

“D”

Initial Study/Negative Declaration

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

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated January 2019)

1. **Project Title:** Saintsbury Winery Major Modification
2. **Property Owner:** Ardy van Winden et al. Saintsbury LLC
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Emily Hedge, Planner III, (707) 259-8226; Emily.Hedge@CountyofNapa.org
4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):** 1500 Los Carneros Road, Napa, CA 94559; APN 047-212-002-000
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Saintsbury LLC, c/o David Graves, 1500 Los Carneros Road, Napa, CA 94559
6. **General Plan description:** Agricultural Resource (AR)
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Watershed (AW)
8. **Background/Project History:**

On July 20, 1983, the Planning Commission (hereafter Commission) approved Use Permit U-488283 for the establishment of a 60,000-gallon winery with six full-time employees, operating five days per week. No tours and tastings were permitted.

On August 29, 1986, the Director approved sign permit #SP-38687 for two directional signs.

On June 15, 1988, the Commission approved Use Permit modification U-258788 allowing construction of a 4,140 square foot addition to the production facility, increase production to 90,000 gallons annually, and recognized by-appointment tours and tastings of a maximum 10 visitors per day and 10 visitors per week (five days per week) as listed in the application.

On July 24, 1998, the Zoning Administrator approved Use Permit Modification 97557-MOD for the installation of an approximately 900 square foot covered tank pad, six open-top fermenters, and a new 170 square foot lab at the existing winery.

On October 7, 1998, the Commission approved Use Permit Modification 97556-MOD to allow a production increase of up to 160,000 gallons per year, not to exceed an average of 135,000 gallons/year over any 3-year period; approved minor additions including an upstairs storage room and a covered equipment porch; added the current marketing plan of eight events with 25 guests and one event with 50 guests; recognized by-appointment tours and tastings of a maximum 12 visitors per day and 24 visitors per week (five days per week); and estimated 10 full-time employees, as listed in the application.

On July 30, 2007, the Director approved Minor Modification P07-00446 to allow construction of a covered porch for additional open-top fermenters, remodeling of the existing winemaking and vineyard offices to add additional production office space and to remodel an existing storage area into restrooms.

On July 17, 2017, the Director approved Very Minor Modification P17-00172 for improvements to waste water system.

Application for this Use Permit Major Modification (P18-00027) was received January 26, 2018 and is the project as described below.

9. **Description of Project:**
The application proposes the following operational changes and physical improvements to the existing 160,000 gallon per year winery. Increase maximum daily visitation from 12 visitors per day to 95 visitors per day; replace the existing marketing program with an annual

program of six events with 50 guests and two events with 100 guests; increase employees from 10 to 19; clarify winery operations seven days a week; use of the existing outdoor patio for visitation activities; and approval of on-premises consumption in the hospitality building and the outdoor patio. The proposal includes appointment of a winery staff member as Travel Demand Management (TDM) coordinator to facilitate reducing auto commuting trips and promote use of shuttle buses to all marketing events in order to reduce overall vehicle trips to the site and lessen Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) associated with the winery. Improvements to the existing onsite sanitary wastewater system and an expansion of the existing subsurface dispersal field and pretreatment system; addition of two 10,000-gallon domestic water storage tanks; convert approximately 500 square feet of existing Production space to Accessory use space for temporary uses for visitation and marketing events; and an increase in parking spaces from 12 to 23.

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

The project site is a 15.83 acre parcel located at 1500 Los Carneros Avenue in Napa. The site has frontage on Los Carneros Avenue, Withers Road, and Cuttings Wharf Road. The winery is on the east side of Withers Road with the project driveway approximately 700 feet west of Cuttings Wharf Road and 540 feet east of Los Carneros Avenue. The project site is developed with approximately 12.5 acres of vineyard, the existing winery, and winery infrastructure. Surrounding land uses include residences, vineyards, and some undeveloped land. An approximately one-acre parcel, also taking access from Withers Road, is surrounded on three sides by the project site. The areas adjacent to the property boundary are planted in vineyards. The winery hospitality building is approximately 200 feet from the residence on the adjacent property. A garage is located on the adjacent property situated between the residence and the winery development. The closest portion of the parking area approximately 100 feet from the garage. The Napa Valley Unified School District Stonebridge School is located on Los Carneros Avenue, approximately 0.4 miles south of the winery property. The Napa River is approximately two miles to the south of the property.

11. **Other agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).

The project may also require various ministerial approvals by the County, including but not limited to building permits, grading permits, waste disposal permits, and an encroachment permit, in addition to meeting CalFire standards. Permits may also be required by the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, & Firearms.

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

None.

Other Agencies Contacted

None.

12. **Tribal Cultural Resources.** Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resource, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

On April 20, 2020, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. On May 8, 2020, Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation responded, noting that they reviewed the project and concluded it was not within the aboriginal territories, and declined to comment.

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 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Emily Hedge

July 24, 2020

Signature

Date

Name:

Emily Hedge, Planner III

Napa County
Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department

I. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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 a publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a.-c. Physical improvements are limited to minor widening of the existing driveway at the connection to the parking area, replacement of two water storage tanks adjacent to existing water storage tanks, designating new parking spaces within the existing driveway and parking area, and improvements to the existing onsite sanitary wastewater system and subsurface dispersal field and pretreatment system. No vineyard or tree removal is required for the site improvements. The area proposed for outdoor visitation is an existing outdoor area surrounded by trees and shrubs. The proposed operational changes will not have an effect on the aesthetics of the existing winery. Because the majority of the physical improvements of the project will take place in areas already developed with winery buildings and infrastructure, views from Los Carneros Avenue, Withers Road, and Cuttings Wharf Road would be relatively the same following the project. The project will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or substantially damage scenic resources. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d. The project does not change the hours of operation for visitation and reduces the total number of annual marketing events by one. No additional lighting will be installed. The project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. ¹ Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a./e. The existing winery site is designated as “other land” as shown on the Napa County Important Farmland Map 2002 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. This portion of the property does not qualify as “prime” or “unique” farmland. The proposed physical improvements are located on the portion of the property that is already developed with the winery buildings and infrastructure. There are no other changes included in this proposal that would result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. No impacts would occur.
- b. The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. The property zoning designation of Agricultural Watershed (AW) permits wineries upon grant of a use permit. General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use policies AG/LU-2 and AG/LU-13 recognize wineries, and any use consistent with the Winery Definition Ordinance and clearly accessory to a winery, as agriculture. The property is not subject to a Williamson Act contract. The project would not conflict with existing zoning or agricultural contract. No impacts would occur.
- c/d. The project site is zoned AW and the proposed development and improvements are located on the portion of the property that is already developed with the winery. No tree removal is required. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As mentioned above, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Operational-Related Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursors Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017.

The screening criteria and thresholds are based on square footage of buildings and associated uses. Given the size of the entire project, which is approximately 20,000 square feet of enclosed floor area (winery production building and hospitality building) with 3,000 square feet of space dedicated to tasting/hospitality uses, compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 541,000 square feet (general light industry) and 47,000 square feet (high quality restaurant) for NOX (oxides of nitrogen), the existing winery would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. (Please note: a high quality restaurant is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, but grossly overstates emissions associated with other portions of a winery, such as office, barrel storage and production, which generate fewer vehicle trips. Therefore, a general light industry comparison has also been used for other such uses.) The existing winery falls well below the screening criteria as noted above, and consequently will not significantly affect air quality individually or contribute considerably to any cumulative air quality impacts. The proposed project does not proposed additional square footage to the existing winery.

The increase in daily visitation and employees could result in an increase of vehicle emissions related to vehicle trips to and from the winery. In order to reduce new vehicle trips and emissions associated with the project, the winery will have a staff person appointed as Transportation Demand Management (TDM) coordinator to facilitate employees reducing auto commuting and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). In addition, the TDM coordinator will promote use of shuttle buses to all marketing events. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

c. AIR QUALITY

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

- 1. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. The BAAQMD's phone number shall also be visible.*
- 2. Water all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) two times per day.*
- 3. Cover all haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site.*
- 4. Remove all visible mud or dirt traced onto adjacent public roads by using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.*
- 5. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.*
- 6. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.*
- 7. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting off equipment when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five (5) minutes (as required by State Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.*
- 8. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator. Any portable engines greater than 50 horsepower or associated equipment operated within the BAAQMD's jurisdiction shall have either a California Air Resources Board (ARB) registration Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) or a BAAQMD permit. For general information regarding the certified visible emissions evaluator or the registration program, visit the ARB FAQ http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/perp/perpfact_04-16-15.pdf or the PERP website <http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/portable.htm>.*

Furthermore, while earthmoving and construction on the site could generate dust particulates in the short-term, the impact would be less than significant with dust control measures as specified in Napa County's standard condition of approval relating to dust:

7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

b. DUST CONTROL

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

While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. The physical improvements and operational changes would not significantly increase odors associated with the winery. The closest off-site residence is approximately 150 feet to the north of the closest existing winery building. Construction-phase pollutants would be reduced to a less than significant level by the above noted standard condition of approval. The project would not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

As noted above, the majority of the physical improvements of the project will take place in areas already developed with winery buildings and infrastructure. The potential for impacts from the site improvements is limited.

- a. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps, the far eastern side of the property is within a buffer for potential habitat of Pallid Bat. The site is already developed with an active winery. Trees on site are located in or near the existing developed area. No new improvements in that far eastern side of the property and no tree removal is proposed as part of the project. No impact would occur.

- b.-c. There is no riparian habitat or wetlands located on the property. No impact would occur.
- d. The project site is not a known wildlife corridor. Proposed site improvements would not alter the ability of wildlife to pass through the property. No impact would occur.
- e.-f. The project will not conflict with local policies or ordinance protecting biological resources. The project site is not covered by any adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a.-c. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Cultural Resources: Historical sites, Historical Sites – Lines, Arch sensitive areas, Arch sites, Arch surveys) no historical or archaeological resources have been identified on the property. Physical improvements are limited to minor widening of the existing driveway at the connection to the parking area, replacement of two water storage tanks adjacent to existing water storage tanks, designating new parking spaces within the existing driveway and parking area, and improvements to the existing onsite sanitary wastewater system and subsurface dispersal field and pretreatment system. No vineyard or tree removal is required for the site improvements. The area proposed for outdoor visitation is an existing outdoor area surrounded by trees and shrubs. The physical improvements of the project will take place in areas already developed with winery buildings and infrastructure. Therefore it is unlikely that cultural resources would be impacted. However, if resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval. The proposed project will not have a significant impact on any historical resource, archaeological resource, paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature.

7.2 ARCHEOLOGICAL FINDING

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

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

d. No human remains have been encountered on the property and no information has been encountered that would indicate that this project would encounter human remains. Most construction activities would occur on previously disturbed portions of the site. However, if resources are found during grading of the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to

investigate the site in accordance with standard condition of approval noted above. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project does not include construction of new structures or installation of new lighting. Any permits required for site improvements would comply with Title 24 energy use requirements and would not result in significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency because there are no plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a. The project would not result in significant impact involving the following:
- i.) A fault line crosses through the property as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. While the proposed project would result in operational changes and minor physical improvements to the site, the winery development, structures, and use of the site are existing. The proposed project would not increase the potential impact to rupturing a known fault. Impacts would be less than significant.
 - ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project would be required to comply with the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
 - iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the improvements are proposed for an area which has a very low susceptibility for liquefaction. Compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.
 - iv.) The property is very flat, with slopes of generally ranging from 0- 5%. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Landslides – line; Landslides – polygon; Landslide Geology), there is no existing documentation of landslides. No impact would occur.
- b. The majority of the physical improvements of the project will take place in areas already developed with winery buildings and infrastructure. As applicable, the project would require incorporation of best management practices and would be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c./d. The following soil type is present at the subject site: Haire loam, 2 to 9 percent slopes. The property is very flat, with slopes of generally ranging from 0- 5%. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the area has a very low susceptibility for liquefaction. Improvements are proposed on the existing developed or improved area. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. The winery facility is serviced by a process wastewater system and a sanitary wastewater system. The proposed project would not generate additional process waste, therefore there are no planned improvements to the existing process wastewater system. The proposed increase in employees and visitation, would generate additional sanitary wastewater. The project includes proposed improvements to the existing onsite sanitary wastewater system and an expansion of the existing subsurface dispersal field and pretreatment system. The study demonstrates that all sanitary wastewater generated from the proposed project can feasibly be handled onsite with the proposed improvements. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings. No impacts would occur.
- f. If resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard Condition of Approval 7.2 identified in **Section V** above.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

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

a.-b. Overall increases in Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions in Napa County were assessed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the Napa County General Plan Update and certified in June 2008. GHG emissions were found to be significant and unavoidable in that document, despite the adoption of mitigation measures incorporating specific policies and action items into the General Plan. Consistent with these General Plan action items, Napa County participated in the development of a community-wide GHG emissions inventory and “emission reduction framework” for all local jurisdictions in the County in 2008-2009. This planning effort was completed by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency in December 2009, and served as the basis for development of a refined inventory and emission reduction plan for unincorporated Napa County.

In 2011, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) released California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Project Screening Criteria and Significance of Thresholds [1,100 metric tons per year (MT) of carbon dioxide and carbon dioxide equivalents (CO2e)]. This threshold of significance is appropriate for evaluating projects in Napa County. During our ongoing planning effort, the County requires project applicants to consider methods to reduce GHG emissions consistent with Napa County General Plan Policy CON-65(e). (Note: Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, because this initial study assesses a project that is consistent with an adopted General Plan for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was prepared, it appropriately focuses on impacts which are “peculiar to the project,” rather than the cumulative impacts previously assessed.) For the purposes of this analysis potential GHG emissions associated with winery ‘construction’ and ‘development’ and with ‘ongoing’ winery operations have been discussed.

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

One time "Construction Emissions" associated with the project include: emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area, construction, and construction equipment and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as Equipment Emissions). These emissions also include underground carbon stocks (or Soil carbon) associated with any existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed. Physical improvements are limited to minor widening of the existing driveway at the connection to the parking area, replacement of two water storage tanks adjacent to existing water storage tanks, designating new parking spaces within the existing driveway and parking area, and improvements to the existing onsite sanitary wastewater system and subsurface dispersal field and pretreatment system.

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

As discussed in the Air Quality section of this Initial Study, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors & GHG Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, including GHG emissions, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. Given the size of the entire project, which is approximately 20,000 square feet of enclosed floor area (winery production building and hospitality building) with 3,000 square feet of space dedicated to tasting/hospitality uses, compared to the BAAQMD's GHG screening criteria of 121,000 square feet for general industrial, and compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 9,000 square feet for high quality restaurant, the project was determined not to exceed the 1,100 MT of CO₂e/yr GHG threshold of significance.

The project includes limited grading, no new landscaping, and no tree removal. Furthermore, the applicant already implements the following greenhouse gas reduction methods at the winery: generates renewable energy onsite, recycling materials, has 70-80% cover crop and reuses pruning and thinning biomass on site, and has electric vehicle charging stations. In order to reduce new vehicle trips and emissions associated with the project, the winery will have a staff person appointed as Transportation Demand Management (TDM) coordinator to facilitate employees reducing auto commuting and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). In addition, the TDM coordinator will promote use of shuttle buses to all marketing events.

The proposed project has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds and determined that the project would not exceed the 1,100 MT/yr of CO₂e. GHG Emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the Cal Green Building Code, tightened vehicle fuel efficiency standards, and more project-specific on-site programs including those winery features noted above would combine to further reduce emissions below BAAQMD thresholds. As indicated above, the County is currently preparing a CAP and as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP has released Final Technical Memorandum #1 (2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016). Table 1 of the Technical Memorandum indicates that 2% of the County's GHG emissions in 2014 were a result of land use change. The increase in emissions expected as a result of the project would be relatively modest and the project is in compliance with the County's efforts to reduce emissions as described above. For these reasons, project impacts related to GHG emissions are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

IX.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard 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 wild-land fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts utilized in typical winery operations. A business plan would be filed with the Environmental Health Division should hazardous materials reach reportable levels. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. Hazardous materials such as diesel, maintenance fluids, and paints would be used onsite during construction. Should they be stored onsite, these materials would be stored in secure locations to reduce the potential for upset or accident conditions. The proposed project consists of the continued operations of an existing winery that would not be expected to use any substantial quantities of hazardous materials. Therefore, it would not be reasonably foreseeable for the proposed project to create upset or accident conditions that involve the release of hazardous materials into the environments. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the existing winery buildings. The Napa Valley Unified School District Stonebridge School is located on Los Carneros Avenue, approximately 0.4 miles south of the winery property. No impacts would occur.
- d. Based on a search of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control database, the project site does not contain any known EPA National Priority List sites, State response sites, voluntary cleanup sites, or any school cleanup sites. No impact would occur as the project site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.
- e. No impact would occur as the project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public or public use airport.
- f. The site is not subject to an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. There are no proposed changes to the existing driveway or internal circulation, both of which meet the standards of the Engineering Division and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. It was determined in the Traffic Impact Study prepared by Crane Transportation Group, January 7, 2020, that the sight lines at the Saintsbury Winery driveway with Withers Road intersection are acceptable to the east and west along Withers Road. No impact would occur.
- g. While the project would permit more people to be onsite at one time, there is no new development or improvements that would provide greater exposure to impacts from wildland fires. As noted above, access to the site meets standards. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

X.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces which would:				
	i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

In general, recent studies have found that groundwater levels in the Napa Valley Floor exhibit stable long-term trends with a shallow depth to water. Historical trends in the Milliken-Sarco-Tulucay (MST) area, however, have shown increasing depths to groundwater, but recent stabilization in many locations. Groundwater availability, recharge, storage and yield are not consistent across the County. More is known about the resource where historical data have been collected. Less is known in areas with limited data or unknown geology. In order to fill existing data gaps and to provide a better understand of groundwater resources in the County, the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan recommended 18 Areas of Interest (AOIs) for additional groundwater level and water quality monitoring. Through the well owner and public outreach efforts of the

Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee (GRAC,) approximately 40 new wells have been added to the monitoring program within these areas. Groundwater Sustainability Objectives were developed and recommended by the GRAC and adopted by the Board. The recommendations included the goal of developing sustainability objectives, providing a definition, and explaining the shared responsibility for Groundwater Sustainability and the important role of monitoring as a means to achieving groundwater sustainability.

In 2009, Napa County began a comprehensive study of its groundwater resources to meet identified action items in the County's 2008 General Plan update. The study, by Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE), emphasized developing a sound understanding of groundwater conditions and implementing an expanded groundwater monitoring and data management program as a foundation for integrated water resources planning and dissemination of water resources information. The 2011 baseline study by LSCE, which included over 600 wells and data going back over 50 years, concluded that "the groundwater levels in Napa County are stable, except for portions of the MST district". Most wells elsewhere within the Napa Valley floor with a sufficient record indicate that groundwater levels are more affected by climatic conditions, are within historical levels, and seem to recover from dry periods during subsequent wet or normal periods. The LSCE Study also concluded that, on a regional scale, there appear to be no current groundwater quality issues except north of Calistoga (mostly naturally occurring boron and trace metals) and in the Carneros region (mostly salinity).

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

The project is categorized as "all other areas" based upon current County Water Availability Analysis policies and therefore water use criteria is parcel specific based upon a Tier 2 analysis. The Water Availability Analysis completed by Bartelt Engineering in June 2017, determined the project would not have a significant impact on groundwater resources.

- a. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. According to the Onsite Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study prepared by Bartelt Engineering, June 2017, the wastewater flows associated with the proposed project can be accommodated with the existing process wastewater system and the proposed improvements to the sanitary wastewater system. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings.
- b. The subject parcel currently has one onsite well located in the northeast corner of the parcel. The project proposes to destroy the existing well and drill a new one in approximately the same location. Per County requirements the applicant will be required to install a transient non-community public water system (TNCWS), which includes certain design standards for the new well.

The findings of the Water Availability Analysis completed by Bartelt Engineering in June 2017, demonstrate that the project would not substantially deplete local groundwater supplies and would not have a significant impact on groundwater resources. According to the water analysis, the existing groundwater use on the project site is 6.77 acre-feet/year. The proposed project would result in an increase of 0.31 acre-feet/year for an anticipated total of 7.08 acre-feet/year. The table below details each source of existing and proposed groundwater use:

Usage	Existing (Acre-feet/Year)	Proposed (Acre-feet/Year)
Winery Process	2.49	2.49
Winery Domestic	0.16	0.50
Winery Landscaping	0.11	0.11
Vineyard Irrigation	4.01	3.98
Total	6.77	7.08

The report notes that vineyard irrigation demand may be offset by beneficially reusing treated winery process wastewater as an additional source for irrigation. Furthermore, recycled water provided by the Los Carneros Water District (LCWD) may also be utilized as an additional source of vineyard irrigation water.

A Root Zone Water Balance was conducted to estimate groundwater recharge for the proposed project. Groundwater recharge is site specific and depends on the conditions of rainfall, type of climate, recharge area(s), soil and crop properties and irrigation method(s). A breakdown of each contributing factor to the water balance is described in detail in the report. The report concludes that total groundwater recharge for the subject parcel is estimated to be 9.5 acre-feet/year.

Based on rainfall data from the PRISM Climate Group at Oregon State University, covering 1981-2010 (30 year normal), the average rainfall data for the project site is estimated to be 24.14 inches.

The 15.83± acre parcel is divided in to several recharge areas depending on permeable surfaces and type of crop planted. The proposed project site includes 1.46± acres of impermeable surface areas (i.e. existing buildings, driveways, etc.) and other non-infiltrative areas (i.e. existing wastewater ponds and proposed open-top process wastewater pretreatment system). The net permeable area for the parcel is 14.37± acres which consists of the following recharge areas: vineyard, landscaping, and naturally occurring grasses.

Using the Root Zone Water Balance to evaluate the potential for each recharge area, the total groundwater recharge for the subject parcel is estimated to be 9.5 acre-feet/year.

The Root Zone Water Balance shows that during winter months when the soil is saturated and potential evapotranspiration requirements are low, the change in groundwater storage is high. The opposite is observed during the summer months when the change in groundwater storage is low. The existing well currently serving the subject parcel is part of the California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring (CASGEM) program. As part of this program, groundwater levels in the existing well were recorded twice per year starting in October 2014. The measured data and plotted graph show a decrease in groundwater storage over the summer months (when rainfall is low and potential evapotranspiration requirements are high) with groundwater replenishment occurring over the winter months (when rainfall is high and potential evapotranspiration is low). This is consistent with the findings from the Root Zone Water Balance.

Dry rainfall years were not evaluated due to the complexity of the Root Zone Water Balance which provides a general pattern for when groundwater recharge occurs. During dry rainfall years when groundwater recharge may be low, supplemental vineyard irrigation (which comprises a large portion of the project water demand) can be sourced by recycled water from the Los Carneros Water District (LCWD) and/or treated winery wastewater to reduce the demand from the project well. However, the existing well has been able to meet the demands of the winery for the history of its use without the need for supplemental sources.

For comparison the study also included a groundwater recharge calculation based on a 2003 water balance study prepared for the Carneros Creek Watershed by the Napa County Resource Conservation District. Utilizing the runoff coefficient determined by that study and the PRISM rainfall data, the potential groundwater recharge was 11.78 acre-feet/year.

As noted above, the proposed replacement well located would be drilled in in the northeast corner of the parcel, in close proximity to the existing well. Based on review of neighboring parcel records from the County and through visual observation, the location of the proposed project well is approximately 415 feet from a neighboring well. Based on the neighboring Well Completion Report, PBES criteria for calculating well drawdown, and using the Theis Equation, it was determined that pumping of the new project well is not anticipated to negatively impact the existing neighboring well.

The winery, as part of its entitlement would include the County's standard condition of approval requiring well monitoring as well as the potential to modify/alter permitted uses on site should groundwater resources become insufficient to supply the use. The proposed project would result in a modest increase of 0.31 acre-feet/year over the existing condition, but would remain below the estimated groundwater recharge rate of 9.5 acre-feet/year, and consequently would not interfere with groundwater recharge or lowering of the local groundwater level. Therefore, the impacts from the project would be less than significant and no further analysis is needed.

- c. The project would not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off the project site. Improvement plans prepared prior to the issuance of a building permit would ensure that the proposed project does not increase runoff flow rate or volume as a result of project implementation. General Plan Policy CON-50 c) requires discretionary projects, including this project, to meet performance standards designed to ensure peak runoff in 2-, 10-, 50-, and 100-year events following development is not greater than predevelopment conditions. The proposed project would implement standard stormwater quality treatment controls to treat runoff prior to discharge from the project site. The incorporation of these features into the project would ensure that the proposed project would not create substantial sources of polluted runoff. In addition, the proposed project does not have any unusual characteristics that create sources of pollution that would degrade water quality. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d. The site lies outside the boundaries of the 100 and 500 year flood hazard boundaries of the Napa River, which is located approximately two miles south of the project site. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. No impacts would occur.
- e. The project site is not subject to a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan, therefore the proposed project would not conflict with an adopted plan. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. The project is a modification to an existing winery. All proposed physical improvements will take place on the property within the vicinity of the existing winery development. The proposed project will not physically divide an established community. No impact would occur.
- b. The subject parcel is located in the AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district, which allows wineries and uses accessory to wineries subject to use permit approval. The proposed project is compliant with the physical limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance. The County has adopted the Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO) to protect agriculture and open space and to regulate winery development and expansion in a manner that avoids potential negative environmental effects. The winery was originally approved in DATE, prior to implementation of the WDO and the buildings do not meet the setback standards provided in the WDO. Proposed improvements are with the existing winery development area and do not affect the setback standards. The proposed project is in compliance with other aspects of the WDO.

Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-1 of the 2008 General Plan states that the County shall, “preserve existing agricultural land uses and plan for agriculture and related activities as the primary land uses in Napa County.” The property’s General Plan land use designation is AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space) which allows “agriculture, processing of agricultural products, and single-family dwellings.” More specifically, General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-2 recognizes wineries and other agricultural processing facilities, and any use clearly accessory to those facilities, as agriculture. The project would allow for the continuation of agriculture as a dominant land use within the county and is consistent with the Napa County General Plan.

The continued use of the property for the “fermenting and processing of grape juice into wine” (NCC §18.08.640) supports the economic viability of agriculture within the county consistent with General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-4 (“The County will reserve agricultural lands for agricultural use including lands used for grazing and watershed/ open space...”) and General Plan Economic Development Policy E-1 (The County’s economic development will focus on ensuring the continued viability of agriculture...).

The General Plan includes two policies requiring wineries to be designed generally of a high architectural quality for the site and its surroundings. No changes to the existing winery buildings are proposed. As such, the project would fit within the context of its surroundings. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XII.	MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
------	---------------------------------------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XIII.	NOISE. Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

Discussion:

a./b. The project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during construction of onsite improvements. Construction activities would be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. As such, the project would not result in potentially significant temporary construction noise impacts or operational impacts. Further, construction activities would occur during the period of 7a.m.-7p.m. on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity. All construction activities would be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). The proposed project would not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts. Conditions of approval identified below would require construction activities to be limited to daylight hours, vehicles to be muffled, and backup alarms adjusted to the lowest allowable levels. There is a low potential for impacts related to construction noise, including groundborne vibration, to be significant. Impacts would be less than significant.

8.3. CONSTRUCTION NOISE

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

The proposed project components that have the potential to generate higher noise levels, compared to existing conditions, include an increase in visitation from 12 visitors a day to 95 visitors a day, changes to the marketing plan that include increasing event size to visitors ranging from 50 guests (six events) to 100 (two events), and use of an outdoor patio for visitation and the revised marketing events. Winery operations would occur between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. (excluding harvest). All events would end by 10:00 p.m., with quite clean-up conducted afterwards until 11:00 p.m.

Visitation and marketing events would continue to take place in the winery buildings and begin occurring on the outdoor patio. The proposed outdoor area is an existing, approximately 2,600-square foot patio. The patio area includes two large mature trees and some smaller trees. The area is surrounded by fencing and landscaping averaging about 4 feet in height. The outdoor area includes tables and chairs with total seating for about 34 persons.

The nearest residence to the project site is approximately 200 feet to the north of the winery hospitality building and 150 feet from the proposed outdoor hospitality area. A garage is located on the adjacent property situated between the residence and the winery development. The nearby residence also is screened by dense vegetation and fencing located at the property line.

Additional regulations contained within County Code Chapter 8.16 establish exterior noise criteria for various land uses in the County. As described in the Project Setting, above, land uses in the area include residences, vineyards, and agricultural uses. Of these land uses, the residential land use is considered the most sensitive to noise. Based on the standards in County Code section 8.16.070, noise levels, measured at the exterior of a residential structure or residential use on a portion of a larger property, may not exceed 50 decibels for more than half of any hour in the window of daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) within which visitation and marketing events could occur. Noise impacts of the proposed project would be considered bothersome and potentially significant if sound generated by it had the effect of exceeding the standards in County Code more than 50 percent of the time (i.e., more than 50 decibels for more than 30 minutes in an hour for a residential use).

Continuing enforcement of Napa County's Noise Ordinance by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff, including the prohibition against amplified music, should further ensure that marketing events and other winery activities do not create a significant noise impact. Events and non-amplified music, excluding quiet clean-up, are required to finish by 10:00 p.m. Amplified music or sound systems would not be permitted for outdoor events as identified in standard Condition of Approval 4.10 below. Temporary events would be subject to County Code Chapter 5.36 which regulates proposed temporary events.

4.10 AMPLIFIED MUSIC

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

Potential changes to noise levels at the closest residence would be limited due to the configuration of the outdoor area, existing landscaping, continued use of indoor hospitality areas, application of standard conditions of approval, and continued enforcement of Noise Ordinance standards. The proposed project would not result in long-term significant permanent noise impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project includes an increase in visitation and marketing events and employees, along with minor site improvements that would only serve the winery site. An increase in visitation to the winery is unlikely to induce population growth in the area. No impact would occur.
- b. No existing housing or people would be displaced as a result of the project. Therefore, the project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere and no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. Public services are currently provided to the project area and the winery parcel. The potential for the increase in visitation to create additional demand on existing services would be minimal. Fire protection is already provided to the site and measures would be required as part of the development pursuant to conditions established by the Napa County Fire Marshall. There would be no foreseeable impact to emergency response times with compliance with these conditions of approval. The Fire Department and Engineering Services Division have reviewed the application and recommend approval, as conditioned. School impact fees, which assist local school districts with capacity building measures, would be levied pursuant to any building permit submittal. The proposed project would have minimal impact on public parks as no residences are proposed. Impacts to public services would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. The project would not significantly increase use of existing park or recreational facilities based on its limited scope. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. No recreational facilities are proposed as part of the project. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XVII.	TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system and/or conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-38, which seeks to maintain an adequate Level of Service (LOS) at signalized and unsignalized intersections, or reduce the effectiveness of existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-14, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The updated CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 states that a project's potential environmental impacts should evaluate the generation of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and that a project's effect on automobile delay and Level of Service (LOS) shall no longer constitute a significant environmental impact. The Final Traffic Impact Report and the associated Addendum include an analysis of both VMT and LOS to address potential environmental impacts and overall effects to the County roadway system.

- a.- b. The Final Traffic Impact Report January 7, 2020, prepared by Crane Transportation Group (CTG), addresses potential transportation impacts generated by the proposed project. The study reviewed LOS, sight distance, and the County left-turn lane warrant to identify potential impacts to the County roadway system. An Addendum to the Traffic Impact Report was prepared on May 18, 2020, to provide additional information on the applicant's project description and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction efforts, which assist in reducing potential impacts from VMT and also decrease the previously identified impacts on the roadway system to less than significant.

Based upon County traffic significance criteria, operating conditions at the State Route (SR) 12-121 intersections with Cuttings Wharf Road and Los Carneros Avenue, as well as at the Withers Road intersections with Cuttings Wharf Road and Los Carneros Avenue, were evaluated for Friday and Saturday PM peak traffic conditions during harvest season under the following scenarios: "Existing", "Year 2020", and "Year 2030 (Cumulative – General Plan Buildout)". Evaluations included conditions with and without project traffic.

The Winery Trip Generation Sheet estimates the winery would generate 75 trips on a typical weekday and 52 trips on a typical Saturday following approval of the project. The report estimates that the Friday PM peak timeframe will include five new Inbound Trips and eight new Outbound Trips, and that the Saturday PM peak timeframe will include eight new Inbound Trips and four new Outbound Trips.

Potential road and intersection impacts were determined to be as follows. It is noted that the SR 12-121 intersections with Cuttings Wharf Road or Los Carneros Avenue are already be operating unacceptably without project traffic. While this intersections currently warrant signalization, in order to comply with General Plan policies regarding maintaining the rural character of County roads, the County is not in favor of signalizing either location.

- Withers Road intersections with Cuttings Wharf Road or Los Carneros Avenue, will not have a significant impact from project traffic under the Existing, Year 2020, or Cumulative (Year 2030) harvest condition Friday or Saturday PM peak hour.
- SR 12-21 intersection with Los Carneros Avenue will not have a significant impact from project traffic under the Existing, Year 2020, or Cumulative (Year 2030) harvest condition Friday or Saturday PM peak hour.
- SR 12-121 intersection with Cuttings Wharf Road will not have a significant impact from project traffic under the Existing or Year 2020 harvest condition Friday or Saturday PM peak hour. The report identified that the intersection would experience a significant impact during the Cumulative (Year 2030) scenario.

In order to address the potential impact SR 12-121 intersection with Cuttings Wharf Road, a Traffic Study Addendum dated May 18, 2020, was submitted, providing additional information on their proposed TDM plan which would appoint a winery staff person as TDM coordinator to facilitate improvements to employees commuting and visitation scheduling. The solution presented in the Addendum requires the TDM coordinator to schedule visitation appointments that would restrict new traffic during the peak hours (Fridays between 3:40 and 4:30 p.m. and Saturdays between 1:00 and 2:00 p.m.). Based upon the winery's current practice of conducting tastings for about an hour and 15 minutes, it will be possible to have guests arrive just before each restricted hour and then leave after the restricted hour. With incorporation of the TDM scheduling, the project will not have a significant impact on the level of service or the capacity and function of the roadway system. Impacts to the County roadway system would be less than significant.

As proposed, the project does not proposed any changes that would reduce the effectiveness of existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities and does not conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation. The project proposes the installation of bicycle racks. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c. The transition to VMT is required of lead agencies beginning July 1, 2020. In anticipation of the transition, the Circulation Element includes new policies that reflect this new regulatory framework for transportation impact assessment, along with a draft threshold of significance that is based on reduction of VMT compared to the unmitigated project rather than the regional average VMT (Policies CIR-7 through CIR-9). Staff believes this alternative approach to determining the significance of a project's transportation impacts would be better suited to Napa County's rural context, while still supporting the efforts of the County to achieve the greenhouse gas emissions goals of its pending Climate Action Plan. The reduction in VMT and, correspondingly, GHG emissions from the transportation sector, is also necessary for Napa County, the region, and the state to achieve long-term, statewide mandates targeted toward reducing GHG emissions. Such mandates include, but are not limited to Executive Orders S-3-05 and B-16-12, which respectively, set a general statewide GHG emissions reduction target of 80 percent

below 1990 levels by 2050, and an 80 percent GHG emissions reduction below 1990 levels (also by 2050) specifically for the transportation sector. The applicant's intent to create a TDM plan and appoint a TDM coordinator demonstrates the winery's efforts to reduce vehicle miles traveled. The project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b). Impacts would be less than significant.

- d.-e. Sight lines at the existing Saintsbury Winery driveway connection to Withers Road meet minimum stopping sight distance criteria based upon the Caltrans March 2014 Highway Design Manual. Minor widening of the existing driveway at the connection to the parking area and designation of new parking spaces have been reviewed by Engineering and Fire Division. They determined that the proposed improvements meet the County of Napa Road and Street Standards for access and onsite safety. No impact would occur.
- f. The total proposed parking of 23 spaces would be comprised of 11 for visitors and 12 spaces for employees. The employee parking is designed as tandem spaces and is covered with a solar array. The parking design takes up less overall space on the site, and the solar panels allow for onsite generation of renewable energy. The spaces would all be located on the existing paved areas; no vineyard removal is required. The proposed parking is not excessive is not likely to stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

On April 20, 2020, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. The Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation responded and declined comment as the project site is not located within their aboriginal territories. No other responses were received within the consultation period. No impacts would occur.

- a.-b. As discussed in Section V above, the proposed physical improvements of this project would occur on the already developed area of the site, therefore discovery of tribal cultural resources is not expected. However, if resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the County of Napa standard Condition of Approval 7.2 *ARCHEOLOGICAL FINDING*. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XIX.	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of a new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The project does not require the construction of a new or expanded, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities. The project would include improvements to the existing on-site wastewater treatment system. Per County requirements, due to the number of water users, the applicant will be required to install a transient non-community public water system (TNCWS), which includes certain design standards for the new well. The system would only serve the property. Documentation has been provided that the improvements can be accommodated on site and will not result in significant impacts.
- b. As discussed in Section X. the findings of the Water Availability Analysis completed by Bartelt Engineering in June 2017, demonstrate that the project would not substantially deplete local groundwater supplies and would not have a significant impact on groundwater resources. According to the water analysis, the existing groundwater use on the project site is 6.77 acre-feet/year, and the proposed project would result in an increase of 0.31 acre-feet/year for an anticipated total of 7.08 acre-feet/year. A Root Zone Water Balance was conducted and the total groundwater recharge for the subject parcel is estimated to be 9.5 acre-feet/year.
- c. The winery facility is serviced by a process wastewater system and a sanitary wastewater system. The proposed project would not generate additional process waste, therefore there are no planned improvements to the existing process wastewater system. The proposed increase in employees and visitation, would generate additional sanitary wastewater. The project includes proposed improvements to the existing onsite sanitary wastewater system and an expansion of the existing subsurface dispersal field and pretreatment system. The study demonstrates that all sanitary wastewater generated from the proposed project can feasibly be handled onsite with the proposed improvements. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings. Wastewater would be treated on-site and would not require a wastewater treatment provider. Impacts would be less than significant.

d./e. According to the Napa County Baseline Data Report, all of the solid waste landfills where Napa County's waste is disposed have more than

sufficient capacity related to the current waste generation. The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. The project site is not covered by an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. The driveway complies with the requirements of the Napa County Road and Street Standards and the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection standards. No impact would occur.
- b.-d. The property is very flat, with slopes of generally ranging from 0- 5%. The project will approve minor physical changes to the site. The project does include installation of infrastructure or utilities that would exacerbate wildfire risks or increase post-fire slope instability or drainage issues. Impacts would be less than significant

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XXI.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?
- c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Discussion:

- a. The proposed development and improvements are located on the portion of the property that is already developed with the winery buildings and associated infrastructure. As identified in Section IV. Biological Resources, due to the location of and limited scope of physical improvements, potential impacts to biological resources and wildlife species would be less than significant. As identified in Section V. Cultural Resources, according to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps no historical or archaeological resources have been identified on the property. However, if resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance County standard condition of approval. The project would not result in significant impacts to rare or endangered plant or animal species or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology, and traffic are discussed in the respective sections above and were determined to have a less than significant impact. Potential impacts to air pollution and GHG emissions are being addressed through Greenhouse Gas Voluntary Best Management Practices and VMT reduction strategies as discussed in Section VIII. Green House Gas and Section XVII. Transportation. The applicant already implements the following greenhouse gas reduction methods at the winery: generates renewable energy onsite, recycling materials, has 70-80% cover crop and reuses pruning and thinning biomass on site, and has electric vehicle charging stations. The winery’s efforts to reduce VMT include the implementation of a TDM plan and appointment of a TDM coordinator to assist with employee scheduling and visitation appointments. Section X. Hydrology includes detail on the Water Availability Analysis which demonstrates that the proposed project would result in a modest increase of 0.31 acre-feet/year over the existing condition, but would remain below the estimated groundwater recharge rate of 9.5 acre-feet/year, and consequently would not interfere with groundwater recharge or lowering of the local groundwater level. The Traffic Impact Report detailed in Section XVII. Transportation concluded that the proposed project, with the restriction on new trips during the peak hours, would not have significant impacts on the County roadway system. The winery’s implementation of a TDM plan will provide reductions in VMT. Potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant.
- c. All impacts identified in this negative declaration are less than significant and do not require mitigation. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in environmental effects that cause substantial adverse effects on human being either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.