area occurs throughout the parcel. The proposed buildings to be located on the eastern portion of the parcel will not impede small (i.e., western gray squirrels (Sciurus griseus), medium (i.e., raccoon, and skunk) or large wildlife (i.e., black-tailed deer (Odocoileus hemionus). The project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors. Impacts would be less than significant.

e. As illustrated on the submitted plans, up to 7 oak trees may be removed as part of the proposed project. As noted above in section a.) General Plan Policy CON-24(c) requires the provision of replacement of lost oak woodlands at a 2:1 ratio when retention of existing vegetation is found to be infeasible. The habitat assessment recommends that at least 14 oak trees should be planted to compensate for the removal of the seven oak trees. Impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measure BIO-4.

f. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans because there are no plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measure:

MM BIO-1: Nesting Bird Surveys

a. For earth-disturbing activities occurring between February 1 and August 31 (which coincides with the grading season of April 1 through October 15 – NCC Section 18.108.070.L, and bird breeding and nesting seasons), a qualified biologist (defined as knowledgeable and experienced in the biology and natural history of local avian resources with the potential to occur at the project site) shall conduct a preconstruction surveys for nesting birds within all suitable habitat on the project site, and where there is potential for impacts adjacent to the project areas (typically within 500 feet of project activities). The preconstruction survey shall be conducted no earlier than 14 days prior to when vegetation removal and ground disturbing activities are to commence. Should ground disturbance commence later than 14 days from the survey date, surveys shall be repeated. A copy of the survey will be provided to the Napa County Conservation Division and the CDFW prior to commencement of work.
b. After commencement of work if there is a period of no work activity of 5 days or longer during the bird breeding season, surveys shall be repeated to ensure birds have not established nests during inactivity.
c. In the event that nesting birds are found, the Permittee shall identify appropriate avoidance methods and exclusion buffers in consultation with the County Conservation Division and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and/or CDFW prior to initiation of project activities. Exclusion buffers may vary in size, depending on habitat characteristics, project activities/disturbance levels, and species as determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with County Conservation Division and the USFWS and/or CDFW.
d. Exclusion buffers shall be fenced with temporary construction fencing (or the like), the installation of which shall be verified by Napa County prior to the commencement of any earthmoving and/or development activities. Exclusion buffers shall remain in effect until the young have fledged or nest(s) are otherwise determined inactive by a qualified biologist.

e. Alternative methods aimed at flushing out nesting birds prior to pre-construction surveys, whether physical (i.e., removing or disturbing nests by physically disturbing trees with construction equipment), audible (i.e., utilizing sirens or bird cannons), or chemical (i.e., spraying nesting birds or their habitats) would be considered an impact to nesting birds and is prohibited.

Method of Monitoring: If vegetation clearing or other land disturbance is proposed during the bird and raptor breeding/nesting season (February 1 through August 31), the pre-construction survey prepared by a qualified wildlife biologist shall be submitted to Planning Division staff and the CDFW prior to commencement of work.

MM BIO-2: Roosting Bats – Demolition of Buildings:

a. To prevent direct mortality of bats in the empty buildings on the project site, a bat habitat assessment of the buildings shall be conducted by a qualified bat biologist at least 3-6 months ahead of demolition. The bat habitat assessment will provide specific recommendations for humane bat eviction and/or partial dismantling to be followed for each building. In general, humane eviction of bats must occur during seasonal periods of bat activity, generally between March 1 and April 15 or September 1 through October 15.

Method of Monitoring: A copy of the habitat assessment shall be submitted to Planning Division staff prior to issuance of a demolition permit for removal of any structure.

MM BIO-3: Roosting Bats – Tree Removal:

a. Bat habitat trees (those trees containing bat habitat features such as limbs and trunks with cavities, crevices and deep bark fissures) as determined by a qualified biologist may be removed between August 15 and October 15 (when young would be self-sufficiently Volant, and prior to hibernation and formation of maternity colonies). Trees shall be trimmed and removed in a two-phased removal system conducted over two consecutive days under the supervision of qualified biologist. The first day (in the afternoon) limbs, branches and trunks without cavities, crevices and deep bark fissures may be removed by a tree cutter using chainsaws only. Limbs and trunks with cavities, crevices and deep bark fissures shall be avoided, and only branches, limbs, trunks without those features may be removed. On the second day, the remainder of the tree may be removed.

    i. For removal of bat habit trees between October 16 and August 14 of the following year, a qualified biologist (defined as having demonstrable qualifications and experience with the particular species for which they are surveying, and with bat surveys in specific roost types for project specific conditions), shall conduct pre-construction survey within 14 days of vegetation removal and ground disturbing activities are to commence to determine absence/presence of special-status bat species. Survey methods, timing, duration, and species shall be provided for review and approval by Napa County prior to conducting pre-construction surveys. A copy of the survey shall be provided to the County Planning Division and CDFW prior to commencement of work. If special-status bat species are not present removal can proceed. Should bats species presence be confirmed an avoidance plan, prepared by a qualified biologist, shall be developed in conjunction with the Planning Division and/or CDFW. The avoidance plan will need to evaluate length of time of work and disturbance activities, equipment noise, work windows, habitat buffers, habitat removal timing, and compensatory measures if necessary. The avoidance plan, upon approval by the Planning Division, shall be implemented.

Method of Monitoring: A copy of the habitat assessment shall be submitted to Planning Division staff and the CDFW prior to commencement of work.

MM BIO-4 Oak Tree Replacement:

a. Prior to vegetation removal or ground disturbing activities, the permittee shall submit an Oak Tree Replacement Plan, prepared by a qualified biologist, to the Planning Division for review and approval. The replacement planting shall be at a 2:1 ratio and shall be monitored for five (5) years. The Replacement Plan shall include the following information: proposed location of replacement planting, including biological justification for why that is an appropriate location; methods of replanting, including source of replants and timing, size of replants, pest protection such as tree tubes and gopher cages, and irrigation; monitoring methods and schedules; success criteria; and management actions should success criteria not be met.

Method of Monitoring: The replacement plan shall be submitted to the Planning Division prior to issuance of the building permit. To ensure a successful replacement effort, the owner/applicant shall submit annual reports to the Planning Division, assessing replacement plantings survival, which shall include recommendations for any additional required action. Replacement plantings shall achieve an 80% survival rate at 5 years.

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

Discussion:

a-c. Archaeological Resource Service prepared a Cultural Resources Evaluation of the parcel (A Cultural Resources Evaluation of a Proposed Winery Site, Kenefick Ranch, 2200 Pickett Road, Calistoga, Napa County, California, Archaeological Resource Service, October 30, 2018). The check of the information on file with their office and the Regional Office of the California Historical Resources Information System, determined that there are no previously recorded prehistoric or historic resources located within the project area. The literature check indicates that Native American village sites are known to exist in the general area, mostly along streams and creeks or near springs, but that none are known to be present in or near the project area.

The proposed winery site was examined by systematically examining all open ground around and in the vicinity of the building and associated paved areas. The project lies in a small canyon that has been modified in the past to accommodate the existing structures and uses. The small seasonal creek that drains the canyon has been diverted around the easterly side of the canyon in a small ditch. This diversion appears to have been in place since the barn was constructed. Part of the area is used for storage of old farm equipment, but this did not interfere with the examination. It appears that the entire canyon mouth area has been excavated and reformed in the past to accommodate the current group of structures. This appears to have occurred several decades ago. No indication of Native American settlement or use was observed in the planned building and parking location. The access road was examined by walking along each unpaved edge of the road. This allowed an examination of a path about five feet wide on each side of the road. No indication of Native American archaeological sites or other potentially significant cultural features was observed at any location along the access road. The surface examination has resulted in a negative finding which indicates that no potentially significant cultural features were observed at any examined location.

The report concludes that the examination of the existing literature and a physical examination of the project area have not revealed any indication of the presence of historic properties meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The surface reconnaissance found no indication of the presence of prehistoric or historic archaeological deposits in the project area.

The report recommends that if resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site. The project would be subject to the standard condition of approval, below, and impacts would be less than significant.

7.2 ARCHEOLOGICAL FINDING

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

If human remains are encountered during project development, all work in the vicinity must be halted, and the Napa County Coroner informed, so that the Coroner can determine if an investigation of the cause of death is required, and if the remains are of Native American origin. If the remains are of Native American origin, the permittee shall comply with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

d. No human remains have been encountered on the property and no information has been encountered that would indicate that this project would encounter human remains. Most construction activities would occur on previously disturbed portions of the site. However, if resources

are found during project grading, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard condition of approval noted above. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure: None required.

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

Discussion:

a.

i.) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.

ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project would be required to comply with the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.

iv.) According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) there are no known landslide areas at the project site.

b. The project would require incorporation of best management practices and would be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable. Impacts would be less than significant.

c/d. Site topography ranges from slopes of less than five percent in the vineyard area, less than 15 percent in the developed area at the base of the hillside, to slopes in excess of 30 percent on the hillside. Soil types include Pleasanton loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, Cortina very gravelly loam, 0 to 5 percent slopes, and Hambright rock-Outcrop complex, 30 to 75 percent slopes. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the hillside has a very low susceptibility for liquefaction and the flatter portions of the property, including

the existing development and vineyards have a medium susceptibility for liquefaction. The proposed winery location is in the area with a very low susceptibility. Impacts would be less than significant.

e. The Septic Feasibility Report prepared by Delta Consulting & Engineering (January 10, 2017) proposes two options for managing the disposal of domestic and process wastewater generated by the proposed winery. The primary option will be connecting the winery development to the existing conventional septic system which currently serves the farm worker housing and vineyard office. Septic tanks with effluent filters will be provided for each waste stream to reduce pollutants in the wastewater prior connecting to the existing leach lines. Effluent from the septic tanks will be combined into one transmission line to transfer combined wastewater to the existing conventional leach lines. The second option for treating wastewater generated at the proposed winery development is to separate the process and domestic wastewater into two separate systems. With this option, the domestic wastewater would be routed to the existing conventional septic system as detailed above. However, the process wastewater would be routed to a separate system to provide a higher level of treatment, allowing the water to be recycled as vineyard irrigation. The report concludes that either options is capable of treating and dispersing the wastewater as estimated by the proposed marketing plan. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

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

the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency in December 2009, and served as the basis for development of a refined inventory and emission reduction plan for unincorporated Napa County.

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

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

For the purposes of this analysis potential GHG emissions associated with winery 'construction' and 'development' and with 'ongoing' winery operations have been discussed.

GHGs are the atmospheric gases whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for the greenhouse effect, including carbon dioxide, methane, ozone, and the fluorocarbons, that contribute to climate change (a widely accepted theory/science explain human effects on the atmosphere). Carbon Dioxide (CO2) gas, the principal greenhouse gas (GHG) being emitted by human activities, and whose concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity, also serves as the reference gas to compare other greenhouse gases. Agricultural sources of carbon emissions include forest clearing, land-use changes, biomass burning, and farm equipment and management activity emissions (http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/glossary/letter_c.html). Equivalent Carbon Dioxide (CO2e) is the most commonly reported type of GHG emission and a way to get one number that approximates total emissions from all the different gasses that contribute to GHG (BAAMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2017). In this case, carbon dioxide (CO2) is used as the reference atom/compound to obtain atmospheric carbon CO2 effects of GHG. Carbon stocks are converted to carbon dioxide equivalents (CO2e) by multiplying the carbon total by 44/12 (or 3.67), which is the ratio of the atomic mass of a carbon dioxide molecule to the atomic mass of a carbon atom (http://www.nciasi2.org/COLE/index.html).

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

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

As discussed in the Air Quality section of this Initial Study, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors & GHG Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, including GHG emissions, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. Because approximately 3,840 square feet of floor area (winery building) is proposed when compared to the BAAQMD's GHG screening criteria of 121,000 square feet for general industrial, and compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 9,000 square feet for a high quality restaurant, the project was determined not to exceed the 1,100 MT of CO2e/yr GHG threshold of significance.

Furthermore, the applicant intends to implement the following GHG reduction methods at the winery: installation of solar collector for winery; installation of energy conserving lighting and water efficient fixtures; cool roof, priority parking for efficient transportation; priority to organized group visits; bicycle riding incentives for employees, installation of bicycle parking and information on biking in Napa; educate staff and guests on sustainable practices; and use of recycled materials. The project is designed to minimize grading and tree removal. The existing vineyard utilizes 70 to 80 percent cover crop, and retains biomass removed via pruning and thinning via chipping the material and reusing it rather than burning on-site. The winery intends to become a Certified Green Business or certified as a "Napa Green Winery" and certified as "Napa Green Land".

The proposed project has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds and determined that the project would not exceed the 1,100 MT/yr of CO2e. GHG Emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the Cal Green Building Code,

tightened vehicle fuel efficiency standards, and more project-specific on-site programs including those winery features noted above would combine to further reduce emissions below BAAQMD thresholds.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a. The proposed project would not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts utilized in typical winery operations. A business plan would be filed with the Environmental Health Division should hazardous materials reach reportable levels. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. Hazardous materials such as diesel, maintenance fluids, and paints would be used onsite during construction. Should they be stored onsite, these materials would be stored in secure locations to reduce the potential for upset or accident conditions. The proposed project consists of a new winery that would not be expected to use any substantial quantities of hazardous materials. Therefore, it would not be reasonably

foreseeable for the proposed project to create upset or accident conditions that involve the release of hazardous materials into the environments. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the existing winery building. According to Google Earth, the nearest school to the project site is Palisades Continuation High School, located approximately 1.3 miles to the southwest in the City of Calistoga. No impacts would occur.

d. According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps (based on the following layer Hazardous facilities (Cortese List)) the project site does not contain any known EPA National Priority List sites, State response sites, voluntary cleanup sites, or any school cleanup sites. No impact would occur as the project site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.

e. No impact would occur as the project site is not located within an airport land use plan.

f. No impact would occur as the project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.

g. The proposed access driveway improvements and on-site circulation configuration would be improved to meet Napa County Road and Street Standards. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division and found acceptable, as conditioned. Therefore, the proposed winery would not obstruct emergency vehicle access and impacts would be less than significant.

h. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. The proposed driveway improvements would provide adequate access to Silverado Trail. The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☒	☐
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:

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

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

In 2009 Napa County began a comprehensive study of its groundwater resources to meet identified action items in the County's 2008 General Plan update. The study, by Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE), emphasized developing a sound understanding of groundwater conditions and implementing an expanded groundwater monitoring and data management program as a foundation for integrated water resources planning and dissemination of water resources information. The 2011 baseline study by LSCE, which included over 600 wells and data going back over 50 years, concluded that "the groundwater levels in Napa County are stable, except for portions of the MST district". Most wells elsewhere within the Napa Valley floor with a sufficient record indicate that groundwater levels are more affected by climatic conditions, are within historical levels, and seem to recover from dry periods during subsequent wet or normal periods. The LSCE Study also concluded that, on a regional scale, there appear to be no current groundwater quality issues except north of Calistoga (mostly naturally occurring boron and trace metals) and in the Carneros region (mostly salinity). The subject property is located within the Western Mountains subarea of Napa County according to the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2013. The County has no record of problems or complaints of diminished groundwater supplies at the project site or in the general vicinity. The applicant has not experienced any issues with the availability of groundwater.

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

The project is categorized as "all other areas" based upon current County Water Availability Analysis policies and therefore water use criteria is parcel specific based upon a Tier 2 analysis. A Water Availability Analysis Tier 1 and Tier 2 analysis was completed by Delta Consulting & Engineering on December 18, 2015 (Resubmitted January 10, 2017 with no changes). The analysis included information on existing and proposed water use and a parcel specific recharge evaluation.

a/f. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and would not substantially degrade water quality. The Septic Feasibility Report prepared by Delta Consulting & Engineering (January 10, 2017) proposes two options for managing the disposal of domestic and process wastewater generated by the proposed winery. The primary option will be connecting the winery development to the existing conventional septic system which currently serves the farm worker housing and vineyard office. Septic tanks with effluent filters will be provided for each waste stream to reduce pollutants in the wastewater prior connecting to the existing leach lines. Effluent from the septic tanks will be combined into one transmission line to transfer combined wastewater to the existing conventional leach lines. The second option for treating wastewater generated at the proposed winery development is to separate the process and domestic wastewater into two

separate systems. With this option, the domestic wastewater would be routed to the existing conventional septic system as detailed above. However, the process wastewater would be routed to a separate system to provide a higher level of treatment, allowing the water to be recycled as vineyard irrigation. The report concludes that either options is capable of treating and dispersing the wastewater as estimated by the proposed marketing plan. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. The Water Availability Analysis Tier 1 and Tier 2 analysis included information on existing and proposed water use and a parcel specific recharge evaluation. The analysis concludes that water demand from existing and proposed uses can be met with the existing on-site well and that the total groundwater use is shown to be less than the annual recharge. Therefore the project will not substantially deplete local groundwater supplies.

Tier 1 Analysis - The existing water uses for the property consist of a residence, farm worker housing, a vineyard management office, and vineyards. There is one well on the parcel that is used to supply the residence, farm worker housing, and vineyard office. The parcel's vineyards are irrigated with surface water from several existing reservoirs on the Kenefick Ranch parcels. The reservoirs are filled by surface water runoff collected during rain events.

Total water use for the existing uses and the proposed winery is 1.43 acre-feet per year. As shown in the table below, the proposed project would result in an increase of 0.54 acre-feet per year.

Usage Type	Existing Usage [af/yr]	Proposed Usage [af/yr]
Residential Water Use	0.875	0.875
Office Use	0.015	0.015
Proposed Winery		
Wine Production 20,000	-	0.43
Domestic (Employees)	-	0.067
Domestic (Visitation)	-	0.04
Net Use (Acre-ft per Year)	0.89	1.43

Tier 2 Analysis – Aquifer Recharge Analysis
To estimate the potential aquifer recharge rate, the analysis reviewed local precipitation, soil permeability, and the land gradient. The analysis used average annual precipitation data from the Western Regional Climate Center (WRCC) for the City of Calistoga from 1948 to 2010 for each month. Based on this information and the property size, the total estimated rainfall on the property is calculated to be 139.7 acre-feet per year. An estimate of how much of the rainfall that can potentially infiltrate in order to recharge the aquifer is based on the property's soil types and their respective permeability. Information on soil types and formations and soil permeability was gathered from the Web Soil Survey (websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov). The analysis utilized the methodology presented in the *City of Rohnert Park City-Wide Water Supply Assessment* (dated January, 2005, and available from the City of Rohnert Park (https://www.ci.rohnert-park.ca.us/)), to determine categories of Recharge Potential. That report defines four categories of recharge potential: Very Low, Low, Moderate and High. The project analysis calculated the recharge potential acreage on the parcel, determined by soil type. Utilizing the methodology followed in the *Water Availability Analysis* (prepared for the Woolls Ranch Winery by Luhdorff & Scalmanini and dated May, 2014), the analysis conservatively assumes that a 10% groundwater recharge takes place in areas with moderate or high recharge potential and that no groundwater recharge takes place in areas with very low or low recharge potential. The average annual groundwater recharge volume is calculated by applying the average rainfall of 37.86 inches to the areas delineated as having moderate or high recharge potential. Based on this analysis, the report concludes that this parcel should experience an average annual groundwater recharge of 9.83 acre-feet, or 0.22 acre-feet/acre/year.

The total estimated annual ground water recharge of 9.83 acre-feet far exceeds the estimated water use of 1.43 acre-feet and therefore meets the County WAA criteria. The winery, as part of its entitlement would include the County's standard condition of approval requiring well monitoring as well as the potential to modify/alter permitted uses on site should groundwater resources become insufficient to supply the use.

4.9 GROUND WATER MANAGEMENT - WELLS

This condition is implemented jointly by the Public Works and PBES Departments:

The permittee shall be required (at the permittee's expense) to record well monitoring data (specifically, static water level no less than quarterly, and the volume of water no less than monthly). Such data will be provided to the County, if the PBES Director

determines that substantial evidence1 indicates that water usage at the winery is affecting, or would potentially affect, groundwater supplies or nearby wells. If data indicates the need for additional monitoring, and if the applicant is unable to secure monitoring access to neighboring wells, onsite monitoring wells may need to be established to gauge potential impacts on the groundwater resource utilized for the project. Water usage shall be minimized by use of best available control technology and best water management conservation practices.

In order to support the County's groundwater monitoring program, well monitoring data as discussed above will be provided to the County if the Director of Public Works determines that such data could be useful in supporting the County's groundwater monitoring program. The project well will be made available for inclusion in the groundwater monitoring network if the Director of Public Works determines that the well could be useful in supporting the program.

In the event that changed circumstances or significant new information provide substantial evidence1 that the groundwater system referenced in the Use Permit would significantly affect the groundwater basin, the PBES Director shall be authorized to recommend additional reasonable conditions on the permittee, or revocation of this permit, as necessary to meet the requirements of the County Code and to protect public health, safety, and welfare.

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

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

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

The proposed project would result in a modest increase on the demand of ground water supplies and therefore would not interfere with groundwater recharge or lowering of the local groundwater level. There are no known offsite wells located within 500 feet of the project well. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Water Deficient Areas/Storage Areas*), the project site is not located within a water deficient area and the County is not aware of, nor has it received any reports of groundwater deficiencies in the area.

c-d. The project would not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off the project site. Improvement plans prepared prior to the issuance of a building permit would ensure that the proposed project does not increase runoff flow rate or volume as a result of project implementation. General Plan Policy CON-50 c) requires discretionary projects to meet performance standards designed to ensure peak runoff in 2-, 10-, 50-, and 100-year events following development is not greater than predevelopment conditions. Impacts would be less than significant.

e. The preliminary grading and drainage plan has been reviewed by the Engineering Division. As conditioned, impacts would be less than significant.

g/h. The site lies outside the boundaries of the 100 and 500 year flood hazard boundaries or the floodway of the blue line stream on the adjacent property to the east. No impacts would occur.

i/j. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. 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
X.	LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
	a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
	b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☒
	c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

a-c. The project would not occur within an established community, nor would it result in the division of an established community. The project complies with the Napa County Code and all other applicable regulations. The winery parcel is split zoned, with the boundary between AW and AP running more or less east/west through the ranch center. The proposed winery site is located on the AW portion of the parcel. The AW zoning designation allow wineries upon grant of a use permit. The proposed project is compliant with the physical limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance. The County has adopted the Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO) to protect agriculture and open space and to regulate winery development and expansion in a manner that avoids potential negative environmental effects. Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-1 of the 2008 General Plan states that the County shall, "preserve existing agricultural land uses and plan for agriculture and related activities as the primary land uses in Napa County." The property's General Plan land use designation is AR (Agricultural Resource); general uses include "agriculture, processing of agricultural products, single-family dwellings". More specifically, General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-2 recognizes wineries and other agricultural processing facilities, and any use clearly accessory to those facilities, as agriculture. No vineyard removal is necessary for development of the project. The project would allow for the continuation of agriculture as a dominant land use within the county and is consistent with the Napa County General Plan. The use of the property for the "fermenting and processing of grape juice into wine" (NCC §18.08.640) supports the economic viability of agriculture within the county consistent with General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-4 ("The County will reserve agricultural lands for agricultural use including lands used for grazing and watershed/ open space…") and General Plan Economic Development Policy E-1 (The County's economic development will focus on ensuring the continued viability of agriculture…). The General Plan includes two policies requiring wineries to be designed generally of a high architectural quality for the site and its surroundings. There are no applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the property. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b. The project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during construction of the proposed winery building and minor driveway improvements. Construction activities would be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. As such, the project would not result in potentially significant temporary construction noise impacts or operational impacts. Because the proposed winery building at the project site is located approximately 950 feet and 1,050 to the west of the nearest neighboring residence, there is a low potential for impacts related to construction noise to result in a significant impact. Further, construction activities would occur during the period of 7am-7pm on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity. All construction activities would be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). The proposed project would not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts. Conditions of approval identified below would require construction activities to be limited to daylight hours, vehicles to be muffled, and backup alarms adjusted to the lowest allowable levels. Impacts would be less than significant.

7.3. CONSTRUCTION NOISE

Construction noise shall be minimized to the greatest extent practical and feasible under State and local safety laws, consistent with construction noise levels permitted by the General Plan Community Character Element and the County Noise Ordinance. Construction equipment muffling and hours of operation shall be in compliance with the County Code. Equipment shall be shut down when not in use. Construction equipment shall normally be staged, loaded, and unloaded on the project site, if at all practicable. If project terrain or access road conditions require construction equipment to be staged, loaded, or unloaded off the project site (such as on a neighboring road or at the base of a hill), such activities shall only occur daily between the hours of 8 am to 5 pm.

c/d. There will be a change in the ambient noise level due to the change in use from an unused agricultural storage shed to a winery. Regulations contained within County Code Chapter 8.16 establish exterior noise criteria for various land uses in the County. As described in the Project Setting, above, land uses that surround the proposed parcel are rural residential use, agricultural (vineyards) use, and wineries. Of these land uses, the residential land use is considered the most sensitive to noise. Based on the standards in County Code Section 8.16.070, noise levels, measured at the exterior of a residential structure or residential use on a portion of a larger property, may not exceed 50 decibels for more than half of any hour in the window of daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) within which the applicant proposes to conduct events. Noise impacts of the proposed project would be considered bothersome and potentially significant if sound generated by it had the effect of exceeding the standards in County Code more than 50 percent of the time (i.e., more than 50 decibels for more than 30 minutes in an hour for a residential use).

Noise from winery operations is generally limited and intermittent, meaning the sound level can vary during the day and over the course of the year, depending on the activities at the winery. The primary noise-generating activities are equipment associated with wineries, delivery

trucks, and other vehicles. Standard conditions of Approval 6.6.c. and 4.16.b.require exterior winery equipment to be enclosed or mufflered and maintained so as not to exceed noise thresholds in the County Code.

4.16 GENERAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE – LIGHTING, LANDSCAPING, PAINTING, OUTDOOR EQUIPMENT STORAGE, AND TRASH ENCLOSURE AREAS
b. All landscaping and outdoor screening, storage, and utility structures shall be permanently maintained in accordance with the landscaping and building plans approved by the County. No stored items shall exceed the height of the screening. Exterior winery equipment shall be maintained so as to not create a noise disturbance or exceed noise thresholds in the County Code.

6.6 OUTDOOR STORAGE/SCREENING/UTILITIES
c. Exterior winery equipment shall be located, enclosed or muffled so as not to exceed noise thresholds in the County Code.

The nearest neighboring residences, located across Pickett Road, are approximately 950 feet and 1,050 to the east of the proposed winery building. The proposed winery location is in a small canyon, with a low, tree-covered hillside between the location and the neighboring residences. Continuing enforcement of Napa County's Noise Ordinance by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff, including the prohibition against amplified music, should further ensure that winery activities do not create a significant noise impact. Amplified music or sound systems would not be permitted as identified in standard Condition of Approval 4.10 below. Temporary events would be subject to County Code Chapter 5.36 which regulates proposed temporary events.

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

The proposed project would not result in long-term significant permanent noise impacts. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a. Staffing for the proposed winery would include three full time and one part time employee. The Association of Bay Area Governments' *Projections 2003* figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase some 23% by the year 2030 (*Napa County Baseline Data Report,* November 30, 2005). Additionally, the County's *Baseline Data Report* indicates that total housing units currently programmed in county and municipal housing elements exceed ABAG growth projections by approximately 15%. Relative to the County's projected low to moderate growth rate and overall adequate programmed housing supply, the potential minor population growth from the four employees, does not rise to a level of environmental significance. In addition, the project would be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs.

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

future housing cycles, while balancing environmental, economic, and fiscal factors and community goals. The policies and programs identified in the General Plan Housing Element function, in combination with the County's housing impact mitigation fee, to ensure adequate cumulative volume and diversity of housing. Cumulative impacts on the local and regional population and housing balance would be less than significant.

b/c. The project would replace an existing agricultural storage building and would not affect the onsite housing. The project would not displace a substantial number of people and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a. Public services are currently provided to the project area and the additional demand placed on existing services as a result of the proposed project would be minimal. Fire protection measures would be required as part of the development pursuant to Napa County Fire Marshall conditions and there would be no foreseeable impact to emergency response times with compliance with these conditions of approval. The Fire Department and Engineering Services Division have reviewed the application and recommend approval, as conditioned. School impact fees, which assist local school districts with capacity building measures, would be levied pursuant to building permit submittal. The proposed project would have minimal impact on public parks as no residences are proposed. Impacts to public services would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a. The project would not significantly increase use of existing parks or recreational facilities based on its limited scope. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. No recreational facilities are proposed as part of the project. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b. The property is accessed via a private driveway off of Pickett Road, which connects to Silverado Trail. The proposed winery would utilize this driveway which will be improved to meet current Napa County Road and Street Standards. Improvements include widening the existing driveway to 20 feet. The current paved driveway is about 15 feet wide with at least five feet of clear space on both sides. The improvements would take place on land already disturbed by the existing driveway.

Traffic conditions on roads and at intersections are generally characterized by their "level of service" or LOS. LOS is a convenient way to express the ratio between volume and capacity on a given link or at a given intersection, and is expressed as a letter grade ranging from LOS A through LOS F. Each level of service is generally described as follows:

LOS A- Free-flowing travel with an excellent level of comfort and convenience and freedom to maneuver.
LOS B- Stable operating conditions, but the presence of other road users causes a noticeable, though slight, reduction in comfort, convenience, and maneuvering freedom.
LOS C- Stable operating conditions, but the operation of individual users is substantially affected by the interaction with others in the traffic stream.
LOS D- High-density, but stable flow. Users experience severe restrictions in speed and freedom to maneuver, with poor levels of comfort and convenience.
LOS E- Operating conditions at or near capacity. Speeds are reduced to a low but relatively uniform value. Freedom to maneuver is difficult with users experiencing frustration and poor comfort and convenience. Unstable operation is frequent, and minor disturbances in traffic flow can cause breakdown conditions.

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

Public Works Department staff reviewed the proposal and concluded that a traffic study was not required due to the expected trip generation, trip distribution, and location of the project. On days with maximum visitation and employment, the project is anticipated to generate up to twenty weekday and weekend daily vehicle trips. Up to 20 daily trips would occur on Saturday during crush. Public Works Department staff reviewed the anticipated trip generation details and concluded that the proposed use in the proposed location would not result in any significant impacts, either project-specific or cumulative, on traffic circulation in the vicinity. Therefore, the project would result in a nominal increase in trips on the study area transportation network. Based upon the project's low level of anticipated trip generation described above, impacts would be less than significant.

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

d-f. After implementation of the proposed project, the site would continue to be accessed via the private driveway. The existing site access and proposed improvements were reviewed and approved by the Napa County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division, as conditioned.

The proposal includes the construction of six parking spaces near the winery building. Using the County standard of 2.6 persons per vehicle during weekdays and 2.8 persons per vehicle during weekends and 1.05 persons per vehicle for employees, a calculation of parking for the maximum of 12 visitors and all four employees at the site simultaneously, would be nine parking spaces. The average daily visitation is estimated to be four visitors per day which would result in the use of five parking spots. The proposed number of parking spaces is sufficient to meet the estimated parking demands.

g. As proposed, the project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b. On October 19, 2018, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1. Two responses were received from the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation and Middletown Rancheria. Neither tribe had comments on the proposed project. As discussed in Section V. the project would be subject to standard Condition of Approval, 7.0 Archaeological Finding, and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure: None Required.

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

Discussion:

a/b. The project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and would not result in a significant impact on the environment relative to wastewater discharge. Wastewater disposal would be accommodated on-site and in compliance with State and County regulations. The Septic Feasibility Report prepared by Delta Consulting & Engineering (January 10, 2017) proposes two options for managing the disposal of domestic and process wastewater generated by the proposed winery. The primary option will be connecting the winery development to the existing conventional septic system which currently serves the farm worker housing and vineyard office. Septic tanks with effluent filters will be provided for each waste stream to reduce pollutants in the wastewater prior connecting to the existing leach lines. Effluent from the septic tanks will be combined into one transmission line to transfer combined wastewater to the existing conventional leach lines. The second option for treating wastewater generated at the proposed winery development is to separate the process and domestic wastewater into two separate systems. With this option, the domestic wastewater would be routed to the existing conventional septic system as detailed above. However, the process wastewater would be routed to a separate system to provide a higher level of treatment, allowing the water to be recycled as vineyard irrigation. The report concludes that either options is capable of treating and dispersing the wastewater as estimated by the proposed marketing plan. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings. Impacts would be less than significant.

There is one well on the parcel that is used to supply the residence, farm worker housing, and vineyard office. The parcel's vineyards are irrigated with surface water from several existing reservoirs on the Kenefick Ranch parcels. The reservoirs are filled by surface water runoff collected during rain events. The existing well will be used to serve the proposed winery. The project would not require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. The preliminary grading and drainage plan has been reviewed by the Engineering Division. As conditioned, impacts would be less than significant.

d. As discussed in Section IX above, the project is categorized as "all other areas" based upon current County Water Availability Analysis policies and therefore water use criteria is parcel specific based upon a Tier 2 analysis. A Water Availability Analysis Tier 1 and Tier 2 analysis was completed by Delta Consulting & Engineering on December 18, 2015 (Resubmitted January 10, 2017 with no changes). The analysis demonstrated that the total estimated annual ground water recharge of 9.83 acre-feet far exceeds the estimated water use of 1.43 acre-feet and therefore meets the County WAA criteria. The parcel water demand can be met with the existing on site well. In summary, the existing yield would be sufficient to serve all uses on the property. Any project which reduces water usage or any water usage which is at or below the established threshold is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels. Impacts would be less than significant as there is sufficient water supply available to serve the proposed project.

e. Wastewater would be treated on-site and would not require a wastewater treatment provider. Impacts would be less than significant.

f. According to the Baseline Data Report (2005) all of the solid waste landfills where Napa County's waste is disposed have more than sufficient capacity related to the current waste generation. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a. As discussed in Section IV above, all potential biological related impacts would be less than significant with implementation of a biological resources mitigation measure. With the implementation of mitigation measures and standard conditions of approval the project will have a less than significant effect on the environment and cultural resources.

b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology, and traffic impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The project would increase the demands for public services to a limited extent, increase traffic and air pollutions, all of which contribute to cumulative effects when future development in Napa Valley is considered. Cumulative impacts of these issues are discussed in previous sections of this Initial Study, wherein the impact from an increase in air pollution is being addressed as discussed in the project's Greenhouse Gas Voluntary Best Management Practices including but not limited to: installation of solar collector for winery; installation of energy conserving lighting and water efficient fixtures; cool roof, priority parking for efficient transportation; priority to organized group visits; bicycle riding incentives for employees, installation of bicycle parking and information on biking in Napa; educate staff and guests on sustainable practices; and use of recycled materials. Additionally, the existing vineyard utilizes 70 to 80 percent cover crop, and retains biomass removed via pruning and thinning via chipping the material and reusing it rather than burning on-site.

The project trip generation was calculated from winery operations, where the calculated trips reflect total visitation, on-site employees and wine production trips generated by the winery. Under the Napa County General Plan, traffic volumes are projected to increase and will be caused by a combination of locally generated traffic as well as general regional growth. The General Plan EIR indicates that much of the forecasted increase in traffic on the arterial roadway network will result from traffic generated outside of the county, however the project would contribute a small amount toward the general overall increase. Public Works Department staff reviewed the anticipated trip generation details and concluded that the proposed use in the proposed location would not result in any significant impacts, either project-specific or cumulative, on traffic circulation in the vicinity. Potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

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

Mitigation Measures: None Required.

Kenefick Winery Use Permit No. P16-00021
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Potential Environmental Impact	Adopted Mitigation Measure	Monitoring and Reporting Actions and Schedule	Implementation	Monitoring	Reporting & Date of Compliance/ Completion
Impact BIO-1: Biological Resources.	MM BIO-1: Nesting Bird Surveys a. For earth-disturbing activities occurring between February 1 and August 31 (which coincides with the grading season of April 1 through October 15 – NCC Section 18.108.070.L, and bird breeding and nesting seasons), a qualified biologist (defined as knowledgeable and experienced in the biology and natural history of local avian resources with the potential to occur at the project site) shall conduct a preconstruction surveys for nesting birds within all suitable habitat on the project site, and where there is potential for impacts adjacent to the project areas (typically within 500 feet of project activities). The preconstruction survey shall be conducted no earlier than 14 days prior to when vegetation removal and ground disturbing activities are to commence. Should ground disturbance commence later than 14 days from the survey date, surveys shall be repeated. A copy of the survey will be provided to the Napa County Conservation Division and the CDFW prior to commencement of work. b. After commencement of work if there is a period of no work activity of 5 days or longer during the bird breeding season, surveys shall be repeated to ensure birds have not established nests during inactivity. c. In the event that nesting birds are found, the Permittee shall identify appropriate avoidance methods and exclusion buffers in consultation with the County Conservation Division and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and/or CDFW prior to initiation of project activities. Exclusion buffers may vary in size, depending on habitat characteristics, project activities/disturbance levels, and species as determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with County Conservation Division and the USFWS and/or CDFW. d. Exclusion buffers shall be fenced with temporary construction fencing (or the like), the installation of which shall be verified by Napa County prior to the commencement of any earthmoving and/or development activities.	If vegetation clearing or other land disturbance is proposed during the bird and raptor breeding/nesting season (February 1 through August 31), the pre-construction survey prepared by a qualified wildlife biologist shall be submitted to Planning Division staff and the CDFW prior to commencement of work.	P	PD	PC __/__/__

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

Potential Environmental Impact	Adopted Mitigation Measure	Monitoring and Reporting Actions and Schedule	Implementation	Monitoring	Reporting & Date of Compliance/ Completion
	Exclusion buffers shall remain in effect until the young have fledged or nest(s) are otherwise determined inactive by a qualified biologist. e. Alternative methods aimed at flushing out nesting birds prior to pre-construction surveys, whether physical (i.e., removing or disturbing nests by physically disturbing trees with construction equipment), audible (i.e., utilizing sirens or bird cannons), or chemical (i.e., spraying nesting birds or their habitats) would be considered an impact to nesting birds and is prohibited.				
Impact BIO-2: Biological Resources.	MM BIO-2: Roosting Bats – Demolition of Buildings: a. To prevent direct mortality of bats in the empty buildings on the project site, a bat habitat assessment of the buildings shall be conducted by a qualified bat biologist at least 3-6 months ahead of demolition. The bat habitat assessment will provide specific recommendations for humane bat eviction and/or partial dismantling to be followed for each building. In general, humane eviction of bats must occur during seasonal periods of bat activity, generally between March 1 and April 15 or September 1 through October 15.	A copy of the habitat assessment shall be submitted to Planning Division staff prior to issuance of a demolition permit for removal of any structure.	P	PD	PC __/__/__
Impact BIO-3: Biological Resources.	MM BIO-3: Roosting Bats – Tree Removal: a. Bat habitat trees (those trees containing bat habitat features such as limbs and trunks with cavities, crevices and deep bark fissures) as determined by a qualified biologist may be removed between August 15 and October 15 (when young would be self-sufficiently Volant, and prior to hibernation and formation of maternity colonies). Trees shall be trimmed and removed in a two-phased removal system conducted over two consecutive days under the supervision of qualified biologist. The first day (in the afternoon) limbs, branches and trunks without cavities, crevices and deep bark fissures may be removed by a tree cutter using chainsaws only. Limbs and trunks with cavities, crevices and deep bark fissures shall be avoided, and only branches, limbs, trunks without those features may be removed. On the second day, the remainder of the tree may be removed. i. For removal of bat habit trees between October 16 and August 14 of the following year, a qualified biologist (defined as having demonstrable qualifications and experience with the particular species for which they are surveying, and with bat surveys in specific roost	A copy of the habitat assessment shall be submitted to Planning Division staff and the CDFW prior to commencement of work.	P	PD	PC __/__/__

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

Potential Environmental Impact	Adopted Mitigation Measure	Monitoring and Reporting Actions and Schedule	Implementation	Monitoring	Reporting & Date of Compliance/ Completion
	types for project specific conditions), shall conduct pre-construction survey within 14 days of vegetation removal and ground disturbing activities are to commence to determine absence/presence of special-status bat species. Survey methods, timing, duration, and species shall be provided for review and approval by Napa County prior to conducting pre-construction surveys. A copy of the survey shall be provided to the County Planning Division and CDFW prior to commencement of work. If special-status bat species are not present removal can proceed. Should bats species presence be confirmed an avoidance plan, prepared by a qualified biologist, shall be developed in conjunction with the Planning Division and/or CDFW. The avoidance plan will need to evaluate length of time of work and disturbance activities, equipment noise, work windows, habitat buffers, habitat removal timing, and compensatory measures if necessary. The avoidance plan, upon approval by the Planning Division, shall be implemented.				
Impact HWQ-1:	MM BIO-4: Oak Tree Replacement: a. Prior to vegetation removal or ground disturbing activities, the permittee shall submit an Oak Tree Replacement Plan, prepared by a qualified biologist, to the Planning Division for review and approval. The replacement planting shall be at a 2:1 ratio and shall be monitored for five (5) years. The Replacement Plan shall include the following information: proposed location of replacement planting, including biological justification for why that is an appropriate location; methods of replanting, including source of replants and timing, size of replants, pest protection such as tree tubes and gopher cages, and irrigation; monitoring methods and schedules; success criteria; and management actions should success criteria not be met.	The replacement plan shall be submitted to the Planning Division prior to issuance of the building permit. To ensure a successful replacement effort, the owner/applicant shall submit annual reports to the Planning Division, assessing replacement plantings survival, which shall include recommendations for any additional required action. Replacement plantings shall achieve an 80% survival rate at 5 years.	P	PD	PC __/__/__

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

PROJECT REVISION STATEMENT
Kenefick Winery Use Permit No. P16-00021

I hereby revise Kenefick Winery Use Permit No. P16-00021 for the approval of a use permit to operate a 20,000 gallon winery on a 44-acre parcel (Assessor's Parcel No.: 020-340-007 located at 2200 Pickett Road, Calistoga, California 94515, to include the four (4) measures specified below:

MM BIO-1: Nesting Bird Surveys

a. For earth-disturbing activities occurring between February 1 and August 31 (which coincides with the grading season of April 1 through October 15 – NCC Section 18.108.070.L, and bird breeding and nesting seasons), a qualified biologist (defined as knowledgeable and experienced in the biology and natural history of local avian resources with the potential to occur at the project site) shall conduct a preconstruction surveys for nesting birds within all suitable habitat on the project site, and where there is potential for impacts adjacent to the project areas (typically within 500 feet of project activities). The preconstruction survey shall be conducted no earlier than 14 days prior to when vegetation removal and ground disturbing activities are to commence. Should ground disturbance commence later than 14 days from the survey date, surveys shall be repeated. A copy of the survey will be provided to the Napa County Conservation Division and the CDFW prior to commencement of work.

b. After commencement of work if there is a period of no work activity of 5 days or longer during the bird breeding season, surveys shall be repeated to ensure birds have not established nests during inactivity.

c. In the event that nesting birds are found, the Permittee shall identify appropriate avoidance methods and exclusion buffers in consultation with the County Conservation Division and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and/or CDFW prior to initiation of project activities. Exclusion buffers may vary in size, depending on habitat characteristics, project activities/disturbance levels, and species as determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with County Conservation Division and the USFWS and/or CDFW.

d. Exclusion buffers shall be fenced with temporary construction fencing (or the like), the installation of which shall be verified by Napa County prior to the commencement of any earthmoving and/or development activities. Exclusion buffers shall remain in effect until the young have fledged or nest(s) are otherwise determined inactive by a qualified biologist.

e. Alternative methods aimed at flushing out nesting birds prior to pre-construction surveys, whether physical (i.e., removing or disturbing nests by physically disturbing trees with construction equipment), audible (i.e., utilizing sirens or bird cannons), or chemical (i.e., spraying nesting birds or their habitats) would be considered an impact to nesting birds and is prohibited.

Method of Monitoring: If vegetation clearing or other land disturbance is proposed during the bird and raptor breeding/nesting season (February 1 through August 31), the pre-construction survey prepared by a qualified wildlife biologist shall be submitted to Planning Division staff and the CDFW prior to commencement of work.

MM BIO-2: Roosting Bats – Demolition of Buildings:

a. To prevent direct mortality of bats in the empty buildings on the project site, a bat habitat assessment of the buildings shall be conducted by a qualified bat biologist at least 3-6 months ahead of demolition. The bat habitat assessment will provide specific recommendations for humane bat eviction and/or partial dismantling to be followed for each building. In general, humane eviction of bats must occur during seasonal periods of bat activity, generally between March 1 and April 15 or September 1 through October 15.

Method of Monitoring: A copy of the habitat assessment shall be submitted to Planning Division staff prior to issuance of a demolition permit for removal of any structure.

MM BIO-3: Roosting Bats – Tree Removal:

a. Bat habitat trees (those trees containing bat habitat features such as limbs and trunks with cavities, crevices and deep bark fissures) as determined by a qualified biologist may be removed between August 15 and October 15 (when young would be self-sufficiently Volant, and prior to hibernation and formation of maternity colonies). Trees shall be trimmed and removed in a two-phased removal system conducted over two consecutive days under the supervision of qualified biologist. The first day (in the afternoon) limbs, branches

and trunks without cavities, crevices and deep bark fissures may be removed by a tree cutter using chainsaws only. Limbs and trunks with cavities, crevices and deep bark fissures shall be avoided, and only branches, limbs, trunks without those features may be removed. On the second day, the remainder of the tree may be removed.

i. For removal of bat habit trees between October 16 and August 14 of the following year, a qualified biologist (defined as having demonstrable qualifications and experience with the particular species for which they are surveying, and with bat surveys in specific roost types for project specific conditions), shall conduct pre-construction survey within 14 days of vegetation removal and ground disturbing activities are to commence to determine absence/presence of special-status bat species. Survey methods, timing, duration, and species shall be provided for review and approval by Napa County prior to conducting pre-construction surveys. A copy of the survey shall be provided to the County Planning Division and CDFW prior to commencement of work. If special-status bat species are not present removal can proceed. Should bats species presence be confirmed an avoidance plan, prepared by a qualified biologist, shall be developed in conjunction with the Planning Division and/or CDFW. The avoidance plan will need to evaluate length of time of work and disturbance activities, equipment noise, work windows, habitat buffers, habitat removal timing, and compensatory measures if necessary. The avoidance plan, upon approval by the Planning Division, shall be implemented.

Method of Monitoring: A copy of the habitat assessment shall be submitted to Planning Division staff and the CDFW prior to commencement of work.

MM BIO-4: Oak Tree Replacement:

a. Prior to vegetation removal or ground disturbing activities, the permittee shall submit an Oak Tree Replacement Plan, prepared by a qualified biologist, to the Planning Division for review and approval. The replacement planting shall be at a 2:1 ratio and shall be monitored for five (5) years. The Replacement Plan shall include the following information: proposed location of replacement planting, including biological justification for why that is an appropriate location; methods of replanting, including source of replants and timing, size of replants, pest protection such as tree tubes and gopher cages, and irrigation; monitoring methods and schedules; success criteria; and management actions should success criteria not be met.

Method of Monitoring: The replacement plan shall be submitted to the Planning Division prior to issuance of the building permit. To ensure a successful replacement effort, the owner/applicant shall submit annual reports to the Planning Division, assessing replacement plantings survival, which shall include recommendations for any additional required action. Replacement plantings shall achieve an 80% survival rate at 5 years.

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

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

Thomas B Kenefick 1/16/19

Thomas Kenefick Date
(Owner)