

“D”

Initial Study/Negative Declaration
(Revised)

Materra Winery
Use Permit Major Modification Application No. P20-00184-MOD
Planning Commission Hearing, June 2, 2021

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

REVISED
{State CEQA Guidelines Section 15073.5[c][4]}
Initial Study Checklist
(form updated January 2019)

1. **Project Title:** Materra Winery Use Permit Major Modification 2020, Application No. P20-00184-MOD
2. **Property Owner:** Brian Cunat
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and E-mail:** Charlene Gallina, Supervising Planner, phone number 707-299-1355, email address charlene.gallina@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):** 4326 Big Ranch Road, Napa; APN 036-160-003
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Brian Cunat, Materra Winery, 4326 Big Ranch Road, Napa, California
6. **General Plan Description:** Agricultural Resource (AR)
7. **Zoning:** AP (Agricultural Preserve) District
8. **Background/Project History:**

On January 7, 2009, the Planning Commission adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) and approved a use permit request (Use Permit P08-00428 – UP) for Cunat Premium Vineyards to operate a wine production facility (Materra Winery) with visitation and marketing events on a 50-acre property located at 4326 Big Ranch Road, in unincorporated Napa County. Up to that time, the property had been used for agricultural vineyard purposes for roughly 50 years and was developed with a residence, barn and four other accessory structures related to the agricultural use. Grapes grown on-site were either sold to wineries or processed offsite for bottling under the Materra wine label created in 2007. A Williamson Act contract, which ensured preservation of the property for agricultural use in exchange for certain property tax benefits, had been in effect on the property since 1975. The contract further allowed establishment of wineries on the property with a conditional use permit. The Williamson Act contract remains in effect to date.

The Planning Commission's 2009 use permit approval included: 1) an annual production capacity of 50,000 gallons of wine; 2) three full-time employees, three part-time employees, and up to four seasonal employees; 3) winery hours of operation between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday (harvest and crush season excepted); 4) an appointment-only tasting room, with attendance of up to 18 guests per day and ~~no more than~~ **an average of 40** guests per week; 5) 12 annual marketing events for up to 25 people, plus 12 annual marketing events for up to 50 people and two annual marketing events for up to 100 people; and 6) construction of a 15,371 square foot production building, a separate 5,094 square foot hospitality building (both buildings of a Mediterranean architectural style), and 5,145 square feet of loading area and outdoor crush pad.

On March 24, 2014, the Napa County Planning Director approved Very Minor Modification Application P13-00283-VMM. With that approval, the project entitlements were revised to include: 1) a change in the architectural style of the winery buildings, from Mediterranean to French country; 2) a decrease in the hospitality room area from 5,094 square feet to 3,640 square feet, and construction of the hospitality room in the same structure as the barrel storage room; 3) an increase in the winery production building area from 15,371 square feet to 23,640 square feet, plus an approximately 1,280 square foot covered crush pad; 4) alignment of the winery access driveway from Big Ranch Road, to a new location 200 feet south of Oak Knoll Avenue, consistent with the mitigation measure adopted under the MND; and 5) on-premise wine consumption, consistent with Business and Professions Code Sections 23358, 23390 and 23396.5, in the tasting room/barrel storage building and adjacent landscaped area. No changes were proposed to the 5,145-square foot loading area and outdoor crush pad at that time. A subsequent modification, Very Minor Modification Application P16-00362-VMM,

authorized construction of a roof structure over and partial enclosure of approximately 4,350 square feet of racking area between the barrel storage and production buildings of the winery.

Construction of the winery and installation of related on-site improvements and infrastructure was completed in April 2015. The original residence, barn and accessory structures were demolished in 2014 (Napa County Building Permits B14-00712, B14-01591), and a new single-family residence was built on the property between 2018 and 2019 (Napa County Building Permit B17-02176). Building permits issued for the winery administratively authorized minor increases in building floor areas specified in the use permit entitlements, allowing expansion of the winery building roofline to cover an additional 1,272 square feet of outdoor work space, plus construction of an additional 783 square feet of interior space needed for the mechanical, fire sprinkler riser, and electrical equipment. Current development on the property thus consists of the winery building of ~~28,604~~ **28,064** square feet; outdoor covered work areas of 6,902 square feet; an ~~18~~ **17**-stall visitor parking lot and separate, seven-stall employee parking lot; asphalt-paved access roads to and around the winery buildings, including a 20-foot wide driveway to the winery buildings from Big Ranch Road and a secondary, gravel-paved service driveway; a racking area and uncovered crush pad; landscaping, including a bioswale for water quality purposes; and various utility infrastructure improvements that include underground septic tanks, aboveground water storage tanks (10,500 gallons and 72,000 gallons), a septic system leachfield with reserve area, and approximately 36.8 acres of grapevines.

Since commencement of operations of the winery, Cunat Premium Vineyards has obtained Planning Commission approval for two additional use permit major modification requests: Use Permit Major Modification P15-00071-MOD and P17-00156-MOD. These two approvals increased the winery's permitted annual wine production capacity from 50,000 gallons to 85,000 gallons to its current entitlement of 110,000 gallons. The approval of P17-00156-MOD also included terms suspending 25-person and 50-person marketing events from occurring during the harvest and crush season between August 1 and October 31, so as to avoid overloading of the winery's wastewater treatment system leachfield.

9. **Description of Project:**

Brian Cunat, Materra Winery proprietor (the applicant or permittee) is requesting a modification to the current winery entitlements authorized by the approvals of Use Permit P08-00428 and subsequent major and minor use permit modification requests. The requested modification encompasses both physical and operational changes to the winery, consisting of:

- An increase in the permitted production capacity of the winery from 110,000 gallons of wine per year to 150,000 gallons of wine per year;
- Expansion of the winery building to include an additional 12,610 square feet, for a total winery building area of 40,674 square feet of interior floor area, with the added square footage to house a visitor reception area, a wine library for wine tasting with food pairings, additional wine tasting space, a low-risk (catering) kitchen, wine storage and administrative offices in a two-story structure;
- An increase in the permitted number of daily wine tours and tastings visitors, from 18 visitors per day, by appointment, to 34 visitors per day, by appointment;
- Expansion of on-premise wine consumption to include an approximately 740 square foot uncovered patio adjacent to the tasting room in the proposed building expansion;
- An increase in the number of winery employees, from three full-time, three part-time and four part-time seasonal employees, to as many as 12 full-time, two part-time and three part-time seasonal employees; and
- An increase in the number of on-site automobile parking stalls allowed under the use permit, from 24 stalls to 25 stalls.

The requested production increase would correspondingly increase the annual tons of grape on-haul from 330 to 510. The proposed operational changes as described above would also increase sanitary and winery process wastewater flows at the winery. Existing sanitary wastewater treatment infrastructure is adequate for treatment of sanitary flows but would need to be expanded to include a new, 3,000-gallon septic tank and 2,142 linear feet of leach line installed in the existing leach field in the vineyards west of the winery building. Upon construction of the winery building addition, hospitality activities and retail sales would be moved from the existing accessory use area in the winery, though administrative functions would continue to occur in the existing winery building. The project as proposed also includes construction of a left-turn lane in the right-of-way of Big Ranch Road at the winery property frontage. Following completion of construction of the proposed winery additions, vineyard acreage would be reduced by approximately 0.2 acres, and the 50-acre property would have approximately 36.6 acres of land planted in vines.

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

As explained above, the 50-acre property is currently developed with a wine production facility and over 36 acres of vineyards. Like the subject site, surrounding properties are zoned AP District and have a General Plan land use designation of Agricultural Resource. Land uses on surrounding properties are also primarily agricultural and include single-family residential and limited commercial uses, as described below:

North: Oak Knoll Avenue borders the site to the north. Beyond Oak Knoll Avenue are four parcels, including a 1.4-acre parcel developed with a single-family residence, two parcels (42.5 acres and 16 acres) planted with vineyards, and a 3.1-acre parcel developed with a bed and breakfast inn.

South: Two parcels, including a 2-acre single-family residential parcel and an 81.3-acre parcel developed with the Monticello Vineyards/Corley Family Winery and planted vineyard lands.

East: The Napa River borders the site to the east. Beyond the river is a 19-acre residential parcel.

West: Big Ranch Road borders the site to the west. Beyond Big Ranch Road are two parcels, including a 9.7-acre parcel developed with a single-family residence and planted with vineyards, and a 41.1-acre parcel planted with vineyards.

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

In addition to the use permit major modification, the project would require various ministerial approvals by the County, including but not limited to building permits, grading permits, waste disposal permits, and an encroachment permit for work in a public right-of-way, in addition to meeting CalFire standards. Permits may also be required by the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, & Firearms.

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

None

Other Agencies Contacted

Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau (TTB)
California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC)

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.? *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.***

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA, Public Resources Code Section 21000 *et seq.*) Section 21080.3.1(d), on March 10, 2021, the Napa County Planning Division contacted Native American individuals and organizations for the Napa Valley area, providing a description of the project and extending an invitation for consultation on the identification, presence, and significance of tribal cultural resources in the project vicinity. As of the writing of this initial study, a tribal representative to whom invitation was mailed requested further consultation on the proposed project.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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



Signature

May 10, 2021
Date

Name: Dana Ayers, Consultant 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-c) The 50-acre project site is located on the Napa Valley Floor and is not within a County-established viewshed. The property fronts onto Big Ranch Road with side street frontage on Oak Knoll Avenue. Both Big Ranch Road and Oak Knoll Avenue are Napa County-managed roadways. Big Ranch Road and Oak Knoll Avenue are not State highways, nor is either roadway a Viewshed Road as identified in Napa County General Plan Community Character Element Figure CC-3 and referenced in Policies CC-8 and CC-10. The site has been previously graded with no visible rock outcroppings. As described in the Materra Winery "Project Guidance for Stormwater Quality Compliance" prepared for the applicant by Applied Civil Engineering and dated June 19, 2020, the property is generally flat, with slope on-site not exceeding 5 percent.

With natural grades on the property not exceeding 5 percent, the construction proposed with the project would not be subject to the requirements of Napa County Code Chapter 18.106 (Viewshed Protection Program), which imposes additional design criteria on development sites for which the native slope exceeds 15 percent. The height of the proposed winery hospitality building addition to the highest point would be 35 feet above grade. This 35-foot building height would not exceed the maximum building height of 35 feet as allowed under Napa County Code Section 18.104.010. A chimney would extend an additional 8 feet above the highest point of the roofline, for a height of 43 feet above grade, and would not exceed the maximum 50-foot height allowed for ornamental and architectural features not intended for human occupancy (Napa County Code Section 18.104.120, Subsection C). The project's impacts would be less than significant.

d) Hours of operation of the winery are proposed to be between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., excluding the harvest/crush season between August and October, when hours of operation of many wineries extend into nighttime hours to allow grape harvesting during cooler hours. Thus, late, nighttime production lighting (after 6:00 p.m.) would not occur for most months of the year, though marketing events would be permitted to occur until 10:00 p.m. If the use permit major modification request is approved, the winery would continue to be subject to the County's standard conditions of approval for wineries that limit outdoor lighting to the minimum necessary for operational and security needs. Up-lighting of buildings and landscaping is prohibited. The winery operators must keep lighting fixtures as low to the ground as possible and include shields to deflect their light downward. Avoidance of highly reflective surfaces would be required, as well, by the standard County conditions. These conditions would apply to all winery activities (excluding harvest activities), including any events that would occur outdoors, and the permittee would be required to demonstrate compliance with lighting requirements in the permittee's submittal of a building permit application for any winery buildings. The text of the County's applicable standard conditions of approval is reproduced below:

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. Lighting utilized during harvest activities is exempt from this requirement.

6.5 COLORS

The colors used for the roof, exterior walls and built landscaping features of the winery shall be limited to earth tones that will blend the facility into the colors of the surrounding site specific vegetation. The permittee shall obtain the written approval of the Planning Division in conjunction with building permit review and/or prior to painting the building. Highly reflective surfaces are prohibited.

Ongoing operations of the winery would also be subject to compliance with the following standard condition of approval:

- 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.
 - b. All landscaping and outdoor screening, storage, and utility structures shall be permanently maintained in accordance with the landscaping and building plans approved by the County. No stored items shall exceed the height of the screening. Exterior winery equipment shall be maintained so as to not create a noise disturbance or exceed noise thresholds in the County Code.
 - c. The colors used for the roof, exterior walls and built landscaping features of the winery shall be limited to earth tones that will blend the facility into the colors of the surrounding site specific vegetation. The permittee shall obtain the written approval of the Planning Division prior to any change in paint colors that differs from the approved building permit. Highly reflective surfaces are prohibited.
 - d. Designated trash enclosure areas shall be made available and properly maintained for intended use.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined 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"/>

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.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a,b,e) California Department of Conservation maps identify the property as Prime Farmland (DLRP Important Farmland Finder, <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/ciff>, viewed April 26, 2021). The County's zoning of the property is AP (Agricultural Preserve) District, and the General Plan land use designation of the property is Agricultural Resource. The proposed winery is consistent with the property's zoning, as Napa County Code Section 18.16.020 lists wineries and related, accessory uses as conditionally permitted in the AP District. General Plan Policy AG/LU-21 also identifies processing of agricultural products (grape crushing/winemaking) as a use that is consistent with the Agricultural Resource land use designation. The agricultural winery use is also consistent with the state designation of the property as Prime Farmland.

A Williamson Act contract, which ensures preservation of the property for agricultural use in exchange for certain property tax benefits, has been in effect on the property since the Napa County Board of Supervisors approved the contract on February 25, 1975. The contract allowed for one single-family residence with accessory structures, and the establishment of wineries on the property with a conditional use permit, as part of the permissible uses of the site. Use Permit P08-00428 and its subsequent major and minor use permit modification requests have been consistent with the allowable uses identified in the contract, and the proposed project, which would continue the winery use approved with those entitlements, would also be consistent with the terms of the contract.

The proposed project would maintain and continue the existing agricultural use of the site, and no element of the project would result in a change in land use of any existing agricultural development off-site of the property. The project's impacts to agricultural resources would be less than significant.

c,d) No forest resources are present on the site, and no part of the site has been zoned for forest or timberland use. The 1975 Williamson Act contract for agricultural use of the property remains in effect to date, and the current uses on-site (including the vineyard, winery, and single-family residence) are consistent with the terms of the contract. With current agricultural zoning and development on the property, and absent any existing or proposed forest resources on the project site, the project would have no impact on forest resources and would not conflict with zoning for forest lands.

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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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 (Thresholds) to assist in the review of projects under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). 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 the Thresholds reflect an appropriate measure of a project's impacts. The 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. The 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 winery currently encompasses 28,064 square feet of enclosed building area, plus 6,902 square feet of covered outdoor racking and crush pad wine production areas. Of the existing enclosed building area, 26,285 square feet is production space (barrel storage, tank room, bottling and laboratory), and the remaining 1,779 square feet is dedicated to hospitality services of the winery (tours and tastings rooms, kitchen, and administrative offices). The proposed project would increase the winery building area by approximately 12,610 square feet of enclosed building area, of which approximately 1,318 square feet would be production area (wine storage) and 11,292 square feet would be dedicated to hospitality services. Thus, under the proposed project, total production area for the proposed project in existing and proposed structures would be 34,505 square feet of enclosed or covered outdoor production space, and total hospitality area would be 13,071 square feet. Compared to the BAAQMD's screening criteria of 541,000 square feet (general light industry) and 47,000 square feet (high quality restaurant) for NOx, the proposed project would contribute a less than significant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. (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 below the screening criteria as noted above, and consequently would not significantly affect air quality individually nor contribute considerably to any cumulative air quality impacts.

In 2017, the BAAQMD adopted an updated Clean Air Plan that outlines a regional program and a set of measures to reduce the emissions of ozone, ozone precursors, particulate matter, toxic air contaminants, greenhouse gases, and other sources of air pollution. As noted in the Clean Air Plan (2-5), the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area as a region is in non-attainment status for achievement of state and federal standards for ozone and particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}). Primary sources of ozone and PM in the Bay Area include combustion (e.g., burning of fossil fuels, wood or vegetation), fugitive dust from earth-moving activities, and vehicle use (including engine combustion and tire and brake pad wear).

The proposed project would not conflict with nor obstruct the implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Wineries in general are not producers of air pollution in quantities substantial enough to result in an air quality plan conflict. Over the long term, emissions resulting from the proposed use permit major modification would consist primarily of mobile sources, including emissions associated with vehicle trips to and from the site.

As noted above, the combustion process of engines in passenger and heavy duty vehicles is a source of air pollutants, including particulate matter as well as carbon dioxide and nitrogen dioxide, two precursors to formulation of ozone. The Clean Air Plan acknowledges that PM_{2.5} continues to be the "most harmful air pollutant to Bay Area residents" (2-26), and that "no safe threshold of exposure to PM has yet been identified, [so] it is important that we continue efforts to further reduce PM emissions and concentrations" (2-25, 2-26). In general, emissions of diesel particulate matter have decreased and are expected to continue to decrease over time due to tighter regulations of the California Air Resources Board and BAAQMD programs (2-25).

The project proponent identified in the use permit major modification application several measures listed in the 2017 Clean Air Plan with which the existing and proposed winery operations would be consistent, including intent to maintain previous installations of photovoltaic panels for solar generation of power, energy-conserving light emitting diode lighting fixtures, and a tan "cool roof" (Napa County Voluntary Best Management Plan [BMP] Checklist for Development Projects, BMP-1, BMP-9 and BMP-10). These measures are intended to reduce demand for energy derived from fossil fuels for space conditioning; the cool roof system reflects light and heat of the sun, reducing demand for energy needed for building cooling, while the photovoltaic panels provide a renewable energy source on the property to reduce the need for energy derived from fossil fuels. Energy-conserving lighting and light colors on the existing winery building also reduce fossil fuel-related energy demands of the winery, and each of these measures is consistent with Measures BL2 (Decarbonize Buildings) and EN2 (Decrease Electricity Demand) of the 2017 Clean Air Plan. Other BMPs identified by the applicant as being currently implemented at the winery, including recycling 75 percent of waste (BMP-17) and composting 75 percent of food and garden material (BMP-18), reduce landfill-related GHG emissions generated from winery refuse. While certain components of the requested use permit major modification would implement elements of the Clean Air Plan, the proposed project would not implement other measures of the Plan that are more generally applicable to heavy industrial rather than winery and hospitality uses. As such, the requested use permit major modification would not obstruct implementation of the applicable Clean Air Plan for the San Francisco region.

In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from earthmoving required for grading of the new hospitality building expansion. Although there are no schools or healthcare facilities that are less than 1 mile from the winery (the nearest school is Sunrise

Montessori at 1226 Salvador Avenue, just over 1 mile southwest of the site), there is an existing residence at 4294 Big Ranch Road (APN 036-170-001) approximately 440 feet southwest of where grading would occur for the proposed building addition. Earthmoving and construction emissions would be short-term, consisting mainly of dust generated during grading activities and exhaust emissions from construction-related equipment and vehicles during the estimated four weeks of site grading. The temporary nature of the work and compliance with Napa County standard conditions (listed below) would not cause a substantial increase in particulate matter and therefore, would result in a less than significant construction impact related to the region's current non-attainment status for particulate matter.

The applicant's engineer estimates that site grading and construction associated with the project would occur over 4 weeks (20 workdays). With an estimated 900 cubic yards of earthwork needed to occur for construction of the winery building addition and related infrastructure installations; applying the heavy- and light-duty construction equipment exhaust emission factors of the BAAQMD (see 1999 CEQA Guidelines, table 7); and an estimated 20 workdays for site grading and preparation, the emissions from vehicles used in the construction of the project site improvements are estimated as follows. For information and comparison, the table includes the thresholds of significance for construction and operations emissions from a project (see the 2017 CEQA Guidelines, table 2-1) in the summary below. Average daily emissions in pounds are converted to kilograms (where one pound equals 0.45 kilograms), for consistency in the units across the table:

Table 1: Average Daily Emissions from Grading and Site Preparation

Contaminant	Emission Factor (grams/cubic yard)	Total Estimated Project Emissions (kilograms, kg)	Daily Emissions Estimated for Project (kg)	Daily Emissions, Threshold of Significance
Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)	9.2	8.3	0.4	24.5 kg (54 pounds)
Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx)	42.4	38.2	1.9	24.5 kg (54 pounds)
Particulate Matter (PM10)	2.2	2.0	0.1	37.2 kg (82 pounds)

The BAAQMD recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction-related air quality impacts, and with application of these measures, indicates that air pollutant emissions from construction activities would be considered a less than significant impact. These measures are incorporated into the County's standard conditions of project approval and include the following. It is noted that the estimated project emissions per day summarized in the above table are considered to be conservative estimates, as they represent uncontrolled emissions (i.e., activities occurring without inclusion of any of the control measures listed below):

7.1.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:

- A. *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.*
- B. *Water all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) two times per day.*
- C. *Cover all haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site.*
- D. *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.*
- E. *All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour.*
- F. *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.*
- G. *Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes (as required State Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.*
- H. *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>.*

7.1.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 miles per hour.

With the project proponent's adherence to these relevant best management practices identified by the BAAQMD and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts of the project are considered to be less than significant. The temporary duration of the work would not cause a substantial increase in particulate matter, and compliance with standard conditions would reduce to less than significant the proposed project's construction impact related to the region's current nonattainment status for this criteria pollutant.

c,d) The BAAQMD defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact. However, land uses that are more commonly known generators of offensive odors typically include landfills and transfer stations, wastewater treatment plants, refineries, and heavy industrial and manufacturing plants. Production of wine and storage of wine barrels are not land uses that are typically associated with generation of offensive odors comparable to these types of industrial uses. Consistent with General Plan Policy AG/LU-15, odors that are associated with production of wine and other agricultural product processing facilities are considered acceptable elements of the County and its agricultural development goals. There are no other substantial air pollutant emissions that would be expected to occur for the winery beyond those discussed herein, and the nearest sensitive receptor (residence located on APN 036-170-001) is over 400 feet southwest of the winery and proposed additions. This impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a) The project site is in a developed condition consisting of existing winery and vineyards. Native vegetation occurs approximately 1,400 feet east of the winery, along the Napa River. The physical changes to the site proposed with the project include the expansion of the winery building and the installation of new landscaped areas and one additional parking stall. These physical changes would occur near the winery building, within existing areas of development and disturbance. As such, no modifications to natural habitats would occur as a result of the project, and the project's impacts would be less than significant.

- b-d) The property is generally flat, having a slope of less than 5 percent. The Napa River borders the property to the east; however, the addition to the winery building and associated utilities improvements associated with the project would be over 1,000 feet away from the riparian area adjacent to the Napa River and well outside of the required 35-foot minimum setback established under the water quality and riparian area conservation regulations identified in Napa County Code Chapter 18.108.025. In the project narrative, the applicant states that “aside from development of the expanded winery building, no significant earthmoving is proposed as part of this application. The new structure will be built on lands entirely within the existing winery development area that have been modified from their natural state by historic and ongoing site operations.” The property has been in agricultural use for over 50 years, and with the exception of the river setback area on the east side of the property, native vegetation and the native species habitat that would have been fostered by that vegetation, has long been removed from the property for sake of maintained crop and vineyard plantings. With no riparian areas, wetlands, native wildlife nurseries or wildlife corridors in the area of disturbance of the project, the project’s impacts would be less than significant.
- e) The project would not conflict with any local policies protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation or the County’s Conservation Regulations. The winery expansion would occur on ruderal or previously disturbed land where no native vegetation or trees would be removed. New landscaping would be provided on the site as part of the project. The project does not conflict with any County ordinance or requirement to preserve existing native trees, and therefore would have a less than significant impact.
- f) There is no habitat conservation plan (HCP) or natural community conservation plan (NCCP) that has been adopted or is being implemented in unincorporated Napa County. The project would have no impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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-c) The proposed use permit major modification consists of a request to amend the operational characteristics of the winery as listed in the project description, above. The now constructed winery and hospitality building is requested to be expanded by 12,610 square feet, for which the excavation of soil for new building foundations would be required. No structures on the property would be considered historic, as the single-family residence (on-site but not part of the project) and the winery building to which the hospitality addition would be attached are both fewer than 10 years old. Thus, the project would not have a significant impact on any historic structure.

There are no known archaeological resources on the property, and none were recorded during the recent construction of the winery buildings, underground tanks, and septic tanks installed on-site in the vicinity of the proposed building expansion. Still, the low (valley floor) elevation and proximity of the property to the Napa River would suggest that the property’s general vicinity might have attracted indigenous peoples. If contractors or the property owner finds culturally significant historic resources during any earth-disturbing activities associated with the construction of winery buildings or related utilities and surface improvements proposed with the project, construction is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist must be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following Napa County standard condition of approval:

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 [Planning, Building and Environmental Services] 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.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a,b) The project would include new construction of a winery hospitality building addition, which must be designed to comply with the Building Energy Efficiency Standards of the California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 6 (California Energy Code) and Part 11 (California Green Building Standards Code). First implemented in 2007, these standards have been updated every three years; the most recent update of the standards adopted in 2019 became effective January 1, 2020 (<https://www.dgs.ca.gov/BSC/Resources/Page-Content/Building-Standards-Commission-Resources-List-Folder/CALGreen>, viewed March 11, 2021). The standards are intended to reduce wasteful consumption of energy in new buildings and building additions, and they are one means to facilitate implementation of broader efforts such as the energy efficiency and “zero net energy” goals of the California Public Utilities Commission. The applicant for the project must demonstrate compliance with the standards in plans and supporting analyses submitted with the building permit application for construction of the new building addition proposed with the project.

The winery buildings are relatively new, with Napa County Building Division records indicating that a final inspection/certificate of occupancy was issued for the structures in April 2015 (Napa County Building Permit Nos. B13-02020 and B13-02021). Though the winery was constructed under a prior iteration of the state Building Energy Efficiency Standards, the buildings nonetheless include energy-conserving light emitting diode (LED) lighting, and an energy-conserving light-colored roof to reflect heat (see Napa County Voluntary BMP Checklist for Development Projects, BMP-9 and BMP-10). In 2017, the winery operators also installed a photovoltaic array on the roof of the production building as a solar energy source for the winery (Napa County Building Permit No. B17-00699). These measures in combination reduce demand for energy derived from fossil fuels otherwise needed for space conditioning and illumination and are consistent with state goals to eliminate wasteful energy consumption.

Though plans submitted with the use permit major modification application are more conceptual than plans required for a building permit, the Voluntary Best Management Practices Checklist for Development Projects included with the application indicated the applicant’s intent to install water-efficient plumbing fixtures in the building addition (BMP-14), in addition to maintaining the energy reduction measures mentioned above. These existing and proposed measures together would conserve energy associated with project operations and groundwater extraction. The applicant reports that the existing photovoltaic system has typically generated in excess of 140,000 kilowatt hours per year, which constitutes approximately 60 to 65 percent of the winery’s approximately 225,000 kilowatt hours of annual energy demand. With the proposed winery expansion, energy demands of the winery complex would increase, though the existing photovoltaic system is anticipated to continue to provide roughly half of the winery’s total energy demand. This impact would be less than significant.

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-c) The property at 4326 Big Ranch Road is not located within any Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone designated by the state Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. Although no fault zone underlies the property, the site is generally located within a region of active fault zones, including those of the West Napa, Mayacama, Concord, Great Valley, North Hayward, Hunting Creek-Berryessa and San Andreas faults. Movement along any of these faults is anticipated to result in intensities of VII and VIII on the Modified Mercalli Scale at the project site; these “very strong” to “severe” intensities would be felt by most people and are likely to result in some damage to well-built structures. Due to the young age of the winery production and storage buildings and related site improvements (one to five years) and requirement for new structures to comply with the 2013 California Building Code (the Building Code in effect at the time that permits were issued for the existing winery structures), damage to any of the recently-built and recently-inspected structures on the property is anticipated to be minor and would not expose people to substantial hazards related to ground shaking during an earthquake. The property owner has previously confirmed that no damage had occurred to the structures that under construction on the property at the time of the 2014 Napa earthquake. The applicant’s consultant has also reported that wine barrels in the production rooms are stored in stacks of no more than three to reduce risks of losses or damages during an earthquake.

The new structures proposed to be built on-site under this use permit major modification request must also comply with the seismic standards of the California Building Code and Occupational Health and Safety Administration regulations. With compliance with these regulations, damage to any newly-built or recently-built structures on the property is anticipated to be minor and would not expose people to

substantial hazards related to ground shaking during an earthquake. Concurrently with submittal of a building permit application for the proposed new hospitality building addition, the property owner must submit a geotechnical report that characterizes the soils on-site and recommends criteria for building foundations and other structural elements of the buildings. These recommendations would have the intent of minimizing structural damage from an earthquake or subsequent liquefaction and would be required to be incorporated into the architectural plans for the project, prior to issuance of the requested building permit.

As described in the Materra Winery "Project Guidance for Stormwater Quality Compliance" prepared for the applicant by Applied Civil Engineering and dated June 19, 2020, the property is generally flat, with slope on-site not exceeding 5 percent. Napa County's geographic information system additionally indicates that the site lies predominantly at 65 feet above mean sea level. Given that the site is flat, underlain with fine silt/loamy soil (Yolo loam) and located in the valley, soil movement and erosion potential is low (by contrast, higher erosion potential is anticipated in areas of steep slopes or more moderate slopes with loose, sandy soils). As depicted on regional maps, the property has a very low or minimal risk of landslide, a common indication among much of the "flat lands" of the Napa Valley Floor on which the property is located (Metropolitan Transportation Commission/Association of Bay Area Governments [MTC/ABAG] Hazard Viewer Map, online at <https://mtc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=4a6f3f1259df42eab29b35dfcd086fc8>, viewed March 15, 2021).

Regional maps of liquefaction suggest that the property is within an area of low to moderate liquefaction potential; the highest liquefaction potential on the property occurs in the vicinity of the Napa River banks on the eastern end of the site, where no structures have been or are proposed to be placed with this proposed use permit major modification.

- d) The Yolo loam that underlays the developed areas on the site generally has moderate limitations in use for septic system absorption fields; these soil limitations, however, can be overcome with proper design, such as expansion of the leachfield area. The "Onsite Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study for the Materra Winery Use Permit Modification," (WDFS) prepared for the applicant by Applied Civil Engineering and dated June 19, 2020, describes the existing sanitary and wastewater treatment system, existing winery wastewater flows, and proposed wastewater flows associated with production and tours and tastings increases requested under the use permit major modification application. The WDFS recommends a new, 3,000-gallon septic tank and an additional 2,142 linear feet of leach line installed in the existing leach field in the vineyards west of the winery building. While the WDFS anticipates this additional infrastructure would be adequate for treatment of the winery's sanitary and process wastewater flows within a roughly 1-acre area on the property, there is more than sufficient area (over 20 acres) in the vineyards west of the winery building to accommodate expanded leach lines if necessary. However, given that the leach field has functioned adequately in this same location for all of the winery's five years of operation, it is not anticipated that any additional acreage for wastewater treatment would be needed. This impact would be less than significant.
- e) Yolo loam has a low to moderate shrink-swell potential. As previously-described, existing above and below-grade structures on the site were built under permits from the Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department, and prior to receiving such permits, the property owner or his contractor would have been required to demonstrate structural stability of the then-proposed building foundations. As also noted in response to questions VII.a and VII.b, above, concurrently with submittal of a building permit application for the proposed new hospitality building, the property owner must submit an updated geotechnical report that characterizes the soils on-site and recommends criteria for building foundations and other structural elements of the new building. These recommendations would have the intent of minimizing structural damage from expansive soils and would be required to be incorporated into the architectural plans for the project, prior to issuance of the requested building permit. With compliance with building code and geotechnical report recommendations, impacts of the project would be less than significant.
- f) The site has been significantly disturbed through past construction and grading activities associated with the existing winery and previously-established agricultural (currently, vineyard, and previously, orchards) uses of the project site. As discussed in Section V, Cultural Resources, of this initial study, there are known archaeological resources sites in the vicinity of the property. If the use permit major modification is approved, standard conditions of Napa County would be made conditions of the permit modification to address potential on-site impacts to unknown archaeological resources during construction of the new hospitality wing. There are no known paleontological resource discoveries on properties near the project site, and planning staff has observed no significant geological features on the relatively flat property. Project impacts on paleontological and geological resources are anticipated to be less than significant.

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:

Greenhouse gases (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 explaining human effects on the atmosphere). Carbon dioxide (CO₂) gas, the principal 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 which 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). Carbon dioxide equivalents (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 gases that contribute to GHG (BAAMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2017). In this case, CO₂ is used as the reference molecule to obtain atmospheric carbon CO₂ effects of GHG. Carbon stocks are converted to 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>).

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

In July 2015, the County re-commenced preparation of the CAP to: i) account for present day conditions and modeling assumptions (such as but not limited to methods, emission factors, and data sources), ii) address the concerns with the previous CAP effort as outlined above, iii) meet applicable State requirements, and iv) result in a functional and legally defensible CAP. On April 13, 2016, the County, as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP, released *Final Technical Memorandum #1: 2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016*. This initial phase included: i) updating the unincorporated County's community-wide GHG emissions inventory to 2014, and ii) preparing new GHG emissions forecasts for the 2020, 2030, and 2050 horizons. Additional information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or online at address <https://www.countyofnapa.org/2876/Current-Projects-Explorer>.

a,b) Overall increases in 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 [MT] per year of CO₂ and 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 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.

One time “Construction Emissions” associated with the project include: emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area, construction, and construction equipment and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as Equipment Emissions). These emissions also include underground carbon stocks (or soil carbon) associated with any existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed. As previously stated, this project includes the construction of a new winery building addition for hospitality services on-site.

“Operational Emissions” of the winery are also considered and can 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, of this initial study, for anticipated number of operational trips. Operational Emissions from the 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. With the existing plus winery building’s production area at approximately 34,505 square feet compared to the BAAQMD’s GHG screening criteria of 121,000 square feet for general industrial uses, and total hospitality area at approximately 13,071 square feet and compared to the BAAQMD’s screening criterion of 9,000 square feet for high quality restaurant, the project as proposed exceeds the screening criteria for projects presumed to have a less than significant GHG impact. The following analysis is therefore provided to approximate the GHG emissions that would be generated from the proposed project.

Ongoing operation emissions from the winery would include GHG emitted from energy demands, wine production and vehicle trips to and from the winery. Air quality and greenhouse gas emissions from operations of vehicles and equipment associated with vineyard maintenance is an existing condition that would continue, with a nominal reduction in emissions as a result of 0.2 acres of existing grapevines that would be removed for the proposed winery building addition. Thus, the primary sources of operational GHG emissions that would result from the project are attributed to: 1) energy demands, such as lighting and condition of space with the winery building; and 2) vehicle trips and wastewater treatment demands generated from the increase in winery employees, tours and tastings visitors, and annual wine production.

In 2017, the winery owner obtained permit approval from Napa County to install an 83-kilowatt photovoltaic array on the roof of the production building as a solar energy source for the winery (Napa County Building Permit No. B17-00699). Information provided by the applicant in the “Voluntary Best Management Practices Checklist for Development Projects” attached to the use permit major modification application indicates that this system produces in excess of 140,000 kilowatt hours of energy each year. According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency GHG equivalencies calculator, the solar energy generated by the winery’s on-site photovoltaic system is equivalent to a savings of 99 MTCO₂e emissions from the renewable energy source (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, www.epa.gov/energy/greenhouse-gas-equivalencies-calculator, viewed March 23, 2021). The applicant has reported that the existing photovoltaic system provides approximately 60 to 65 percent of the 28,064 square foot winery building’s energy needs. For this analysis, the array is proportionately estimated to produce roughly 45 percent of the expanded, 40,674 square foot winery’s energy needs. The remaining estimated 185,000 kilowatt hours of energy needs from the expanded winery is presumed to come from traditional energy sources and would result in approximately 131 MTCO₂ emissions per year.

Visitor and employee vehicle travel to and from the winery is also a source of operational GHG, and is estimated in this initial study using vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as a factor. To estimate emissions from vehicle travel for the proposed project, the maximum number of employees plus tours and tastings visitors to the winery (17 and 34, respectively) is combined to arrive at the maximum number of persons (51) that would travel to the winery on any given day. This number is then multiplied by the daily VMT per capita for the San Francisco-Oakland Metropolitan Area (20.8; see *Federal Highway Administration: Highway Statistics Series*, Table HM-72: Vehicle-Miles of Travel by Urbanized Area [2019], online at <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policyinformation/statistics.cfm>, viewed March 23, 2021), to arrive at a combined daily count of VMT for the proposed project (1,061). Daily VMT is then multiplied by 365 for an annual estimate of VMT (387,265 miles). Marketing event guest vehicle miles uses the same per capita VMT but would not occur on a daily basis, and so is more simply the product of the total number of event guests in a year (1,100) times per capita VMT (20.8), or 22,880 miles. According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s Greenhouse Gas Equivalencies Calculator, each mile of vehicle travel generates 0.00403 MTCO₂e, so that the estimated 410,145 vehicle miles associated with the project would result in 165 MTCO₂e of annual emissions. It is noted that this estimate is considered conservative, as it: 1) assumes maximum visitation is achieved everyday; 2) does not account for VMT reductions from ridesharing or group transportation, as would be reasonably assumed to occur for wine tours and tastings; and 3) does not account for seasonal reductions in employees outside of the harvest/crush season.

Existing plus net operational emissions from the winery are estimated to be 300 metric tons of carbon dioxide and carbon dioxide equivalents per year and would fall below the BAAQMD threshold of 1,100 MTCO_{2e} per year threshold of significance. The project's impacts would be less than significant. GHG Emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the Cal Green Building Code, tightened vehicle fuel efficiency standards, and more project-specific on-site programs including recycling and composting efforts of the winery operators as noted above, would combine to further reduce emissions below BAAQMD thresholds.

As indicated above, the County is currently preparing a CAP and as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP has released Final Technical Memorandum #1 (2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016). Table 1 of the Technical Memorandum indicates that 2% of the County's GHG emissions in 2014 were a result of land use change. The increase in emissions expected as a result of the project would be relatively modest and the project is in compliance with the County's efforts to reduce emissions as described above. For these reasons, project impacts related to GHG emissions are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures:

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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,b) The proposed project consists of the construction of an addition and operation of a winery offering sales and service of wine and wine-related items, wine tours and tastings, and wine marketing events with and without food. These types of food and beverage production and service uses might utilize chemicals for purposes of cleaning and property maintenance activities but are not typically generators or users of significant quantities of hazardous materials. During construction of the improvements associated with the project, some hazardous materials, such as building coatings and adhesives would be utilized. However, given the quantities of hazardous materials and the limited duration of construction, their use on-site would result in a less than significant impact.

Wine production and vineyard maintenance, the latter of which currently occurs on the property and would continue to occur alongside winery operations, involve utilization of chemicals such as fuels, diatomaceous earth and ammonia. Pursuant to California Health and

Safety Code, commencing with Section 25500, the project proponent and winery operator is required to file a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) and to maintain a Hazardous Waste permit with the Napa County Environmental Health Division. Napa County Code Section 16.28.120 authorizes County Environmental Health Division staff to collect permit fees and to conduct periodic inspections under the HMBP; County staff conducts these inspections every three years or more frequently as needed to confirm ongoing compliance with State regulations for management of hazardous materials. With compliance with regulatory requirements for use of hazardous materials, the project's impacts would be less than significant.

- c) The winery and proposed operational modifications thereto would not affect schools within 0.25 mile. The school closest to the winery site is Sunrise Montessori School, which is approximately 1 mile southwest of the subject property. The project would have no impact.
- d) The property is not on the California Environmental Protection Agency's list of hazardous sites in Napa County (Government Code Section 65962.5) per the DTSC's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List – Site Cleanup aka the Cortese List (<https://dtsc.ca.gov/dtscs-cortese-list/>) and DTSC's Envirostor (<https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search?basic=True>), both viewed March 2, 2021. The project would have no impact.
- e) The winery and proposed operational modifications thereto would not cause an unsafe condition within 2 miles of a public or private airport or airstrip, as the winery site is not within 2 miles of any public or private airport or airstrip. Napa County Airport, the closest airport to the site, is over 10 miles south of the site, and the property at 4326 Big Ranch Road is outside of the boundaries of the land use compatibility plan for that airport. The proposed project includes no air traffic component that could potentially increase flight hazards or aircraft noise. The project would have no impact.
- f) The Napa County Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) outlines procedures, including establishing leadership roles and responsibilities of various agency staff, that guide local preparedness, response, recovery and resource management efforts associated with occurrence of a natural disaster, significant emergency, or other threat to public safety. The proposed winery use permit major modification would not result in closure or permanent obstruction of adjacent public rights-of-way; during construction of the left-turn lane in Big Ranch Road, the contractor would have to provide traffic control to ensure northbound and southbound access around the construction area, as a provision of the encroachment permit, and temporary detours would be removed upon completion of work. No component of the implementation of the EOP would otherwise be impaired by proposed minor and major modifications to the use permit. The project's impacts would be less than significant.
- g) With the exception of the native plant growth along the riverbanks on the eastern end of the parcel, the property is substantially landscaped with vineyards and surrounded by other properties planted with vineyards, and thus is not considered high risk for damage from wildland fires. Three sides of the steel winery structures themselves are bounded by asphaltic concrete access drives and loading area. The fourth side is slated to be modified though a gap of unplanted soil will continue to separate the structure from the vineyard area. The project's 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

On January 14, 2014, Governor Jerry Brown declared a drought emergency in the state of California. That declaration was followed 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. On April 7, 2017, Governor Jerry Brown signed an executive order lifting California’s drought emergency in all but four counties (Fresno, Kings, Tulare and Tuolumne). The County of Napa had not adopted or implemented any additional mandatory water use restrictions. The County requires all discretionary permit applicants to complete necessary water analyses in order to document that sufficient water supplies are available for the proposed project and to implement water saving measures to prepare for periods of limited water supply and to conserve limited groundwater resources.

In general, recent studies have found that groundwater levels in the Napa Valley Floor exhibit stable long-term trends with a shallow depth to water. Historical trends in the Milliken-Sarco-Tulucay (MST) area, however, have shown increasing depths to groundwater, but recent stabilization in many locations. Groundwater availability, recharge, storage and yield are not consistent across the County. More is known about the resource where historical data have been collected. Less is known in areas with limited data or unknown geology. In order to fill existing data gaps and to provide a better understanding of groundwater resources in the County, the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan recommended 18 Areas of Interest (AOIs) for additional groundwater level and water quality monitoring. Through the well owner and public outreach efforts of the Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee (GRAC,) approximately 40 new wells have been added to the monitoring program within these areas. Groundwater Sustainability Objectives were developed and recommended by the GRAC and adopted by the Board of Supervisors. The recommendations included the goal of developing sustainability objectives, providing a definition, and explaining the shared responsibility for Groundwater Sustainability and the important role of monitoring as a means to achieving groundwater sustainability.

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

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

a,c) Provision E.10 of the statewide Phase II municipal stormwater National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit reissued by the California State Water Resource Control Board in 2013 requires all individuals undertaking public or private construction or ground disturbing activities to take steps to prevent the discharge of pollutants resulting from their projects. Existing impervious surfaces on the subject parcel consist of the residential, winery and accessory building foundations, asphalt-paved surfaces of the winery parking lot and access driveways extending from Big Ranch Road, pedestrian pathways around the winery building, and the concrete paved surfaces of outdoor work areas and crush pad. The *Stormwater Control Plan for a Regulated Project for Materra Winery*, dated June 19, 2020 (Materra Winery SCP or SCP) describes the winery impervious surfaces as encompassing 122,480 square feet. The proposed project would expand the winery building footprint, also adding a vehicle parking stall and paved pathways to the site, and would increase winery impervious surface area to 136,230 square feet, or approximately 3.1 acres of the 50-acre site.

In addition to describing the existing and proposed impervious surfaces on-site, the Materra Winery SCP describes existing storm flow patterns on-site and the stormwater control measures to be implemented with the proposed expanded winery facilities. As described in the SCP, stormwater on the property flows from west to east and ultimately discharges to the Napa River on the eastern edge of the property. Though the site is somewhat constrained by slow-permeating soils, the SCP recognizes that the shallow slope on-site, proposed landscaping and large remaining area of pervious surfaces provide opportunities for on-site stormwater retention and treatment. As proposed, the area next to the proposed development footprint would be graded to allow runoff from newly-proposed impervious surfaces (buildings and paved areas), as well as, half of the existing roofs over the racking area and tasting room, to drain to a new, 1,800 square foot bioretention facility southeast of the proposed building addition. This planned bioretention facility would be in addition to an existing facility installed north of the winery building with the initial winery construction. The new bioretention facility would be bounded by a concrete curb, wood header or similar boundary, with layers of gravel, soil and rock to allow for infiltration of stormwater discharged from the adjacent buildings and paved and compacted surfaces. At 1,800 square feet (see civil plan sheet C5), the bioretention facility would be over 6 percent of the area of the adjacent paved and compacted surfaces from which stormwater would be discharged (26,100 square feet, before adjusting for reduced runoff from partially pervious compacted surfaces) and would be more than adequately sized to treat stormwater runoff from the adjacent area. (The minimum sizing factor is 4 percent of the associated area of discharge.) Although a sign would be installed in or near the facility to identify the area as a stormwater treatment facility, drought-tolerant plantings in the bioretention facility would otherwise give it the appearance of an additional landscaped area adjacent to the winery building.

The planned bioretention facility would serve to remove pollutants from runoff from the pervious surfaces on the property, prior to discharge of stormwater to the storm system. The bioretention facility also provides an opportunity for stormwater to percolate into on-site soils so that runoff volumes are not substantially increased as a result of new impervious surfaces resulting from the proposed Project. Given that the site is flat, underlain with fine silt/loamy soil (Yolo loam) and located in the valley, soil movement and erosion potential is low (by contrast, higher erosion potential is anticipated in areas of steep slopes or more moderate slopes with loose, sandy soils). The banks of the Napa River, which border the eastern property line and where slopes are steeper relative to the majority of the project site, would not be modified or graded with the project. Existing and proposed structures would be outside of the 100-year and 500-year floodplains of the Napa River, and thus, would not result in impediment or redirection of flows in the event of a severe storm causing significant flooding.

The new bioretention facility is proposed for compliance with provision E.10 of the Phase II municipal NPDES permit; construction details of the facility would be subject to review and approval by the Napa County Engineering Division staff prior to issuance of a building permit for the winery building addition. With the majority of the mostly flat site remaining as pervious surface, with no change to the overall existing west-east stormwater flow pattern on the property, with no structures placed in a floodplain, and with introduction of an additional bioretention facility to capture and treatment of runoff from new impervious surfaces proposed with the project consistent with NPDES permit provision E.10, the potential for the project to negatively affect stormwater quality through pollution, siltation, or redirection of storm flows is less than significant.

b) There are four existing wells on the property, all of which are located west of the winery building in the vineyard area between the winery and Big Ranch Road (see project civil plan sheet C1). Water for the winery and existing residence on-site is currently provided from the well located near the southwestern corner of the property; this well would continue to serve the project as modified. As noted in the "Transient Non-Community Water System Information for the Materra Winery," prepared for the applicant by Applied Civil Engineering and dated June 19, 2020, the project well meets standards to serve a new public water system that would be required for the winery because the proposed visitation increase would increase the daily number of winery employees and visitors on the property to 25 or more on at least 60 days of the year (see California Health and Safety Code, Division 104, Part 12, Chapter 4). Other wells on the property supply water for on-site landscape irrigation. Under California State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Rights, License 11513 (amended September 2008), the property owner is also licensed to draw supplemental water from the Napa River for irrigation and frost protection purposes, in an amount not to exceed 76.5 acre-feet per year (35 acre-feet for reservoir storage between January 15 and March 15, and up to 2.99 cubic feet per second between March 15 and May 15 for replenishment of storage).

The "Tier 1 Water Availability Analysis for the Materra Winery Use Permit Modification," prepared for the applicant by Applied Civil Engineering and dated June 12, 2020 (Materra Winery WAA), provides an estimate of water usage associated with currently-permitted winery operations as described in "Background/Project History" of this initial study, above. To provide a comparison between currently-

permitted water demand and projected water demand associated with the requested use permit major modification, the WAA breaks down water usage by activity, inclusive of the on-site residence, using utilization factors from Appendix B of Napa County's "Water Availability Analysis Guidelines" (May 2015). Applying these factors, currently-permitted groundwater demand on the property is estimated to be 41.1 acre-feet per year, as summarized in the following Table 1.

Table 1: Winery Groundwater Demand – Entitled Uses

Winery Activity	Water Utilization Rate (WAA Guidelines, Appendix B)	Quantity	Estimated Annual GW Demand (acre-feet)
Residence with Landscaping	0.75 acre-feet per year	One residence	0.75
Wine Production	2.15 acre-feet per 100,000 gallons of wine	110,000 gallons of wine	2.37
Winery Employees	15 gallons per employee shift	6 FT/PT employees (year round) 4 seasonal employees (half-year)	0.10
Tasting Room Visitors	3 gallons per visitor	40 max. avg. weekly visitors	0.02
Marketing Event Guests	15 gallons per guest	1,100 guests per year	0.05
Marketing Event Employees	15 gallons per shift	116 employees per year *	0.01
Vineyard Irrigation (including Heat and Frost Protection)	1 acre-foot per year	36.8 acres	36.8
Other Landscape Irrigation	<i>Irrigation demand based on landscaping plans prepared for winery building permit</i>		1.00
Total Demand, Current Entitlement			41.1 acre-feet

* Event employees are assumed to consist of three employees per 25-person event, five employees per 50-person event, and 10 employees per 100-person event.

Applying the same water usage factors from Table 2 to the scope requested in the use permit major modification application, the WAA estimates annual groundwater demand for the requested entitlement at 42 acre-feet, as itemized in Table 2, below.

Table 2: Winery Groundwater Demand – Requested Entitlement

Winery Activity	Water Utilization Rate (WAA Guidelines, Appendix B)	Quantity	Estimated Annual GW Demand (acre-feet)
Residence with Landscaping	0.75 acre-feet per year	One residence	0.75
Wine Production	2.15 acre-feet per 100,000 gallons of wine	150,000 gallons of wine	3.23
Winery Employees	15 gallons per employee shift	17 FT/PT employees (year round) 5 seasonal employees (half-year)	0.29
Tasting Room Visitors	3 gallons per visitor	40 max. weekly 34 daily visitors	0.11
Marketing Event Guests	15 gallons per guest	1,100 guests per year	0.05
Marketing Event Employees	15 gallons per shift	116 employees per year *	0.01
Vineyard Irrigation (including Heat and Frost Protection)	1 acre-foot per year	36.8 36.6 acres	36.6
Other Landscape Irrigation	<i>Irrigation demand based on landscaping plans prepared for winery building permit</i>		1.00
Total Demand, Requested Entitlement			42.0 acre-feet

Based on the summaries in the tables above, groundwater usage on the property is estimated to increase by less than 1 acre-foot for the proposed project.

The subject property is located within the Napa Valley Floor – Napa subarea of Napa County according to Figure 2-2 of the "Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2013." Within the Napa Valley Floor, the County has determined that an annual groundwater draw of up to 1 acre-foot of water per acre of a parcel is a scientifically and operationally adequate threshold. Any project on the Napa Valley Floor for which groundwater demand is at or below that threshold is concluded not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels (Napa County "Water Availability Analysis Guidelines," May 2015, pages 7-8). Thus, with the location of the 50-acre project site on the Napa Valley Floor, the requested use permit major modification would have a potentially significant groundwater impact if it resulted in more than 50 acre-feet of groundwater extraction per year. With an estimated demand of 42 acre-feet of water per year, prior to accounting for groundwater demands that would be reduced by already licensed drawing of water from the Napa River, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on groundwater.

While no significant groundwater impacts from the project are anticipated, the winery use permit major modification, if approved, would subject the winery's operators to compliance with the following, most-recently adopted standard groundwater condition of approval:

4.9 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 evidence 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 evidence** 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.*

*** Substantial evidence is defined by case law as evidence that is of ponderable legal significance, reasonable in nature, credible and of solid value. The following constitute substantial evidence: facts, reasonable assumptions predicated on facts; and expert opinions supported by facts. Argument, speculation, unsubstantiated opinion or narrative, or clearly inaccurate or erroneous information do not constitute substantial evidence.*

- d) According to Napa County GIS data (http://gis.napa.ca.gov/Html5Viewer/Index.html?viewer=Public_HTML, viewed April 2, 2021) and the project civil plans prepared by Applied Engineering, the portion of the property with the residence and existing winery building lies in an area of minimal flood hazard. The existing winery building and site improvements were constructed outside of the 100-year floodplain of the Napa River. The existing building is also situated outside of the river's 500-year floodplain, with only parking spaces and landscaped swales potentially incurring some damage as a result of a 500-year flood. While vines might incur damage as a result of flooding of the Napa River, as might occur with extended duration rainstorms, the winery's existing occupied structures (such as offices, employee work and break rooms and hospitality areas within the existing storage and production buildings) would not be damaged by a 100- or 500-year flood. The entirety of the proposed winery building additions and site improvements would be outside of both floodplain boundaries. With no existing or proposed structures located within the 100-year floodplain, for which the National Flood Insurance Program and Napa County Code Chapter 16.04 would require a floodplain permit with plans describing structural floodproofing methods, the project's impacts related to flooding of the Napa River would be less than significant.
- e) The Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA, California Water Code Sections 10720-10737.8) requires local governments and water agencies in medium and high priority basins in California to create long-term sustainability plans that would result in balanced groundwater extraction and recharge within 20 years of adoption of the plan, and no later than 2042. Plans for medium or high priority basins are due to the Department of Water Resources (DWR) by January 2022. As designated by the DWR in its SGMA 2019 Basin Prioritization, the Napa Valley Subbasin in which the property is located is a high priority due to local reliance on groundwater resources (<https://water.ca.gov/Programs/Groundwater-Management/Basin-Prioritization>, viewed April 2, 2021). In December 2019, Napa County established a Groundwater Sustainability Agency, and in the first half of calendar year 2020, the GSA established an Advisory Committee and selected LSCE to provide technical support for preparation of a groundwater sustainability plan for the County.

As described in response to question X.b above, the anticipated water demands of the proposed project would be less than the estimated groundwater recharge rate for the parcel. Thus, the proposed project would not impede with the County's ongoing efforts toward groundwater management under the requirements of SGMA. Further, as noted in response to questions X.a and X.c, above, the proposed project includes stormwater quality and treatment measures in compliance with County regulations and the Phase II municipal stormwater NPDES permit. The impact of the project with respect to compliance with water quality or groundwater management programs would be less than significant.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a) The project site is currently developed with vineyards, a winery production and hospitality building, and a single-family residence (a permitted land use that is unrelated to the winery or this use permit major modification request). The proposed project would not change the existing agricultural and residential uses of the property. The Napa County General Plan (Policy AG/LU-2) defines agriculture as the raising of crops, trees, and livestock; the production and processing of agricultural products; and related marketing, sales and other accessory uses. The surrounding land uses are also predominantly agricultural land uses (vineyards and wineries), some also with residences, and therefore, the existing development on the property is consistent with the development pattern of the properties surrounding the site. The proposed project does not include any permit modifications that would introduce non-agricultural use to the property nor interfere with other existing agricultural or residential uses on nearby properties. The proposed project would integrate with the property's surroundings and would not physically divide an established community, and thus, would have a less than significant impact.

b) The use permit modifications would not change the property's agricultural use, which includes agricultural product processing (winemaking from grapes) and related, accessory uses. The requested use permit major modification is generally consistent with the uses described in General Plan Goal AG/LU-1 and Policies AG/LU-1, AG/LU-2. The proposed project is also consistent with General Plan Policy AG/LU-9, which was specifically adopted by the Board of Supervisors as a mitigation measure of the General Plan EIR and is intended to prioritize preservation of farmland in the County. Napa County Code Section 18.16.030 also identifies wineries as conditionally permitted uses within the AP District where the site is located. The vineyard supports the economic viability of agriculture within the County consistent with General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-4 ("The County will reserve agricultural lands for agricultural use including lands used for grazing and watershed/ open space...") and General Plan Economic Development Policy E-1 (The County's economic development will focus on ensuring the continued viability of agriculture...).

The General Plan includes two policies (Policy AG/LU-10 and Community Character Element Policy CC-2) requiring new wineries to be designed generally of a high architectural quality for the site and its surroundings. Although the Materra Winery is not a new winery, the use permit major modification includes a request to construct a new winery building addition to house new winery hospitality and administrative space. As depicted in the plans submitted with the use permit major modification application, the exterior walls of the proposed winery building addition would be built of cement plaster finished in neutral tan, brown and gray-green colors. Combined with the deep building setback and placement of the new structure behind the existing single-family residence, these neutral color selections would reduce the prominence of the winery building expansion from the perspective of the nearest public vantage point of Big Ranch Road. The architectural design of the project would follow on the existing French country architectural style of the existing, recently-built winery building and single-family residence on the property and would not degrade the existing character of the site and its surroundings.

The Napa River adjoins the eastern property line of the site. With over 1,400 feet of distance between the edge of the river bank and the closest existing winery structure, the distance between the existing winery buildings are and would remain well outside of the required 45-foot minimum setback established under the water quality and riparian area Conservation Regulations identified in County Code Chapter 18.108. Construction proposed with the current use permit major modification request (hospitality building addition, parking, walkways and landscaping) would occur adjacent to and west of the existing winery buildings (i.e., further from the Napa River), and over 1,600 feet from the edge of the Napa River's riparian bank. (Also see EIR Mitigation Measure 4.5.2c and General Plan Conservation Element Policy CON-27.) With no portion of the property having a slope in excess of 15 percent, the proposed new physical elements of the project are not subject to the requirements of Napa County Code Chapter 18.106 (Viewshed Protection Program) and so would not conflict with the aesthetic regulations of that code chapter. For these reasons, the project is not anticipated to 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. The impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XII.	MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XIII.	NOISE. Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a) The proposed project would cause a temporary increase in noise levels as a result of construction of the building and site modifications, including grading for new landscaping and surface parking areas. Examples of construction equipment that would be associated with site improvements include bulldozers for grading, along with smaller-scale equipment necessary for installation of planting or building details. Noise levels generated from such equipment has been measured as high as 90 decibels at 50 feet from the source (https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/handbook/handbook09.cfm, viewed April 6, 2021). With a 6-decibel reduction in noise levels per doubling of distance from the source, and with the County's noise threshold of 75 A-weighted decibels (dBA, a measurement of sound that mimics human hearing by de-emphasizing low- and very-high frequency sound) during daytime hours for construction noise effects on residential uses (County Code Section 8.16.080), a residence located within 400 feet of the location of

construction activities could potentially be affected by construction noise generated by grading or construction activities associated with the project. The closest off-site sensitive receptor to the winery property is a single-family residence located on APN 036-170-001 over 400 feet southwest of where grading would occur for the proposed new winery building and patio additions. With no residence less than 400 feet away from the proposed area of construction on the property, construction-related noise impacts of the project would be less than significant. Nonetheless, the project would be subject to standard conditions of development in Napa County that are intended to reduce to acceptable levels the potential impacts of construction-related noise on neighboring uses, by requiring mufflers on construction equipment, prohibiting operation of noise-disturbing construction tools or equipment between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., and limiting construction noise levels measured at property lines to 75 dBA between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m.:

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 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Increased wine production as requested under the proposed use permit major modification would occur within existing wine production and fermentation buildings and would not significantly change the existing noise environment associated with wine production. However, the application includes a request to increase the number of daily tours and tastings visitors to the winery, from 18 to as many as 34 visitors per day, and the proposed new construction includes a new outdoor patio adjacent to the hospitality building addition where some tours and tastings or marketing event guests may be inclined to congregate. Because this proposed patio is closer to the nearest off-site residence than the winery's existing patio (located north of the existing production building), the applicant hired a noise consultant to evaluate the potential for noise disturbance to sensitive receptors as a result of the new patio. The "Materra Cunat Family Vineyards, Environmental Noise Assessment," prepared by Salter and dated October 29, 2020, projected noise levels from the combined speaking voices of 17 people (half of the maximum number of daily tours and tastings guests) congregated on the proposed outdoor patio could be as high as 83 dBA at the source, but would drop to 37 dBA at the nearest residential neighbor (4).

Regulations contained within Napa 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 project site are predominantly agricultural (vineyard and winery) with some rural residential and transient residential uses. Based on the standards in County Code Section 8.16.070, noise levels may not exceed 50 dBA during daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) or 45 dBA during nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) at the exterior of a residential structure or residential use on a portion of a larger property. Given the predominant land uses around both parcels, noise impacts of a proposed project would be considered bothersome and potentially significant if sound generated by it had the effect of creating volume exceedances more than 50 percent of the time (i.e., 30 minutes in any hour).

As calculated by Salter, noise levels generated by guests of the winery are estimated at 37 decibels at the nearest off-site residence and would not exceed the codified noise limit of 50 dBA during daytime hours (7:00 a.m. until 10:00 p.m.) With the exception of the harvest and crush season, the winery would be open between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. and would not operate during nighttime hours between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Salter also estimated the additional noise that would be generated from the increase vehicle use associated with the increase in daily visitation and employment. Their analysis concluded that the increase of as many as 15 daily vehicle trips on the property would result in a 2 to 3 decibel increase in noise that would be "just noticeable" and not a significant change to the existing noise environment. The project's potential noise impacts from increase visitation would be less than significant.

The winery operators would nonetheless continue to be subject to the following Napa County standard condition of approval with respect to amplified sound generated during events, to further regulate noise impacts from winery event operations:

4.10 AMPLIFIED MUSIC

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

- b) Groundborne vibration can occur as a result of movement of heavy machinery, such as diesel trains or large vehicles on uneven road surfaces, or as a result of impactful construction activity such as pile driving or blasting. There are no ongoing activities related to project operations that would cause groundborne vibrations, though the project includes construction of new structures and surface installations (new paved surfaces and landscaping) on-site. Site preparations and grading necessary for this construction would not require pile driving or blasting but would require soil movement and excavation conducted by heavy equipment, as described in section XIII.a, above. These excavation and grading activities, though construction-related and therefore temporary in nature, could generate groundborne vibrations.

Noise regulations in County Code Chapter 8.16 do not include specific criteria for groundborne vibration. In the absence of local County criteria for vibration analysis, this initial study utilizes the guidance in the "Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual" (2018) prepared for the Federal Transit Administration (FTA, online at <https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/research->

[innovation/118131/transit-noise-and-vibration-impact-assessment-manual-fta-report-no-0123_0.pdf](#), viewed April 6, 2021). While the project is not a transit project, the noise levels generated by heavy construction equipment that would be used for construction of the project are similar to those that would be generated by locomotive engines (85-90 decibels).

The guidance in the FTA manual suggests screening criteria for different land use types, from the most sensitive land uses such as recording studios and research facilities that rely on vibration-sensitive equipment, to comparably less sensitive institutional facilities occupied by potentially sensitive receptors during days and residences occupied by sleeping residents at night. Projects that do not fall within the screening criteria are not considered to have a significant groundborne vibration impact on a sensitive receptor, and no further analysis is required.

Land uses proximate to the project site include wineries, vineyards, a bed and breakfast inn, and single-family residential uses. There are no highly vibration-sensitive land uses in the general vicinity of the property. Table 6-8, Screening Distances for Vibration Assessments, of the FTA "Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual" indicates that a residential use located within 200 feet of the right-of-way of a conventional railroad track could potentially be negatively affected by groundborne vibration from the source, and an office type of use could be impacted if it was within 120 feet of the vibration source. Translating this criterion to the requested use permit major modification, a residence within 200 feet of areas of excavation or grading could potentially be negatively impacted by groundborne vibration from construction of the project. As described above, the closest off-site residence (permanent or transient) is more than 400 feet southwest of the area of construction of the winery addition, so the project would not have a significant impact related to groundborne vibration.

- c) The requested use permit major modification would not expose people to excessive noise levels from air traffic. The existing winery use and requested use permit major modification excludes any air travel component. There are two public use airports in the County for which the County has adopted an airport land use compatibility plan: Angwin-Parrett Field and Napa County Airport. Angwin-Parrett Field is 16 miles northwest of the project site, and the Napa County Airport is 10 miles southeast of the site. The property at 4326 Big Ranch Road is outside of the boundaries of the land use compatibility plans for both airports. There are no permitted private airports or heliports within 2 miles of the project site. With no element of the project generating additional air traffic in the project vicinity, and with the location of the project site more than 2 miles from any public or permitted private airport or heliport, the project would have no impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a) The requested use permit major modification would facilitate the continued operation of a winery on the project site, with expanded production and hospitality service. It is not anticipated that housing demands would increase as a result of allowances for increased daily tours and tastings guests to the winery, who are considered transient visitors that are not on-site on a daily basis. However, the proposed modification also includes a request to increase winery employment from three full-time, three part-time and four seasonal employees, to as many as 12 full-time and five part-time employees, an increase of seven employees overall. These seven new jobs would be new jobs in the Napa County area.

California Department of Finance demographic data indicates that there are an estimated 70,000 workers in Napa County as of 2019 (2019 American Community Survey, 1-year estimates for Employment Status, online at www.dof.ca.gov/Reports/Demographic_Reports/American_Community_Survey, viewed on March 11, 2021). With a total 10 employees existing and 17 employees proposed out of the County total of 70,000, the winery is not a major employer or job generator whose employment would significantly increase demand for new housing. Still, the project would be subject to County Code Section 18.107.060

(Nonresidential developments – Housing fee requirement), which requires developers of nonresidential projects to pay a fee to help meet demand for local affordable housing. This fee would be charged to the permittee on a per square foot basis for the area in the proposed winery building addition and must be paid to the County by the permittee prior to issuance of a building permit for the addition.

The proposed modifications do not otherwise include any new infrastructure that might induce growth by adding through lanes to increase capacity of existing roads, or by extending utilities or services outside of the boundaries of the winery owner’s property.

Absent a large increase in employment, without an expansion of services or infrastructure beyond the boundaries of the project site, and with imposition of the County’s housing impact fee on the additional building square footage, the project would have a less than significant impact on population growth.

- b) The owner’s existing residence on the property would remain with the requested use permit major modification. No residential buildings on or off of the property would be demolished as a result of the project. Thus, no residents would be displaced, and the project would have no impact.

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) The property is located within the service areas of both the Napa County Sheriff’s Department (Beat 4), as well as the CAL-FIRE, the Napa County Fire Department (Napa County Baseline Data Report, Figure 13-3 and Table 13-9). The existing winery building associated with this use permit major modification request was inspected by County building inspectors and fire prevention officials, prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy for the building in 2015, to ensure that the recent construction of the building was in accordance with then applicable Building and Fire Codes. The winery hospitality addition proposed to be built with this use permit major modification request would also be inspected by County building inspectors and fire prevention officials to ensure that construction occurs in accordance with current Building and Fire Codes applicable at the time of submittal of the requisite building permit application. If approved, the requested use permit major modification would facilitate the continued operation and expansion of an existing winery on-site of an existing vineyard. 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 cities north and south of the winery. No new

parks or other public recreational amenities or facilities (such as police or fire stations) are proposed to be built with or as a result of the requested use permit major modification. Also see discussion under Section XVI, Recreation, of this initial study. Impacts of the project would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures:

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

Discussion:

a/b) The proposed major use permit modification consists of operational changes including increased permitted capacity of the winery, increased number of permitted daily wine tours and tasting visitors, and increase in the number of winery employees. The modification request also includes physical changes to the property including the expansion of the winery building by an additional 12,610 square feet, and an increase in the number of automobile parking stalls from 24 to 25.

The current proposal includes no residential units nor introduction of new residents that would utilize existing parks in the area, potentially accelerating the facilities' deterioration. No new parks or other public recreational amenities are proposed to be built with the proposed amendment to the approved use permit.

The proposal does include an increase in the permitted number of winery employees from 3 full-time, 3 part-time and 4 seasonal to up to 12 full-time and 5 part-time. The number of guests is also proposed to be increased from a maximum of 18 per day to 34 per day. Some of the employees and patrons might visit recreational facilities in the area during breaks or before or after work or winery visits. 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. This impact would be less than significant.

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) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) 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"/>
	c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) 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 project site is located on the Napa Valley floor. The property has frontage on two County-managed roadways: Big Ranch Road and Oak Knoll Avenue. Big Ranch Road adjoins the site's western property line; it is a two-lane, two-way collector roadway that extends from within the city of Napa south of the project site, northward to a terminus approximately 0.7 mile north of the project site. Oak Knoll Avenue adjoins the site's northern property line; it is a two-lane, two-way, east-west collector roadway that extends between State Route 29 located 1.2 miles west and Silverado Trail (also a County-managed north-south arterial roadway) located 0.8 mile east of the project site. Oak Knoll Avenue has an offset alignment, such that it intersects with Big Ranch Road at two, T-intersections that are spaced approximately 200 feet apart. The southern intersection of Oak Knoll Avenue and Big Ranch Road is on the opposite side of Big Ranch Road from the project site, just over 200 feet north of the primary residential and winery access driveway onto the project site from Big Ranch Road. At both intersections of Oak Knoll Avenue with Big Ranch Road, the Oak Knoll Avenue is the minor approach and is stop sign controlled. In the vicinity of the project site, the speed limit on Big Ranch Road is 50 miles per hour, and the speed limit on Oak Knoll Avenue is 55 miles per hour (Napa County Code Chapter 10.04) with the exception of two locations on Big Ranch Road where posted speed is 20 or 40 miles per hour at a bridge crossing and curve (respectively). Neither Big Ranch Road nor Oak Knoll Avenue has bicycle or pedestrian facilities (e.g., bicycle lanes, sidewalks or multi-use paths). Vehicular access onto the property is from Big Ranch Road.

- a) Level of service standards for roads in the unincorporated areas have been established by the County in its General Plan Circulation Element, last updated in February 2019. Level of service (LOS) is a system for classifying roadway segments' and intersections' operations using a letter rating of A through F, based on how much delay a driver experiences on the particular facility. LOS A indicates free flowing traffic with minimal delays, and LOS F indicates a severely congested segment or intersection. Traffic impact analysis prepared for the applicant by Crane Transportation Group (CTG) in December 2020 applied the LOS calculation methodology in the *Year 2017 6th Edition Highway Capacity Manual*. Using this methodology, for signalized intersections, LOS is determined by averaging the seconds of delay experienced by all vehicles traveling through the intersection. For intersections where the minor approaches are stop sign controlled, LOS indicates the seconds of delay experienced by each driver on the minor approach or making a turn movement, where LOS A indicates no more than 10 seconds of delay, and LOS F indicates more than 50 seconds. In both instances, delay includes time spent decelerating, accelerating, stopping and moving up in the queue at the intersection.

General Plan Policy CIR-38 establishes the County's desired LOS on all County roadways as LOS D. LOS D represents the level at which traffic nears an unstable flow; intersections still function, but short queues develop, and cars at signalized intersections may have to wait through one traffic signal cycle during peak traffic periods. The policy lists some exclusions, including segments of State Route 29 and Silverado Trail north of the project site, where the General Plan policy specifies that LOS E or F is acceptable. The County has further clarified its General Plan policy to specify the following objectives as they apply to proposed projects:

- If an unsignalized intersection operates at LOS A through D under existing PM peak hour conditions, and the project would cause the intersection level of service to fall to LOS E or F, then the applicant should implement actions to restore level of service to LOS D or better.
- If an intersection or segment operates at LOS E or F under existing conditions, and the project would increase automobile delay by 5 or more seconds on the minor approach to an unsignalized intersection, or by one or more percent of total segment volume, then the applicant should implement actions to reduce the increased delay.

The December 2020 CTG traffic impact study analyzed potential traffic impacts to the intersections of: 1) Oak Knoll Avenue and State Route 29; 2) Oak Knoll Avenue and Big Ranch Road (northern and southern intersections); 3) Oak Knoll Avenue and Silverado Trail; and 4) Big Ranch Road and the Materra Winery main driveway. The traffic study also analyzed potential impacts to two road segments: Oak Knoll Avenue just east and west of Big Ranch Road, and Big Ranch Road south of the Materra Winery. Traffic data (turn movement counts, 24-hour volumes and speed surveys) were collected for the studied road segments and intersections for two consecutive weeks, on Friday and Saturday, in October 2020, during the harvest season. Daily (24-hour) volume counts and speed surveys were collected on Big Ranch

Road at the project site and on the winery main access driveway. Turn movement counts were collected between the hours of 2:00 and 6:00 p.m. on Friday, and between 12:00 and 6:00 p.m. on Saturday. Data from these traffic counts reflect that peak hours of traffic occur between 3:15 and 4:15 p.m. on a weekday (Friday) and between 4:45 and 5:45 p.m. on a weekend day (Saturday), though CTG notes that other hours on both days had similar volumes to those of the peak hours. Because traffic data was collected during the the period of business closures and service reductions mandated as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, CTG adjusted the system of 2020 counts to reflect the higher volumes of prior year 2019, to provide a representation of more typical traffic conditions.

Intersection impacts, with and without the project, are described in the traffic study in terms of LOS and seconds of delay. Estimated traffic from two approved but unbuilt winery use permit or use permit modification applications (Boyd Winery and H&L Winery). The latter of these only includes a site circulation revision, but the former would generate new vehicle trips as a new winery, and these new trips were added to the proposed Materra Winery traffic to generate near-term (2025) and General Plan buildout (2030) traffic projections.

Network performance for three scenarios (Operations without the Project, Operations with the Project, and Cumulative Operations with the Project) are summarized from the traffic study, below:

Operations without the Project: The majority of segments and intersections evaluated in the traffic impact study currently operate acceptably for General Plan policy, with the exception of the Oak Knoll Avenue minor approach to Silverado Trail that currently operates at LOS E before adding any project trips in the 2019 horizon. By the mid-term horizon (2025), the delay on the minor approach to the Oak Knoll Avenue/Silverado Trail intersection would deteriorate to LOS F without the project, and the minor approach to the southern intersection of Oak Knoll Avenue/Big Ranch Road would fall to LOS E. By the General Plan buildout horizon year of 2030, both locations would operate at LOS F; remaining facilities analyzed in the traffic study would operate acceptably at LOS D or better.

The Oak Knoll Avenue/Silverado Trail intersection and the southern intersection of Oak Knoll Avenue/Big Ranch Road currently exceed peak hour warrant criteria for installation of a traffic signal during weekday (both intersections) and Saturday (Oak Knoll Avenue/Silverado Trail only) peak hours.

Operations with the Project: Adding project trips to the network would not change the LOS from the three analysis horizons without the project. For the Oak Knoll Avenue minor approach to Silverado Trail, where operation would be an unacceptable LOS E during the weekday afternoon peak hour, addition of project trips to the existing (2019) condition would increase delay by 0.6 seconds, fewer than the 5 seconds for which County policy would trigger action by the applicant to restore or otherwise improve LOS. By the mid-term horizon (2025), with project traffic, the delay on the minor approach to the Oak Knoll Avenue/Silverado Trail intersection would deteriorate to LOS F without the project during the Friday afternoon peak hour, and the minor approach to the southern intersection of Oak Knoll Avenue/Big Ranch Road would fall to LOS E during the same peak. The increase in delay caused by the project at both intersections would be 1.2 seconds, and again fewer than the 5 seconds for which County policy would trigger action by the applicant to restore or improve LOS. All of the studied road segments would operate at acceptable LOS.

The Oak Knoll Avenue/Silverado Trail intersection and the southern intersection of Oak Knoll Avenue/Big Ranch Road would continue to exceed peak hour warrant criteria for installation of a traffic signal during weekend and weekday peak hours.

Cumulative - Operations with the Project Plus Other Projects: Adding project trips and other projects' trips to the long-term (2030) horizon scenario would increase delay but not to the extent of triggering corrective action by the applicant. For the Oak Knoll Avenue minor approach to Silverado Trail, where the operation would be an unacceptable LOS F during weekday and weekend peak hours, the Materra Winery's contribution to the increase in delay would be 1.8 seconds, fewer than the 5 seconds for which County policy would trigger action by the applicant to restore or improve LOS. The Oak Knoll Avenue minor approach to Big Ranch Road (south) would also be an unacceptable LOS F during weekday and weekend peak hours, with the Materra Winery's contribution to the increase in delay projected to be 2 seconds. All of the studied road segments would operate at acceptable LOS.

The Oak Knoll Avenue/Silverado Trail intersection and the southern intersection of Oak Knoll Avenue/Big Ranch Road would continue to exceed peak hour warrant criteria for installation of a traffic signal during weekend and weekday peak hours.

Although the proposed project would not be inconsistent with County LOS policy, the winery operator would nonetheless implement measures to decrease the delay caused by the winery. These measures include financial incentives for carpooling and programs supporting work flexibility, as described in response to section XVII.b, below.

Napa County Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 2013-01, adopted on January 8, 2013, adopted a Complete Streets Policy for the County. Section B.1 of the Complete Streets Policy specifies that the "[p]lanning, design, construction and maintenance of projects affecting the transportation system shall incorporate the recommendations of local bicycle, pedestrian, transit, multimodal, and other relevant plans, except...where this cannot be achieved without negative consequences." In adopting Resolution No 2013-01, it was the intent of the Board to provide for the County "a comprehensive, integrated transportation network with infrastructure and design that allows safe and convenient travel along and across streets for all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, persons with disabilities, motorists, movers of commercial goods, agricultural vehicles, products and equipment, residents, workers and visitors, users and operators of public

transportation, seniors, children, youth, and families.” The Complete Streets Policy was later incorporated in the County’s General Plan Circulation Element (2019) by reference in Policy CIR-29.

The Napa County Board of Supervisors adopted the Napa Countywide Bicycle Plan (2012 Bicycle Plan) most recently on June 26, 2012 (Resolution No. 2012-98). The adopted 2012 Bicycle Plan identifies existing Class 2 on-street bicycle lanes on both sides of Silverado Trail, and proposed (now built) alignment of the Napa Valley Vine Trail parallel to State Route 29. Proposed Class 2 bicycle lanes are identified on both Oak Knoll Avenue and Big Ranch Road. The more recently drafted 2019 Countywide Bicycle Plan, adopted by the Napa Valley Transportation Authority Board of Directors in September 2019, does not identify proposed bicycle facilities on either Oak Knoll Avenue or Big Ranch Road. However, the Napa County Board of Supervisors has not yet adopted the 2019 Countywide Bicycle Plan.

Big Ranch Road at the project site frontage currently lacks paved shoulders; however, preliminary plans for construction of the left turn lane in that right-of-way also reflect an additional 4 feet of pavement outside of the through travel lane. While not proposed to be striped as a bicycle lane, this additional 4 feet of pavement would provide equivalent width to a bicycle lane for a collector street (see Napa County Road and Street Standards, Detail C-3). No improvements are proposed on Oak Knoll Avenue north of the project site, where current bicycle plan policy indicates a proposed Class 2 lane. However, as provided in Resolution No. 2013-01, exceptions may be made when the transportation system improvement would have a negative consequence. In the case of the Oak Knoll Avenue right-of-way, the eastbound lane adjacent to the project site abuts an open drainage ditch extending the length of the property line. Thus, while currently-adopted bicycle planning policy calls for a bicycle lane on this east-west roadway, construction of the lane could have negative hydrology and biological resources impacts. It is again noted that more recent Napa County bicycle network planning documents yet to be adopted by the Board of Supervisors do not indicate planned bicycle facilities on either Big Ranch Road or Oak Knoll Avenue. The project’s impacts to bicycle planning policy would be less than significant.

There are no existing sidewalks at any point along Oak Knoll Avenue, and the nearest existing sidewalk on Big Ranch Road starts at the intersection of Big Ranch Road and Rosewood Lane approximately 2 miles south of the project site. Thus, there are no existing sidewalks in the vicinity of the project site to which any sidewalk installed at the project site frontage would reasonably provide safe pedestrian connectivity. There are no proposed or planned sidewalks, nor are there any existing or proposed public transit routes, on Big Ranch Road or Oak Knoll Avenue at the project site frontage. With no existing or proposed facilities along either street frontage or in the vicinity of the project site, the project would have no impact on pedestrian or public transit transportation modes.

- b) Approved by the Governor in 2013 and codified in Section 21099 of Public Resources Code (CEQA), Senate Bill 743 (Steinberg) directs a change in transportation impact analysis conducted under CEQA, wherein transportation impacts of a project are evaluated using the metric of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) rather than LOS. In contrast to the automobile delay and congestion measured by LOS, VMT accounts for the number of trips generated by a project, multiplied by the length in miles of each trip. The intent of the legislation is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from automobile use by reducing the length and/or number of automobile trips.

Public Resources Code Section 21099 directs the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to develop criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts of projects. Technical guidance offered by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research in its “Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA,” (December 2018) suggests that a development project would have a potentially significant VMT impact if it did not reduce VMT by 15 or more percent below the per capita average for the region in which the project is located. OPR’s technical advisory provides no direct guidance for short-term projects or construction impacts, though it does include a screening criterion of 110 new vehicle trips, below which a project would not be anticipated to have a significant impact (12).

Recently-adopted General Plan Policy CIR-7 suggests that project applicants should aim to reduce their project’s unmitigated VMT by at least 15 percent. The County’s approach to determining the significance of a project’s VMT impacts was considered by its Board to be appropriate for Napa County’s rural context, while still supporting the efforts of the County to achieve the greenhouse gas emissions goals of its pending Climate Action Plan. The reduction in VMT and, correspondingly, GHG emissions from the transportation sector, is also necessary for Napa County, the region, and the state to achieve long-term, statewide mandates targeted toward reducing GHG emissions. Such mandates include, but are not limited to Executive Orders S-3-05 and B-16-12, which respectively, set a general statewide GHG emissions reduction target of 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050, and an 80 percent GHG emissions reduction below 1990 levels (also by 2050) specifically for the transportation sector.

The traffic study prepared by Crane Transportation Group, consultant for the applicant, evaluated roadway volumes, project trip generation and LOS resulting from the project, as well as alternative transportation modes (pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities), on-site vehicle parking and sight lines. Using Napa County winery trip generation factors, as listed in the County’s Use Permit/Major Modification Application for Winery Uses, estimated daily vehicle trips could be as many as 83 trips on days when proposed all full-time and part-time employees are working on-site and visitation (34 guests) is maximized. These 83 daily trips encompass both existing and proposed operations of the winery.

Of the 83 daily trips anticipated to occur under proposed winery operations, and using the same Napa County winery trip generation factors, 43 daily trips are estimated under existing conditions. Thus, the requested use permit modification, if approved, would result in an estimated 40 net new daily trips. Both the estimated 40 net new daily trips, as well as the 83 total trips anticipated under existing conditions plus the

proposed project, are under the suggested screening criterion of 110 new daily vehicle trips for which further analysis of potential VMT impacts would be performed. Thus, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact with respect to VMT.

While additional VMT analysis is not necessary and project impacts would be less than significant, to further the regional objectives toward reducing transportation-related air emissions, the applicant and winery operator has proposed to implement a transportation demand management (TDM) program administered by the winery's human resources staff and general manager. The proposed program would include a \$5.00 daily stipend for any employee who commutes to the winery by carpool or public transportation, coupled with an emergency guaranteed-ride-home program for winery employees and guests. The proposed TDM program would be added to the winery operators' current trip and transportation-related greenhouse gas reduction efforts that include: flexible work schedules, including a four-day work week; work-from-home option for some administrative staff; a courtesy shuttle for guests lodging at accommodations within 15 miles of the winery; and on-site amenities to accommodate bicycle tours and electric vehicle charging. These current and proposed commitments are listed in Appendix H of the transportation impact study.

- c/d) The traffic study submitted with the use permit major modification application evaluated vehicle sight distance at the intersection of Big Ranch Road and the existing main winery access driveway. Page 29 of the traffic study notes that based on field measurements, sight distance from the winery access driveway is over 800 feet to the south (to see approaching northbound vehicles on Big Ranch Road) and over 500 feet to the north (to see approaching southbound vehicles on Big Ranch Road). A vehicle traveling at the posted speed limit of 50 miles per hour would need 430 feet to stop to avoid a collision with an obstruction in the roadway (in this case, a vehicle exiting the project site at the main driveway). Thus, the minimum sight distances to the north and south provide sufficient stopping distances for the vehicles exiting at the driveway. A vehicle traveling 5 miles per hour over the posted speed limit would require 500 feet to stop to avoid collision with an obstruction; the driveway's existing sight lines in excess of 800 and 500 feet would remain adequate for this higher traveling speed.

Page 12 of the traffic study notes that there was only one reported vehicular collision on Big Ranch Road near the project site driveway in 5.5 years preceding preparation of the traffic study. The collision involved two vehicles, one of which was making a U-turn movement on the roadway. Within the same time span, higher number no vehicle collisions were reported for the intersections of Oak Knoll Avenue/State Route 29 (35 collisions) and Oak Knoll Avenue/Silverado Trail (28 collisions).

In 1971, Napa County adopted its initial iteration of the Napa County Road and Street Standards (RSS). The intent of the RSS was to establish a uniform set of standards for public and private roads that strive to preserve the natural landscape and water quality, minimize impacts to environmental sensitive areas and native habitats, and provide adequate safety and service in the interest of protecting public health and welfare. As further described in the RSS Objectives, the RSS "attempt to meet the related interests of several other agencies, including the Resource Conservation District, Cal-Fire, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department, and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife" (5). The RSS has since been amended to reflect changes in the best practices and regulations of the respective agencies, with the most recent amendment occurring in February 2020 (Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 2020-12).

Existing and proposed access roadways on the project site conform to the standards in the RSS, and the applicant requests no exceptions to any RSS requirement with this use permit major modification request. Excluding construction of a left-turn lane proposed with the project, access to the winery from Big Ranch Road is not proposed to change with the project. Except during construction of the left-turn lane, during which time the encroachment permit would require that at least one lane remain open under typical traffic control measures, no existing roadways would be closed so as to constrain or preclude travel by emergency vehicles needing access to the site or surrounding properties. The existing 20-foot wide driveway with shoulders meets the minimum standards for a "common drive" as defined in Section 14 of the RSS, would remain unchanged with the proposed project, and would continue to allow large emergency response vehicles sufficient width to use the driveway to respond to emergencies at the site. The traffic study notes that proposed on-site circulation is and would be consistent with County and CAL-FIRE roadway design criteria (31).

The project as proposed includes a left-turn lane in the right-of-way of Big Ranch Road. The proposed left turn lane will allow vehicles entering the winery driveway a sheltered location to wait and queue safely outside of the flow of traffic in the through lane. With the proposed left-turn lane, adequate sight distance at the Big Ranch Road approaches to the winery access driveway, and adequate turning radii and road widths on-site to accommodate large emergency vehicle movements, the potential for the project to create a hazard or impair emergency vehicle response would be less than significant.

- e) The property currently has 24 striped stalls on-site for winery vehicle parking, and one stall is proposed to be added with this use permit major modification request. This new parking stall would have less than significant environmental impacts to water and water quality.

As described in Section X, Hydrology, of this initial study, the project would include vegetation swales, a bioretention facility, and existing vineyard areas to treat stormwater runoff from impervious surfaces, in protection of stormwater quality. With installation and maintenance of these stormwater quality facilities, the addition of one paved parking stall on the property would not have a significant environmental impact related to storm drainage or pollutant loads. Although the proposed parking lots would not have significant environmental effects, the Planning Commission will be tasked with determining whether the proposed increase from 24 to 25 parking stalls as requested with the use permit major modification application is consistent with General Plan Policy CIR-14, which discourages permit applicants from providing

unnecessary or excessive quantities of parking stalls for their uses, as part of the Commission's evaluation of the merits of the requested use permit modification.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public 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/b) As discussed in Section V, Cultural Resources, of this initial study, there are no known archaeological resources on the property, and none were recorded during the recent construction of the winery buildings, underground tanks, and septic tanks installed on-site in the vicinity of the proposed building expansion. Still, the low (valley floor) elevation and proximity of the property to the Napa River would suggest that the property's general vicinity might have attracted indigenous peoples. If contractors or the property owner finds culturally significant historic resources during any earth-disturbing activities associated with the construction of winery buildings or related utilities and surface improvements proposed with the project, construction is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist must be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the standard condition of development approval referenced in Section V, Cultural Resources, above.

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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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) Utility infrastructure necessary to serve the existing winery, including water, wastewater treatment, storm drainage, is currently accommodated on the property within the existing boundaries of the project site. Power service to the site, including the existing roof-mounted solar photovoltaic array, currently serves the existing vineyard maintenance and winery operations. While the power load within the winery building would increase, the power service would occur on-site within existing, previously-disturbed areas and would not cause significant environmental impacts due to the already disturbed terrain on the property and distance to any biologically sensitive areas, as described in the above sections. The project would have a less than significant impact.
- b) The winery utilizes an existing automated diversion valve system that, coupled with on-site biofiltration, serves as a stormwater quality preservation measure on-site. No expansions to the existing on-site stormwater quality measures are necessary to accommodate the proposed production increase. The proposed production increase is not anticipated to require extraction of groundwater at a quantity over one acre-foot per acre of the site per year, a quantity that the County has determined to be a sustainable level of groundwater extraction in the low-lying valley areas. The Water Availability Analysis submitted with the use permit major modification application estimates water use at the site at 42.0 acre-feet per year with the proposed project, an increase of 0.9 acre-feet per year as compared to currently-entitled conditions. Both the current estimated water use and the increase estimated with the currently requested modification, even without accounting for 76.5 acre-feet per year that the property owner is licensed to draw from the Napa River, are within the 50 acre-feet per year (1 acre-foot per acre on the property) that the County has established as a sustainable level of groundwater extraction. (Also see Section IX, Hydrology and Water Quality.)
- c) The winery would continue to utilize on-site systems for treatment of process wastewater and sanitary wastewater generated on the property. Will-serve letters or commitments from a wastewater treatment provider are not necessary for the project.
- d/e) The Greenhouse Gas Best Management Practices checklist that the applicant submitted with the use permit major modification request indicated that the winery operations include recycling of 75 percent of all waste at the winery, and composting of 75 percent of food and garden material. Non-recyclable and non-organic waste is collected by Napa Valley Disposal Service 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 2004, after beginning in 1992. Extrapolating that same rate of material to date, the landfill is assumed to have adequate capacity remaining to accommodate any non-recyclable and non-organic waste generated from the winery's proposed production increase.

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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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) The Napa County Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) outlines procedures, including establishing leadership roles and responsibilities of various agency staff, that guide local preparedness, response, recovery and resource management efforts associated with occurrence of a natural disaster, significant emergency, or other threat to public safety. No component of the project would result in permanent closure or obstruction of adjacent public right-of-way; during construction of the left-turn lane on Big Ranch Road, typical traffic control measures enforced by the County's encroachment permit would require at least one lane to remain open to allow continued vehicular access through the work area. No component of the implementation of the EOP would otherwise be impaired by the requested use permit. The project's impacts would be less than significant.

b/c) The property is located in a Local Responsibility Area for fire protection services (Board of Forestry, <https://calfire-forestry.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=73510b7d74ee410bfd9e73725ddad04>, accessed March 2, 2021). The property is not located in an area of wildland fire interface nor in an area of high or moderate fire risk (Napa County General Plan, Figure SAF-2). The property is in a moderate density location, with single-family residences within 0.5-mile of the winery building being associated with large parcels of vineyards. The nearest areas of very high fire risk in the State Responsibility Area approximately 0.7 miles east of the winery building, on the east side of Silverado Trail.

Other than on-site modifications for additional parking and internal building fire sprinklers required by the California Building Code, no new roads, water lines or other installations necessary to support fire suppression efforts would be needed for the project, and installation of such facilities would not affect safety of surrounding properties. The project's impacts would be less than significant.

d) As shown on the civil plans submitted by the applicant, the site is generally flat, with slope not exceeding 2 percent in the proposed area of disturbance. Surrounding properties are also generally flat, and the terrain proximate to the site lacks any notable hillsides or grade changes. Without steep slopes on or adjacent to the property, post-fire slope instability, landsliding or excessive runoff that would result in damage to structures or substantial risks to persons is not likely to occur. This impact is 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 project site has been previously developed and disturbed with orchard and currently vineyard plantings, and buildings associated with wine production vineyard maintenance. Construction of the proposed winery building expansion, new landscaping and parking areas would occur in previously-disturbed and planted areas on the property that are adjacent to existing winery buildings. Visual impacts of the project would be less than significant, as the project would maintain the minimum required 300-foot setback from Big Ranch Road, would not exceed maximum building heights specified in the Napa County Code, would not occur on slopes in excess of 15 percent such that the project would be subject to the County’s viewshed regulations. The new hospitality building addition would be partially visible from Big Ranch Road, due to its location behind the permitted single-family residence on-site, but would be constructed using neutral colors of green, tan and brown. As previously described, none of the proposed site modifications would be subject to creek setbacks nor likely to disturb any sensitive species. There are no structures on the property that are more than 10 years old, and thus no historic structures that would warrant preservation measures because of the proposed project. The property has been significantly disturbed by previous construction and agricultural activity, and while the likelihood of archaeological resources remaining on the property is low, standard Napa County conditions of development approval would require work to cease and a qualified archaeologist to be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the standard condition of approval referenced in Section V, Cultural Resources, of this initial study. With implementation of standard Napa County conditions of approval, impacts of the project would be less than significant.
- b) The project would not result in any impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively significant. The proposed project would have the effect of increasing water usage of the winery, although estimated water usage would continue to support winemaking and winery accessory activities and the overall continued use of the property for agricultural purposes, and estimated water use (42 acre-feet per year) for the existing vineyard and proposed expanded winery operations is within the County’s established threshold of 1 acre-foot per parcel acre per year for the 50-acre winery parcel located on the Valley Floor. Likewise, the approval of the requested modification would increase traffic generation to and from the parcel, though the winery operators’ existing practice of offering flexible work schedules for administrative employees and a courtesy shuttle for guests lodging at accommodations within 15 miles of the winery reduces daily trips and vehicle miles compared to base project conditions without these programs. These existing programs would be augmented by additional trip-reduction programs that the winery operators intend to implement, including a \$5.00 daily stipend for any employee who commutes to the winery by carpool or public transportation and an emergency guaranteed-ride-home program for winery employees and guests. Noise and air quality impacts associated with construction of building and site improvements would be temporary in nature, and so would also be less than significant. Construction and operational noise and air quality impacts are also anticipated to be less than significant due to the large size of the parcel, such that there are no sensitive receptors within 400 feet of proposed areas of construction. The project supports the BAAQMD’s Clean Air Plan to reduce regional emissions ozone, ozone precursors, particulate matter, toxic air contaminants, greenhouse gases, and other sources of air pollution, through its continued use of on-site renewable (solar) energy, energy-conserving lighting, and building design that includes an energy-conserving light-colored roof to reflect heat. The project would have a less than significant impact.
- c) There are no schools or hospitals housing potentially sensitive receptors within 0.5 mile of the project site. There is an off-site residence located between 400 feet and 500 feet of the areas of proposed project construction. Noise from construction of proposed winery facilities

would be temporary; would be limited to day time hours, in accordance with the standard County condition of approval noted in Section XIII, Noise, of this initial study; and would be subject to best management practices intended to limit fugitive dust and protect stormwater quality, also in accordance with standard conditions noted in Section III, Air Quality, of this initial study. Compliance with permit regulations governing the design and/or periodic inspection of stormwater and floodplain management improvement, wastewater treatment systems, and hazardous materials storage facilities, as described in Section VII, Geology and Soils, Section IX, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Section X, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this initial study would ensure preservation of public health and safety by minimizing risk of contamination of surface or groundwaters. The project would have a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.
