

“B”

**Initial Study Checklist
Inn at the Abbey
P18-00038-MOD**

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

Initial Study Checklist

1. **Project Title:** Inn at the Abbey, Use Permit Major Modification Application No. P19-00038-MOD
2. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and Email:** Trevor Hawkes, Planner III, (707) 253-4388, Trevor.Hawkes@countyofnapa.org
3. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel No. (APN):** 3018/3020 N. St. Helena Highway; 3010 N. St. Helena Highway; 3022 N. St. Helena Highway; 1189 Lodi Lane (also known as 3000 State Route [SR] 29); and 1157, 1160, 1165, 1179, and 1191 Lodi Lane; APNs 022-130-027, 022-130-028, 022-130-023, 022-130-024, 022-220-028, and 022-220-029
4. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Jackson Family Investments III, LLC, Geoff Scott, 421 Aviation Boulevard, Santa Rosa, CA 95403
5. **Property Owner:** Jackson Family Investments III, LLC
6. **General Plan Designation:** Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space (AWOS)
7. **Zoning:** Commercial Limited (CL) and Agricultural Watershed (AW)
8. **Background/Project History:** The property that is the subject of this application is a 15-acre site composed of six parcels located at Lodi Lane along SR 29, approximately one-half mile north of the city limits of St. Helena, in unincorporated Napa County (Figure 1). The project site includes land zoned for CL and AW uses. The project site is currently used as the Freemark Abbey Winery complex and has been used for a blend of agricultural and commercial uses since the 1960s. There are also six residences on the site. For more than 50 years, the site has been entitled for multiple winery, retail, restaurant, and motel uses through several use permits and modifications. Current operations include the Freemark Abbey Winery production and wine tasting facilities, retail uses, a restaurant, a café, a motel, and residential units (Figure 2).
9. **Description of Project:** The applicant has submitted a use permit major modification request (P19-00038-MOD) to demolish three structures (a restaurant, a commercial building, and a motel) and redevelop the site with a 79-room hotel and associated guest amenities, including a spa with treatment rooms, a fitness studio, a rooftop lounge and back-of-house uses totaling approximately 78,400 square feet (sq. ft.) (Figure 3). Other site features would include a parking garage, a swimming pool, a plunge pool, and an outdoor lawn area. The existing residences would be used for on-site employee housing. Major modification of a use permit by Napa County is a discretionary action subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The applicant is also seeking approval of a development agreement with Napa County. The 15-acre project site includes six parcels owned by the project applicant. Three of these parcels are zoned for AW, two are zoned CL, and one parcel includes both AW and CL zoning. The four parcels located north of Lodi Lane are referred to as the "North Parcel," and the two parcels south of Lodi Lane are known as the "South Parcel." The North Parcel totals 1.84 acres of land zoned CL and 8.43 acres of land zoned AW. The South Parcel includes 1.70 acres zoned CL and 4.83 acres zoned AW.



Source: Adapted by Ascent Environmental in 2020

Figure 1 Project Location



Source: Adapted by Ascent Environmental in 2020.

Figure 2 Existing Project Site



Source: Adapted by Ascent Environmental in 2020.

Figure 3 Proposed Site Plan

The project would involve demolition of three buildings totaling 10,048 sq. ft. These buildings are currently used as a restaurant, retail wine shop, art gallery, and five-room motel. Demolition activities would also include removal of asphalt concrete driveways and parking areas, as well as concrete slabs.

The proposed hotel would include 79 rooms that would be split between the North Parcel (50 rooms) and the South Parcel (29 rooms). The existing Stone Building on the North Parcel is currently used for winery, retail, retail wine, and restaurant uses. Under the proposed project, there would be no physical change to the building's structure, but the interior may require minor renovations to serve as the hotel's main lobby, which may include a retail component, meeting space, and/or a bar/lounge component. Current barrel storage, wine lab, and bottle storage spaces in this building would be removed, and this space would be used for hotel conference space and back-of-house needs. The Stone Building has nearly 13,000 sq. ft. of floor space split between the basement and ground levels.

The project involves constructing a new North Hotel Building on the North Parcel in approximately the same location as the existing restaurant building, which would be demolished as part of this project. The North Hotel Building would have approximately 55,000 sq. ft. of floor area. Of this amount, approximately 21,000 sq. ft. would be used for the 50 guest rooms, and the remaining 34,000 sq. ft. would be used for the spa, retail operations, a rooftop terrace and other public areas, circulation, and back-of-house uses. An underground parking garage would be located below the North Hotel Building and would include 54 stalls for valet parking. The North Hotel Building would be a split-level structure with four levels, with a maximum building height of 45 feet.

On the South Parcel, the existing restaurant and five-room motel buildings would be demolished and replaced with a two-story South Hotel Main Building, a two-story South Hotel Barn Building, a freestanding single-story fitness studio, and two separate two-story bungalow buildings. The South Hotel Main Building would include 11 guest rooms, a support kitchen, a library, and back-of-house uses for a total of approximately 11,100 sq. ft. The South Hotel Barn Building would include 12 guestrooms totaling approximately 7,500 sq. ft. and an adjacent plunge pool. The 350-sq. ft. fitness studio would be proximate to the plunge pool. A lawn area would be located between the South Hotel Main Building and the South Hotel Barn Building. Each of the two bungalow buildings would include three rooms for a total of approximately 4,000 sq. ft. between the two buildings. Buildings on the South Parcel would be connected by a series of walkways, breezeways, patios, courtyards, and landscaped areas. The South Parcel also includes six existing on-site residential dwelling units that would be used to house workers employed on the property.

Overall, the project would involve 10,048 sq. ft. of demolition and 78,481 sq. ft. of new construction. Current uses on the project site have 55 employees, and the project is expected to add 48 new employees for the new hotel use, for a total of 103 employees at the project site.

The City of St. Helena has provided water service to the project site since at least the 1930s. Under an agreement modification executed in March 2000, Freemark Abbey Winery receives up to 2.7 million gallons per year (mgy), or 8.3 acre-feet per year (AFY), of water from the City of St. Helena. The North Parcel uses water from two on-site groundwater wells and a connection to the City of St. Helena water system. A separate public water system serves the South Parcel. The project would integrate the proposed hotel development on the South Parcel with the public water system on the North Parcel. The projected annual water demand, including demand for irrigation, the winery process, and domestic water, is 7.1 mgy, or 21.79 AFY. Up to 2.7 mgy, or 8.3 AFY, of water from the City of St. Helena would reduce the demand on project wells to 4.4 mgy, or 13.5 AFY. The daily average well water demand would be 12,055 gallons with a peak demand estimate (200 percent of average) of 24,110 gallons.

The North Parcel currently collects and conveys its wastewater to a Combined Wastewater Management System (CWMS). This system, known as the Markham CWMS, is located on the adjacent Markham Vineyards property and is operated under a waste discharge order approved by the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board. The CWMS currently serves Markham Vineyards, Freemark Abbey, the Culinary Institute, and Wine Country Inn. The Freemark Abbey allocation under the CWMS is 4.0 mgy. Domestic wastewater from the North Parcel, which is estimated to be 3.5 mgy, would be disposed of through the Markham CWMS.

The South Parcel's existing commercial and residential use buildings are served by on-site wastewater treatment systems. Historically, uses in the CL-zoned areas of the South Parcel have disposed of 0.93 mgd of wastewater in systems on the AW-zoned areas of the site. This legacy of shared wastewater disposal would be preserved with the new development. Wastewater from the new South Parcel hotel buildings would be disposed of through discharge to the existing underground septic system and disposal to a new on-site gray water treatment system. The existing shared septic system, which has a capacity is 0.55 mgd, would serve an existing residence at the south end of the parcel (0.13 mgd) and would be used to dispose of black water from the proposed hotel and meeting space (0.42 mgd). Gray water from the hotel would be reclaimed for landscape irrigation (0.60 mgd). A maximum of 0.51 mgd of gray water would be used for irrigation on the AW-zoned areas of the site to maintain the historic balance of 0.93 mgd of CL-zoned wastewater on AW-zoned areas of the site. The gray water treatment would meet NSF 350 requirements for gray water systems in jurisdictions with no local requirements for these systems. Treated gray water would be stored and reused through surface drip irrigation on-site.

Runoff from the project site flows via roof gutters and surface flow to on-site storm drains and natural flow lines that ultimately discharge to the Napa River. The project would include improvements throughout the project site to install new bioretention basins, vegetated buffer strips, and self-retaining areas. The project design incorporates low-impact development design strategies, including stormwater treatment elements, minimization of impervious surfaces, and stormwater control measures. Additionally, the project would be subject to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit because more than 1 acre of land would be disturbed through project construction activities. Pursuant to the NPDES General Permit, a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) would be developed and implemented at the project site. In addition to the SWPPP, source control best management practices (BMPs) would be designed and implemented as recommended by the California Stormwater Quality Association's BMP handbooks.

Project information is available online at <https://www.countyofnapa.org/2876/Current-Projects-Explorer>. Project materials, including the application and technical reports, can be viewed online at: <https://pbes.cloud/index.php/s/5ybiJ33kpd7S7Yf>.

10. **Describe the Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses:** The project site is located on six parcels totaling approximately 15 acres owned by Jackson Family Investments III, LLC. It includes vineyards, winery operations, wine tasting, retail sales, a restaurant, a café, a five-room motel, commercial buildings, and six residential structures. Vineyards and wineries surround much of the project site, with scattered residential units, including a small mobile home park, located west across SR 29 from the project site. SR 29 and the Vine Trail border the western edge of the project site, and Lodi Lane bisects the site as it travels east from SR 29. The project site and surrounding properties are generally flat.
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?

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.

Consultation with Native American tribes pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 has been initiated. On March 19, 2020, Napa County extended invitations to consult to Middletown Rancheria, Mishewal Wappo, and Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation. Middletown Rancheria has requested consultation on the project and has been in contact with County staff. The Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation responded to the letter, informing the County that the project was not within the aboriginal territories and the tribe declined to comment on the project. The letter to the Mishewal Wappo was returned to the County, and County staff is attempting to resend the letter to the

tribe. The outcome of the consultation process will be discussed in the draft environmental impact report (EIR) for this project.

12. **Other Agencies Whose Approval Is Required (e.g., Permits, Financing Approval, or Participation Agreement):**

State

- ▶ **Bay Area Air Quality Management District:** Authority to construct (for devices that emit air pollutants); permit to operate.
- ▶ **California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 2 (San Francisco):** Permits for the on-site gray water treatment and reuse system.

Local

- ▶ **Napa County:** Approval of a use permit major modification and various ministerial approvals, including building permits and grading permits. The applicant is also seeking approval of a development agreement.

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 project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the 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 project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) is required.
- I find that the 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, or 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the 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 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 project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Trevor HawkesDate 7/23/2020

Name

Trevor Hawkes, Planner IIINapa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services
Department

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. Aesthetics.				
Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099 (where aesthetic impacts shall not be considered significant for qualifying residential, mixed-use residential, and employment centers), would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 points.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a-c) The project site is located in a vineyard setting surrounded by rural residences, vineyards, and winery operations, and it contains relatively flat topography. Existing development on the property includes vineyards, winery operations, retail and restaurant buildings, a motel, and residential units. The project would include construction and operation of a 79-room hotel and associated guest amenities, such as a spa, fitness room, and pool. Maximum building height for new structures would be 45 feet. Three buildings would be demolished as part of the project. The project would be visible from off-site public viewpoints, including along adjacent SR 29 and the Vine Trail.

Scenic vistas of Napa Valley ridgelines and vineyards are located east and west of the project site. There are no designated scenic resources in the project vicinity. However, SR 29 is a County-designated scenic road and is eligible for designation as a state scenic highway (Caltrans 2020).

Although the project site is currently developed with existing commercial and residential buildings, implementing the project would result in a change in the visual character of the project site by replacing generally single-story commercial development with multiple multilevel structures and by increasing the overall number of structures on-site. The project design is intended to maintain and complement the existing rural character of unincorporated Napa County and the existing winery operations; however, construction and operation of the project would result in a change to the visual character of and views within the project area and could contribute to aesthetic impacts. Project renderings are included in the project plan set available for review on the County website. Therefore, this is a potentially significant impact and will be analyzed further in the EIR.

- d)** The project site includes sources of nighttime lighting associated with existing uses. The project would introduce additional nighttime lighting consistent with the hotel use on-site. This new source of light could contribute to adverse effects on nighttime views in the area. This is a potentially significant impact and will be analyzed further in the EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
----------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

II. Agriculture and Forest Resources.

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997, as updated) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by 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?	<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 or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) The project site includes lands designated as Prime Farmland and Urban and Built-Up Land by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (California Department of Conservation 2016a). Because the project site includes Prime Farmland, this impact would be potentially significant and will be analyzed in detail in the EIR.
- b) The project site is not subject to a Williamson Act contract (California Department of Conservation 2015). The project site includes lands zoned for AW and CL, with the proposed 79-room hotel and associated guest amenities to be constructed in the CL-zoned parcels. Some site improvements may occur in the AW-zoned land, but they would not interfere with existing agricultural uses. Therefore, impacts related to conflicts with agricultural zoning would be less than significant. This issue will not be analyzed further in the EIR.

- c, d)** The site is developed with existing buildings, including a winery, restaurant, retail wine shop, art gallery, and small motel, and it is not used or zoned for timber harvest. Although minimal tree removal may be required for the project, no forestland exists on the site. Therefore, there would be no impact on forestland. This issue will not be analyzed further in the EIR.
- e)** The project would include several new buildings, including the proposed hotel and associated facilities, but would not result in any direct impacts on agricultural resources. Given the proximity of the Prime Farmland and agricultural uses to the proposed development, construction and operation of the 79-room hotel and associated amenities could affect the agricultural uses. Therefore, this impact would be potentially significant and will be analyzed in detail in the EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
III. Air Quality.					
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied on to make the following determinations.					
Are significance criteria established by the applicable air district available to rely on for significance determinations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No			
Would the project:					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

The project applicant has submitted an air quality and greenhouse gas assessment, which will be utilized in preparation of the Draft EIR. Project materials, including the application and technical reports, can be found on the County website at: <https://pbcs.cloud/index.php/s/5ybiJ33kpd7S7Yf>.

DISCUSSION

- a) Construction of the project would result in construction- and operation-related emissions of criteria air pollutants. These project-generated emissions could potentially exceed significance criteria established by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and could potentially conflict with BAAQMD regulations and air quality plans. This potentially significant impact will be analyzed further in the EIR.
- b) In Napa County, ozone and particulate matter are the most problematic pollutants (Napa County 2007:4.8-6). Construction of the project would result in construction- and operation-related emissions of criteria air pollutants, including ozone and particulate matter, for which the County is currently in nonattainment (BAAQMD 2017). These project-generated emissions, along with emissions from other development in the region, could potentially exceed significance criteria established by BAAQMD for criteria air pollutants. This potentially significant impact will be analyzed further in the EIR.
- c) Construction and operation of the project would generate pollutants near existing rural residences. Use of diesel equipment during construction would be limited in scope and duration. After construction, automobiles would be the primary source of air pollutants. Further analysis of the potential for these anticipated emissions to affect area residents is necessary to determine whether a significant impact would result. This issue will be analyzed in detail in the EIR.

- d) Construction of the project would not be expected to generate substantial objectionable odors. The project would involve the operation of a 79-room hotel and associated hotel facilities, as well as a retail space, two pools, a parking garage, and on-site employee housing. None of these uses is expected to generate substantial objectionable odors. However, the project would include on-site bioretention basins, vegetated buffer strips, and self-retaining water areas, all of which could result in operational odor emissions. This potentially significant impact will be analyzed further in the EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. Biological Resources. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, 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"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) The project site is in a rural area. The project would involve demolition and construction adjacent to existing agricultural uses and west of the Napa River. Special-status plant or wildlife species could potentially occur in the project area and could be directly or indirectly affected by demolition of existing structures or project construction and operation. Further analysis of the potential for the site and surrounding area to support special-status species is necessary to determine whether a significant impact would result. This issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.
- b) The project site is fully developed with existing uses and is in an area identified as developed and agricultural cropland (Napa County 2007:4.5-4). No riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities are located on the project site. Therefore, the project would have no impact on riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities. This issue will not be analyzed further in the EIR.

- c) The project would be constructed in an area that is currently entirely paved and disturbed, and it would not include disturbance of or placement of fill into any waterways. As discussed further in Section X, "Hydrology and Water Quality," the existing hydrology of the site would be maintained, and the site's contribution to surface water flows into the Napa River would not be affected. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant. This issue will not be analyzed further in the EIR.
- d) As discussed above, the project would be located on a property that is currently disturbed, paved, and used for winery, commercial, retail, and restaurant uses. Because the site has been previously developed with buildings and parking areas, implementation of the project is not anticipated to interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established wildlife corridors, nor would it impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. This impact would be less than significant and will not be analyzed further in the EIR.
- e) The Napa County General Plan Conservation Element contains natural resource goals and policies that specifically address protection of biological resources. Construction of the project would be confined to existing disturbed areas within the project boundaries, and it is not anticipated to result in impacts on biological resources or conflict with any policies pertaining to the protection of such resources. However, further analysis is necessary to determine whether a significant impact would result. This issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.
- f) The project site is not located in any habitat conservation or natural community conservation plan area (Napa County 2007:4.5-13). Therefore, the project would not conflict with a habitat conservation or natural community conservation plan. This issue will not be analyzed further in the EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	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 pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) A cultural resources study (Tom Origer & Associates 2019) prepared for the project site indicates that the existing buildings on-site are not historic resources. However, a review of the indicates that physical evidence of human activities more than 45 years old may be recorded for purposes of inclusion in the Office of Historic Preservation’s filing system. Because some of the buildings are more than 45 years old, impacts related to historical resources on-site could be potentially significant. This issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.
- b) Known cultural or archaeological resources are located on the project site, and many regions of Napa County are highly sensitive for the presence of archaeological resources because of the settlement pattern of indigenous populations (Napa County 2007:4.12-17). Such archaeological resources could be undisturbed beneath the project site, and removal of the existing surface material during grading and excavation activities could expose (and possibly damage or destroy) sensitive resources. This impact would be potentially significant. Implementing Mitigation Measure CUL-1, described below, would reduce this impact to less than significant. Therefore, this issue will not be analyzed further in the EIR.
- d) No human remains have been found previously on the project site. However, the potential for human remains to occur below the ground surface in the project area is currently unknown. Implementation of the project would involve soil disturbance during construction, which could result in impacts on any interred on-site human remains. This impact would be potentially significant. Implementing Mitigation Measure CUL-1, described below, would reduce this impact to less than significant. Therefore, this issue will not be analyzed further in the EIR.

Mitigation Measure CUL-1:

- ▶ In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Subsection 15064.5(f), if site contractors encounter cultural resources during ground-disturbing activities of the project, the permittee and his or her contractors shall halt work within 50 feet of the find and immediately contact a qualified archaeologist (36 Code of Federal Regulations Part 61) to assess the significance of the find. Construction activities could continue in other areas. If the discovery proves to be significant, additional work, such as data recovery excavation, may be warranted and would be discussed in consultation with the applicant, Napa County, and/or any other relevant regulatory agency, as appropriate.
- ▶ If site contractors encounter human remains during ground-disturbing activities of the project, the permittee and his or her contractors shall immediately notify the Napa County coroner of the find to determine whether an investigation of the cause of death is required and/or if the remains are of Native American origin. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, if such remains are of Native American origin, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which will determine and notify a most likely descendent (MLD). The MLD shall complete the inspection of the site within 48 hours of notification and may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials.
- ▶ The permittee shall ensure that all persons working on-site shall be bound by contract and instructed in the field to adhere to these provisions and restrictions.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. Energy. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a, b) Project construction and operation activities would require energy resources, such as fuel and electricity. The EIR will include calculation of potential energy use for construction and operation (mobile and stationary sources). This issue is potentially significant and will be analyzed in the EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. Geology and Soils. 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 California Geological Survey 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, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994, as updated), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<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"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project applicant has submitted a geotechnical report, which will be utilized in preparation of the Draft EIR. Project materials, including the application and technical reports, can be found on the County website at: <https://pbcs.cloud/index.php/s/5ybiJ33kpd7S7Yf>.

DISCUSSION

- a) The project site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo active fault zone; however, several active faults are located in the region, including the Green Valley, West Napa, and Rogers Creek Faults (California Department of Conservation 2016b). The project would include construction of several buildings associated with hotel, retail, and residential uses that would be occupied by humans. The buildings would be constructed in conformance

with the standards contained in California Building Code Title 24, which identifies specific design requirements to reduce damage from strong seismic ground shaking, ground failure, landslides, soil erosion, and expansive soils. The project itself would not increase the risk of seismic events or exacerbate hazards from such events. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant and will not be analyzed further in the EIR.

- b) The project would involve soil disturbance, including grading and excavation activities, associated with construction of new hotel and other on-site buildings, as well as the underground parking garage. Potential impacts related to erosion are discussed further in Section X, "Hydrology and Water Quality," below, and can be addressed using common and accepted practices to manage runoff and prevent pollution of stormwater. With incorporation of standard measures required by the County, in addition to conformance with standards required through SWPPP and BMP implementation, the effect of soil disturbance during construction would be less than significant. Project design includes minimization of impervious surfaces and stormwater control measures, as well as incorporation of landscaping, lawn, gravel, and decomposed granite and permeable paved surfaces that would reduce the potential for erosive stormwater flows. Therefore, the potential for the project to result in substantial erosion or loss of topsoil during operation would be less than significant. This issue will not be analyzed further in the EIR.
- c) As described for item a) above, the project site is located in a seismically active area. However, the project site and the surrounding area are flat. For this reason, the project would not be expected to be prone to landslides, lateral spread, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. Furthermore, the project would not increase the risk of such events. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant and will not be analyzed further in the EIR.
- d) Expansive soils are soils that are high in clays or silts and that swell and shrink with wetting and drying, respectively. This shrinking and swelling can result in differential ground movement, which can cause damage to foundations. However, proper fill selection, moisture control, and compaction during construction can prevent these types of soils from causing significant damage. In compliance with Section 1803 of the California Building Code, the project applicant would be required to arrange for soil investigations to be performed by a registered engineer to determine the presence of expansive soils before construction. If the project site is determined to contain expansive soils, the project applicant would be required to provide design and construction solutions to reduce the risks associated with unstable and expansive soils. Therefore, the project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to expansive soils, and this issue will not be analyzed further in the EIR.
- e) The North Parcel of the project site is served by the existing Markham CWMS, whereas the South Parcel is served by on-site wastewater treatment systems. No new septic tanks are proposed as part of the project. The project does, however, propose a gray water treatment system wherein reclaimed gray water would be treated and reused on-site for landscape irrigation. The project applicant has submitted a geotechnical report that concluded that the project site is suitable from a geotechnical perspective for the planned improvements (Miller Pacific 2019:8). Because site soils would be appropriate for the planned project, this impact would be less than significant. This issue will not be analyzed further in the EIR.
- f) No known paleontological resources are located on the project site; however, the potential for discovery of such resources exists because of the high biodiversity in the Napa Valley region (Napa County 2007:4.12-17). This impact would be potentially significant because paleontological resources could be discovered during project construction. Implementing Mitigation Measure GEO-1, described below, would reduce effects on previously unknown paleontological resources if any are discovered during project construction. With implementation of this mitigation, the impact would be less than significant. Therefore, this issue will not be analyzed further in the EIR.

Mitigation Measure GEO-1

- ▶ If site contractors discover paleontological resources during ground-disturbing activities of the project, the permittee and his or her contractors shall halt work in that area and within 50 feet of the find and immediately contact a qualified paleontologist to evaluate the find. Construction activities could continue in other areas. If the discovery proves to be significant under Society of Vertebrate Paleontology criteria, additional work, such as fossil recovery excavation, may be warranted and would be discussed in consultation with the applicant, Napa County, and/or any other relevant regulatory agency, as appropriate.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project applicant has submitted an air quality and greenhouse gas assessment, which will be utilized during preparation of the Draft EIR. Project materials, including the application and technical reports, can be found on the County website at: <https://pbes.cloud/index.php/s/5ybiJ33kpd7S7Yf>.

DISCUSSION

- a) Construction and operation of the project would result in the emission of greenhouse gases (GHGs), which could contribute considerably to cumulative climate change impacts. This potentially significant impact will be analyzed further in the EIR.
- b) The emission of GHGs associated with project construction and operation could conflict with General Plan policies and local and regional plans for reduction of GHG emissions. This potentially significant impact will be analyzed further in the EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. 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 reasonably foreseeable upset and/or 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a) Construction and operation of the project would not be expected to involve the use of or generate large quantities of hazardous materials. However, construction activities, including demolition, would involve the use of commercially available hazardous materials, such as solvents, gasoline, and oil. During operation, hazardous materials, such as cleaners, solvents, and fuels, would be used during hotel operations. The use of hazardous materials and disposal of hazardous wastes are subject to numerous laws and regulations at all levels of government. Although it is not anticipated that the routine use of these materials, handled in accordance with laws and regulations, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment, the facility operator would be required to file a hazardous materials business plan with the County Environmental Health Division if the quantity of hazardous materials on-site reach reportable levels during construction or,

subsequently, as part of hotel operations. This impact would be less than significant and will not be analyzed further in the EIR.

- b) Data on historic and documented releases of hazardous materials in the surrounding area were obtained through internet searches, including review of the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker database, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Envirofacts/Enviomapper website, and the state Cortese list via the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database (DTSC 2020). No hazards were identified on-site. However, buildings on the project site that would be demolished may be constructed of materials containing lead and/or asbestos. Removal of these materials must be done in compliance with applicable local, state, and federal laws regarding the safe removal and disposal of materials. This impact would be less than significant and will not be analyzed further in the EIR.
- c) No schools are located within 0.25 mile of the project site. Therefore, there would be no impact on nearby schools. This issue will not be analyzed further in the EIR.
- d) As described for b) above, the project site does not contain known hazards, and it is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Therefore, there would be no impact related to hazardous materials sites. This issue will not be analyzed further in the EIR.
- e) The project site is not located within 2 miles of a public airport and is not located in an airport land use plan. No impact would occur; therefore, this issue will not be analyzed further in the EIR.
- f) As described for e) above, the project site is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip or within 2 miles of a private airstrip. No impact would occur; therefore, this issue will not be analyzed further in the EIR.
- g) The project, which includes construction of multiple structures on-site, would be required to comply with standard County conditions of approval related to the provision of adequate access for emergency vehicles and secure evacuation routes.

The Napa County Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) outlines procedures, including those related to establishing the leadership roles and responsibilities of various agency staff, that guide local preparedness, response, recovery, and resource management efforts associated with occurrence of a natural disaster, significant emergency, or other threats to public safety. The project would not modify any County-owned roads or access points to the project site from SR 29.

No component of the implementation of the EOP would be impaired by the proposed project, nor would the project impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. This impact would be less than significant. Therefore, this issue will not be analyzed further in the EIR. See Section XV, "Public Services," for more detailed discussion regarding emergency response.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. Hydrology and Water Quality. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) Result in substantial on- or offsite erosion or siltation;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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; or	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project applicant has submitted a stormwater control plan, which will be utilized during preparation of the Draft EIR. Project materials, including the application and technical reports, can be found on the County website at: <https://pbcs.cloud/index.php/s/5ybiJ33kpd7S7Yf>.

DISCUSSION

a; c-i, ii, iii, iv)

All earth-disturbing activities during construction would be subject to the County's Stormwater Ordinance, which requires applicants and contractors to implement measures to prevent erosion, sedimentation, and waste materials from entering waterways both during and after any construction activities. With implementation of the SWPPP and the County's BMPs, which comply with regional water quality control board requirements, the project would not have the potential to significantly affect water quality and discharge standards during construction.

During operation, the project has the potential to generate polluted runoff associated with storage of cleaning chemicals, as well as vehicle leaks. The Napa County Post-Construction Runoff Management Requirements and Provision E.12 (Post-Construction Stormwater Management Plan) of the Small Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit, Order No. 2013-0001-DWQ, include postconstruction stormwater BMPs. The goal of Provision E.12 is to include appropriate source control, site design, and stormwater treatment measures in development projects to address both soluble and insoluble stormwater runoff pollutant discharges and prevent increases in runoff flows from new development and redevelopment projects.

The project applicant has submitted a technical report regarding stormwater and the project's anticipated provisions for stormwater and water quality. A peer review of this technical report will be conducted, and the resulting impact analysis will be included in the EIR. Because operation of the project has the potential to result in impacts related to water quality, this issue is potentially significant and will be analyzed in the EIR.

- b, e)** The project would use a combination of public water provided by the City of St. Helena, groundwater, and gray water. The project applicant has submitted a report documenting the availability of water for the project. This report will be evaluated and used for the analysis in the EIR. Because the project would require groundwater, the project could decrease groundwater supplies. Therefore, this issue is potentially significant and will be analyzed in the EIR.
- d)** According to Napa County Geographic Information System online interactive mapping, the project site is not located in or adjacent to a floodway and is in an area of minimal flood hazard. Also, the terrain of the project site and surrounding area is generally flat. The project site is not in a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone, thereby reducing the risk of release of pollutants from inundation in one of those zones. There would be no impact related to being in a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone; therefore, this issue will not be analyzed further in the EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. 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) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) The project would be located on private property in a rural agricultural portion of the Napa Valley. Because the project would be limited to construction and operation within a previously developed property situated between residences and vineyards, the project would not divide an established community. Therefore, there would be no impact. This issue will not be analyzed further in the EIR.
- b) Requests for discretionary permits in Napa County are subject to review for compliance and consistency with a variety of policy and regulatory programs that have been adopted to avoid or reduce the severity of potential environmental effects. Such regulations include the General Plan policies and adopted mitigation measures of the General Plan EIR; area specific plans, where applicable; subdivision, zoning, and other ordinances incorporated into the Napa County Code; and various other resolutions and policy documents adopted by County decision-making bodies. The project is subject to review for compliance and consistency with the County zoning ordinance and General Plan EIR mitigation measures adopted as policies in the General Plan. This impact is potentially significant; therefore, the EIR will analyze the project’s consistency with applicable plans, policies, and regulations.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. 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) Napa County contains four active mines (rock quarries), two of which are not presently being mined but serve only as mineral storage areas. These quarries produce construction materials. The only significant mine currently in operation in Napa County is the Syar Napa Quarry, operated by Syar Industries, which is more than 20 miles south of the project site (WICC 2005).

The project site is not located in a mapped mineral resource zone. No loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state would occur. There are no locally important mineral resource recovery sites delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan that includes the project area. Therefore, there would be no impact related to mineral resources. This issue will not be analyzed further in EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. Noise. 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 in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project applicant has submitted an environmental noise and vibration assessment, which will be utilized during preparation of the Draft EIR. Project materials, including the application and technical reports, can be found on the County website at: <https://pbcs.cloud/index.php/s/5ybiJ33kpd7S7Yf>.

DISCUSSION

a) Project construction would result in a temporary increase in noise levels. Construction-related noise sources would include both mobile and stationary on-site equipment (e.g., bulldozers, backhoes, front end loaders, graders, pavers, generators, and compressors), as well as impact tools. Construction would also generate vehicle noise associated with the delivery of building supplies and hauling away of construction debris. Construction activities would be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles; noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. All construction activities would be required to be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (County Code Chapter 8.16), which establishes noise limits for construction activities during permissible hours and prohibits nonemergency noise-generating construction activities between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.

The Napa County Noise Ordinance sets the maximum permissible received sound level for a rural residence at 45 decibels (dB) between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Although the 45-dB limitation is strict (45 dB is roughly equivalent to the sound generated by a quiet conversation), the area surrounding the subject property is not densely developed. The project’s consistency with applicable County regulations and the potential to expose people working or residing in the area to excessive noise levels will be analyzed in the EIR.

The project would include a 79-room hotel, retail space, a spa, and other hotel-associated facilities. Occupants of nearby rural residences located north, east, south, and west of the project site could be affected by the traffic noise and noise generated from operation of the project, as well as any periodic events that could be hosted on-site. The project applicant has submitted an environmental noise and vibration assessment, which will be used in the analysis of project impacts. This potentially significant impact will be analyzed further in the EIR.

- b) Equipment used during demolition and construction of the project may generate ground-borne vibration that could affect existing sensitive land uses. This impact would be potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.
- c) The project site is not within an airport land use plan and is more than 17 miles east of the nearest major airport, Charles M. Schultz – Sonoma County Airport. Additionally, the project site is more than 24 miles north of the Napa County Airport. The project site is outside of the boundaries of both the Sonoma County Airport Land Plan and the Napa County Airport Land Use Plan. No impact would result; therefore, this issue will not be analyzed further in the EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. Population and Housing. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>
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 project includes the construction of a new hotel and associated guest amenities, including a spa, a fitness studio, and gathering spaces. The six residential units on the project site would be retained to house employees during project operation. New employment positions generated by project construction and operation would likely be filled by workers already in the region. Napa County, like much of California, has a shortage of housing, particularly housing for employees in the region who must often commute from outside the county. Because it is possible that the new jobs generated by the project could attract workers to the area, there is the potential to induce population growth. This potentially significant impact will be analyzed in the EIR.
- b, c) The project would not remove any existing homes. Therefore, the project would have no impact related to the displacement of homes or people. This issue will not be analyzed further in the EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. Public Services. Would the project:				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a) The project does not include new residential units, so it would not generate new residents. Because residents are associated with additional demand for schools and park facilities, these public services would not be affected by the project.

The project would include operation of a new 79-room hotel and associated guest amenities. Although police and fire staffing ratios are generally associated with the number of new residents, additional commercial development may also generate additional need for fire and police services. Because the demand for fire or law enforcement protection may increase with implementation of the project, this impact would be potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. 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) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that 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 increase the number of residents in the area, but it would increase the number of employees at the project site. As previously discussed, new employment at the project site would be filled by workers currently living in the Napa County region; thus, an increase in recreational use resulting from employment generated at the site is not anticipated, and impacts related to the use of existing recreational facilities would be less than significant. This issue will not be analyzed further in the EIR.
- b) The project does not include public recreational facilities. Therefore, there would be no impact related to the construction or expansion of public recreational facilities. The project includes on-site recreational facilities (e.g., pool, fitness center, and spa) that would be used exclusively by hotel guests. Because these private on-site facilities are part of the project description, their construction would not result in physical effects not discussed in this initial study. This issue will not be analyzed further in the EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. Transportation. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project applicant has submitted a traffic impact study, which will be utilized during preparation of the Draft EIR. Project materials, including the application and technical reports, can be found on the County website at: <https://pbes.cloud/index.php/s/5ybij33kpd7S7Yf>.

DISCUSSION

- a, d) The project site is located east of SR 29 and occupies property north and south of Lodi Lane. Primary access would be provided by existing entrances on SR 29 and Lodi Lane. The project includes a paved driveway and turnaround/drop-off area adjacent to the North Hotel Building, as well as on the southeastern portion of the site near the South Hotel Main Building. Because the project site offers multiple entrance and egress points and is located on a major county road (SR 29) and a large arterial (Lodi Lane), emergency vehicle access is currently provided and would continue to be maintained through project construction and operation.

The project applicant has provided a traffic impact study, which includes analysis of alternative transportation modes, access, and circulation. This study will be used to evaluate project impacts in the EIR. This potentially significant impact will be analyzed further in the EIR.
- b) CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) sets forth criteria for analyzing transportation impacts and determining level of significance. The appropriate metric to be used to determine whether a project would result in significant transportation impacts is vehicle miles traveled (VMT). The project would induce VMT from worker commute trips and guest trips to and from the project site. Therefore, this impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed in the EIR.
- c) The project does not include any changes to existing road, bicycle, or pedestrian infrastructure and would not introduce any transportation design features that would be considered hazardous. The Vine Trail bike path is located along the project site frontage on SR 29. The project would not add additional points of ingress and egress from SR 29 and would therefore not increase hazards to users of the Vine Trail. If any modification to site access points is needed, such modifications would be required to comply with California Department of Transportation and County standards. Therefore, the project will not result in any impacts related increased traffic hazards or incompatible uses, and this issue will not be analyzed further in the EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources.				
Has a California Native American Tribe requested consultation in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1(b)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
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)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a, b) Assembly Bill (AB) 52, signed by Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr., in September 2014 and effective on July 1, 2015, established a new class of resources under CEQA: “tribal cultural resources.” AB 52, as provided in Public Resources Code Sections 21080.3.1, 21080.3.2, and 21082.3, requires that lead agencies undertaking CEQA review must, upon receiving a written request from a California Native American tribe, begin tribal consultation after the lead agency determines that the application for the project is complete or before the release of an EIR or notice of intent to adopt a negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration.

The requirements of AB 52 apply to the project and its EIR process. On March 19, 2020, Napa County extended invitations to consult to Middletown Rancheria, Mishewal Wappo, and Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation. Middletown Rancheria has requested consultation on the project and has been in contact with County staff. The Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation responded to the letter, informing the County that the project was not within the aboriginal territories and the tribe declined to comment on the project. The letter to the Mishewal Wappo was returned to the County, and County staff is attempting to resend the letter to the tribe.. Because consultation is ongoing, this impact is potentially significant and will be analyzed in the EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. Utilities and Service Systems. Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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) Fail to comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project applicant has submitted a water availability analysis and wastewater feasibility report, which will be utilized during preparation of the Draft EIR. Project materials, including the application and technical reports, can be found on the County website at: <https://pbes.cloud/index.php/s/5ybiJ33kpd7S7Yf>.

DISCUSSION

- a) The project includes a 79-room hotel with associated guest amenities such as lounge space, a spa with treatment rooms, a main pool and a small plunge pool, a parking garage, a rooftop terrace, a fitness room, an outdoor lawn and gathering space, back-of-house uses, and on-site employee housing. Although the project would use existing infrastructure for water supply, wastewater/stormwater conveyance, and electricity where feasible, it is possible that existing water conveyance infrastructure would be upgraded and/or replaced. As previously described, the project would integrate the proposed hotel development on the South Parcel with the public water system on the North Parcel. Additionally, a new on-site gray water treatment system would be constructed to treat wastewater produced by the South Parcel hotel buildings. The gray water treatment would meet NSF 350 requirements for gray water systems in jurisdictions with no local requirements for these systems. The project would also involve construction of new stormwater management infrastructure, including installation of new bioretention basins, vegetated buffer strips, and self-retaining areas.

The potential environmental effects of construction activities on the project site are evaluated throughout this initial study as part of the proposed project. Any utility-related construction activities would occur in compliance with BMPs set forth in the NPDES General Permit and as recommended by the California

Stormwater Quality Association's BMP handbooks. The potentially significant impact related to construction or relocation of new or expanded utility infrastructure will be analyzed further in the EIR.

- b)** Existing water supply is provided by two on-site groundwater wells and a connection to the City of St. Helena water system on the North Parcel, whereas a separate public water system serves the South Parcel. Implementation of the project would generate increased water demand from the existing entitlement of 2.7 mgy (8.3 AFY) to 7.1 mgy (21.79 AFY). Therefore, the net increase in water demand would be 4.4 mgy (13.5 AFY). This projection includes demand for irrigation, the winery process, and domestic water. As previously described, project implementation would integrate the proposed hotel development on the South Parcel with the public water system, on the North Parcel. The project applicant has submitted a water availability analysis, which will be used in the EIR. Because the project would increase water demand, this issue is potentially significant and will be analyzed in the EIR.
- c)** As previously described, wastewater at the North Parcel is served by the Markham CWMS. The South Parcel's existing commercial and residential use buildings are served by on-site wastewater treatment systems. Through project implementation, domestic wastewater from the North Parcel would continue to be disposed of through the Markham CWMS while wastewater from the new South Parcel hotel buildings would be disposed of through discharge to the existing underground septic system and disposal to a new on-site gray water treatment system. Any treated gray water would be stored and reused through surface drip irrigation on-site. The impact related to wastewater is potentially significant and will be analyzed further in the EIR.
- d, e)** The project would include demolition of three buildings on the site. These structures total 10,048 sq. ft. Demolition activities would also include removal of existing asphalt concrete driveways and parking areas, as well as concrete slabs. In addition, operation of the project would result in the production of waste related to the proposed hotel and associated facilities, as well as retail uses. The nearest waste disposal site is the Clover Flat Landfill, which is approximately 4 miles north of the project site. Upper Valley Disposal and Recycling, which is located approximately 4.75 miles southeast of the project site, provides waste, recycle, and compost services in the county. Waste disposed of at this facility is ultimately disposed of at the Clover Flat Landfill, which is permitted to receive 600 tons of waste per day. As of September 2012, the landfill had a remaining capacity of more than 4.5 million cubic yards. The landfill is expected to remain in operation until the end of 2047 (CalRecycle 2019). In accordance with Section 5.408 of the California Green Building Standards Code, the project would implement a construction waste management plan for recycling and/or salvaging for reuse a minimum of 65 percent of construction and demolition debris generated during project construction. Additionally, project implementation would comply with all federal, state, and local regulations related to the disposal of waste. This less-than-significant impact will not be analyzed further in the EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. Wildfire.				
Is the project located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as high fire hazard severity zones?				
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a-d) The project site is not within a State Responsibility Area (SRA) or on lands classified as High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, but there are SRA areas opposite the project site, on the other side of SR 29 (CAL FIRE 2007). Although the project site is in a Local Responsibility Area and not in a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, wildfire activity in the Napa Valley is of concern for all development. Because of the project site’s proximity to SRAs, impacts related to wildfire are potentially significant and will be analyzed in the EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance.				
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 an endangered, rare, or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) Additional evaluation is necessary to determine whether the project would affect sensitive and special-status biological resources. This potentially significant impact will be analyzed further in the EIR.
- b) Generally, because of the limited scope of the project, implementation would not result in cumulatively considerable contributions to the cumulative effects of development in the area. Evaluation of the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts related to agricultural resources, aesthetics, air quality and GHG emissions, biological resources, cultural and tribal cultural resources, energy, hydrology and water quality, noise, population and housing, public services and utilities, transportation, and wildfire will be evaluated after the project impacts are characterized in the EIR. This potentially significant impact will be analyzed further in the EIR.
- c) The EIR will evaluate environmental effects that could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings associated with the operation of this project, either directly or indirectly. This potentially significant impact will be analyzed further in the EIR.

REFERENCES

- BAAQMD. See Bay Area Air Quality Management District.
- Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2017 (January). Air Quality Standards and Attainment Status. Available: <http://www.baaqmd.gov/research-and-data/air-quality-standards-and-attainment-status>. Accessed July 2020.
- CAL FIRE. See California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.
- California Department of Conservation. 2015a. Napa County Williamson Act FY 2015/2016. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, 1:100,000 Scale. Sacramento: California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection.
- . 2015b. Fault Activity Map of California (2010). California Geological Survey. Available: <http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/>. Accessed December 14, 2016.
- . 2017. Napa County Important Farmland 2014. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, 1:100,000 Scale. Sacramento: California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection.
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2008 (September 24). Napa County Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA. Available: https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/6732/fhszl_map28.pdf. Accessed July 2020.
- California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery. 2019. SWIS Facility Detail, Clover Flat Resource Recovery Park (28-AA-0002). Available: <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/28-AA-0002/Detail/>. Accessed July 2020.
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control. 2020. EnviroStor database. Available: <http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>. Accessed July 2020.
- California Department of Transportation. 2020. Scenic Highways. Available: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways>. Accessed July 9, 2020.
- CalRecycle. See California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery.
- Caltrans. See California Department of Transportation.
- DTSC. See California Department of Toxic Substances Control.
- Miller Pacific. See Miller Pacific Engineering Group.
- Miller Pacific Engineering Group. 2019 (January). *Geotechnical Investigation, Inn at the Abbey, 3000 St. Helena Highway North, St. Helena, California*. Novato, CA.
- Napa County. 2007 (February). *Napa County General Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report*. Napa, CA.
- . 2008 (June). *Napa County General Plan*. Napa, CA.
- Napa Valley Transportation Authority. 2013 (September). *Napa Valley Vine Trail Project Plan*.
- NVTA. See Napa Valley Transportation Authority.
- State Water Resources Control Board. 2020. GeoTracker database. Available: <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>. Accessed July 2020.
- SWRCB. See State Water Resources Control Board.
- Tom Origer & Associates. 2019 (February 1). *Cultural Resources Study for the Inn at the Abbey Project Napa County, California*.

Watershed Information Center & Conservancy of Napa County. 2005. Chapter 2, Mineral and Rock Resources. *In Napa County Baseline Data Report*. Available: http://www.napawatersheds.org/app_pages/view/196 and http://www.napawatersheds.org/files/managed/Document/2374/Ch02_MineralResources.pdf. Accessed December 2016.

WICC. See Watershed Information Center & Conservancy of Napa County.