

“D”

Initial Study/Negative Declaration

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:** Matthiasson Family Winery, Use Permit #P17-00394-UP and Viewshed #P19-00190
2. **Property Owner:** Squirrel Hill Vineyards LLC, 73 Luke Drive, Napa, California 94558; phone 707-265-9349; or email jill@matthiasson.com
3. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Jill Klein, 73 Luke Drive, Napa, California 94558; phone 707-265-9349; or email jill@matthiasson.com
4. **Representative:** Jeffrey Redding, Land Use Planning Services; 2423 Renfrew Street, Napa, California 94558; phone 707-255-7375; or email jreddingaicp@comcast.net
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 5.75 acre site located at 3171 Dry Creek Road, Napa, California 94558; APN: 035-460-022
7. **General Plan Description:** Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space (AWOS) District
8. **Zoning:** Agricultural Watershed (AW)
9. **Background/Project History:**

In November 1986, a Small Winery Exemption was approved for a winery with a production capacity of 5,000 gallons annually. The exemption did not permit public tours, wine tastings, sales of winery related items, or public social events. In order to allow for modifications to a winery that was approved under a Small Winery Exemption, the winery must apply for and be issued a Use Permit. If approved, the current Use Permit application would bring the winery under a Use Permit and allow the requested changes to the existing winery.

The parcel is approximately 5.75 acres in size with approximately 3.85 acres of vineyards. The parcel is currently developed with a single family residence, an agricultural storage building, and the winery building. The agricultural storage building is proposed to be converted to a winery storage building.
10. **Project Description:** Approval of a Use Permit for an 18,000 gallon winery (existing 5,000 gallon winery approved under a Small Winery Exemption) to allow the following:
 - a) Maximum annual permitted maximum production of 18,000 gallons (increased from 5,000 gallons);
 - b) Remodel of the interior of the existing winery building (approximately 3,500 square feet) and addition of an employee breakroom (approximately 64 square feet) increasing the winery building size to approximately 3,600 square feet;
 - c) Conversion of an existing, approximately 1,200 square foot agricultural storage building to a winery storage building;
 - d) Construction of an approximately 3,800 square foot cave (spoils being transported offsite to a permitted location);
 - e) Hours of operation seven days a week: 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM - production hours, except during harvest and 10:00 AM to 6:00 PM - visitation hours (the winery was previously only open for production six days a week and no visitation was permitted);
 - f) Employment of seven employees (four full time and three part time) non harvest (increase from 2 full-time employees);
 - g) Tours and tastings by appointment only for 17 per day; weekly maximum of 119 visitors;
 - h) Food and wine pairings with daily visitation (applicant to obtain a food facility permit as required);
 - i) Annual marketing plan of five events comprised of four events (maximum of 30 guests per event) and one event (maximum of 50 persons), catered food may be served at events;
 - j) 7 parking spaces (increased from 5);
 - k) Construction of a wastewater system (two options proposed);
 - l) Use of the on-site well (Well #1);
 - m) Installation of two 10,000 gallon water storage tanks;
 - n) Install landscaping on property and driveway; and
 - o) Improvement of the existing on site driveway (widening to 20 feet) to meet Napa County Road and Street Standards.

The project includes a review of the proposed water tanks under the Viewshed Protection Program (Chapter 18.106 of the Napa County Code) to review the visibility from County designated Viewshed roads.

11. **Environmental setting and surrounding land uses:**

The 5.75 acre project site is located at 3171 Dry Creek Road, approximately 0.8 miles north of the City of Napa. The project parcel is within the AW zoning district. The project site is currently developed with a single family residence, an agricultural storage building, and the winery building. Approximately 3.85 acres are planted in vineyards. The project parcel is accessed via a private driveway off of Dry Creek Road. The driveway serves five residences, including the residence on the project parcel and one residence past the project parcel. The winery building is located approximately 700 feet down the private driveway, past four of the residences that share the driveway.

The winery building is proposed to remain. New construction includes an approximately 64 square foot addition for an employee breakroom, minor changes to the exterior, and an interior remodel. The agricultural storage building is proposed to be converted to a winery storage building. No changes are proposed to the storage building.

The property is located on the western edge of the valley floor with slopes of approximately 5-15% percent on the flat, eastern portion of the property and 15-30% percent on the western hillside. The existing development is on the flat portion of the property, and the 3.85 acres of vineyards are planted on the hillside. The proposed cave would be dug into the hillside on the northern portion of the property near the existing winery building. Proposed driveway improvements include widening of the existing driveway to meet Napa County Road and Street Standards.

Soil types include Fagan clay loam, 30-50% slopes on the hillside. The site lies outside the boundaries of the 100 and 500 year flood hazard boundaries of the blue line stream that is located approximately 475 feet north of the existing winery building on the adjacent property to the north. The hillside area is designated as Moderate Fire Hazard Severity.

The property is surrounded by rural residential uses and agricultural (vineyards) use. Within one mile of the site there are seven approved wineries and one winery pending approval. Surrounding undeveloped areas further to the west, include naturally vegetated and/or wooded hillsides.

The nearest neighboring residences, are directly east of the property and utilize the same driveway. The closest is approximately 225 feet from the existing winery building.

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 meeting CalFire standards. 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

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. A response requesting information was received from the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation on December 10, 2018, and the requested information was sent on December 19, 2018. No additional requests for consultation were received within the consultation period.

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

4/19/19
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-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, and agricultural (vineyards) use. The nearest neighboring residences, located directly east, are approximately 225 feet from the existing winery building. The construction of the cave and installation of the water tanks and septic system will result in the removal of 0.2 acres of vineyards. There are no rock outcroppings on the property.

The existing winery building and agricultural storage building that will be converted for winery storage are both located on the flat portion of the property. The buildings are a light beige color with white trim. There are no proposed changes to the existing color or materials of the existing winery building. The addition of the employee breakroom (approximately 64 square feet) will match the existing structure. No additional changes are proposed to the exterior of the structure. There are no changes to the existing color or materials of the existing agricultural storage building. The two proposed 10,000-gallon water tanks would be located on the hillside west of the winery storage building. Dry Creek Road is a County designated Viewshed Road. The proposed tanks would potentially be visible from the road and therefore require review under the Viewshed Program. The tanks would be partially dug into the hillside and would sit approximately 8 feet above grade when viewed from the east. The applicant proposes plantings 13 evergreen trees surrounding the tanks. Proposed tree types include evergreens such as olive trees, Catalina Cherry, and Strawberry tree and would range from eight feet to ten feet in height. The trees would reduce visibility of the tanks from Dry Creek Road. 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. Existing lighting on the building is shielded and directed downward. The project does not include changes to the location of existing lighting or the installation of new lighting. If new lighting is proposed in the future it would be subject to standard Napa County conditions of approval for wineries, and the 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b/e. The majority of the site, include the vineyards, winery, and agricultural building are on land designated as "Unique Farmland". The portion of the project developed with the residence and the existing driveway is designated "Other Land". Proposed improvements to the existing winery development and the existing driveway would be taking place on portions of the property that are already developed and will not change the use. The construction of the cave and installation of the water tanks and septic system will result in the removal of 0.2 acres of vineyards, however, the proposed improvements will not result in an overall change in the use of the property. 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 zoned AW which allows wineries upon grant of a use permit. According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps (based on the following layers – Sensitive Biotic Oak Woodlands and Sensitive 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.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

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

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

Ozone and fine particle pollution, or PM2.5, are the major regional air pollutants of concern in the San Francisco Bay Area. Ozone is primarily a problem in the summer, and fine particle pollution in the winter. In Napa County, ozone rarely exceeds health standards, but PM2.5 occasionally does reach unhealthy concentrations. There are multiple reasons for PM2.5 exceedances in Napa County. First, much of the county is wind-sheltered, which tends to trap PM2.5 within the Napa Valley. Second, much of the area is well north of the moderating temperatures of San Pablo Bay and, as a result, Napa County experiences some of the coldest nights in the Bay Area. This leads to greater

fireplace use and, in turn, higher PM2.5 levels. Finally, in the winter easterly winds often move fine-particle-laden air from the Central Valley to the Carquinez Strait and then into western Solano and southern Napa County (BAAQMD, *In Your Community: Napa County*, April 2016)

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

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

As mentioned above, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Operational-Related Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursors Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. The proposed winery development of approximately 8,600 square feet (winery building, winery storage building, cave, 200 square foot winery tasting room), when compared to the BAAQMD's operational criteria pollutant screening size of 541,000 square feet for general light industrial, and compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47,000 square feet for a high quality restaurant, 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 8,600 square feet of development, 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 cave and access driveway improvements. Project earthwork, primarily from construction of the cave, will produce approximately 4,150 cubic yards of spoils that will be hauled offsite to a permitted location. This is estimated to generate approximately 16 truck trips per day spread over an approximate 30-day period (480 trips). 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, directly east of the existing winery are approximately 225 feet from the existing winery building. The proposed increase in production and visitation is not likely generate significant impacts from the existing winery. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The parcel is currently developed with a single family residence, an agricultural storage building, and the winery building. Approximately 3.85 acres of vineyards are planted on the property. Proposed improvements to the existing winery development and the existing driveway would be taking place on portions of the property that are already developed and will not change the existing use or remove native vegetation. The construction of the cave and installation of the water tanks and septic system will result in the removal of 0.2 acres of vineyards, however, the proposed improvements will not result in a significant change in the level of development on the property.

- a/b. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Owl habitat (CNDDDB)) the project parcel falls within a 1.5 mile buffer surrounding mapped habitat for Spotted Owl. In May 2018, the project ornithologist reviewed the site and determined that based on the development of the site, including the vineyard, winery infrastructure, residential improvements, and non-native landscape species, the site lacks spotted owl habitat. As of December 2017, the nearest known Spotted Owl observation is 3.7 miles northwest of the project site. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Sensitive biotic vegetation groups, Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), U.S. Fish & Wildlife Critical Habitat) no additional environmental resources were identified on the property. The project will not 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; nor will it 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. There are no wetlands located at the project site. Accordingly, the project, would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands. No impact would occur.
- d. The parcel is already developed and the proposed development would not result in a significant change to the level of development on the property. 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.
- ef. The project does not require the removal of any native vegetation or propose improvements that would conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. 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 Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a-c. The Northwest Information Center (NWIC) conducted a records search for the property and provided their findings in a letter dated February 5, 2018. The review of information indicates that there have been no cultural resource or architectural studies of the project site and the project site contains no recorded archaeological resources. The State Office of Historic Preservation Historic Property Directory (OHP HPD) lists no recorded buildings or structures on or adjacent to the proposed project area. Based on an evaluation of the environmental setting, there is a low potential for unrecorded Native American resources. Review of historical literature and maps gave no indication of the possibility

of historic-period activity, therefore, there is a low potential for unrecorded historic-period archaeological resources in the project area. There is a low possibility of identifying any buildings or structures 45 years or older.

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 during previous site development and no information has been encountered that would indicate that this project would encounter human remains. Excluding the cave excavation, most construction activities would occur on previously disturbed portions of the site. However, if resources are found during project construction, work on the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist shall 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a.
- i.) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.
 - ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project 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) there are two small landslide deposits on the western hillside near the property line. All new development would be required to comply with the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code, which would require a geotechnical analysis as appropriate, and would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- 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 area developed with the winery and residential development to 15-30% on the hillside portion of the property. Soil types include Fagan clay loam, 5 to 15 percent on the flatter, developed portion of the property and Fagan clay loam 30 to 50 percent on the hillside. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the parcel has a very low susceptibility for liquefaction. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. The Wastewater Feasibility Report prepared by Madrone Engineering (Revision 1: May 2, 2018) proposes two options for managing the disposal of domestic and process wastewater generated by the existing winery and the increase in production, visitation, and marketing. The onsite wastewater systems for both options would be designed for the peak winery process and domestic wastewater flows along with the existing residential uses.

Option #1 proposes to handle the domestic and process wastewater separately. Domestic wastewater would be dispersed into the existing winery septic system and process wastewater would utilize a hold and haul system. The domestic wastewater would be treated via a standard septic tank with final disposal to the existing leach lines which have been in place since its installation in 1986. Under this option winery process waste would be separated out to a hold and haul, resulting in a reduction in the amount of wastewater going to the leach lines. The existing system appears to be well-functioning, but portions of the leach lines extend into easement and well setbacks. The leach field would be required to be modified to comply with Napa County Environmental Health Division standards. Process wastewater would be handled through the installation of a new holding tank that can be periodically pumped and hauled offsite by a licensed sewage hauling company. The holding tank shall be sized to meet County Code requirements. Suitable area has been identified for a reserve area.

Option #2 proposes to handle the combined domestic and process wastewater with a pretreatment system, and disperses effluent into sub-surface driplines. The domestic and process wastewater would undergo primary treatment in separate standard septic systems. The semi-treated effluent from both the domestic and process waste septic tanks would undergo secondary treatment in the same unit prior to final disposal via subsurface drip lines. The primary disposal area for the combined wastewater, approximately 3,500 square feet, is proposed to be located in the existing vineyard. Suitable area has been identified for a reserve area.

The study concludes that the parcel contains suitable soils and adequate available dispersal area and the proposed increase in winery wastewater disposal needs can be accommodated onsite by either option. The existing residence has a separate septic system that will not be impacted or modified by the project. The Napa County Environmental Health Division has reviewed the report and concurred with their conclusion. Full design calculations and construction plans will be prepared in accordance with Napa County standards at the time of building permit application submittal. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GHGs are the atmospheric gases whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for the greenhouse effect, including carbon dioxide, methane, ozone, and the fluorocarbons, that contribute to climate change (a widely accepted theory/science explain human effects on the atmosphere). Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) gas, the principal greenhouse gas (GHG) being emitted by human activities, and whose concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity, also serves as the reference gas to compare other greenhouse gases. Agricultural

sources of carbon emissions include forest clearing, land-use changes, biomass burning, and farm equipment and management activity emissions (http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/glossary/letter_c.html). Equivalent Carbon Dioxide (CO₂e) is the most commonly reported type of GHG emission and a way to get one number that approximates total emissions from all the different gasses that contribute to GHG (BAAMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2017). In this case, carbon dioxide (CO₂) is used as the reference atom/compound to obtain atmospheric carbon CO₂ effects of GHG. Carbon stocks are converted to carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e) by multiplying the carbon total by 44/12 (or 3.67), which is the ratio of the atomic mass of a carbon dioxide molecule to the atomic mass of a carbon atom (<http://www.nciasi2.org/COLE/index.html>).

One time "Construction Emissions" associated with a winery development project include: i) the carbon stocks that are lost (or released) when existing vegetation is removed and soil is ripped in preparation for a new winery structure and associated infrastructure; and ii) emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area, 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 excavation of an approximately 3,800 square foot cave, installation of a water tank pad, widening of an existing paved driveway, and minor changes to the existing winery building. Project earthwork, primarily from construction of the cave, will produce approximately 4,150 cubic yards of spoils, which is estimated to generate approximately 16 truck trips per day spread over an approximate 30-day period (480 trips).

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. Based on the proposed winery square footage of 8,600 (winery building, winery storage building, cave, 200 square foot winery tasting room) 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 energy conserving lighting and water efficient fixtures; installation of solar panels; installation of electrical vehicle charging station(s); implementing bicycle incentives; constructing low-impact development for storm water management; installing water efficient landscaping including planting native plant habitat and working with Healthy Soils Program of the CDFA; recycling 75% of all waste and composting 75% of food and garden materials; educating staff and visitors on sustainable practices; and implementing a sustainable purchasing and shipping program. The winery currently uses 70-80% cover crop; retains biomass for reuse on site; utilizes two electric vehicles; and has shade trees in close proximity to the building. The winery intends to become a Certified Green Business or certified as a "Napa Green Winery" and/or 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. 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 could 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 site improvements and operational changes to an existing winery, which 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. 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. The project site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites. The adjacent parcel to the north had an underground storage tank on a portion of the parcel that is located across Dry Creek Road. The site has been cleaned up and the associated Cleanup Program Site case was closed in March 2003. That portion of the neighboring property has one well that the project parcel has water rights to use. The well will not be used for the winery. No impact would occur.
- 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 property is designated as a Moderate Fire hazard severity zone and is within the State Responsibility Area (SRA). The proposed driveway improvements would provide adequate access to Dry Creek Road. The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and the 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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 Lohdorff 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.

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 project location 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 Revised Water Availability Analysis Tier 1 and Tier 2 analysis was completed by Madrone Engineering on May 2, 2018 (original submittal November 10, 2017). In addition a Memorandum (Updated Draft October 10, 2018) was prepared by Richard C. Slade and Associates LLC (RCS) to provide a calculation of the estimated annual groundwater recharge rate for the project parcel.

The analyses included information on existing and proposed water use and a parcel specific recharge evaluation. There are three wells available for use by the parcel. Two of the wells (Wells #01 onsite and Well #02 on neighboring parcel) are exclusively for use by the parcel, while the third well (Well #04 offsite across Dry Creek Road) is shared 50%-50% with a neighboring parcel (3173 Dry Creek Road). Currently, water from Wells #02 and #04 is plumbed to the parcel and available for use. However, after completion of this Use Permit modification, parcel plumbing will be configured such

that only Well #01 serves the winery. All other water uses associated with the parcel (vineyard irrigation, existing residence, and residential landscaping) will be served by Wells #02 and #04. For this analysis, Well #01 will be considered the "Project Well" as it will be the only water source for all winery water usage.

- a/f. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and would not substantially degrade water quality. As discussed in detail in the Section VI. Geology and Soils, the Wastewater Feasibility Report prepared by Madrone Engineering (Revision 1: May 2, 2018) proposes two options for managing the disposal of domestic and process wastewater generated by the proposed winery. The onsite wastewater systems for both options would be designed for the peak winery process and domestic wastewater flows along with the existing residential uses. Option #1 proposes to handle the domestic and process wastewater separately. Domestic wastewater would be dispersed into the existing winery septic system and process wastewater would utilize a hold and haul system. Option #2 proposes to handle the combined domestic and process wastewater with a pretreatment system, and disperses effluent into sub-surface driplines. The study concludes that the parcel contains suitable soils, adequate available dispersal area, and that the proposed increase in winery wastewater disposal needs can be accommodated onsite by either option. The existing residence has a separate septic system that will not be impacted or modified by the project. The Napa County Environmental Health Division has reviewed the report and concurred with their conclusion. Full design calculations and construction plans will be prepared in accordance with Napa County standards at the time of building permit application submittal. The preliminary grading and drainage plan has been reviewed by the Engineering Division. As conditioned, impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The Madrone Water Availability Analysis and the memorandum from RSC contained Tier 1 and Tier 2 analyses, including information on existing and proposed water use for the winery, as well as a total for all water uses on the parcel (winery, residence, and vineyard irrigation). Additionally, a parcel specific recharge evaluation and well interference analysis were generated. As discussed in detail below, the analyses conclude that water demand of the project can be met with the existing on-site project well and that the total groundwater usage of the winery is less than the estimated annual recharge for the parcel. Therefore, the project will not substantially deplete local groundwater supplies. Two project specific conditions of approval has been included to require a Groundwater Demand Management Program to meter all wells serving the property and ensure that the total water usage on the parcel does not exceed the proposed estimate.

Tier 1 Analysis

As broken down in the table below, the total existing water use for the property, including the residence, winery (process, domestic, landscaping, employees, and visitors), and vineyard irrigation is approximately 1.68 acre-feet per year. Existing water use for the winery is 0.163 acre-feet per year. If the project is approved as proposed, the annual winery water use would increase by 0.42 acre-feet, to a total of 0.583 acre-feet per year. In March 2018, a constant rate pumping test was conducted on the project well (Well 1). Based on the results of the test, it appears the well will be capable of pumping at rates needed to meet the future groundwater demands of the project.

Due to a switch from irrigating the vineyards to dry-farming the vineyards, the annual water usage associated with the vineyard irrigation will decrease by 0.586 acre-feet per year. Although water usage associated with the winery will increase, due to the reduction in water usage associated with vineyard irrigation (conversion to dry farming), overall water usage on the property will decrease by approximately 10 percent. As detailed in Condition of Approval 4.20, the total water usage associated with the parcel is limited to 1.52 acre feet per year which includes the assumption of the reduction in irrigation water.

Water Use	Existing AF/YR	Proposed AF/YR	Change in Water Usage AF/YR
Residence	0.75	0.75	0
Winery			
- Process Water	0.108	0.387	+ 0.279
- Domestic Water + Landscaping	0.025	0.090	+ 0.065
- Employees	0.024	0.054	+ 0.030
- Visitors	0.006	0.044	+ 0.038
- Event Visitors per Year	0	0.008	+ 0.008
Vineyards			
- Irrigation Only	0.77	0.184	- 0.586
Total Winery Only Water Usage	0.163	0.583	+ 0.42
Total Parcel Water Usage	1.683	1.517	- 0.166

Tier 2 – Aquifer Recharge Analysis

Groundwater recharge on a long-term average annual basis at the property can be estimated as a percentage of average rainfall that falls on the subject property and becomes available to deep percolate into the aquifer over the long-term. The report notes that a calculation of average annual rainfall for any long-term period always includes periods of below-average rainfall and above-average rainfall that occurred during the period over which the average was calculated; therefore, the recharge calculations also include consideration of drought year conditions. The actual percentage of rain that deep percolates can be variable based on numerous conditions, such as the slope of the land, the soil type that exists at the property, the evapotranspiration that occurs on the property, the intensity and duration of the rainfall, etc. Therefore, RCS has considered various analyses of deep percolation into the rocks of the Great Valley Sequence, as relied upon by other consultants and government agencies for projects in Napa Valley.

The study concluded the groundwater recharge at the 5.8 acre property on an average annual basis is estimated to be 1.44 AF/yr. This value is based on conservative estimates of average annual rainfall at the property and estimates of the percentage of rainfall that could be available to deep percolate into the subject property. RCS selected precipitation data published by Oregon State University's PRISM Climate Group which estimates a rainfall volume of 29.8 inches (2.48 feet) on the subject property on a long term average annual basis. RCS utilized the estimate from the "Updated Napa County Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model" (LSCE&MBK, 2013) that approximately 10% of the average annual rainfall is available to deep percolate. This estimated annual future recharge volume of 1.44 AF/yr is greater than the 0.583 AF/yr proposed onsite groundwater demand (to be pumped from onsite Well #1) for the proposed project.

RCS included an analysis of a potential "prolonged drought period". For the purposes of this report, a "prolonged" drought period rainfall is conservatively based on rainfall data collected from a local rain gage during a drought period of two years - 48% of the average annual rainfall. Further, to again be conservative, a "prolonged drought period" is estimated to last 6 years, which is the longest drought period on record according to DWR (DWR 2015). The conservative estimate of recharge show that, over a theoretical six-year drought period in which only 48% of the average annual rainfall that might occur, a total of 4.14 AF of rainfall recharge would occur within the boundaries of the subject property. This recharge estimate of 4.14 AF is greater than the total estimated groundwater demand of 3.50 AF for that same six-year drought period. The Madrone WAA estimates that water use for the project is not expected to vary between normal water years and dry water years. The analysis concludes that the property has sufficient recharge during the "prolonged drought scenario".

Tier 2 - Well interference

Because there are at least five offsite wells (including easement Well #2) located within 500 feet of the onsite project well (Well #1), a Well Interference analysis was completed. The analysis included a pumping test of Well #1. During the March 16, 2018, 8-hour pumping test of Well #1, water level measurements were also manually recorded by LGS in easement Well #2 (the observation well). During the pumping portion of the Well #1 pumping test, no water level drawdown impacts were induced in the offsite easement Well #2. Additionally, RCS used the Advanced Aquifer Test Analysis (AQTESOLV) software to perform a "predictive" simulation of the potential, theoretical water level drawdowns that might occur in the region due to future pumping by the project well. The theoretical water level drawdown values for the five wells ranged between 8.2 feet and 9.3 feet. These values are less than the range of acceptable values defined in the "Default Well Interference Criteria" of the May 12, 2015, Napa County WAA Guidelines (WAA 2015). Drawdown criteria in the WAA Guidelines (WAA 2015) show that drawdown is not considered significant if drawdown is less than 10 feet for offsite wells with a casing diameter of six inches or less, and less than 15 feet for offsite wells with a casing diameter greater than six inches. The project is not expected to have a significant impact on wells within 500 feet.

The following Project Specific Conditions will be applied to the project. Impacts will be less than significant.

4.20 OTHER CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO THE OPERATIONAL ASPECTS OF THE PROJECT

- a. The parcel shall be limited to 1.52 acre-feet of groundwater per year for all water consuming activities on the parcel. A Groundwater Demand Management Program shall be developed and implemented for the property as outlined in COA 6.15(a) below.*

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.

¹ *Substantial evidence is defined by case law as evidence that is of ponderable legal significance, reasonable in nature, credible and of solid value. The following constitute substantial evidence: facts, reasonable assumptions predicated on facts; and expert opinions supported by facts. Argument, speculation, unsubstantiated opinion or narrative, or clearly inaccurate or erroneous information do not constitute substantial evidence.*

6.15 OTHER CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO THE PROJECT PERMITTING PROCESS

a. Groundwater Demand Management Program

1. The permittee shall install a meter on each well serving the parcel. Each meter shall be placed in a location that will allow for the measurement of all groundwater used on the project parcel. Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit for the winery or expanding any operations as approved under this modification, the permittee shall submit for review and approval by the Director of Public Works a groundwater demand management plan which includes a plan for the location and the configuration of the installation of a meter on all wells serving the parcel.
2. The Plan shall identify how best available technology and best management water conservation practices will be applied throughout the parcel.
3. The Plan shall identify how best management water conservation practices will be applied where possible in the structures on site. This includes but is not limited to the installation of low flow fixtures and appliances.
4. As a groundwater consuming activity already exists on the property, meter installation and monitoring shall begin immediately and the first monitoring report is due to the county within 120 days of approval of this modification.
5. For the first twelve months of operation under the Use Permit, the applicant shall read the meters at the beginning of each month and provide the data to the Public Works Director monthly. If the water usage on the property exceeds, or is on track to exceed, 1.52 acre-feet per year, or if the permittee fails to report, additional reviews and analysis and/or a corrective action program at the permittee's expense shall be required and shall be submitted to the Public Works Director and the PBES Director for review and action.
6. The permittee's wells shall be included in the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring program if the County finds the well suitable.
7. At the completion of the reporting period per 5 above, and so long as the water usage is within the acre-feet per year as specified above, the permittee may begin the following meter reading schedule:
 - a. On or near the first day of each month the permittee shall read the water meter, and provide the data to the Public Works Director during the first weeks of April and October. The Public Works Director, or his designated representative, has the right to access and verify the operation and readings of the meters during regular business hours.

9.9 OTHER CONDITIONS APPLICABLE PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF A FINAL CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY

- a. All required meters shall be installed and all groundwater usage monitoring required in COA 4.20(a) and 6.15(a) shall commence prior to final occupancy.

- 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 pre-development conditions. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. The preliminary grading and drainage plan has been reviewed by the Engineering Division. As conditioned, the project would not 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. 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 northern property line of the adjacent property to the north. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-c. The property is currently developed with a winery that was approved in 1986 under a Small Winery Exemption. The expansion of the winery would not 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 zoned AW. 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 Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space (AWOS) District; 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. Historically, the two most valuable mineral commodities in Napa County in economic terms have been mercury and mineral water. More recently, building stone and aggregate have become economically valuable. Mines and Mineral Deposits mapping included in the Napa County Baseline Data Report (*Mines and Mineral Deposits*, BDR Figure 2-2) indicates that there are no known mineral resources nor any locally important mineral resource recovery sites located on 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. The project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during construction of the proposed winery addition, cave, septic system, 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. The nearest neighboring residences, directly east of the existing winery, are approximately 225 feet from the existing winery building. The onsite residence and a section of vineyards are located between the existing building and the closest residence. 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 may be a change in the ambient noise level due to the addition of daily visitation and annual marketing events. Given the proximity to the neighbors, there could be a potential for impacts related to noise from any exterior activities, specifically the proposed marketing events. 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 and agricultural use (vineyards). 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 visitation and 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). Enforcement of Napa County's Exterior Noise Ordinance, is and will be provided by the Napa County Sheriff, which address any noise related issues including, but not limited to, prohibiting outdoor-amplified sounds, as stated in the standard noise use permit condition outlined above. The generation of significant levels of noise would not be expected. The proposed visitation of 17 people

per day maximum would occur within the winery building. Additionally, existing development on the property, including the residence, surrounded by trees, and the trees and landscaping along the driveway, would assist in reducing noise levels reaching other properties.

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 muffled 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, directly east of the existing winery are approximately 225 feet from the existing winery building. 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.

ef. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or the vicinity of a public or 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a. The number of employees would increase from 2 full-time employees to seven employees (four full time and three part time). 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. The project would not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly

b/c. The project would include a minor expansion of an existing winery and conversion of an agricultural storage building to winery storage. The project 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a. Public services are currently provided to the project 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-23, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. W-Trans prepared a Draft Traffic Impact Study for the Matthiasson Winery project on April 17, 2018. The study included an analysis of Level of Service (LOS) and Roadway segment operation at the study intersections of Dry Creek Road/Orchard Avenue and Dry Creek Road/Trower Avenue.

The study calculated the Existing Conditions (current operation based on existing traffic volumes during the weekday p.m. and weekend midday peak periods); Baseline Conditions (Existing plus Approved projects near the study area); and Future Conditions (Future volumes for the horizon year 2040). Future volumes for the horizon year 2040 were calculated based on output from the Napa Solano Travel Demand Model, maintained by the Solano Transportation Authority (STA).

Based on the Napa County Trip Generation form estimating a typical weekday to have four full-time employees and 15 visitors, the proposed project is expected to generate an average of 16 additional trips per day over existing conditions, including six weekday p.m. peak hour trips and four new trips during the midday peak hour for Saturday operations. The largest proposed marketing event would have 30 attendees and would be expected to generate 11 trips before and after the event on either a weekday or weekend day.

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)

Under Existing conditions, the study intersections operate acceptably at LOS A or B during both peak periods and they would be expected to continue operating at these service levels with the addition of project generated traffic. The study roadways are operating acceptably at LOS A or B under existing conditions and are expected to continue operating acceptably with the addition of project-generated traffic.

Under anticipated Baseline and Future volumes, the study intersections are expected to continue operating acceptably at LOS A or B overall and on the stop-controlled minor street approaches during both peak hours and upon the addition of project-related trips. The study roadways are expected to operate at acceptable service levels during both peak hours and with the addition of project and event-produced traffic volumes.

- 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. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or the vicinity of a public or private airstrip. No impact would occur.
- d-f. After implementation of the proposed project, the site would continue to be accessed via the private driveway. The W-Trans study evaluated sight distances from and to the project driveway along Dry Creek Road based on sight distance criteria contained in the Highway Design Manual published by Caltrans. The study determined that sight distances are adequate toward the north and south. Based on Left Turn Lane Warrant Graph from the Napa County Road and Street Standards, a left-turn lane is not warranted on Dry Creek Road at the project driveway. The existing site access and proposed improvements were reviewed and approved by the Napa County Public Works Department, Fire Department, and Engineering Services Division, as conditioned.

The proposal includes increases parking spaces from five to seven. The W-Trans study evaluated a proposal of six parking spaces and determined that based on the parameters of a typical week day traffic of four full-time employees and 17 visitors daily, the proposed supply of six spaces is expected to be adequate for typical daily activity. For the largest, 30-person marketing event, the parking would not be sufficient. The applicant would allow temporary overflow parking near the winery storage building. The proposed number of parking spaces is sufficient to meet the estimated parking demands.

- g. There are currently no pedestrian facilities providing access to the project site; however, due to the rural and agricultural nature of the study area, it would be reasonable to assume there would not be any pedestrian travel, and therefore, no additional facilities recommended. Similarly, the lack of transit service is not anticipated to result in a negative impact due to the lack of demand for such services. Existing Class II bike lanes on Dry Creek Road and Trower Avenue, in addition to planned future facilities, provide adequate access for bicycles to the site. 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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. A response requesting information was received from the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation on December 10, 2018, and the requested information was sent on December 19, 2018. No additional requests for consultation were received within the consultation period.

As part of subsequent correspondence with representatives from the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation, it was requested that a project specific condition of approval be included requiring the applicant to contact the tribe directly if artifacts are discovered.

7.5. *OTHER CONSTRUCTION CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO THE PROJECT PROPOSAL*

a. *In the event that archeological artifacts or human remains are discovered during construction, the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation shall be contacted.*

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 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/e. 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. As discussed in detail in the Section VI. Geology and Soils, the Wastewater Feasibility Report prepared by Madrone Engineering (Revision 1: May 2, 2018) proposes two options for managing the disposal of domestic and process wastewater generated by the proposed winery. The onsite wastewater systems for both options would be designed for the peak winery process and domestic wastewater flows along with the existing residential uses. Option #1 proposes to handle the domestic and process wastewater separately. Domestic wastewater would be dispersed into the existing winery septic system and process wastewater would utilize a hold and haul system. Option #2 proposes to handle the combined domestic and process wastewater with a pretreatment system, and disperses effluent into sub-surface driplines. The study concludes that the parcel contains suitable soils, adequate available dispersal area, and that the proposed increase in winery wastewater disposal needs can be accommodated by either option. The existing residence has a separate septic system that will not be impacted or modified by the project. The Napa County Environmental Health Division has reviewed the report and concurred with their conclusion. 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. Hydrology and Water Quality** above a Memorandum (Updated Draft October 10, 2018) was prepared by Richard C. Slade and Associates LLC (RCS) to provide a calculation of the estimated annual groundwater recharge rate for the project parcel. The analysis concludes that water demand of the project can be met with the existing on-site project well and that the total groundwater usage of the winery is less than the estimated annual recharge for the parcel. Therefore, the project will not substantially deplete local groundwater supplies. Additionally, the reports calculate the proposed total water usage associated with the parcel. Two project specific conditions of approval has been included to require a Groundwater Demand Management Program to meter all wells serving the property and ensure that the total water usage on the parcel does not exceed the proposed estimate.
- f. According to the Baseline Data Report (2005) all of the solid waste landfills where Napa County's waste is disposed have 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The project does not 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. Although the site is located within proximity to spotted owl habitat, in May 2018, the project ornithologist reviewed the site and determined that based on the development of the site, including the vineyard, winery infrastructure, residential improvements, and non-native landscape species, the site lacks spotted owl habitat. The Northwest Information Center (NWIC) conducted a records search for the property. There have been no cultural resource or architectural studies of the project site and the project site contains no recorded archaeological resources. The State Office of Historic Preservation Historic Property Directory (OHP HPD) lists no recorded buildings or structures on or adjacent to the proposed project area. Based on an evaluation of the environmental setting, there is a low potential for unrecorded Native American resources. Review of historical literature and maps gave no indication of the possibility of historic-period activity, therefore, there is a low potential for unrecorded historic-period archaeological resources in the project area. There is a low possibility of identifying any buildings or structures 45 years or older. The project does not have the potential to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. 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 will have a less than significant effect on the environment and cultural resources.
- b. 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, potentially add to traffic, and contribute to air pollution. Cumulative impacts of these issues are discussed in previous sections of this Initial Study. Impact from an increase in air pollution is being addressed as discussed in the project's Greenhouse Gas Voluntary Best Management Practices. The traffic study looked at proposed Future plus Project Conditions, including traffic projections and reasonably foreseeable projects. 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 Negative Declaration have been found to be 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 beings either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None Required.