

“D”

Initial Study/Negative Declaration

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

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated January 2019)

1. **Project Title:** Signorello Estate Winery, Use Permit Modification (P19-00198-MOD)
2. **Property Owner:** Raymond Signorello, 4500 Silverado Trail, Napa, CA 94558
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 56.59 acre property on the east side of Silverado Trail, approximately 300 feet south of Oak Knoll Avenue. 4500 Silverado Trail, Napa. APN: 039-400-080.
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Donna Oldford, Plans4Wine, 2620 Pinot Way, St. Helena, CA 94574
6. **General Plan description:** Agricultural Resource/Agriculture Watershed & Open Space
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Preserve
8. **Background/Project History:**

On May 17, 1980, the Planning Commission approved a use permit (file #U-587980) to establish a 20,000 gallon per year winery within an 8,000 s.f. building with a 2,413 s.f. covered outdoor crush pad. The approval included four (4) full-time, 20 parking spaces, and a left-turn lane on Silverado Trail. Tours and tastings were allowed by appointment with a maximum of 20 visitors per day and 120 visitors per week. On August 6, 1985, a modification to #U-587980 was approved to allow a second story within the approved 8,000 s.f. building

In 2002 building permit #B02-00377 was approved to allow living area on the second floor of the winery building.

On July 16, 2003, the Planning Commission approved a use permit modification (file #02269-MOD) to add a 325 s.f. kitchen and storage area within the existing winery building and to add a marketing plan with 12 events per year (maximum of two per month) for up to 20 guests at each event and two events per year during auction week, one for up to 80 guests (on Thursday or Friday, luncheon or dinner) and one with up to 175 guests (an open house on Sunday.)

On March 28, 2019, the Director approved a use permit modification (file #P18-00359-MOD) to reconstruct and relocate the winery building and associated improvements lost as a result of the 2017 Napa fires. The approval included construction of a one-story 7,969 s.f. winery building; a 1,440 s.f. covered crush pad; enclosed mechanical and electrical rooms; a fenced outdoor mechanical yard; a covered trash enclosure, fire pump room and water treatment room with a fenced area for a transformer; two 10,000 gallon water storage tanks; and, on-site parking for 10 vehicles. The winery was relocated to the south of its former location, centered on the existing driveway. No changes to production, visitors or number of employees were proposed or approved.

On February 21, 2020, a building permit (B18-01473) was approved to allow the construction of a new 8,886 s.f. two-story structure with storage/garage on the first floor and a residence on the second floor to replace the structure lost in the 2017 Napa fire. The structure is proposed in the same location as the original winery building with living area on the second floor.
9. **Description of Project:**

Approval of Use Permit Major Modification to an existing 20,000 gallon per year winery to modify previous project approval to allow the following:

 - (a) increase in maximum annual permitted wine production from 20,000 to 50,000 gallons;
 - (b) increase daily tours and tastings by appointment from 20 visitors per day, 120 visitors per week (6,240 visitors per year), to 60 visitors per day, 350 visitors per week (18,200 visitors per year);

- (c) replace the existing marketing plan (14 events per year with up to 395 guests) to allow two (2) events per month with up to 24 guests at each event, two (2) events per month with up to 40 guests at each event, three (3) events per year with up to 75 guests at each event, and two (2) events per year with 125 persons at each event (53 events per year for up to 2,011 guests). No separate tours and tastings will occur on the same day as the two events with up to 125 guests;
- (d) construction of 15,906 s.f. of cave area;
- (e) conversion of 3,155 s.f. of the first floor of the two-story residence/storage building;
- (f) provide 17 on-site parking spaces for the winery;
- (g) increase employees from four (4) full-time to a total 20 full and part time employees;
- (h) upgraded water and wastewater treatment systems; and,
- (i) driveway improvements, modify the existing entry gate, and landscape improvements.

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

The 56.59 acre project site is located on the east side of Silverado Trail, approximately 300 feet south of Oak Knoll Avenue. The project site is currently developed with an agricultural barn and other outbuildings, and approximately 35 acres of vines. The site also includes the remnants of the original winery and residence and other improvements not destroyed in the 2017 fires. The water source for the winery, vineyards and home are from two existing onsite wells. Domestic and process wastewater are treated and dispersed on-site. Access to the site is provided by an existing driveway connection from Silverado Trail. The front half of the site, from Silverado Trail to the development area, is relatively flat ($\pm 0-7\%$ slope), and then gently slopes up to a small knoll on the property where an agricultural building is located. Elevations on the property range from approximately 60 feet above mean sea level (msl) near the street frontage to approximately 260 feet above msl at the top of the knoll before descending to approximately 170 feet above msl at the rear (east) property line.

Surrounding land uses are primarily vineyards, wineries, and residences. Properties in the vicinity of the project site range in size between 2.0 and 31 acres. The nearest residence to the original winery building is approximately 305 feet to the north. The nearest winery, James Cole Winery, is located approximately 660 feet to the west of the project site. Dariosh Winery is located approximately 1,200 feet south of the project site.

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, grading permits and encroachment 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 October 8, 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 Middletown Rancheria requesting consultation. Staff met with a representative of the Middletown Rancheria on November 18, 2020, at the project site to discuss any issues or concerns regarding the proposed project. See section XVIII of this initial study.

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

November 23, 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 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 had been previously development with a two-story building (winery on the first floor and a residence above), vineyards, and agricultural buildings. As noted above, the building was destroyed in the 2017 Napa fires. A building permit has been issued to construct a new two-story building to replace the building that was destroyed in the same location as the previous building. This request would allow the conversion of the first floor of the approved two-story building to winery uses, with a residence above, as was the case prior to the 2017 fires. In addition, a second winery building was previously approved to the south of the original winery building. Neither building is currently under construction (as of date of publication). 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 was previously developed with a winery, with a residence above, and is currently developed with several agricultural buildings, the proposed improvements may result in the installation of additional lighting that may have the potential to impact nighttime views. The project is in an area that has a certain amount of existing nighttime lighting, but the installation of new sources of nighttime lights may affect nighttime views. Pursuant to Napa County's standard 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. ¹ Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the 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 vineyards planted on the western portion of the property (between the winery development area and Silverado Trail) as "Farmland of Statewide Importance" and the vineyards planted immediately in front of the original winery site and behind the winery development area as "Unique Farmland." The winery development area and balance of the property is designated as "grazing" 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. No vines are proposed to be removed to facilitate construction of the proposed project. 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 Agricultural Preserve (AP) and the General Plan land use designation of the property is Agricultural Resource and Agriculture Watershed & Open Space. 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

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

Plan Policies AG/LU-20 and AG/LU-21 also identify processing of agricultural products (grape crushing/winemaking) as a use that is consistent with the General Plan land use designations. There is not a Williamson Act contract that is applicable to this property.

- c/d. The project site is zoned AP, which allows wineries upon grant of a use permit. The proposed project is located in an area of the site that had been previously developed. The site is also developed with vineyards and other improvements. No vines are proposed to be removed to accommodate the proposal. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Sensitive Biotic Oak woodlands, Riparian Woodland forest, and Coniferous forest) the proposed development is located in a previously disturbed area and is not located within an area classified as containing sensitive biotic communities. The undeveloped areas of the site, generally located between the winery development area and the agricultural buildings and vineyards east of the winery development, are classified as including sensitive biotic communities. However, no development is proposed within these areas. 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 parcel’s AP 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_{2.5}, are the major regional air pollutants of concern in the San Francisco Bay Area. Ozone is primarily a problem in the summer, and fine particle pollution in the winter. In Napa County, ozone rarely exceeds health standards, but PM_{2.5} occasionally does reach unhealthy concentrations. There are multiple reasons for PM_{2.5} exceedances in Napa County. First, much of the county is wind-sheltered, which tends to trap PM_{2.5} within the Napa Valley. Second, much of the area is well north of the moderating temperatures of San Pablo Bay and, as a result, Napa County experiences some of the coldest nights in the Bay Area. This leads to greater fireplace use and, in turn, higher PM_{2.5} levels. Finally, in the winter easterly winds often move fine-particle-laden air from the Central Valley to the Carquinez Strait and then into western Solano and southern Napa County (BAAQMD, *In Your Community: Napa County*, April 2016)

The impacts associated with implementation of the project were evaluated consistent with guidance provided by BAAQMD. Ambient air quality standards have been established by state and federal environmental agencies for specific air pollutants most pervasive in urban environments. These pollutants are referred to as criteria air pollutants because the standards established for them were developed to meet specific health and welfare criteria set forth in the enabling legislation. The criteria air pollutants emitted by development, traffic and other activities anticipated under the proposed development include ozone, ozone precursors oxides of nitrogen and reactive organic gases (NO_x and ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), and suspended particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}). Other criteria pollutants, such as lead and sulfur dioxide (SO₂), would not be substantially emitted by the proposed development or traffic, and air quality standards for them are being met throughout the Bay Area.

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

As mentioned above, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Operational-Related Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursors Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. The project includes approximately 5,477 sq. ft. of floor area devoted to hospitality and administrative uses (including 947 sq. ft. of tasting floor area) and approximately 22,278 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_x (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 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 residence is approximately 481 feet northwest of the location of the existing winery building that was destroyed in the 2017 fire. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/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. Most of the site within the proposed development area is disturbed and developed with vineyards, and the previous winery/residence building, parking areas, accessory structures and associated improvements. The proposed modification to the winery use would occur within the previously disturbed areas. No trees, vegetation, or structures are proposed to be removed to accommodate the proposed site improvements. 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), no blue line streams traverse the site and vernal pools and wetlands are not present. All proposed improvements would occur within a previously disturbed area that is not 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. No impacts would occur.
- 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. According to Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Archaeological Resources Layer, historical site, points & lines), no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified within the project site. There is no information in the County's files that would indicate that there is a potential for occurrence of these resources. The site has been previously developed with a winery/residence building, vineyards and agricultural buildings. Development is generally proposed in previously disturbed areas. It is therefore 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 or cave drilling 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 within previously disturbed areas or areas previously approved for development. 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 Haire loam and Hambright rock-Outcrop complex. According to the Napa County GIS Sensitivity Maps (Surficial Deposits layer), the site is underlain by Early or mid-Pleistocene fan or terrace deposits and Pre-Quaternary deposits and bedrock. Based on the Napa County GIS Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the property includes areas generally subject to very low 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 BFK Engineers, dated September 9, 2019. Soils on the property have been determined to be adequate to support the proposed septic improvements including the winery's process waste as well as the proposed number of visitors to the winery.
 - f. No paleontological resources or unique geological features have been identified on the property or were encountered on the property when the previous and 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) develop a functional and legally defensible CAP. On April 13, 2016 the County, as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP, released Final Technical Memorandum #1: 2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016. This initial phase included: i) updating the unincorporated County's community-wide GHG emissions inventory to 2014, and ii) preparing new GHG emissions forecasts for the 2020, 2030, and 2050 horizons. Additional information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or <http://www.countyofnapa.org/CAP/>.

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

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

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

One time "Construction Emissions" associated with the project include: emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area, construction, and construction equipment and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as Equipment Emissions). These emissions also include underground carbon stocks (or Soil carbon) associated with any existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed. As previously stated, this project does not include the construction of any new buildings, but does include the development of a 3,659 sq. ft. uncovered patio, new parking spaces, as well as some driveway and landscaping improvements.

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 5,477 sq. ft. of floor area devoted to hospitality and administrative uses, including 947 sq. ft. of floor area for wine tasting, and approximately 22,278 sq. ft. of floor area devoted to production. 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 CO₂e/yr GHG threshold of significance.

Furthermore, the applicant proposes to incorporate the following additional GHG reduction methods: generation of on-site renewable energy, new vegetation, VMT reduction measures, solar hot water heating, energy conserving lighting, cool roofing, bicycle incentives, use of water efficient fixtures, low impact development, installation of water efficient landscaping; recycling 75% of all waste, composting, implementation of a sustainable purchasing and shipping program, planting shade trees, electric vehicle charging stations, use of recycled materials and a number of other measures as outlined in the application submittal materials.

The proposed project has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds and determined that the project would not exceed the 1,100 MT/yr of CO₂e. GHG Emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the Cal Green Building Code 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 modification to an existing winery that would not be expected to use any substantial quantities of hazardous materials. Therefore, it would not be reasonably foreseeable for the proposed project to create upset or accident conditions that involve the release of hazardous materials into the environments. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the 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 driveway that serves the project has been designed to comply with County standards and access to the building has been designed to accommodate fire apparatus and large trucks. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division and found acceptable as conditioned. Therefore, the design of the project will not negatively impact or hinder emergency vehicle access.
- 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. 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 towns 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-Tulocay (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 the Napa Valley Subbasin of the valley floor and lies partially within the Northeast Napa Management Area. According to the Napa County Groundwater Sustainability Annual Report – Water Year 2019, prepared by LSCE in April 2020, long-term trends in the Napa Subarea have been generally stable with the exception of the a monitoring well in the Northeast Napa Management Area, where groundwater levels have locally declined by about 20 to 30 feet since monitoring began in 2000. However, from 2009 and onward, the monitoring well has generally stabilized and shown an increase in groundwater elevation, despite showing responses to dry years. As part of increased attention on the northeast portion of the Napa Subarea, three additional monitoring wells, have been added to the County's monitoring networks in the area in recent years.

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. 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 Water Availability Analysis (WAA), dated April 27, 2020, was prepared by Richard C. Slade & Associates LLC (RCS), to determine the estimated water use of the existing development, the proposed project and water availability. There are two existing wells on the project site that will serve

the winery, residence, and vineyards. Generally, since the groundwater extraction for the winery, residence, and vineyards would be from wells located on the Valley Floor area, the Valley Floor screening criteria of one acre-foot of water per acre of land will be used for the 56.59 acre property generating a water use availability of 56.59 acre-feet per year. However, properties that lie within the Northeast Napa Management Area, east of the Napa River, generally require additional review or parcel specific water use criteria based upon a Tier 2 analysis unless it can be shown that the project results in a reduction of water use. As noted above, the project site lies partially within the Northeast Napa Management Area. According to the analysis conducted by Slade, the calculated groundwater recharge rate for the property is 18.2 acre-feet per year.

a/b. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements nor substantially deplete local groundwater supplies. According to the Septic Feasibility Report prepared by BFK Engineers, dated September 9, 2019, 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.

The facility's domestic water system is classified as a transient, non-community public water system and is owned and operated by the winery. Water sources for the project site consist of two groundwater wells. One well (Domestic well) will serve as the groundwater source for the public water system providing water for the winery and residence. The second well (Agricultural well) is used as the groundwater source for the vineyards and fire protection. A minimum 50-foot seal depth is required for wells to be sued for public supply purposes per Nap county and State requirements. According to the WAA prepared by RCS, the Domestic well was constructed in 2019, has a depth of 600-feet with a 60-foot concrete seal. The well was not equipped with a pump at the time of the WAA, therefore no pump rate data is available. The Agricultural well was constructed in 1979, has a depth of 670 feet with a 25-foot seal, and a yield of 118 gpm for a 5.5 hour test. Prior to the 2017 Napa fires, water was supplied to the project site by the Agricultural well.

As noted above, the applicant submitted a Water Availability Analysis (WAA) completed by RCS. The WAA indicated that the projected overall water demand for the project site will be 16.12 AF/YR representing a 2.48 AF/YR increase of the existing water demand of 13.64 AF/YR. The parcel water demand can be met with the existing project well. Therefore, the impacts from the project would be less than significant and no further analysis is needed. Below is a table that details each source of existing and proposed groundwater use:

Usage Type	Existing ¹ Usage	Proposed Usage
Vineyard Irrigation	12.3	12.3
Winery		
Process/Domestic	1.0	1.07
Commercial Kitchen	-	0.81
Landscaping/pool	-	0.95
Residential Water Use	0.34	0.99
Net Use (Acre-ft per Year)	13.64	16.12

¹. Existing water use estimates are based on information submitted as part of use permit modification file #02269.

The estimated groundwater demand of 16.12 AF/YR, represents an increase of 2.48 AF/YR over the existing condition and is below the groundwater recharge rate of 18.2 AF/YR for the project site noted above. The winery, as part of its entitlement would include the County's standard condition of approval 4.9, below, requiring well monitoring as well as the potential to modify/alter permitted uses on site should groundwater resources become insufficient to supply the use.

4.9 GROUND WATER MANAGEMENT - WELLS

This condition is implemented jointly by the Public Works and PBES Departments:

The permittee shall be required (at the permittee's expense) to record well monitoring data (specifically, static water level no less than quarterly, and the volume of water no less than monthly). Such data will be provided to the County, if the PBES Director determines that substantial evidence¹ indicates that water usage at the winery is affecting, or would potentially affect, groundwater supplies or nearby wells. If data indicates the need for additional monitoring, and if the applicant is unable to secure monitoring access to neighboring wells, onsite monitoring wells may need to be established to gauge potential impacts on the groundwater resource utilized for the project. Water usage shall be minimized by use of best available control technology and best water management conservation practices.

In order to support the County's groundwater monitoring program, well monitoring data as discussed above will be provided to the County if the Director of Public Works determines that such data could be useful in supporting the County's groundwater monitoring program. The project well will be made available for inclusion in the groundwater monitoring network if the Director

of Public Works determines that the well could be useful in supporting the program.

In the event that changed circumstances or significant new information provide substantial evidence¹ that the groundwater system referenced in the Use Permit would significantly affect the groundwater basin, the PBES Director shall be authorized to recommend additional reasonable conditions on the permittee, or revocation of this permit, as necessary to meet the requirements of the County Code and to protect public health, safety, and welfare.

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

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

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

The proposed project would result in an increase on the demand of ground water supplies. Generally, a well interference analysis is conducted as part of a Tier 2 analysis to review the project's potential impacts on neighboring wells within 500 feet from the property wells. According to the WAA, there are no wells on neighboring properties within 500 feet of the two wells on the project site. The Tier 2 well interference criterion is presumptively met if there are no non-project wells located within 500 feet of the project well.

- 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. A small portion of the vineyard in the northwest corner of the property is within 500 year flood hazard boundary. However, the winery development area lies outside both the 100 and 500 year flood hazard boundaries. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. No impacts would occur.
- 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 designations are AR (western portion including the winery development area) and AWOS (eastern portion) which allow "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 project. 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 is approximately 305 feet north of the hospitality building, which will be located within the footprint of the original winery building, 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. Conditions of approval identified below would require construction activities to be limited to daylight hours, vehicles to be muffled, and backup alarms adjusted to the lowest allowable levels. Impacts would be less than significant.

7.3. CONSTRUCTION NOISE

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

The proposed project involves increasing the maximum annual permitted wine production from 20,000 to 50,000 gallons, increasing the number of daily visitors from 20 to 60 and changes to the approved marketing program to allow two (2) events per month with up to 24 guests at each event, two (2) events per month with up to 40 guests at each event, three (3) events per year with up to 75 guests at each event, and two (2) events per year with 125 persons at each event.

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 41 dBA 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 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. (excluding harvest) with marketing events generally occurring between 11:00 AM and 10:00 PM.

The nearest off-site residence in proximity to the original winery building, that will include hospitality uses, is approximately 305 feet to the north. Noise sampling performed under County authority (RGD Acoustics, November 16, 2015), as part of the analysis for the Bell Winery use permit modification (P13-00055), measured sound from an 85-person event using a meter placed 123 feet from the sound source (event). Measurements taken from that sound meter indicated that sound from the event exceeded 56 decibels 50 percent of the time. The studied event had fewer attendees than the largest, 125-person event proposed by the applicant, and so the noise level measured from the Bell Winery event is adjusted upward by two decibels (based on a standard rate of 3 dB per doubling of number of noise sources) to an estimated 58 decibels exceeded 50 percent of the time, to estimate the noise level from the largest marketing event of the proposed project. Even with adjustment, these levels are considered to be conservative given that the Bell Winery event had a live music act included in its event, and there would be no outdoor amplified sound at the winery. The noise study further states that sound levels are reduced with distance in accordance with the "inverse square law", which yields a six (6) dB sound reduction for each doubling of the distance from the source. Thus, using the Bell Winery study as a model, and applying a six-decibel reduction per doubling of distance from the noise source, it is anticipated that exterior noise experienced at the nearest residence 305 feet to the north of the winery hospitality building which is located where the original building was located (estimated 49 decibels for half of the event duration) would not exceed the County Code standard of 50 decibels during 50 percent of daytime hours.

Under the proposed project, the largest event that would occur on the parcel would have an attendance of no more than 125 people, and all events would end by 10:00 p.m., with clean-up conducted afterwards. Continuing enforcement of Napa County's Noise Ordinance by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff, including the prohibition against amplified music, should further ensure that marketing events and other winery activities do not create a significant noise impact. Events and non-amplified music, excluding quiet clean-up are required to finish by 10:00 p.m. Amplified music or sound systems would not be permitted for outdoor events as identified in standard Condition of Approval 4.10 below. Temporary events would be subject to County Code Chapter 5.36 which regulates proposed temporary events. The proposed project would not result in long-term significant permanent noise impacts.

4.10 *AMPLIFIED MUSIC*

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

- 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:

- b. Proposed staffing for the project includes increasing the number of employees from four full-time to a total of 20 full and part time

employees. 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 16 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 parking areas, 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 and expansion of an existing winery on-site of existing vineyards. 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 Use Permit allowing operation of the winery. The proposal would increase the number of employees at the winery and visitors to the property, some of whom might visit recreational facilities in the area during breaks, before or after work, or on the way to or from other wineries. However, given that the purpose of employees' and guests' 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 the park 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

pedestrian facilities?

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 Silverado Trail, approximately 300 feet south of Oak Knoll Avenue at 4500 Silverado Trail. Access to the winery is from an existing driveway on Silverado Trail at the approximate mid-point of the property. A two-way-left-turn-lane (TWLTL) is present on Silverado Trail along a portion of the project frontage extending beyond either side of the driveway. The TWLTL allows motorists and trucks to gain access to the Winery and/or merge onto Silverado Trail from the Winery without delaying through-traffic on Silverado Trail. The applicant has submitted a traffic study for the project, prepared by Crane Transportation Group (CTG), dated April 19, 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 20,000 gallons per year to 50,000 gallons per year and increasing the number of full and part time employees from four (4) to 20, increasing daily tours and tastings by appointment from 20 visitors per day, 120 visitors per week, to 60 visitors per day, 350 visitors per week, and replacing the existing marketing plan to allow two (2) events per month with up to 24 guests at each event, two (2) events per month with up to 40 guests at each event, three (3) events per year with up to 75 guests at each event, and two (2) events per year with 125 persons at each event. No separate tours and tastings will occur on the same day as the two events with up to 125 guests;

- 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 CTG, dated April 29, 2020, with the winery use permit modification application submittal. CTG collected vehicle counts for the traffic analysis between 2:00 and 6:00 PM on two Fridays and between noon and 6:00 PM on two Saturdays in September and October 2019, at Silverado Trail intersections with Oak Knoll Avenue, Trancas Street, and the project driveway. Based on the traffic counts, peak hour traffic flows occur between 3:15 and 4:15 on Friday and between 4:45 and 5:45 PM on Saturday. According to the traffic study the project is expected to generate 78 new daily trips during the weekday, 14 during the harvest PM peak hour, and 60 new daily trips during on Saturday, 15 during the PM peak hour during harvest, as a result of the project.

Three intersections along Silverado Trail at Oak Knoll Avenue, the project driveway and Trancas Street were evaluated for existing and future operating conditions with and without the proposed project. In addition, Silverado Trail was evaluated for peak hour weekday and weekend operating conditions. The Oak Knoll Avenue approach to Silverado Trail is stop sign controlled, the project does not have a stop sign, but motorist stop prior to accessing Silverado Trail. The Silverado Trail/Trancas intersection is signalized. Per the County's Circulation Element, in general, the County seeks to maintain Level of Service (LOS) D on arterial roadways and at signalized intersections, as the service level that best aligns with the County's desire to balance its rural character with the needs of supporting economic vitality and growth. However, the Circulation Element also identifies roadway segments where there are exceptions to the LOS D standard, including Silverado Trail between State Route 128 and Yountville Cross Road, where LOS E is considered acceptable.

According to the study, for informational purposes, all three study intersections and the Silverado Trail arterial segment currently operate at acceptable service levels, between LOS B and E, during both peak periods. The Silverado Trail/Oak Knoll Avenue intersection would qualify for signalization under peak hours warrants with or without project traffic. 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 segment would not exceed the level of significance under near-term and future conditions, except for Silverado Trail north of Trancas Street during the Friday

PM peak hour. 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 Silverado Trail in the vicinity of the project. The winery will provide 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, guidance may be taken from by 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 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."

According to the traffic study, the winery intends to develop a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan and appoint a TDM coordinator to achieve the goals mentioned above. It is not unreasonable to suggest that specific project TDM measures 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 78 net new daily weekday trips as a result of the proposed project.

A project condition of approval will be included that 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 project site includes an existing driveway on Silverado Trail. A two-way-left-turn-lane (TWLTL) is present on Silverado Trail along the project frontage. The primary driveway has been designed to comply with all County standards including emergency vehicle access. Sight lines along Silverado Trail exceed Caltrans standards based on the posted speed limits and speeds observed as part of the traffic analysis. The project will not result in any changes to levels of service or cause any new safety risks.
- f. 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. A total of 17 parking spaces for the winery are proposed on-site based on the winery's business plan, visitation, and employment levels. The proposed parking spaces would be located in previously disturbed areas of the site. Parking for the larger marketing events will be off-site with shuttle service to the winery. No parking is proposed or will be permitted within the right-of-way of Silverado Trail.

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

Discussion:

- a. The project site is currently developed with an agricultural barn and other outbuildings. The site also includes the remnants of the original winery and residence and other improvements not destroyed in the 2017 fires. None of the existing structures, or the structure destroyed by the 2017 fires, are listed in a local, state or federal register of historic resources.
- b. As noted above, on October 8, 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 Middletown Rancheria requesting consultation. Staff met with a representative of the Middletown Rancheria on November 18, 2020, at the project site to discuss any issues or concerns regarding the proposed project.

Previous ground disturbance has occurred to remove native vegetation and grade the site to accommodate construction of the winery/residence (since destroyed in the 2017 fires), vineyard, agricultural buildings, parking, driveways and utilities. There is no documentation of cultural resources discovered during these construction activities. If the project is approved and any 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 County's standard condition of approval referenced in section V, above.

In addition to the County's standard condition, and in an effort to further protect potential Native American resources that might be discovered during new construction activities for this project, additional measures developed in consultation with the Middletown Rancheria representative during the site visit, are recommended for inclusion as conditions of project approval. The additional measures include notifying the Middletown Rancheria prior to any earth disturbing activities so a tribal representative can provide training to construction crews of the potential presence of Native American resources on the property, the potential types of resource that could be found on-site, and the procedures to follow in the event of discovery of such resources.

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. An existing well, constructed at the site in 2019, is proposed as the project's water source. There is also another well on-site that provides water for the vineyard and fire protection. As noted above, the applicant submitted a Water Availability Analysis (WAA) completed by RCS showing the projected overall water demand for the project site of 16.12 AF/YR representing a 2.48 AF/YR increase of the existing water demand of 13.64 AF/YR. The parcel water demand can be met with the existing project well. 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 state responsibility area and is classified as a moderate fire hazard severity zone. There are no project features that would substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project site has an average slope of approximately 6.8% from the street frontage to the proposed cave area with access from Silverado Trail. There are currently overhead power lines along both sides of Silverado Trail. The existing overhead lines will not be affected by the project. The existing two-way left turn lane provides adequate access to the site from Silverado Trail. Water storage tanks for fire suppression will be provided on site. The proposed winery building will include fire sprinklers as well. 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.
