

“C”

## Initial Study/Negative Declaration

Rombauer Vineyards Wine Production Facility  
Use Permit Major Modification  
#P19-00109-Mod  
Hearing October 2, 2019

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

**Initial Study Checklist**  
**(form updated January 2019)**

1. **Project Title:** Rombauer Vineyards Wine Production Facility, Major Modification #P19-00109-MOD
2. **Property Owner:** Rombauer Vineyards, Inc., 3522 Silverado Trail, St. Helena, CA 94574
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Sean Kennings, 415-533-2111, sean@lakassociates.com
4. **Project Location and APN:** This 5.95-acre parcel is located at 601 Airpark Road within the IP:AC (Industrial Park: Airport Compatibility) Zoning District; APN 057-240-015
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Rombauer Vineyards; contact Lynn Sletto, 3522 Silverado Trail, St. Helena, CA 94574
6. **General Plan description:** Industrial
7. **Zoning:** Industrial Park: Airport Compatibility (IP:AC)
8. **Background/Project History:**

The project site was originally part of a 14.8-acre property that was subdivided in 1992 into three parcels with a total of four buildings. The largest lot created by the subdivision had two of the four buildings, including the 100,800 sq. ft. building that is part of this application. A subsequent parcel map was approved in 2012 splitting the largest parcel thereby creating separate lots for the two buildings. Rombauer Vineyards is currently operating a crush, barrel storage and bottling facility at 601 Airpark Road in the Napa Valley Gateway Business Park. The 5.95-acre site, located at the intersection of Airport Boulevard and Airpark Road, is in the Napa County Airport Area Specific Plan and IP Zoning District. The winemaking facility and existing operations have been previously approved by Napa County allowed under prior Use Permit #U-90-25 which authorized the first phase development of 75,600 sq ft, and subsequent modifications #P07-00368-MODVMIN, #P08-00101-MOD, and #P17-00142. The first Use Permit modification authorized the use of an existing building to allow for bottling, distribution and barrel aging of wine with a total capacity of 880,000 gallons per year. The second Use Permit Modification authorized the construction of a 25,200 square foot single story addition for additional barrel storage, a new grape receiving area, and grape crush and press operations. The third Use Permit modification authorized the installation of a new wastewater pre-treatment system. The total authorized capacity remained unchanged at 880,000 gallons per year.

**Description of Project:**  
Modification to a Use Permit and subsequent Modifications to allow the following at an existing 100,800 sq.ft. warehouse building to: (1) increase annual production capacity by 320,000 gallons to a total of 1,200,000 gallons per year (up from 880,000 gallons per year); and (2) add five full-time and 10 part-time employees (total of 35 full-time and 10 part-time employees) during crush activities. Rombauer Vineyards is currently operating a crush, barrel storage and bottling facility from 7:00 am to 7:00 pm, Monday through Friday in the Napa Valley Gateway Business Park. The project site has 77 total parking spaces. No tours and tastings or marketing events are included in the proposal. There are no proposed changes to the interior or exterior of the building.
9. **Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses.**

The 5.95-acre project site is located within the within the Napa Valley Business Park (NVBP) at 601 Airpark Road to the southwest of the Airpark Road / Airport Boulevard intersection and approximately 600 feet east of the Napa County Airport. The parcel is comprised entirely of existing development including the existing 100,800 square foot warehouse building with wastewater pre-treatment system and associated vehicle parking, and truck loading and unloading areas.

The property is bordered on the west by train-tracks and the Napa County Airport father west; to the south by a warehouse for Last Bottle Wines and another Rombauer Winery warehouse; to the east by Airpark Road and commercial building further east, and to the north by Airport Boulevard and large commercial and warehouse buildings. The property has access and frontage on Airpark Road via an existing access driveway.
10. **Other agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).

The project will require various ministerial approvals by the County and Cal Fire, including but not limited to building permits and grading permits. Water and sewer utility service is provided by the City of American Canyon and Napa Sanitation District, respectively.

11. **Tribal Cultural Resources. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?** On August 7, 2019, 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. One response has been received from the Yoche Dehe Tribal Historic Preservation Officer on August 16, 2019 stating that they have a continued interest in the project and would like to receive updates.

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:**

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services  
Department

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>I. AESTHETICS.</b> Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

a-d. The proposed project includes increasing the yearly production of wine and the addition of 5 full-time and 10 part-time employees for a total of 35 full-time employees and 10 part-time employees. There are no proposed improvements or modifications to the exterior of site conditions. There are no changes in daily operations except for additional employee's vehicle trips and additional truck trips associated with the increase in production. The project site is completely developed within the NVBP where no scenic vistas occur. There will be no change to daily usage and no new source of light or glare.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

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

<sup>1</sup> "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.

- e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.

Discussion:

- a-e. The project site has an Industrial land use designation in the Napa County General Plan. The project site is completely developed and is not Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The site is designated as "Urban Land (X)," as shown on the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. As such, there are no significant impacts to prime farmland created by the project. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>III. AIR QUALITY.</b> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district 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) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emission (such as those leading to odors) adversely 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 Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC) Thresholds of Significance to assist in the review of projects under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). These TAC 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 TAC thresholds are advisory and may be followed by local agencies at their own discretion.

The TAC thresholds were challenged in court (California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (1st Dist., Div. 5, 2016) 2 Cal.App.5th 1067) because BAAQMD did not conduct CEQA review of their potential environmental impacts. 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 TAC 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 TAC 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 TAC 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-b. 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 the development the proposed solar energy generation use include ozone, ozone precursors oxides of nitrogen and reactive organic gases (NO<sub>x</sub> and ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), and suspended particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>). Other criteria pollutants, such as lead and sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), 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 existing facility is approximately 100,800 square feet of floor area. When compared to the BAAQMD's operational criteria pollutant screening size of 541,00 square feet and 864,000 square feet for light industrial and warehousing, respectively, the project would not significantly impact air quality and does not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2017 Pages 3-2 & 3-3.). Given the size of the project compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 864,000 square feet (warehousing) and 346,000 square feet (general office) for NO<sub>x</sub> (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.

- c. There are no improvements or modifications proposed as part of the project. Since there would be no construction activities, there would be no potential air pollutant concentrations and air quality impacts.
- d. While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, light industrial or manufacturing uses are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. There would be no construction-phase pollutants and the project would not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts are considered less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

---

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

Discussion:

a-f. The project area is completely developed and located within an existing industrial/business park. There is no potential for breeding and foraging habitat for special status species and no habitat modifications required as a result of the project. There are no wetlands on the property and no physical improvements or site modifications required for the project. The project site is located within an industrial/business park and is completely disturbed/developed. No evidence of wildlife corridors, raptor nests, wildlife dens, burrows or other unique or sensitive biological habitats or resources are located on site. As such, there would be no loss of significant wildlife or other sensitive habitat. Implementation of the project does not result in conflict with any County of Napa General Plan policy or ordinance protection vegetation or wildlife. In addition, there are no Habitat Conservation Plans, or other local or state habitat conservation plans that apply to this site.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

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

Discussion:

a-b. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology surveys, sites, sensitive areas, and flags) no historic sites have been identified on the property. No structural or site modifications are proposed as part of the project, and no site disturbance will occur. No impacts will occur

- c. No structural or site modifications are proposed as part of the project, and no site disturbance will occur. No human remains would occur on the property and no information has been encountered that would indicate that this project would encounter human remains. No impacts will occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VI. ENERGY.</b> Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

a-b. The project applicant included a Voluntary Best Management Practices checklist as part of the project application, including incentives for employees carpools, installation of water efficient fixtures; application of low impact development; installation of water efficient landscape in compliance with the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (WELO); installation of energy conserving lighting; continue implementing Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) reduction plan including employee carpool or vanpool, bike riding incentives; and the designation of clean air/carpool/electric vehicle parking spaces. Furthermore, as discussed in the **Section III** Air Quality of this Initial Study above, Napa County has been working to develop a Climate Action Plan (CAP). 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/>. Energy would be consumed during the operational phase of the project. The building already exists and consumes energy for multiple purposes, including but not limited to building heating and cooling, lighting, appliances, and electronics. The existing facility utilizes on-site renewable energy solar panels with an estimated annual electric production of 632.081 kwh.

In addition, vehicle trips associated during operation would consume gasoline. The project would include a variety of energy-saving elements, including energy-efficient building orientation and design features, lighting, utilities, and appliances. Adherence to building code requirements for any mechanical changes to accommodate increased production would ensure reduced energy use during operations would not be inefficient and would result in a less than significant impact.

Compliance with the California Building Code and Best Management Practices would further reduce emissions and ensure no overall environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during operation. Therefore, these impacts would be considered less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial direct or indirect 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

As there is physical change to the property or building footprint and no earthwork associated with the project, a geotechnical report was not prepared for the subject property.

- 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 no impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.
  - ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. However, the project does not involve a physical change to the facility and site. Therefore, there would be no impact in regards to seismic ground shaking.
  - iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. However, the project does not involve a physical change to the facility and site. Therefore, there would be no impact in regard to seismic related ground-failure and liquefaction.
  - iv.) According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) there are no known landslide areas within the area of the subject site proposed for use modification. Therefore, there would be no impact.
- b. The project would require incorporation of best management practices during operations and would be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance, as applicable. As there is no physical change occurring on-site as a result of the project, there would be no impacts related to soil erosion or loss of topsoil.
- c/d. There is no impact as there is no physical change occurring on-site as a result of this project.
- e. According to the On-Site Wastewater Feasibility Study prepared by Bartlett Engineering in March 2019, the project site and system would have adequate capacity to serve the project. Napa Sanitation reviewed this report and concurred with its findings. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.
- f. As there is no physical change associated with the project on-site, there is no impact related to destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.</b> 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 (CO<sub>2</sub>e)]. This threshold of significance is appropriate for evaluating projects in Napa County.

During the 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.)

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 (CO<sub>2</sub>) 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](http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/glossary/letter_c.html)). Equivalent Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>e) is the most commonly reported type of GHG emission and a way to get one number that approximates total emissions from all the different gasses that contribute to GHG (BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2017). In this case, carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) is used as the reference atom/compound to obtain atmospheric carbon CO<sub>2</sub> effects of GHG. Carbon stocks are converted to carbon dioxide equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e) 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>).

As there is no physical development or change to the building footprint, there are no “construction emissions” associated with this project and there is no impact.

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. As discussed above, the proposed project would not exceed the 1,100 MT/yr of CO<sub>2</sub>e as the project size does not involve a physical change or modification to the site or existing building envelope. Operational GHG emissions are associated with area sources (landscape and building maintenance), energy use, mobile sources (motor vehicle trips), water use, and wastewater treatment and is well below the 864,000 sq ft size threshold for operational emissions pollutant generating uses. Although, the Rombauer facility would generate more vehicular trips than the existing operations, the project would fall below the BAAQMD thresholds, and the impact is considered less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would not involve the transport of hazardous materials. No impacts would occur.
- b. The proposed project consists of increasing the wine production at the existing Rombauer Vineyards facility. The existing wastewater pre-treatment system serving the facility can accommodate the proposed increase and no physical change to the facility will occur as a result of this project. 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. No impact would occur.
- c. According to Google Earth, the nearest school to the project site is Napa Junction Elementary School to the southeast, located approximately 2.4 miles from the site. However, as stated in Section VIII (b) above, the operational use of the project would not include hazardous materials or substances. Therefore, the impacts would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.
- d. Based on a search of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control database, the project site does not contain any known EPA National Priority List sites, State response sites, voluntary cleanup sites, or any school cleanup sites. No impact would occur as the project site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.

- e. The project site is approximately 0.1 miles east of the Napa County Airport and is therefore subject to the requirements of the County's Airport Compatibility Combination zoning district and the requirements of the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). The project site is located within compatibility Zone D of the Napa County Airport, which is a common traffic pattern zone with aircraft overflight between 300-feet and 1,000-feet above ground level. The proposed use of the building is considered to be compatible with the risk and noise impacts associated with properties within Zone D. The existing building has also been designed to comply with specific requirements regarding light and glare to ensure airport land use compatibility. County development regulations have been certified as meeting ALUC compatibility requirements, and consequently the project is not subject to separate ALUC review because it has been designed to comply with County airport compatibility land use requirements.
- f. The existing access driveway would continue to serve the project and meets Napa County Road and Street Standards. Therefore, the project would not obstruct emergency vehicle access. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division and found acceptable, as conditioned.
- g. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b> Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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, 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or substantial groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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.

- a. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements nor substantially deplete local groundwater supplies. The proposed project will continue to discharge into an approved storm drainage system designed to accommodate the drainage from the site. The applicant is required to obtain a stormwater permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) which is administered in part by the County Engineering Services Division on behalf of the RWQCB. Given the essentially level terrain, and the County's Best Management Practices, which comply with RWQCB requirements, the project does not have the potential to significantly impact water quality and discharge standards.
- b. The project will receive water from the City of American Canyon. The project is located within an area designated for urban development by the City of American Canyon. The City has acquired water rights to provide adequate water for all areas within their service area. The City has reviewed the proposed project and determined that in order to comply with the City's Zero Water Footprint (ZWF) Policy the applicant shall contribute to the City's water conservation fund and a new Will Serve letter must be issued for the proposal which will be made a condition of project approval. No groundwater wells are associated with this property.
- c (i-iv). As there is no physical change or new development associated with the project, it would not result in an impact to substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off the project site. Napa County Engineering Division reviewed the project and indicated there is no impact.
- d. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to flood hazards, tsunamis, or seiches, and would not be at risk of releasing pollutants due to inundation. No impacts would occur.
- e. The proposed modification to the Rombauer Vineyard Production Facility is an existing condition which does not include development of an and will not obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or substantial groundwater management plan. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-b. The project would not occur within an established community, nor would it result in the division of an established community.

The project complies with the Napa County Code and all other applicable regulations. The proposed project complies with the Napa County General Plan, the Napa County Zoning Ordinance, applicable County Code sections, the Napa County Airport Area Specific Plan/Napa Valley Business Park Specific Plan, and all other applicable regulations. There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the property. Therefore, the project results in no impact.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XII. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> 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
<b>XIII. NOISE.</b> Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. The project would not result in a temporary increase in noise levels as there would not be any site construction or grading for the proposed project. As such, the project would not result in temporary construction noise impacts or operational impacts nor would the project result in long-term significant construction noise impacts. The project would be conditioned to comply with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (N.C.C. Chapter 8.16).

c. The proposed project site is located within compatibility Zone D of the Napa County Airport, which is a common traffic pattern zone with aircraft overflight between 300-feet and 1,000-feet above ground level. As such, persons on the project site will be exposed to noise from the regular aircraft overflight. The Napa County Zoning Code, section 8.16.070, Exterior noise levels, lists the maximum allowable level for industrial areas as 75 dBA. Based on the County General Plan Community Character Element, figure CC-1: Napa County Airport Projected Noise Levels (dBA CNEL), the project site is located outside of the airport area projects of 60 dBA or less, which is less than the maximum allowed in the Industrial area. The nature of the uses allowed in the Industrial Park (IP) zoning is not sensitive to increased noise levels from aircraft and is considered compatible with aircraft operations. Therefore, the location of the project within the airport land use area will result in a less than significant impact on people working in the project area.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b/c. The proposed project is located in an existing Rombauer Vineyards Production Facility which is within an industrial park. The project would increase the number of jobs within the facility and the industrial park. However, given the size of the project, the new jobs, 10 full-time positions and 5 part-time positions (for a total of 35 full-time and 10 part-time employees) are considered to be relatively small compared to the overall business park and nearby communities. Therefore, this increase in jobs will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable increase in the demand for housing units within Napa County and the general vicinity. No impacts would occur. There are no existing homes, on or adjacent to, the project site. The project would not result in the displacement of any housing units or people.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

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

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. The project would not significantly increase use of existing parks or recreational facilities based on its limited scope. No impacts would occur.
- 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
<b>XVII. TRANSPORTATION.</b> 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 a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-23, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b/c/. Weekday traffic volumes within the project vicinity consist primarily of commute traffic within the peak traffic periods, with residential flows from nearby communities and commercial, tourist, and industrial park traffic occurring throughout the day. Southern Napa County is characterized by two distinct commute traffic patterns a Napa to Bay Area commute and a Solano County to Napa commute. The existing traffic congestion and potential cumulative impacts are primarily the result of regional growth impacts.

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) serves as the transportation planning, coordinating and financing agency for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. The MTC created and maintains the Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS), a multimodal system of highways, major arterials, transit service, rail lines, seaports and airports. MTS facilities within the vicinity of the project site include State Routes 12, 29, 121, and 221, and Airport Boulevard. The State routes are maintained and operated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans.) The MTS is incorporated into MTC's 2001 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and is used as a guideline in



prioritizing for planning and funding of facilities in the Bay Area.

Major improvements to both Highway 29 and Highway 12 are necessary to address existing and cumulative regional traffic congestion. The RTP and the Napa County General Plan 2008 update identify roadway improvements in South Napa County to address potential cumulative impacts. These improvements include construction of a flyover ramp at SR 12/29/221 intersection, construction of a new interchange at SR 12/Airport Blvd/SR 29 intersection, widening Jamieson Canyon (SR 12) to four lanes (recently completed), widening SR 29 to six lanes between south Airport Blvd and the south County line (in coordination with the City of American Canyon), and extending Devlin Road south to Green Island Road. These improvements are not yet fully funded, except as noted above, but are expected to be in place by 2030 addressing potential cumulative impacts in the southern part of the County.

As mandated by Napa County, projects within the industrial park are responsible for paying “fair share” costs for the construction of improvements to impacted roadways within the NVBSP. Since 1990, the County has imposed and collected traffic mitigation fees on all development projects within the NVBSP area. A developer’s “fair share” fee goes toward funding roadway improvements within the NVBSP area including improvements designed to relieve traffic on State Highways. The traffic mitigation fee is further described in the Board of Supervisor’s Resolution 08-20. The project applicant prepared Winery Traffic Information/Trip General Sheets for both the existing and proposed conditions for the proposed project. The Department of Public Works reviewed these and determined that based the Trips Generation Sheets, there is not significant change or increase in the weekday PM peak hour trips (12 trips) and daily trips (41) trips from the existing condition to the proposed condition. The project is located in the fully developed area of Napa County Airport Area Specific Plan /Napa Valley Business Park. No other roadway improvements are pending and/or proposed for this area. The Department of Public Works has determined that a new Traffic Impact Study is not warranted for the proposed project, and as there is no additional development associated with this project, only a modification, and no further Traffic Mitigation Fee is required by this proposed modification.

d/e. The project is a Use Permit Major Modification to the existing Rombauer Winery Production Facility and does add to the development of the site. As such, no physical design changes would occur at the site. Therefore, there would be no impact to hazards due to a geometric design feature or inadequate emergency access, or incompatible uses, and no mitigation is required.

f. Based on the project site plan dated June 2019, 77 parking spaces are provided at the Rombauer Winery Production Facility project, in which includes 73 standard parking and 2 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible standard spaces and 2 ADA accessible van spaces. The proposed use modification is expected to employ an additional 5 full-time employees and 10 part-time employees for a total of 35 full-time employees and 10 part-time employees for the entire facility. The previous 2008 Minor Modification consisted of 89 parking spaces on-site, where the functional requirement was for 40 spaces. Therefore, the project will not result in inadequate parking and there is no impact.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> 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. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology surveys, sites, sensitive areas, and flags) no historic sites or tribal resources have been identified on the property. Invitation for tribal consultation was completed in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1. On August 7, 2019, 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. As of the preparation of this environmental assessment, only one response has been received from the Yoche Dehe Tribe stating that they would like to be updated during the project process. As discussed in **Section V** of this initial study, as there will be no earth disturbing activities associated with the proposed use modification, there is no significant impact related to cultural resources found on the site. Should any resources not previously uncovered during this prior disturbance are found associated with the proposed project, a qualified archaeologist must be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the standard county conditions of approval.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of a new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry year?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The project would not require the relocation or construction of a new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities as a result of the project. The project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and would not result in a significant impact on the environment relative to wastewater discharge. Wastewater disposal would be accommodated on-site and in compliance with State and County regulations. According to the Onsite Wastewater Feasibility Study prepared by Bartelt Engineering in March 2019, the project site and use modification for the Rombauer Vineyards Production Facility could be served by an on-site system with a maximum total flow of 9,026 average gallons per day at peak flows. The proposed system includes a flowmeter and waste sampler which are installed on the waste discharge line to the Napa Sanitation District (NSD) services area as a condition of the Industrial Waste Discharge Permit with NSD. The process wastewater generated at the facility will continue to be pretreated at the project site and discharged to the NSD for final treatment and disposal. The Bartelt Engineering report concludes that the project site would have adequate disposal capacity to serve the system designed for the project. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings. As conditioned, impacts would be less than significant.
- b/c. On January 14, 2014, Governor Jerry Brown declared a drought emergency in the state of California. That declaration was followed up on April 1, 2015, when the Governor directed the State Water Resources Control Board to implement mandatory water reductions in cities and towns across California to reduce water usage by 25 percent. However, on April 7, 2017, Governor Jerry Brown signed an executive order lifting California's drought emergency in all but four counties (Fresno, King, Tulare and Tuolumne).

The project would receive water from the City of American Canyon. On October 23, 2007, the City of American Canyon adopted a Zero Water Footprint (ZWF) Policy which defines a ZWF as "no net loss of water service reliability or increase in water rates to the City of American Canyon's existing water service customers due to requested increase demand for water within the City's water service area." In 2008, as part of an earlier Use Permit modification for the subject property, Bartelt Engineering prepared a water availability analysis for the City of American Canyon,

incorporated herein by reference, to determine if the requested water service is consistent with City ordinances, policies and practices; whether the City's water supply is sufficient to grant the request; and, establish a water allocation for the property. In 2008, the City of American Canyon issued a will serve letter for domestic water usage at 9,026 gallons per day (consistent with a previous will-serve letter from 2007).

According to the Onsite Wastewater Feasibility Study prepared by Bartelt Engineering in March 2019, the proposed operation has sufficient water availability for the increased wine production. . Per the will-serve letter from American Canyon, the facility is allocated 9,026 average gallons of water per day or 3,294,490 gallons per year. Bartelt concluded that the volume of domestic water that could be utilized for wine production can be calculated for the facility by subtracting the total domestic water used by employees from the annual service water allocation for a total of 145,950 gallons per year for full and part time employees. As a result, Rombauer would have 3,148,540 gpy available for wine production. Based on data collected Bartelt Engineering found that at this facility, Rombauer Vineyards has the ability to produce 1.0 gallons of wine utilizing 2.6 gallons of water which is consistent with the allocation of 9,026 gpd or 3,120,00 gpy. As a condition of project approval, Rombauer Vineyards is required to continue to track water usage to ensure that they are at or below the ratio of 2.6 to accommodate the requested increase in wine production and staffing. The City of American Canyon reviewed the Bartelt Engineering Onsite Wastewater Feasibility Study and concluded that the existing water use and anticipated project use is within the limits established in the 2007/2008 will-serve letters. The City of American Canyon has commented that if water needs exceed current water limits a new will serve letter will be required and additional capacity and zero water footprint fees will also be required.

Wastewater would be treated on-site and would not require a wastewater treatment provider to evaluate adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. Therefore, the impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

- d. The project would be served by Keller Canyon Landfill which has a capacity which exceeds current demand. As of January 2004, the Keller Canyon Landfill had 64.8 million cubic yards of remaining capacity and has enough permitted capacity to receive solid waste through 2030. No impacts will occur.
- e. The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XX. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas of lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</b>				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-d. The subject property is located in the Napa Valley Business Park which is predominately industrial development. It is also located in the Napa County Local Responsibility Area (LRA) and the fire hazard severity zone is classified as Urban Unzoned. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. There are no project features that would impair an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. The project site is currently served by underground utilities for power and would continue to do so as a result of the proposed project. No new underground power line infrastructure would be required for the proposed use modification. Therefore, impacts would be considered less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None Required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The site has been previously disturbed and does not contain any known listed plant, animal species, and special-status species. There is no development proposed as part of the use modification. The project will not degrade the quality of the environmental, 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. There are no potentially biological related impacts. No historic or prehistoric resources are anticipated to be affected by the proposed project nor will the proposed project eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. In the event archaeological artifacts are found, a standard condition of approval would be incorporated into the project. There would be no impact.
- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and traffic associated impacts are discussed in their respective sections above. The analysis determined that all potential impacts were less than significant and would not contribute significantly to cumulative impacts. The proposed project is consistent with previous Use Permit modification approvals from Napa County and does not propose new development that would have a significant impact on the environment or substantially change the existing conditions. With the imposition of standard and project specific conditions of approval, the project does not have impacts that are individually limited, or cumulatively considerable.
- c. All impacts identified in this Initial Study are 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.