

“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:** Cakebread Cellars, Use Permit Modification (P19-00074)
2. **Property Owner:** Bruce and Dennis Cakebread, P.O. Box 216, Rutherford CA 94573
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Sean Trippi, Principal Planner, (707) 299-1353, sean.trippi@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):** The project is located on a 36.76 acre property on the east side of State Route 29, approximately 900 feet south of Bella Oaks Lane. 8300 St. Helena Highway, Rutherford. APN: 031-010-014.
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Joshua Devore, DP&F Attorneys at Law, 1455 First Street, Napa, CA 94559
6. **General Plan description:** Agricultural Resource
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Preserve
8. **Background/Project History:**

On November 19, 1975, the Planning Commission approved use permit #U-337576 to establish a wine storage and aging facility within a 576 s.f. portion of an existing building with two parking spaces. The building (now the "pond building") was adjacent to an existing irrigation pond and was to be used primarily for case wine storage and barrel storage of bulk wine having a total capacity not to exceed 3,000 gallons. No wine production was proposed or approved. No public tasting or tours were allowed.

On April 20, 1977, the Planning Commission approved a modification to use permit #U-337576 to add two 1,500 gallon fermentation tanks to the wine storage and aging facility.

On May 3, 1978, the Planning Commission approved use permit #U-477778 to utilize an existing structure (now the "Rutherford" winery building) for the production of wine in conjunction with the existing storage/aging facility with a total of three parking spaces. No public tasting or tours were allowed. The application submittal materials indicated an annual production capacity of 25,000 gallons, 3-5 existing employees (family) plus two proposed additional employees, eight existing parking spaces, and 1-2 visitors a day.

On June 4, 1980, the Planning Commission approved use permit #U-507980 to construct a 6,250 s.f. addition to the Rutherford winery building. No increase of wine production was requested. No public tasting or tours were allowed.

On November 7, 1990, the Planning Commission approved use permit #U-90-5 to increase production to 250,000 gallons per year, allow construction of a 14,500 s.f. addition to the Rutherford winery building, a wastewater pond, and to provide no more than 37 parking spaces. Wine production was to be averaged over any consecutive three year period, not to exceed 300,000 gallons in any given year. Any production over 25,000 gallons was subject to the requirement that 75% of the grapes being used were to be from Napa County. The approval also recognized existing marketing events including one event per year with 120 vehicles, one event per year with 15 guests, and four events per week with between four to 40 guests, and an average of 10 guests per event. The approval also included a condition of approval limiting the maximum number of visitor carrying vehicles entering the winery to 64,800 per year.

On December 5, 1990, the Planning Commission approved use permit #U-90-22 and variance #V-90-15 to allow use of 1,244 s.f. of an existing residence (now the "Winery House") for winery offices and marketing events located within the required 600-foot setback from State Route 29. The existing residence is located approximately 78-feet from State Route 29.

On December 17, 1993, the Zoning Administrator approved a modification (#93218) to use permit #90-5 to allow a 73 s.f. addition to the pond building, a 595 s.f. addition to the Rutherford building and a 400 s.f. recycling building (totaling approximately 1,069 s.f. of additional floor area), 10 parking spaces for seasonal employees, and expansion of an existing deck at the pond building. The approval also included interior remodeling of the two buildings.

On September 21, 1994, the Planning Commission approved use permit #94013 to expand the unbuilt phases of the Rutherford winery building from 14,500 s.f. to 31,350 s.f. There were no changes to production, the number of employees, visitors or marketing events.

On June 3, 1997, the Zoning Administrator approved use permit #96591 to convert approximately 600 s.f. of barrel aging area to tasting area within the Rutherford winery building. There were no changes to production, the number of employees, visitors or marketing events.

On August 20, 1998, the Planning Commission approved use permit #97439 to increase production from 250,000 to 500,000 gallons per year (75% of 475 gallons sourced from Napa County grapes), construct a 30,750 s.f. fermentation and aging building (now the "Oakville" winery building), renovate an existing 1,500 s.f. production building for additional wine storage, add 17 new employees, and add 29 new parking spaces (19 employee and 10 visitor) for a total of 22 visitor and 44 employee parking spaces. The approval also included an exception to the Conservation Regulations to allow the new winery building to encroach into the stream setback.

On June 9, 1999, the Zoning Administrator approved use permit #98437-MOD to construct a 2,331 s.f. addition to the Oakville winery building. There were no changes to production, the number of employees, visitors or marketing events.

On May 5, 2004, the Planning Commission approved use permit #03511-UP to expand and remodel the Rutherford winery building, add employees, expand the parking lot, and modify the marketing plan. The winery expansion and remodel was approved over four phases. The approval included building additions of 9,924 s.f. and 7,056 s.f. on the north and east sides of the winery, respectively, adding 25 employees, constructing a new parking area with 57 parking spaces for a total of 117 parking spaces on the north and west side of the building, and other site and infrastructure improvements. The marketing plan was modified to allow two events per year on consecutive days in February for 832 guests (320 vehicles) per day, one event per year for 520 guests (200 vehicles), one event per year for 30 guests, and 14 events per week for 50 guests per event.

On April 17, 2005, use permit modification #P05-0155-MOD was administratively approved to modify the phasing, add an additional 2,124 s.f. to the addition to the east side of the Rutherford winery building for a total building addition of 9,180 s.f., and delete a previous condition related to a Housing Element injunction that had been settled.

On June 27, 2013, the Director approved use permit very minor modification P12-00421-VMM to redesign and increase the floor area of the previously approved 9,924 s.f. addition on the north side of the Rutherford winery building to approximately 17,000 s.f., redesign the new parking area, provide an area for limousine and larger vehicles to park, and allow on-premise consumption of wines produced on site in the tasting room and the existing and proposed outdoor patios in accordance with Business and Professions Code Sections 23358, 23390 and 23396.5. There were no changes to production, the number of employees, visitors or marketing events.

On September 20, 2016, the Director approved use permit very minor modification P16-00331-VMM to increase the floor area of the Rutherford winery building by 4,776 s.f., including reducing the area of an approved tasting room addition from 302 s.f. to 236 s.f.; expanding the first floor production area by 779 s.f.; converting an approved visitor center room to office space and increasing the size from 609 s.f. to 717 s.f.; an addition of 746 s.f. of second floor office space on the west side of the building; and, increasing the size of the approved second floor office space from 1,068 s.f. to 2,600 s.f. on the east side of the building. There were no changes to production, the number of employees, visitors or marketing events.

On March 8, 2017, the Director approved use permit very minor modification P17-00029 to temporarily house office employees in two pre-manufactured trailers during construction of the winery improvements.

On September 23, 2019, Lot Line Adjustment 1951 was recorded incorporating the parking area north of the Rutherford winery building into the project site.

9. **Description of Project:**

Approval of Use Permit Major Modification to an existing 500,000 gallon per year winery to modify previous project approvals to allow the following:

- (a) increase production to 800,000 gallons per year;
- (b) rename the existing marketing events and modify the frequency as follows:
  - ~~Annual Open House~~ Two Large Events  
Frequency: ~~Two consecutive days in February~~ per year  
Number of persons: 832 (320 vehicles) per event  
Time of day: 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.  
The winery will close for retail sales and tours and tastings (other than for event attendees) during this event
  - ~~Cabernet Release day, Grilling day and Rubaiyat Day~~ Three Medium Events  
Frequency: ~~one day/year each event~~ three per year  
Number of persons: 520 (200 vehicles) per event  
Time of day: 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.  
If the number of persons attending the event exceeds 195, the winery will close for retail sales, tours and tastings (other than for event attendees) during this event
  - ~~Annual American Harvest Workshops~~ One Small Event  
Frequency: one per year  
Number of persons: 30 persons  
Time of day: 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m.
  - Private promotional events with or without food service  
Frequency: 14 events per week  
Number of persons: 50 persons  
Time of day: 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m.

The conditions that all activity, including cleanup, shall cease by 11:00 p.m. and the start and finish time of activities shall be scheduled to minimize vehicles arriving or leaving between 4:00 p.m. and 5:30 p.m. will continue to be applied.

- (c) two water storage tanks with a storage capacity of approximately 1,006,200 gallons each for fire suppression. The tanks would be located adjacent to the north side of the fire protection and irrigation pond or adjacent to the west side of the Oakville winery building;
- (d) four water storage tanks with a storage capacity of approximately 10,000 gallons each for domestic use. The tanks would be located next to the existing tanks west of the Oakville winery building and next to the east side of the Rutherford winery building for future installation as needed;
- (e) increase employees from 77 full and part time employees to 120 full and part time employees;
- (f) wastewater pretreatment system; and,
- (g) minor driveway improvements.

The request includes an exception to the Napa County Road & Street Standards from the commercial driveway width standard (20.0 foot wide driveway) in four separate locations throughout the existing driveway network, at an existing bridge, an existing gate, and two other portions of the existing access roads.

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

The 36.76 acre project site is located on the east side of State Route (SR) 29, approximately 900 feet south of Bella Oaks Lane. The project site is currently developed with four winery buildings, a storage building, two wastewater treatment ponds, a fire protection and irrigation pond, water storage tanks, parking areas/access ways, and approximately 20 acres of vines. The water source for the existing winery and vineyards are from two existing onsite and two existing off-site wells. Domestic and process wastewater are treated and dispersed on-site. Primary access to the site is provided by a driveway connection from State Route 29, near the northwest corner of the site. Glos Lane, a private drive near the southwest corner of the site, provides access from SR 29 through the winery to residences and vineyard properties east of the site. The property is relatively flat ( $\pm 0-5\%$  slope) with elevations on the property ranging from approximately 140 feet above mean sea level (msl) to approximately 145 feet above msl. Bella Oaks creek runs east from the western hills, flows in a culvert beneath SR 29, and through the southern portion of the site separating the Oakville winery building from the majority of the property and then to the Napa River. The Napa River is approximately 750-feet to a  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile from east of the project site.

Surrounding land uses are primarily vineyards, wineries, and residences. Properties in the vicinity of the project site range in size between 0.50 to 147 acres. The nearest winery, Sequoia Grove Vineyards, is located on the adjoining property to the north. Adjoining a portion of the property to the south is Turnbull Cellars.

11. **Other agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).  
Discretionary approval required by Napa County consists of a use permit modification. The proposed project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County including, but not limited to building permits and grading permits. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is required to meet San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board standards and is administered by the Engineering Services Division.

**Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies**

None

**Other Agencies Contacted**

Federal Trade and Taxation Bureau  
Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control

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 July 17, 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. A response was received from the Yoche Dehe Wintun Nation stating that the project site is not within their aboriginal territories and have no comments. No other comments were received and the consultation period closed on August 31, 2020.

**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.

*Sean Trippi*

Signature

October 12, 2020

Date

Name: Sean Trippi, Principal Planner, 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-c. Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms, geological features, water, trees and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of a beautiful or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken-in. As generally described in the **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses** section, above, this area is defined by a mix of vineyard, winery, and residential uses. The project would not result in a substantial damage to scenic resources, including trees and rock outcroppings, or substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The project site is currently developed with a winery, vineyards, and an agricultural building. External changes to the winery are limited to new water storage tanks. The proposed project would not be located in an area which would damage any known scenic vista, or damage scenic resources, trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings.
- d. Although the site is currently developed with an existing winery and agricultural building, the proposed improvements may result in the installation of additional lighting that may have the potential to impact nighttime views. Although the project is in an area that has a certain amount of existing nighttime lighting, the installation of new sources of nighttime lights may affect nighttime views. Pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approval for wineries, outdoor lighting would be required to be shielded and directed downwards, with only low level lighting allowed in parking areas. As subject to the standard conditions of approval, below, the project will not have a significant impact resulting from new sources of outside lighting.

6.3 LIGHTING – PLAN SUBMITTAL

- a. Two (2) copies of a detailed lighting plan showing the location and specifications for all lighting fixtures to be installed on the property shall be submitted for Planning Division review and approval. All lighting shall comply with the CBC.
- b. All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward, shall be located as low to the ground as possible, shall be the minimum necessary for security, safety, or operations; on timers; and shall incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. All lighting shall be shielded or placed such that it does not shine directly on adjacent properties or impact vehicles on adjacent streets. No flood-lighting or sodium lighting of the building is permitted, including architectural highlighting and spotting. Low-level lighting shall be utilized in parking areas as opposed to elevated high-intensity light standards.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None required

II.	AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. <sup>1</sup> 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 California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	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. The California Department of Conservation District map designates the planted vineyards as "Prime Farmland" and the winery development area as "Other Land." The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. 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. Thus, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact with respect to conversion of farmland. The proposed water storage tanks for fire protection would require minimal vineyard removal (approximately ¼ of an acre). No vines would be removed to facilitate construction of the future domestic water storage tanks as they would be located next to the existing domestic water storage in existing disturbed areas. There are no other changes included in this proposal that would result in the conversion of Farmland.
- b. The County's zoning of the property is AP (Agricultural Preserve) and the General Plan land use designation of the property is Agricultural Resource. The winery and proposed modifications are consistent with the property's zoning, as Napa County Code Section 18.16.030 lists wineries and related, accessory uses as conditionally permitted in the AP District. General Plan Policies AG/LU-20 and AG/LU-21 also identifies processing of agricultural products (grape crushing/winemaking) as a use that is consistent with the Agricultural Resource land use designation. There is not a Williamson Act contract that is applicable to this property.
- c/d. The project site is zoned AP (Agricultural Preserve), which allows wineries upon grant of a use permit. The existing winery and associated improvements are located in an area of the site that is also developed with vineyards and other improvements. A minimal amount of vineyard acreage would be removed to accommodate the water storage tanks for fire protection. No vines would be removed to

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

accommodate the future domestic water storage tanks. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Sensitive Biotic Oak woodlands, Riparian Woodland forest, and Coniferous forest) the project site does not contain lands classified as containing sensitive biotic communities. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

- e. As discussed in item "a.", above, the winery and winery accessory uses are defined as agricultural by the Napa County General Plan and are allowed under the parcels' AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning. Neither this project, nor any foreseeable consequence thereof, would result in changes to the existing environment which would result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use.

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 PM<sub>2.5</sub>, 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 PM<sub>2.5</sub> occasionally does reach unhealthy concentrations. There are multiple reasons for PM<sub>2.5</sub> exceedances in Napa County. First, much of the county is wind-sheltered, which tends to trap PM<sub>2.5</sub> 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 PM<sub>2.5</sub> 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 (NO<sub>x</sub> and ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), and suspended particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>). Other criteria pollutants, such as lead and sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), would not be substantially emitted by the proposed development or traffic, and air quality standards for them are being met throughout the Bay Area.

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

As mentioned above, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Operational-Related Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursors Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. The existing winery includes approximately 5,542 sq. ft. of floor area devoted to wine tasting and approximately 103,370 sq. ft. of floor area devoted to production. When compared to the BAAQMD's screening criteria of 541,000 sf for general industrial and 47,000 sf for high quality restaurant for NO<sub>x</sub> (oxides of nitrogen), the project would not significantly impact air quality and does not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2017 Pages 3-2 & 3-3.) The project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. (Please note: a high quality restaurant is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, but grossly overstates emissions associated with other portions of a winery, such as office, barrel storage and production, which generate fewer vehicle trips. Therefore, a general light industry comparison has also been used for other such uses.)

The project falls well below the screening criteria as noted above, and consequently will not significantly affect air quality individually or contribute considerably to any cumulative air quality impacts.

- c. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from earthmoving and construction activities required for project construction. Earthmoving and construction emissions would have a temporary effect; consisting mainly of dust generated during grading and other construction activities and exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles. If grading were to result in off or on-haul of soils, these potential construction impacts would be temporary in nature and subject to standard conditions of approval from the Engineering Division as part of the grading permit or building permit review process.

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 will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and are considered less than significant:

7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENT

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 tracked 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 State Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.*

*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/perpfaq\\_04-16-15.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/perp/perpfaq_04-16-15.pdf) or the PERP website <http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/portable.htm>*

Furthermore, while earthmoving and construction on the site will 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 IMPROVEMENT

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.*

- d. While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. The nearest residences are approximately 494 feet east of the Rutherford winery building and 196 feet west of the Oakville winery building (on a property under Cakebread's control). 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. According to the Napa County GIS Sensitivity Maps (Natural Diversity Data Base and US Fish and Wildlife Critical Habitat) no known candidate, sensitive, or special status species have been identified as occurring within the project boundaries. The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any special status species, or species of particular concern, as there are none identified within the project area. The project site is disturbed and developed with multiple winery buildings, vineyards, above ground ponds, parking areas and access drives, and associated improvements. No trees, vegetation, other than a minimal amount of vineyards, or structures are proposed to be removed to accommodate the proposed water storage tanks. The development area is not located within a riparian area. The site has not been identified in any local/regional or State plans as being a sensitive community. The potential for this project to have an impact on special status species is less than significant.
- c/d. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – water bodies, vernal pools & vernal pool species), vernal pools and wetlands are not present. As noted above, Bella Oaks creek traverses the southern portion of the site. The proposed water storage tanks would be located outside the stream setbacks established in the County's Conservation Regulations and not interfere or be located within a wildlife corridor. Therefore, project activities would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with their corridors or nursery sites. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e/f. This project would not interfere with any ordinances protecting biological resources. There are no tree preservation ordinances in effect in the County. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans because there are no plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. A previous archaeological survey, dated July 30, 1990, was conducted on the project site. The study noted a recorded archaeological site, however, no development is proposed within the boundaries of that area. No other historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features were identified on the project site. The physical improvements associated with this application are proposed in previously developed or disturbed areas. It is not anticipated that any cultural resources are present on the site, and the potential for impact is considered less-than-significant. 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 the following standard condition of approval that will be imposed on the project:

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.*

c. No human remains have been encountered on the property and no information has been encountered that would indicate that construction of this project would encounter human remains. Construction activities would occur on previously disturbed portions of the site. However, if resources are found during project grading, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard condition of approval noted above. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

- ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project would be required to comply with the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
  - iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.
  - iv.) The Napa County GIS Sensitivity Maps (Landslides line and polygon) did not indicate the presence of landslides within the area proposed for development.
- b. The proposed improvements would occur on slopes of five percent or less. The project would require incorporation of best management practices and would be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c/d. Based upon the Soil Survey of Napa County, prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the site is composed of Bale Clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes. According to the Napa County GIS Sensitivity Maps (Surficial Deposits layer), the site is underlain by Holocene fan deposits. Based on the Napa County GIS Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the property includes areas generally subject to medium tendencies to liquefy. All proposed construction will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction. Compliance with the latest editions of the California Building Code for seismic stability would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible, resulting in less than significant impacts.
- e. The Napa County Division of Environmental Health has reviewed this application and recommends approval based on the submitted wastewater feasibility report prepared by Bartelt Engineering, dated September 2019. Soils on the property have been determined to be adequate to support the on-site treatment and dispersal of wastewater generated by the project including the winery's process waste resulting from the increased wine production capacity as well as sanitary wastewater based on the proposed number of employees.
- f. No paleontological resources or unique geological features have been identified on the property or were encountered on the property when the existing buildings were constructed or when the vines were planted. 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Conflict with a county-adopted climate action plan or another applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Napa County has been working to develop a Climate Action Plan (CAP) for several years. In 2012, a Draft CAP (March 2012) was recommended using the emissions checklist in the Draft CAP, on a trial basis, to determine potential greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with project development and operation. At the December 11, 2012, Napa County Board of Supervisors (BOS) hearing, the BOS considered adoption of the proposed CAP. In addition to reducing Napa County's GHG emissions, the proposed plan was intended to address compliance with CEQA for projects reviewed by the County and to lay the foundation for development of a local offset program. While the BOS acknowledged the plan's objectives, the BOS requested that the CAP be revised to better address transportation-related greenhouse gas, to acknowledge and credit past

accomplishments and voluntary efforts, and to allow more time for establishment of a cost-effective local offset program. The Board also requested that best management practices be applied and considered when reviewing projects until a revised CAP is adopted to ensure that projects address the County's policy goal related to reducing GHG emissions.

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

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

In 2011, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) released California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Project Screening Criteria and Significance of Thresholds [1,100 metric tons per year (MT) of carbon dioxide and carbon dioxide equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e)]. This threshold of significance is appropriate for evaluating projects in Napa County. During 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 (CO<sub>2</sub>) gas, the principal greenhouse gas (GHG) being emitted by human activities, and whose concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity, also serves as the reference gas to compare other greenhouse gases. Agricultural sources of carbon emissions include forest clearing, land-use changes, biomass burning, and farm equipment and management activity emissions ([http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/glossary/letter\\_c.html](http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/glossary/letter_c.html)). Equivalent Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>e) is the most commonly reported type of GHG emission and a way to get one number that approximates total emissions from all the different gasses that contribute to GHG (BAAMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2017). In this case, carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) is used as the reference atom/compound to obtain atmospheric carbon CO<sub>2</sub> effects of GHG. Carbon stocks are converted to carbon dioxide equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e) by multiplying the carbon total by 44/12 (or 3.67), which is the ratio of the atomic mass of a carbon dioxide molecule to the atomic mass of a carbon atom (<http://www.nciasi2.org/COLE/index.html>)

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. As previously stated, this project includes the construction of a replacement winery office building and improvements to existing internal access road.

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. There is approximately 5,532 sq. ft. of existing floor area devoted to wine tasting and approximately 103,370 sq. ft. of floor area devoted to production within the existing building. When compared to the BAAQMD's GHG screening criteria of 121,000 sq. ft. for general industrial and 9,000 sq. ft. for high quality restaurant, the project was determined not to exceed the 1,100 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr GHG threshold of significance.

Furthermore, the applicant proposes to incorporate the following additional GHG reduction methods: generation of on-site renewable energy, and VMT reduction plan. The winery has already implemented the following GHG reduction practices: habitat restoration/tree plantings, alternative fuel and electrical vehicles in fleet, energy conserving lighting, bicycle incentives, use of recycled water, use of water efficient fixtures, low-impact development, water efficient landscaping, waste recycling, composting, sustainable purchasing and shipping, and electrical vehicle charging stations. In addition, the winery has been Napa Green Certified since 2008.

The proposed project has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds and determined that the project would not exceed the 1,100 MT/yr of CO<sub>2</sub>e. GHG Emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the Cal Green Building Code and tightened vehicle fuel efficiency standards. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 a new winery that would not be expected to use any substantial quantities of hazardous materials. Therefore, it would not be reasonably foreseeable for the proposed project to create upset or accident conditions that involve the release of hazardous materials into the environments. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed winery building.
- 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 airport or public use airport.
- f. The existing internal access roads and on-site circulation configuration generally meets Napa County Road and Street Standards (NCRSS) except for four locations. The applicant has submitted a request prepared by Bartelt Engineering, dated September 11, 2019, seeking an exception to the NCRSS from the commercial driveway width standard (20.0 foot wide driveway) in four separate locations throughout the existing driveway network, at an existing bridge, an existing gate, and two other portions of the existing access roads.

The subject parcel falls entirely within the Local Fire Protection Responsibility Area (LRA) and is not designated as being in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ). Unlike exceptions within the State Fire Protection Responsibility Area (SRA) or for property located within the VHFHSZ, exceptions for property located completely within the LRA may be permitted when they do not provide the same overall practical effect as the SRA Fire Safe Regulations. However the exception request must provide measures which provide safe access for emergency apparatus, safe civilian evacuation, and the avoidance of delays in emergency response based on the demands of the property.

The Road Exception Request letter prepared by Bartelt Engineering, referenced above, and associated exhibits attached demonstrate how the exception request provides measures which provide safe access for emergency apparatus, safe civilian evacuation, and the avoidance of delays in emergency response based on the demands of the property. Alternative ingress and egress routes are provided in areas where exceptions are being requested as well as clear line of sites and commercial roadway widths before and after each section an exception is being requested. It should be noted the Exception No.5 of the exception request letter discusses two special purpose roads ("Rutherford" and "Oakville") that will be signed and stripped as fire lanes and not accessible by the general public; these specific roads are considered Special Purpose Ways and will be stripped and/or signed as a fire lane and therefore do not require an exception to the RSS. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division and found acceptable, as conditioned. Therefore, the proposed project would not obstruct emergency vehicle access and impacts would be less than significant.

- g. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. In addition, the project is located within an urbanized area as identified in the in the Land Use Element of the General Plan. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input 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 (GRAC) approximately 40 new wells have been added to the monitoring program within these areas. Groundwater Sustainability Objectives were developed and recommended by the GRAC and adopted by the Board. The recommendations included the goal of developing sustainability objectives, provided a definition, explained the shared responsibility for Groundwater Sustainability and the important role monitoring as a means to achieving groundwater sustainability.

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

Thresholds for water use have been established by the Napa County Department of Public Works, using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS), the GRAC recommendations, and the LSCE reports. 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 and LSCE. The County has concluded that the annual one acre-foot of water per parcel acre criteria on the Valley Floor has proven to be both scientifically and operationally adequate. Any project that reduces water usage or any water usage that is at or below the established threshold is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels.

A Tier I Water Availability Analysis (WAA), dated September 2019 (revised), was prepared by Bartelt Engineering, Inc., to determine the estimated water use of the existing development, the proposed project and water availability. There are four existing wells used as primary, secondary and backup water sources, although one well is currently not in use. The project is categorized as being located within the Valley Floor in an area that has an established acceptable water use criteria of 1.0 acre foot per acre per year based upon current County Water Availability Analysis policies. Based upon those criteria, the Allowable Water Allotment for the project site is 36.76 acre-feet per year (af/yr), determined by multiplying the 36.76 acre Valley Floor site by a one AF/YR/acre fair share water use factor. Based on the WAA prepared for the project, proposed water use would be 1.85 AF/YR less than current water due to the use of recycled or treated process wastewater for vineyard irrigation (Bartelt Engineering September 2019). (Note: the WAA was prepared prior to the recordation of the lot line adjustment when the site area was 36.49 acres. The lot line adjustment and slight increase in site area do not affect or change the conclusions of the WAA.)

- a. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements nor substantially deplete local groundwater supplies. According to the Wastewater Dispersal Feasibility Study prepared by Bartelt Engineering, dated September 2019 (Revised), the project site and existing systems have adequate disposal capacity to serve the project. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality. Any earth disturbing activities will be subject to the County's Stormwater Ordinance which complies with State requirements, would include measures to prevent erosion, sediment, and waste materials from entering waterways both during and after any construction activities. By following the above mentioned measures the project does not have the potential to significantly impact water quality and discharge standards. Potential impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The facility's domestic water system is classified as non-transient, non-community and is owned and operated by the winery. Water sources for the project site consist of four groundwater wells, two onsite and two off-site. The Oakville well (aka "Evensen" well) will serve as the main groundwater source for the public water system providing water for the existing winery. The River well (aka Glos Lane well) serves as the backup water supply for the winery. Both the Evensen and Glos Lane wells are located on adjoining properties under control of the winery ownership group. The Oakville Winery well and the McKay well, both located on site serve as the backup water supply for landscape irrigation, however, the McKay well is currently not in use. Vineyard irrigation is provided by treated process wastewater. According to information provided by Bartelt Engineering, the Oakville (Evensen) well was drilled in 1998 and the River (Glos Lane) well was drilled in 1991. The Oakville well produces 100 gallons per minute (gpm) and the River well produces 40 gpm but is limited to 15 gpm with the installation of a flow restrictor.

As noted above, the applicant submitted a Water Availability Analysis (WAA) completed by Bartelt Engineering. The WAA indicated that the projected overall water demand for the project site will be 22.3 AF/YR representing a 1.85 AF/YR decrease of the existing water demand of 24.15 AF/YR. The parcel water demand can be met with the existing project wells. Therefore, the impacts from the project would be less than significant and no further analysis is needed. The project would result in an improvement over existing groundwater conditions because water use is being reduced. Below is a table that details each source of existing and proposed groundwater use:

Usage Type	Existing Usage	Proposed Usage
Vineyard		
Irrigation (only)	10.0	10.0
Heat Protection	5.0	5.0
Frost Protection (Fans)	0	0
Winery		
Process	15.35	23.6
Domestic - Employees/Visitors And Landscaping	2.0	4.0
Recycled Process Wastewater	-8.2	-20.3
<b>Net Use (Acre-ft per Year)</b>	<b>24.15</b>	<b>22.3</b>

The estimated groundwater demand of 22.3 AF/YR, represents a decrease of 1.85 AF/YR over the existing condition. 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 slight decrease on the demand of ground water supplies and therefore would not interfere with groundwater recharge or lowering of the local groundwater level.

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

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

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

- 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 grading or building permits 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 preliminary grading and drainage plan has been reviewed by the Engineering Division. 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. Portions of the site are within the boundaries of the 100 and 500 year flood hazard boundaries and within the Conn dam inundation area. Any new construction will be required to obtain a floodplain management permit pursuant to Chapter 16.04 of the Napa County Code. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows.

- e. The proposed project would not conflict with a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management 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/b. The project would not result in the division of an established community. The project complies with the Napa County Code and all other applicable regulations. The subject parcel is located in the AP zoning district, which allow 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.

Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-1 of the 2008 General Plan states that the County shall, “preserve existing agricultural land uses and plan for agriculture and related activities as the primary land uses in Napa County.” The property’s General Plan land use designation is AR 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 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...).

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. The project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during construction of the water storage tanks, wastewater pretreatment system, and minor roadway widening. Construction activities would be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. As such, the project would not result in potentially significant temporary construction noise impacts or operational impacts. Because the nearest residence not associated with the winery is approximately 528 feet to the east of the proposed water tank and wastewater pretreatment system area, there is a low potential for impacts related to construction noise to result in a significant impact. Further, construction activities would occur during the period of 7am-7pm on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity. All construction activities would be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). The proposed project would not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts. Standard condition of approval 7.3 identified below would require construction activities to be limited to daylight hours, vehicles to be muffled, and backup alarms adjusted to the lowest allowable levels. Impacts would be less than significant.

Additional regulations contained within County Code Chapter 8.16 establish exterior noise criteria for various land uses in the County. As described in Project Setting, above, land uses that surround the proposed project site are predominantly agricultural (vineyard and winery) but include low density residential 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 the applicant proposes to conduct events. Noise impacts of the proposed project would be considered bothersome and potentially significant if sound generated by it had the effect of exceeding the standards in County Code more than 50 percent of the time (i.e., more than 50 decibels for more than 30 minutes in an hour for a residential use). Noise from winery operations is generally limited and intermittent, meaning the sound level can vary during the day and over the course of the year, depending on the activities at the winery. The primary noise-generating activities are equipment associated with wineries including refrigeration equipment, bottling equipment, barrel washing, de-stemmers and press activities occurring during the harvest crush season, delivery trucks, and other vehicles. The Napa County General Plan EIR indicates the average, or equivalent, sound level (Leq) for winery activities is 51dBA in the

morning and 41dBA in the afternoon. Audibility of a new noise source and/or increase in noise levels within recognized acceptable limits are not usually considered to be significant noise impacts, but these concerns should be addressed and considered in the planning and environmental review processes. Typical winery operations would occur between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. (excluding harvest) with marketing events generally occurring between 7:00 AM and 10:00 PM.

The proposed production increase request was not accompanied by a request to change or extend the hours of operation of the winery or increase visitation as entitled. Thus, while there might be a minor increase in noise generated by vehicles used for shipment of the increased volume of fruit and wine, noise generated by the winery operations would continue to fall within previously-analyzed hours of the day, within a 12-hour window between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., excluding harvest. Without any physical changes to the winery production structures, the separation of the winery buildings from the closest residential structures to the east would continue to exceed 500 feet.

7.3. CONSTRUCTION NOISE

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

- c. The proposed winery would not expose people to excessive noise levels associated with air traffic. No private landing facility is proposed with the requested modification, and the winery is neither within the boundaries of an airport land use compatibility planning area nor within two miles of any public or private airport or airstrip.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. Proposed staffing for the project includes increasing the number of full and part-time employees from 77 to 120 as part of this project. The Association of Bay Area Governments' *Projections 2003* figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase some 23% by the year 2030 (*Napa County Baseline Data Report*, November 30, 2005). Additionally, the County's *Baseline Data Report* indicates that total housing units currently programmed in county and municipal housing elements exceed ABAG growth projections by approximately 15%. The additional full and part-time employees which are part of this project could lead to minor population growth in Napa County. Relative to the County's projected low to moderate growth rate and overall adequate programmed housing supply that population growth does not rise to a level of environmental significance. In addition, the project would be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs.

Cumulative impacts related to population and housing balance were identified in the 2008 General Plan EIR. As set forth in Government Code §65580, the County of Napa must facilitate the improvement and development of housing to make adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community. Similarly, CEQA recognizes the importance of balancing the prevention of

environment damage with the provision of a “decent home and satisfying living environment for every Californian.” (See Public Resources Code §21000(g).) The 2008 General Plan sets forth the County’s long-range plan for meeting regional housing needs, during the present and future housing cycles, while balancing environmental, economic, and fiscal factors and community goals. The policies and programs identified in the General Plan Housing Element function, in combination with the County’s housing impact mitigation fee, to ensure adequate cumulative volume and diversity of housing. Cumulative impacts on the local and regional population and housing balance would be less than significant.

The proposed use permit modification would facilitate ongoing operation of an existing winery. Other than new on-site water storage tanks, a wastewater pretreatment system, and minor on-site roadway improvements, no new infrastructure is proposed that might induce growth by extending service outside of the boundaries of any of the winery owner’s properties.

- 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 additional demand placed on existing services as a result of the proposed project would be minimal. The property is located within the service areas of both the Napa County Sheriff’s Department as well as the Napa County Fire Department. The proposed winery improvements, if approved, would be inspected by County building inspectors and fire officials in order to ensure that construction occurs in accordance with current Building and Fire Codes applicable at the time of submittal of any requisite building permit application. If approved, the requested use permit modification would facilitate the continued operation of an existing winery. The proposed project scope does not include construction of any new residential units nor accompanying introduction of new residents that would utilize existing parks or potentially increase student enrollment in schools located in the area of the winery. School impact fees, which assist local school districts with capacity building measures, would be levied pursuant to building



permit submittal. No new parks or other public recreational amenities or institutions are proposed to be built with the proposed use permit. Impacts to public services would be less than significant. Also see discussion under Section XV, below.

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/b. The proposed project is a request for modification to the existing entitlements allowing continued operation of the winery. The proposal would increase the number of employees at the winery, some of whom might visit recreational facilities in the area during breaks, before or after work. However, given that the purpose of employees' trips are to and from the winery as the primary destination, such visits to area recreational facilities are anticipated to be infrequent and would not drastically accelerate the deterioration of recreational amenities. No new parks or other public recreational amenities are proposed to be built with the proposed winery.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

The site is located on the east side of State Route 29 (SR 29), approximately 900 feet south of Bella Oaks Lane at 8300 St. Helena Highway. Access to the winery is from an existing driveway on SR 29 at the north end of the site. A two-way-left-turn-lane (TWLTL) is present on SR-29 along the project frontage extending from Bella Oaks Lane to approximately 200-feet past the Cakebread Cellars Winery driveway. The TWLTL on SR-29 allows motorists and trucks to gain access to the Winery and/or merge onto SR-29 from the Winery without delaying through-traffic on SR-29. The applicant has submitted a traffic study *Focused Traffic Analysis for the Cakebread Cellars Use Modification Project*, prepared by GHD, dated June 2020, which analyzes existing and proposed traffic conditions and provides the basis for this analysis. The current proposal includes increasing the production capacity of the winery from 500,000 gallons per year to 800,000 gallons per year and increasing the number of full and part time employees from 77 to 120, and other infrastructure improvements. There is no proposed increase to visitation.

- a. 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. As noted above, the applicant submitted a traffic impact study, prepared by GHD, dated June 2020, with the winery use permit modification application submittal. GHD collected vehicle counts for the traffic analysis between 3:00 and 6:00 PM on a Friday and between noon and 4:00 PM on a Saturday on May 31, and June 1, 2019 and November 15 and 16, 2019. Based on the traffic counts, peak hour traffic flows occur between 4:00 and 5:00 PM on a weekday and between 1:45 and 2:45 PM on Saturday. The counts taken in November were significantly higher than those from May/June due to a very late harvest so a seasonal adjustment factor was not applied. According to the traffic study the project is expected to generate 96 new daily trips during the weekday and 25 new trips during the weekday PM peak and Saturday mid-day peak as a result of the increased number of employees and production.

Three intersections along State Route 29 (SR-29) at Rutherford Road, Cakebread Cellars Winery driveway, and Oakville Cross Road-Walnut Lane were evaluated for existing and future operating conditions with and without the proposed project. In addition, the arterial segments of State Route 29 south of the project driveway as well as Rutherford Road and Oakville Cross Road-Walnut Lane were evaluated for peak hour weekday and weekend operating conditions. All three intersections with SR 29 are controlled by a stop sign on the minor street and driveway approach.

According to the study, for informational purposes, the SR-29/Rutherford Road and SR-29/Oakville Cross Road-Walnut Lane intersections currently operate at an unacceptable service level during both peak periods. The winery driveway operates at an acceptable level during both peak periods. The SR-29 arterial segment also operates at an unacceptable service level during both peak periods. The Rutherford Road and Oakville Cross Road segments operate acceptably during both peak periods. Both the SR-29/Rutherford Road and SR-29/Oakville Cross Road-Walnut Lane intersections would qualify for signalization under peak hours warrants. The peak hour warrant(s) are one of several standards to help determine if installation of a traffic signal is appropriate. Qualifying for signalization using the peak hour warrants does not necessarily mean a signal should be installed. The decision to install a traffic signal should be based on further studies utilizing additional warrants as presented in the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. However, traffic added to all three intersections and the road segments would not exceed the level of significance under near-term and future conditions. Again, the thresholds of significance and potential impacts are related to LOS, which is no longer considered an environmental impact. 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 roadway system would be less than significant.

- b. As proposed, the project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation. There are no bus stops within walking distance of the project site. There are existing Class II bicycle facilities (on-street or highway bike lane) on SR 29 in the vicinity of the project. The winery provides bicycle racks for employees and visitors.
- 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 (Draft 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 this 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.

Napa County is currently in the process of establishing a threshold for minimum vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for various land uses. The "winery" project category does not fall neatly into traditional land use categories and is a hybrid land use combining VMT characteristics of agriculture and office uses. Until minimum VMT thresholds are established by the County for winery projects, a qualitative review of proposed project trips has been conducted by the project traffic consultant with guidance from the *California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA, December 2018*. The Advisory indicates that the VMT metric supports three statutory goals: "the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and diversity of land uses." The Advisory goes on to state that "achieving 15 percent lower per employee (office) VMT than existing development is both generally achievable and is supported by evidence that connects this level of reduction to the State's emissions goals." With regard to the proposed Cakebread Cellars Winery Use Modification project, the Technical Advisory provides "screening thresholds" for small projects as follows:

"Many local agencies have developed screening thresholds to indicate when detailed analysis is needed. Absent substantial evidence indicating that a project would generate a potentially significant level of VMT, or inconsistency with a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) or general plan, projects that generate or attract fewer than 110 trips per day generally may be assumed to cause a less-than-significant transportation impact."

Since the proposed project's primary trip generator is employment it would tend to mimic an office development; with employees arriving in the morning and leaving during the PM peak commute period. However, it is noted that new project trips associated with expanded wine production activities would typically occur during off-peak or non-peak hours. It is not unreasonable to suggest that specific proposed project TDM measures (discussed below) would help to reduce overall employee VMT towards the 15% threshold. However, it is also likely the proposed project would be exempt from VMT threshold reductions since it is only generating 96 net new daily trips as a result of increased employment and production uses.

Over the last five years, the winery has implemented a number of TDM measures to reduce overall employee trips to/from the Winery and to encourage commuter traffic goals, reduce the Winery's overall carbon footprint, and to bring awareness and behavioral changes to both employees and the surrounding community. Some of these measures include: an employee carpool incentive program; an employee pre-tax benefit program; an emergency ride home program; and participation in Solano-Napa commuter programs and Napa Forward program. Additional measures/activities are included in Section 7 of the traffic study. The applicant's implementation of a TDM program demonstrates the winery's efforts to reduce vehicle miles traveled. A project condition of approval will be included that memorializes winery's TDM program and requires submittal of the TDM program to the County for review. The condition of approval will also include a requirement to provide an annual report to the County regarding the effectiveness of the TDM measures. The project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b). Impacts would be less than significant.

- d/e. The primary access to the site is from an existing driveway entrance near the Rutherford winery building in the northern portion of the property. A two-way-left-turn-lane (TWLTL) is present on SR-29 along the project frontage extending from Bella Oaks Lane to approximately 200-feet past the Cakebread Cellars Winery driveway. No changes are proposed to the primary entrance or on-site roadway network. The primary driveway was designed to comply with all County standards including emergency vehicle access. Sight lines along SR 29 exceed Caltrans standards based on the posted speed limits and speeds observed as part of the traffic analysis. As noted above, the request includes an exception to the Napa County Road & Street Standards from the commercial driveway width standard (20.0 foot wide driveway) in four separate locations throughout the existing driveway network, at an existing bridge, an existing tree, and two other portions of the existing access road near existing buildings. The Engineering Division has reviewed and supports the exception request.
- f. There are currently a total of 131 parking spaces provided on site including spaces for employees, visitors and limousines. Developers of new or expanded land uses are required to provide adequate parking or demonstrate that adequate parking exists to meet their anticipated parking demand. Excess parking that could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or commercial activity exceeding the site's capacity is discouraged. In order to maximize parking efficiency, parking spaces are not specifically reserved for visitors or employees. Typically, there are more employees on-site during the weekdays with fewer visitors and vice-versa on the weekends. Shared parking serves to provide adequate parking supply while reducing the project's on-site parking footprint.

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:

a/b. On July 17, 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. A response was received from the Yoche Dehe Wintun Nation stating that the project site is not within their aboriginal territories and have no comments. No other comments were received and the consultation period closed on August 31, 2020.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-c. The project would not require the 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. The primary and backup water supply is provided by four existing wells, although one well is currently not in use. Vineyard irrigation is provided by recycled process wastewater. As noted above, the applicant submitted a Water Availability Analysis (WAA) completed by Bartelt Engineering showing the projected overall water demand for the project site of 22.3 AF/YR representing a 1.85 AF/YR decrease of the existing water demand of 24.15 AF/YR. The parcel water demand can be met with the existing wells. Similarly, all of the wastewater generated by the winery (process wastewater and sanitary wastewater) would be treated on-site using existing treatment systems. With water and wastewater treatment facilities provided on-site, the proposed project requires no determination of service or will-serve letters from water or wastewater treatment service providers.
- d/e. Non-recyclable and non-organic waste generated on the property is collected by Napa Recycling and Waste Services (NRWS) and ultimately deposited at the Keller Canyon Landfill (located in unincorporated eastern Contra Costa County), which, having reached roughly 15 percent of its capacity in the first 12 years of its approximated 50 years of operation (which began in 1992), and extrapolating that same rate of material to date, has adequate capacity remaining to accommodate any non-recyclable and non-organic waste generated from the proposed winery. Beginning in 2016, all establishments that would generate organic waste (such as food waste from wine/food pairings or food service at the proposed winery's marketing events) are required to participate in NRWS's food composting program, as a means to support efforts to achieve State mandates for reductions of greenhouse gas emissions generated from decomposition of material deposited into landfills.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Due to slope, prevailing winds and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-d. The proposed project is located within the local responsibility area. There are no project features that would substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project site is generally flat with slopes ranging from 0-5% and is located on the valley floor with access from State Route 29. There are no existing overhead power lines along the highway. Water storage tanks for fire suppression will be provided on site. The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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)?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a. The site has been previously disturbed and does not contain any known listed plant or animal species. The project will not 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, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. All potential biological related impacts would be less than significant. As identified in Section V above, no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, sites of unique geological features have been identified within the project site. No historic or prehistoric resources are anticipated to be affected by the proposed project nor will the proposed project eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. In the event archaeological artifacts are found, a standard condition of approval and mitigation measure would be incorporated into the project. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology, and traffic impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The analysis determined that all potential impacts were less than significant and would not contribute significantly to cumulative impacts. The project does not propose new development that would have a significant impact on the environment or substantially change the existing conditions. With the imposition of standard and project specific conditions of approval, the project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- c. There are no schools or hospitals housing sensitive receptors within a quarter-mile of the project site. Noise from construction that would occur with construction and installation of the proposed site improvements would be temporary, would be limited to day time hours, and would be subject to best management practices intended to limit fugitive dust and protect stormwater quality. Ongoing operations of the winery are also anticipated to have less than significant noise impacts on nearby residences due to distance between those residences and the proposed tasting room patio and partially enclosed work area.

Mitigation Measures: None required.