

COUNTY OF NAPA
PLANNING, BUILDING & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT
1195 THIRD ST., SUITE 210, NAPA, CA 94559
(707) 253-4416

Revised Initial Study Checklist
(form updated September 2010)

1. **Project Title:** Bell Wine Cellars Use Permit Modification #P13-00055.
2. **Property Owner:** Spanos Berberian Properties, LLC; 2021 West March Lane, Stockton, CA 95207; 209-473-6827.
3. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Anthony Bell, Bell Wine Cellars; 6200 Washington St, Napa, CA 94559; 707-944-1673.
4. **Representative:** Scott Greenwood-Meinert; 1455 First Street, Ste 301, Napa, CA 94559; (707) 252-7122; scottGM@dpf-law.com.
5. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Wyntress Balcher; (707) 299-1351; wyntress.balcher@countyofnapa.org.
6. **Project Location and APN:** The project is located on a 7.8 acre parcel on the east side of the State Highway 29 frontage road, Washington St., approximately 600 feet north of its intersection with Hoffman Lane and .5 miles south of the town of Yountville, within the AP (Agricultural Preserve) Zoning District; 6200 Washington St., Yountville, CA APN: 036-110-030. The winery site is located ±2000 ft. from Washington St. at the end of a private road. The private road runs parallel to the "flag" portion of the subject parcel, which serves three other parcels.
7. **General Plan Description:** Agricultural Resource (AR) Designation.
8. **Zoning:** Agricultural Preserve (AP) District.
9. **Background/Project History:**

Formatted: Left

This project was approved by the Napa County Planning Commission on May 6, 2015. Subsequent to that action, a timely appeal of the Planning Commission's approval was filed by a project neighbor including comments on this CEQA document. As an appealed item the matter is now subject to a final decision before the Board of Supervisors. This Initial Study has therefore been updated to respond to the comments received after the Commission's action, including incorporation of new technical information (noise) prepared by the County, applicant and appellant in connection with the appeal.

As a result of new information received the preliminary environmental determination has changed from a Negative Declaration to a Mitigated Negative Declaration (noise mitigation measures added). Consequently, and pursuant to State California Environmental Quality (CEQA) Statute (Section 15088.5(a)), this Initial Study is being recirculated for comment prior to final consideration of the project and appeal by the Board of Supervisors.

Updated information in this Initial Study is shown in underlined and strikethrough text.

The existing parcel is 7.8 acres in area and includes an existing 8,911± sq. ft. winery. The winery was first established as a 20,000 gallon small winery on October 2, 1980, with one full-time and one part-time employees, but no public sales, no visitation nor marketing activities.

Use Permit #U-90-42 was approved on appeal by the Board of Supervisors on January 21, 1992, to expand the annual production capacity of the winery from 20,000 gallons to 40,000 gallons; add an additional employee for a total 1 full-time, one part-time; and 8 parking spaces. Approved activities: 1) Private tours, tastings and retail sales (by appointment only) for individuals 5-10 per week with a maximum of 2-4 people in attendance, and 1-2 groups per week, with a maximum 12 people in attendance; 2) Trade and Marketing Representatives (by appointment only) 1-2 visits per week, with a maximum 2-6 people in attendance; and, 3) Marketing and Social Events (by invitation only): Lunch or dinner for trade, press, VIP's, etc., 4-6 per year, attendance of 4-8 people; Educational lunch for club or non-profit group maximum 2-4 per year, maximum 20-40 people; Harvest Festival, Grape Picking, Grape Stomp, etc., maximum 1-2/year, maximum 30 60 people in attendance; and an Open House by invitation (i.e. Napa Valley Wine Auction), maximum 1-2 per

Formatted: Font: Arial Narrow, Italic

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Arial Narrow, Italic

year with maximum 100-200 people, but no more than 20-30 at any given time. Conditions to limit bus visitation to a maximum of three (3) per year, to those persons who are members of the wine trade with specific drop-off location, and time limit for duration of bus engines were included in the conditions of approval.

A Minor Modification (#02129-MOD) to U-90-42 to enclose an existing work area, refrigeration unit and to allow the use of an existing shed for incidental winery office activities was approved administratively by the Department on May 20, 2002.

On November 17, 2003, Use Permit Modification #03315-MOD was approved by the Planning Commission to remove 1,220 sq.ft of the existing 3,990 sq.ft. existing winery building to allow the construction of a 6,261 sq.ft. winery building addition to house barrel storage; a tasting room; a meeting room; a conference room; a kitchen; a storage area, stairway, loft and restroom, and covered crush pad for a total 9,031 sq.ft. winery building. The modification also included the construction of a patio with a pergola, a barbecue area, and a bocce ball court; an increase of 4 full time employees for a total of 5 and a reduction of 1 part-time employee for a total of 1. No changes in production, tours/tasting by appointment only, and no changes in the established marketing plan were proposed.

Use Permit Modification #P06-0168-Mod was administratively approved by the Department on May 18, 2006 to reconfigure the addition to the remaining portion of the original winery for a total 8,911± sq. ft. winery plus a 1,450± sq. ft. covered crush pad designated as: 5,465 sq. ft. barrel storage area, 288 sq.ft. tasting area, 132 sq.ft. restroom, 413 sq.ft. loft/storage area. The requested revision decreased the size of the tasting area and eliminated the 5,000 sq.ft. patio.

Use Permit Minor Modification #P08-00447 was approved on August 21, 2008, to allow the original tasting area in the tank room to remain as a second, informal tasting area, and to allow the outside area under a trellis along the north and west sides of the winery addition to be used for visitor seating: by-appointment visitors and marketing event attendees. No additional visitors, picnicking or any other changes were authorized by that permit.

The property is planted in 4.6 acres of vineyards. There is an existing vacant residence on the parcel next to the winery building which the applicant indicates is currently only used for vineyard operations.

This use permit modification was submitted on February 25, 2013, to increase the production capacity from 40,000 gallons to 60,000 gallons, remodel the interior of the winery building and to modernize visitation and marketing activities. The application indicates that the current maximum daily visitation at the winery ranges from 24-76 persons, thereby exceeding the approved maximum 24- 76/week.

10. **Project Description:** Request for approval of a modification to Use Permits #U-90-42 and #03315-MOD to allow the following:

- A. Increase in the approved production capacity from 40,000 to 60,000 gallons;
- B. Increase the approved visitation from 24-76 persons per week to a maximum of 100 persons per day with a maximum of 420 persons per week;
- C. Interior remodeling of the 8,911± sq. ft. winery to allocate a new 628 sq.ft. tasting room area; a new 150 sq.ft. commercial kitchen for on-site marketing event meals and food pairings at tastings; a 210 sq.ft. meeting room; and to construct a 1,048 sq.ft. storage mezzanine, resulting in a total of 9,959± sq.ft. winery floor area with a 1,450 sq. ft. exterior covered crush pad;
- D. On-premise consumption of the wines produced on-site, consistent with Business and Professions Code §§23356, 23390, and 23396.5 (also known as AB 2004 (Evans 2008 or the Picnic Bill) outside on the adjacent patio or lawns;
- E. Employ 11-24 persons; maximum 15 persons;
- F. Modify the existing Marketing Event Program to remove the following events: 1) Lunch or dinner for trade, press, VIP's, a maximum 6/year with maximum 8 persons; 2) Educational lunch for club or non-profit group maximum 4/year , maximum 40 people; 3) Harvest Festival, Grape Picking, Grape Stomp, etc., maximum 2/year, maximum 60 people; and 4) Open House by invitation (i.e. Napa Valley Wine Auction), maximum 2/year, with maximum 200 people, but no more than maximum 30 at any given time to replace with the following new Marketing Event Program: 1) Events for wine club members, wine education seminars and trade events with appetizers or full lunch or dinner, up to four (4) per week (no more than 1 per day) with a maximum 40 guests; 2) Wine Auction-related and other major events such as the Napa Film Festival, accompanied by food and wine, sometimes with non-amplified musical program, four (4) per year for a maximum 200 guests.
All marketing events will continue to be held in all of the various winery facilities, including the winery structure and patio area. The events will last approximately 4-5 hours between 10:00 AM and 9:00 PM depending on morning or evening schedule. Up to 80 overflow parking spaces in the vineyard along the side of the access road are available during large events; five spaces are available on the grass-crete hard surface adjacent to the winery (near lawn area adjacent to the winery and driveway entrance); and nine spaces available in the center area of the circular driveway near the residence;
- G. Revise the annual limit condition on the number of buses (maximum 3 per year) permitted to visit the winery (Condition #7, Use Permit #U90—42) to exclude for-hire cars, vans and public transit;
- H. Installation of a new subsurface drip wastewater system; and
- I. Installation of a Transient Non-Community Water system and a water backflow prevention system.

10. **Environmental setting and surrounding land uses:**

The 7.8 acre parcel is located on the east side of Washington St. which runs parallel to State Route 29 (SR29), north of its intersection with Hoffman Lane with 20' frontage on Washington St. This parcel is a "flag lot" with the 20' width frontage continuing ±1,238 feet to the main portion of the property. The access driveway for this parcel and three other parcels is situated adjacent to this 20' wide strip, 15 feet of pavement.

The property is relatively flat at the 75'± elevation above mean sea level and drains from the southwest to the northeast. Hopper Creek, a blue-line stream flows along the easterly edge of the property; Napa River is 1,000± feet northeast of the property. The property is located within the FEMA 100 year Flood Zone. The geology of the property is quaternary surficial deposits, overlain by alluvium, undifferentiated. Soils on the majority of the property are Cole silt loam (0 to 2 percent slopes), with Clear Lake clay, drained along the southeasterly property line and along the "flag" portion.

According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps, the foothill yellow-legged frog has been identified as occurring within the creek adjacent to the project boundaries.

Improvements to the site include a 8,911± sq. ft. winery, vacant single family residence (currently used as storage) with carport, shed, paved courts, storage tank, fire pump building, 2 wells, small concrete pad, and 11-space parking lot, served by an existing paved road adjacent to the "flag" portion of the parcel. The property is planted in approximately 4.6± acres of vineyards.

Adjacent land uses include agriculture (vineyards); one residence located to the east; two residences located to the west; and a small winery, Hopper Creek Winery, 3,200 sq.ft. in area with a 20,000 gallon/year production capacity, no visitors, and 2.5 employees, located to the west of the subject winery. The closest residence is approximately 190 feet southeast of the winery structures.

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

Discretionary approvals required by the County consist of a use permit modification request. The project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County, including but not limited to building permits, grading permits, and waste disposal permits. Permits may also be required by the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, & Firearms.

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

Federal Trade and Taxation Bureau
Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control

Other Agencies Contacted

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

Date

Name: Wyntress Balcher, Planner II

Napa County Planning, Building & Environmental Services Department

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-c. This project is located on the valley floor where the viewsheds of the highest visibility are mostly concentrated in the mountain's foothills to the east and west of the valley floor, between Napa city boundary and the Yountville town boundary. The project site is currently developed with a winery, residence, and vineyards. Only interior changes are proposed to the winery structure and there is no proposal to alter the 8,911± sq. ft. winery structure. Therefore, there would not be a change to the visual quality of the site nor will the proposal result in an obstruction, or adversely affect the scenic vistas. There are no rock outcroppings visible from the road, or any other designated scenic resources on the property. The existing residence is not considered a historic structure.

d. The project does not propose any changes to the exterior of the existing winery structure and will not create any new source of light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in an area. However, ~~expansion of the Marketing Program and use of outdoor areas may require the need for the installation of new sources of nighttime lighting that may affect nighttime views~~ public comments were received from the neighbor that existing lighting fixtures do not contain sufficient shielding that results in slippage of light and glare onto the neighbor's property and at the neighbor's residence. This is an existing condition and thus would not be a new source of substantial light or glare, and thus, the project under consideration with this Initial Study does not have the potential to result in a substantial adverse effect on day or nighttime views. However, the ~~standard condition of approval, below, will be applied to the entire development project and includes augmented language requiring all existing lighting to be evaluated for off-site light and glare slippage, and shielded or otherwise altered to eliminate this existing condition. As such, both the existing development and the proposed project expansion~~ will not have a significant impact resulting from new sources of outside lighting.

All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward, shall be located as low to the ground as possible, and shall be the minimum necessary for security, safety, or operations and shall incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. 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 not subject to this requirement. Prior to issuance of any building permit for construction of ~~the winery~~ improvements associated with Use Permit Modification P13-0005, the permittee shall have a lighting professional conduct an assessment of existing lighting to determine the degree of compliance with glare and lighting requirements. Any lighting found to result in off-site glare or light spillage shall be modified to prevent off-site light and glare, and all modifications to lighting shall be addressed in the assessment. ~~two~~ Two (2) copies of a detailed lighting plan showing the location and specifications for ~~all~~ all existing and any proposed lighting fixtures to be installed or modified on the property shall be submitted for Planning Division review and approval. All lighting shall comply with California Building Code.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. ¹ Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. Based on a review of Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Department of Conservation Farmlands, 2008* layer), the site is classified as "Prime Farmland". General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use policies AG/LU-2 and AG/LU-13 recognize wineries, and any use consistent with the Winery Definition Ordinance and clearly accessory to a winery, as agriculture. As a result, this application will not result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use.
- b. The property is zoned Agricultural Preserve (AP) and is not subject to a Williamson Act contract. No changes in agricultural activities will result from the project, and there will be no resulting conflict with the zoning or the ability to initiate an agricultural contract.
- c/d. The project site is zoned AP (Agricultural Preserve), which allows wineries upon grant of a use permit. The project site does not contain woodland or forested areas, and thus would not result in the loss of or conversion of forest lands to a non-forest use.
- e. As discussed in item "a.", above, the winery and winery accessory uses are defined as agricultural by the Napa County General Plan and are allowed under the parcels' AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning. Neither this project, nor any foreseeable consequence thereof, would result in changes to the existing environment which would result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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:				
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) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<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) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-c. On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Board of Directors unanimously adopted thresholds of significance to assist in the review of projects under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The thresholds were designed to establish the level at which the District believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA and were posted on the Air District's website and included in the Air District's May 2011 updated CEQA Guidelines.

On March 5, 2012 the Alameda County Superior Court issued a judgment finding that the Air District had failed to comply with CEQA when it adopted the thresholds. However, on August 31, 2013, the Court of Appeals reinstated the Air District's thresholds of significance provided in Table 3-1 (Criteria Air Pollutants & Precursors Screening Levels Sizes) which are applicable for evaluating projects in Napa County.

Over the long term, emission sources for the proposed project will consist primarily of mobile sources including vehicles visiting the site. The Air District's threshold of significance provided in Table 3-1 has determined that similar projects such as a quality restaurant that do not exceed a threshold of 47,000 sq. ft. will not significantly impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2011 Pages 3-2 & 3-3.). Given the size of the entire project, which is approximately ±2036 sq.ft. of reallocated enclosed floor area for tasting/hospitality uses compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47ksf (high quality restaurant) and 541ksf (general light industry) for NO_x (oxides of nitrogen), the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. (Please note: a high quality restaurant is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, but grossly overstates emissions associated with other portions of a winery, such as office, barrel storage and production, which generate fewer vehicle trips. Therefore, a general light industry comparison has also been used for other such uses.)

The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plan. Wineries as proposed here are not producers of air pollution in volumes substantial enough to result in an air quality plan conflict. The project site lies within the Napa Valley, which forms one of the climatologically distinct sub-regions (Napa County Sub region) within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The topographical and meteorological features of the Valley create a relatively high potential for air pollution. Over the long term, emissions resulting from the proposed project would consist primarily of mobile sources, including production-related deliveries and visitor and employee vehicles traveling to and from the winery. The resulting busiest day plus marketing total is well below the threshold of significance. The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

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

During all construction activities, the permittee shall comply with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Basic Construction Mitigation Measures (Table 8-1, May 2011 Updated CEQA Guidelines) as provided below:

- All exposed surfaces (e.g. parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access (road) shall be watered two times per day.
- All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
- All visible mud or dirt tracked out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
- 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.
- Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.

- All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.
- Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible.

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

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 during windy periods.

- e. While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. The closest residence is located approximately 190 feet southeast of the winery structure. Ground-disturbing activities, expansion of wastewater system and new water system, will occur on the northwest side of the parcel, approximately 350 feet away from the residence. Construction-phase pollutants will be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. The project will not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or 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 Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers: plants CNPS points & polygons, plant surveys, red legged frog core area and critical habitat, vernal pools & vernal pool species, Spotted Owl Habitat – 1.5 mile buffer and known fish presence), the foothill yellow-legged frog species have been identified as occurring within the project boundaries, within the Hooper Creek riparian area. The species' environment is not proposed to be disturbed, since the project proposes remodeling within the existing winery structure and there is no expansion of the building footprint proposed. The waste disposal system will be installed outside of the 50' creek setback and will involve minimal grading on relatively flat land. No tree removal is involved with the project and no disturbance of the creek is proposed. The potential for this project to have an adverse impact on special status species, specifically the yellow-legged frog, is less than significant.

- c/d. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – water bodies, vernal pools & vernal pool species; Known Fish Presence) Hooper Creek is a Biological Critical Habitat Area for Steelhead. The project activities will be located over 100 feet from the creek and will not be located within the stream or adjacent to the stream banks. Therefore, the project as proposed would have no impact to biological resources.
- e/f. This project would not interfere with any ordinances protecting biological resources. There are no tree preservation ordinances in effect in the County. Since the project will not require for the removal of any trees and the grading will be minimal, the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans.

Mitigation measure: None required.

Formatted: Left

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

Discussion:

- a-c. The site includes an existing winery and residential structure. The residential structure will remain on the property and is currently being used for agricultural storage.

The property is located within an area that is archaeologically sensitive. The project will not require the construction of any new buildings within the sensitive area. All construction will occur for installation of an improved waste water system and water backflow prevention device, which are outside of the archaeological sensitivity area. However, if resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval:

"In the event that archeological artifacts or human remains are discovered during any subsequent construction in the project area, work shall cease in a 50-foot radius surrounding the area of discovery. The permittee shall contact the 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 the development, all work in the vicinity must be, by law, 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 nearest tribal relatives as determined by the State Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted by the permittee to obtain recommendations for treating or removal of such remains, including grave goods, with appropriate dignity, as required under Public Resources Code Section 5097.98."

- d. No human remains have been encountered on the property during past grading or construction activities. However, if resources are found during the minimal grading activities of the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard condition of approval noted above

Mitigation measure: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to 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 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"/>

Discussion:

- a.
- i) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the project is located within an existing winery building and the installation of wastewater system and water backflow prevention device would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.
 - ii) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the interior changes in the facility will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible.
 - iii) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. The Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Alquist Priolo and geology layers) did not indicate the presence of faults on the property.
 - iv) The Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) did not indicate the presence of landslides on the property.
- b. The proposed interior remodeling of the existing structure will occur on flat land. Based upon the Soil Survey of Napa County, prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the site is composed of two soil types. Soils in the southwestern portion of the site are classified as Clear Lake clay (drained); and Cole silt loam soils are found on the northeasterly side of the parcel. Clear Lake clay and Cole silt loam soil types are all found on lands with 0-2% slopes. Soils in the Clear lake soil series characterized as poorly drained, formed in alluvium derived from sedimentary rock, and medium erosion hazard. Cole series soils are created from alluvium derived from sandstone and shale and/or alluvium derived from igneous rock, with little or no erosion hazard. The land is flat, and the soils have little erosion potential, therefore, the project would not have an erosional impact on the topsoil.
- c/d. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Geology layer and Surficial Deposits layer) the geology of the property is quaternary surficial deposits, overlain by Holocene alluvium, undifferentiated. Based upon the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Liquefaction layer) the project site has high susceptibility for liquefaction. The proposal does not include the construction of any new structures, just interior remodeling, and the installation of the new waste disposal system expansion, new surface drip water system, and water backflow prevention equipment. There are two wells on the property, and the second well was found to meet the requirements for a Class 1B well standards, and no additional wells will be needed. The installation of the waste disposal system will not involve a significant

change in the land and which will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

- e. The Napa County Division of Environmental Health has reviewed this application and recommends approval based on the submitted wastewater feasibility report and septic improvement plans. Soils on the property have been determined to be adequate to support the proposed septic improvements including the winery's process waste as well as the proposed number of visitors to the winery.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
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:

- a/b. Overall increases in Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions in Napa County were assessed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the Napa County General Plan Update and certified in June 2008. GHG emissions were found to be significant and unavoidable in that document, despite the adoption of mitigation measures incorporating specific policies and action items into the General Plan.

Consistent with these General Plan action items, Napa County participated in the development of a community-wide GHG emissions inventory and "emission reduction framework" for all local jurisdictions in the County in 2008-2009. This planning effort was completed by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency in December 2009, and served as the basis for development of a refined inventory and emission reduction plan for unincorporated Napa County.

In 2011, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) released California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Project Screening Criteria and Significance of Thresholds [1,100 metric tons per year (MT) of carbon dioxide and carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e)]. This threshold of significance is appropriate for evaluating projects in Napa County.

During our ongoing planning effort, the County requires project applicants to consider methods to reduce GHG emissions consistent with Napa County General Plan Policy **CON-65(e)**. (Note: Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, because this initial study assesses a project that is consistent with an adopted General Plan for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was prepared, it appropriately focuses on impacts which are "peculiar to the project," rather than the cumulative impacts previously assessed.)

The applicant proposes to incorporate GHG reduction methods including but not limited to: continued a Transportation Demand Management Plan with bicycle riding incentives and bus transportation for large marketing events; exceed Title 24 energy efficiency standards built to CALGREEN Tier 1; energy conserving lighting; energy star roof; water efficient fixtures; recycling 75% of all waste; composting; implement a sustainable purchasing and shipping programs; public transportation accessibility on The Vine Route 10 and the Yountville Trolley; intent to become a Certified "Napa Green Land"; use of recycled materials; education to staff and visitors on sustainable practices; use of 70%-80% cover crop; and to retain biomass removed via pruning and thinning by chipping the materials and reusing it rather than burning on site.

The proposed project has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds and determined that the project would not exceed the 1,100 MT/yr of CO₂e. GHG Emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the Cal Green Building Code, tightened vehicle fuel efficiency standards, and more project-specific on-site programs including those winery features noted above would combine to further reduce emissions below BAAQMD thresholds.

The increase in emissions expected as a result of the project will 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 Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through 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 for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, 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 for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. The proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts normally used in alteration of the buildings and subsequent winery operations. A Business Plan will be filed with the Environmental Health Division should the amount of hazardous materials reach reportable levels. However, in the event that the proposed use or a future use involves the use, storage or transportation of greater than 55 gallons or 500 pounds of hazardous materials, a use permit and subsequent environmental assessment would be required in accordance with the Napa County Zoning Ordinance prior to the establishment of the use. During construction of the project some hazardous materials, such as building coatings/ adhesives/ etc., will be utilized. However, given the quantities of hazardous materials and the limited duration, they will result in a less-than-significant impact. Therefore, the project would not result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site.
- d. The proposed site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.
- e. The project site is not located within two miles of any public airport.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.
- g. The proposed project is not on a major highway and will not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan.

- h. The project is not located within a State Fire Hazard Severity Zone and would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<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, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or 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"/>
e) 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"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not violate any known water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. A new on-site domestic and process wastewater systems is proposed to accommodate the increase in visitation. The Napa County Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the proposed domestic and process wastewater systems and recommends approval as conditioned. Additionally, any earth disturbing activities would be subject to the County's Stormwater Ordinance which would include measures to prevent erosion, sediment, and waste materials from entering waterways both during and after any construction activities. CAB Consulting Engineered submitted a Water System Technical Managerial and Finance Report (dated January 23, 2015) for the proposed Transient Non-Community Water system to support the proposed visitation. The report indicates that water quality data for the existing well was available to the engineer and all constituents evaluated met current water quality requirements. Given the County's Best Management Practices, which comply with RWQCB requirements, the project does not have the potential to significantly impact water quality and discharge standards.
- b. On January 14, 2014 Governor Jerry Brown declared a drought emergency in the state of California. The declaration stopped short of imposing mandatory conservation measures statewide. Mandatory water restrictions are being left to individual jurisdictions. At this time the County of Napa has not adopted or implemented mandatory water use restrictions. The County requires all Use Permit applicants to complete necessary water analyses in order to document that sufficient water supplies are available for the proposed project. On June 28,

2011 the Board of Supervisors approved creation of a Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee (GRAC). The GRAC's purpose was to assist County staff and technical consultants with recommendations regarding groundwater, including data collection, monitoring, well pump test protocols, management objectives, and community support. The County completed a county-wide assessment of groundwater resources (Napa County Groundwater Conditions and Groundwater Monitoring Recommendations Report (Feb. 2011)) and developed a groundwater monitoring program (Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2013 (Jan. 2013)). The County also completed a 2013 Updated Hydrogeologic Conceptualization and Characterization of Groundwater Conditions (Jan. 2013).

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 is not consistent across the County. More is known about the resource where historical data have been collected. Less is known in areas with limited data or unknown geology. In order to fill existing data gaps and to provide a better understand of groundwater resources in the County, the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan recommended 18 Areas of Interest (AOIs) for additional groundwater level and water quality monitoring. Through the well owner and public outreach efforts of the (GRAC) approximately 40 new wells have been added to the monitoring program within these areas. Groundwater Sustainability Objectives were developed and recommended by the GRAC and adopted by the Board. The recommendations included the goal of developing sustainability objectives, provided a definition, explained the shared responsibility for Groundwater Sustainability and the important role monitoring as a means to achieving groundwater sustainability.

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

Minimum thresholds for water use have been established by the Department of Public Works using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS). These reports are the result of water resources investigations performed by the USGS in cooperation with the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. Any project which reduces water usage or any water usage which is at or below the established threshold is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels. The project is located on the valley floor in an area that has an established acceptable water use criteria of 1.0 acre foot per acre per year. The Allowable Water Allotment for the subject property is 7.84 acre-feet per year (af/yr), determined by multiplying its 7.84 acre size by a one af/yr/acre fair share water use factor.

A Water System Technical Managerial and Financial Report was prepared by Carl Butts, P.E., CAB Consulting Engineers (dated 1/23/2015) to demonstrate the technical, managerial and financial capabilities of the proposed transient non-community water system required to support the additional visitation proposed by the project. The report states there are two wells on the property, and Well #2 will be used for the domestic water system proposed. Well #1 did not meet the source requirements for the water system due to the lack of a 50-foot annular seal. Well #1 will be used to provide irrigation water and will be independent of the domestic water system.

This application indicates a proposal to expand the production capacity from 40,000 to 60,000 gallons, and increase weekly visitation and marketing events, specifically, an increase from 76 visitors/week to a maximum 420 visitors/week; 4 marketing events per week with a maximum 40 people; 4 large events with a maximum of 200 guests. For events with more than 60 guests, portable toilets and hand washing stations would be utilized. The winery is approved for 6 employees, and the applicant indicates there will be between 11-24 employees. The water study report is prepared for 15 employees.

Based on the submitted Phase One water availability analysis prepared by Carl Butts, CAB Consulting Engineers (dated January 23, 2015), the water demand for the existing approved winery would be 5.04 af/yr, but the existing total water demand is currently 5.11 af/yr; and the estimated total water demand with the proposed project would be 6.14 af/yr. The following chart breaks down the various water demands for each element causing the demand for the winery:

PROPERTY WATER DEMANDS	#03315-Approval (40,000 gal. winery)	Current Demand (40,000 gal. winery)		Proposed Demand (60,000 gal. winery)	
	Acre feet/year	Acre feet/year		Acre feet/year	
Winery Processing (40,000 gallons)	.86	.86		1.29	
Employees (15 employees) [approved 6 employees]	.25 [.10]	.25		.25	
Tasting Visitors (visitors/week)	76/week .04	210/week .10	420/week .20		
Event/Marketing (visitors/year)	528/yr .02	528/yr .02	9129/yr .42		
Landscaping (per production)	.20	.20		.30	
Subtotal	1.37 [1.22]	1.43		2.46	
Vineyard – Irrigation (4.6 acres)	2.30	2.30		2.30	
Vineyard – frost protection (0 acres)	0	0		0	
Subtotal	2.30	2.30		2.30	
Residence	.75	.75		.75	
Residence landscaping (per ac/home)	.63	.63		.63	
Subtotal	1.38	1.38		1.38	
TOTAL	5.04 [4.90]	5.11		6.14	

This report states that there is an expected increase in the total annual water demand of .56 af/year due to the increase in visitation. With the increase in production there would be an increase of .43 af/yr. and a .10 af/yr increase from landscaping. The hydrologist report indicates that existing Well #2 is located approximately 900 feet from an adjacent well located up gradient, based upon preliminary research and field visits. They estimated, based upon aerial photos research, there is another off-site well approximately 300 feet south and east of the well, near Hopper Creek. Existing Well #2 has an approximate 500 gallon per minute capacity based on well logs. During the irrigation season, a minimum 6.72 gallons per minutes sustained yield would be required to meet both domestic and irrigation demands. The 500 gallon per minute capacity of the existing well exceeds that requirement by a factor of 74.

Based on these figures, the project would remain below the established fair share for groundwater use on the parcel, and the water system engineer's report indicated there is adequate water available to serve the project. Therefore, the project will not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater level. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Water Deficient Areas/Storage Areas*), the project site is not located within a water deficient area.

- c-e. The proposed project will not substantially alter the drainage pattern on the site nor cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off site. There are no existing or planned stormwater systems that would be affected by this project. If the project disturbs more than one acre of land, the permittee will be required to comply with the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board addressing stormwater pollution during construction activities. The project site includes vineyards, landscaping and other pervious areas that have the capacity to absorb runoff.
- f. There is nothing included in this proposal that would otherwise substantially degrade water quality. As discussed in greater detail at, "a.," above, the Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the sanitary wastewater proposal and has found the proposed system adequate to meet the facility's septic needs as conditioned. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality.
- g-i. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Flood Zones and Dam Levee Inundation* layers), the site falls within the 100-year flood zone, a Federal Emergency Management Area (FEMA) designated Special Flood Hazard Area, and within a dam inundation area Rector Dam and Conn Dam). No housing is proposed as a part of this project. The interior modifications to the existing winery structure will be required to obtain a floodplain management permit and required to show it can meet the requirements of Chapter 16.04 of the Napa County Code, prior to the issuance of a building permit. The applicant will be responsible for re-validation and re-certification of the flood proofing plan for this winery located inside a flood hazard area, prior to issuance of the building permits, thus the potential flood hazard impacts will be less than significant.
- j. In coming years, higher global temperatures are expected to raise sea level by expanding ocean water, melting mountain glaciers and small ice caps, and causing portions of Greenland and the Antarctic ice sheets to melt. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change estimates that the global average sea level will rise between 0.6 and 2 feet over the next century (IPCC, 2007). However, the project area is located at approximately ±75-ft. above mean sea level and there is no known history of mud flow in the vicinity. The project will not subject people or structures to a significant risk of inundation from tsunamis, seiche, or mudflow.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required

[Bell Wine Cellars Use Permit Modification](#)
[P13-00055/Bell Winery- Use Permit P13-00055](#)

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project is located in an area dominated by agricultural, open space and rural residences. The proposed use and the improvements proposed here are in support of the ongoing agricultural use in the area. This project will not divide an established community.
- b. The subject parcel is located in the AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning district, which allows wineries and uses accessory to wineries subject to use permit approval. The proposed project is compliant with the physical limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance. The County has adopted the Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO) to protect agriculture and open space and to regulate winery development and expansion in a manner that avoids potential negative environmental effects.

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

The proposed modification to expand the production capacity will not change the use of the property for the "fermenting and processing of grape juice into wine" (NCC §18.08.640) and 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 visitation increase and modification of the marking program supports the economic viability of agriculture within the county.

- c. There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the property.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

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

Discussion:

- a/b. 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 or near the project site.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels 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) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project 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"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. The proposed project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during the project construction phase. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles; noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. The proposed project would not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts. Construction activities would generally occur during the period between 7 am and 7 pm on weekdays- normal waking hours. All construction activities will be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (N.C.C. Chapter 8.16). The ground-disturbing activities will not be expected to generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels, and the activities will be limited in duration to construct the expansion of the septic drain fields.

c/d. Noise from winery operations is generally limited; however, the proposed new marketing plan could create additional noise impacts. The submitted marketing plan includes four large annual events with a maximum of 200 visitors, and 4 events per week with a maximum of 40 people, occurring between the hours of 10:00AM and 9:00PM. Prior to the Planning Commission's decision, the applicant revised the marketing plan reducing events to 2 events per month for a maximum of 40 guests, and include those guests in the total visitation tally, and 4 events per year with maximum of 200 guests. The Napa County Noise Ordinance, which was adopted in 1984, sets the maximum permissible received sound level for a rural residence as 45db between the hours of 10 PM. and 7 AM. While the 45 db limitation is strict (45 db is roughly equivalent to the sound generated by a quiet conversation), the area surrounding the subject property is very lightly developed, with only a scattering of homes located in the immediate vicinity, the nearest residence approximately 190 feet from the south side of the winery building. Marketing activities are will occur on the north side of the building and will cease prior to 10:00 PM, which will maintain compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance and reduce potential substantial noise impacts to a non-significant level.

The original use permit application was taken to the Board of Supervisors on appeal with the neighbors citing concerns about the potential noise from buses arriving at the winery. The use permit approved in 1991 included a condition limiting the amount of buses allowed at the site to three per year, and a limitation on the amount of time a bus could idle. That use permit limited the location of bus passenger staging area north of the winery or at points northwesterly of that area. There is no record that this condition has been violated. The applicant is not proposing transit of visitors by large buses but by small multi-passenger vehicles such as for-hire limousines and vans, which would be quieter than buses. These vehicles will utilize the existing passenger staging area on the north side of the parcel. The condition placed on the original permit regarding idling vehicles would remain in place. As discussed above, in compliance with Napa County's Noise Ordinance enforced by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff, the applicant proposes marketing events to occur between the hours of 10:00 AM and 9:00 PM with clean-up to end before 10:00 pm. The events will not include outdoor amplified music. This should ensure that marketing events and other winery activities would have a less than significant noise impact.

This project was approved by the Napa County Planning Commission on May 6, 2015 after a duly noticed public hearing. During the public hearing, a neighbor raised concerns that the existing winery operation caused noise impacts to his property and requested that the Commission not expand the entitlement. No noise study had been prepared prior to the Commission's decision. Subsequent to the Commission's decision on May 6, 2015, the neighbor filed a timely appeal of the Commission's action. On August 3, 2015 and August 4, 2015 noise studies were submitted by the appellant neighbor and the applicant. The appellant's noise professional is Charles M. Salter Associates, Inc. (Salter), and the applicant's noise professional is Illingworth & Rodkin, Incorporated. Both of these firms are recognized as having expertise in acoustics and preparation of CEQA noise studies.

County Staff evaluated both studies and determined that each study correctly applies County Noise Ordinance standards, but that some of the conclusions in both studies were not well supported by substantial evidence in the form of actual noise measurements or made assumptions regarding the level of activity occurring at the existing facility. The reported and forecasted noise levels were generally quite close between the two studies with the applicant's study finding that project related noise fell below County noise standards, and the appellant's study forecasting that noise exceeded County standards. In general, the applicant's noise study did not have actual noise measurements on the neighbor's property, and the appellant's noise study speculates on the size/scope of uses occurring on the winery property. Staff raised these issues with both parties and as such both parties agreed to fund the County preparing a third, comprehensive sound study performed by a qualified firm chosen by the County and under the County's independent direction.

The independent third noise impact report was prepared by RGD Acoustics (RGD). This study includes actual sound measurements of the winery's activities, including outdoor events, with measurements taken on both the winery property and the neighbor's property. The size and scope of the activities were also known by RGD. The RGD study finds that most of the uses do not exceed the County's sound level thresholds, but conservatively determines that mobile bottling operations has the potential to exceed sound levels by 1 dBA. A 1 dBA increase is not typically discernable to the human ear. This study indicates that this forecasted exceedance could feasibly be addressed by relocating or reorienting the mobile bottling truck.

RGD Acoustics' study was shared with both parties in November, 2015. On December 3, 2015, the appellant submitted a response to RGD Acoustics' findings. Expert opinion was provided again by Salter and by an additional land use and planning firm, J. Kapolchok & Associates (Kapolchok). This correspondence has also been incorporated into this Initial Study (see attachments). Below are responses to the points raise in that correspondence:

1. Salter and Kapolchok are critical of how RGD classifies the land use occurring at the shared property line at Hopper Creek. Under the direction of the County Zoning Administrator and County Noise Officer, RGD properly classifies those areas of the appellant's property that are not used for residential use as agriculture. Salter and Kapolchok improperly suggest that the "residential multiple or country" designation from the Noise Ordinance (Title 8.16) be applied to the Hopper Creek area on the basis that Table 8.16.070 A.2 classifies the open space area of the creek as "residential multiple and country." It appears that Salter and Kapolchok did not consult with or otherwise contact County staff prior to rendering their interpretation of County Zoning and the Noise Ordinance. The term "residential multiple and country" is derived by the Zoning Ordinance (Title 18) land uses for Residential Multiple (RM) and Residential Country (RC). The County does apply the word "country" to describe open space. Open space is a land use within the General Plan Agricultural Resource and Agriculture, Open Space and Watershed land use designations, which are reflected under zoning as Agricultural Preserve (AP) and Agricultural Watershed (AW) respectively. In evaluating noise impacts, Table 8.16.070 A.2 set conservative standards for noise intrusion to receiving land uses. The 45 dBA standard for "residential multiple and country" applies to residential multiple and residential country (i.e. - rural residences) land uses. It does not apply to creeks or open spaces which are designated by the County as Agricultural Resource or Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space. There is no noise standard for agricultural lands, due to the County's long standing "right to farm" statute which acknowledges that noise from agricultural operations is necessary to sustain agriculture as the highest and best use of land within the Agricultural Preserve (AP). This interpretation is consistent with past practices.
2. Salter states that the RGD report inappropriately subtracts ambient noise levels when evaluating noise generated from existing mechanical equipment and thus understates noise generation by 2 dBA (44 dBA versus 42 dBA). Although the County Noise Officer and Zoning Administrator believe the RGD report properly considers ambient noise levels, County accepts Salter's more conservative opinion and has treated the sound from the existing mechanical equipment as a potentially significant impact requiring mitigation although 44dBA is 1 dBA below the threshold of significance. A mitigation measures has been applied requiring the construction of a sound attenuating enclosure around the mechanical equipment prior to issuance of building permits for any portion of the proposed project. The enclosure will ensure that sound generated from the mechanical equipment will not result in an increase in mechanical equipment noise above existing conditions, but within an ambient noise setting context and without consideration of existing noise levels. Existing mechanical equipment noise will be reduced as a result of constructing the enclosure.
3. Salter states that the ambient nighttime noise level is as low as 34 dBA and opines that noise from the mechanical equipment would be perceived as twice as loud. Salter does not opine on the fact that the mechanical equipment is part of the existing project and therefore represents the existing setting from which the existing ambient noise levels were taken. The project proposes no expansion, relocation, replacement or otherwise redevelopment of this existing mechanical equipment configuration, and therefore, the project does not have a potential to result in a new significant impact. However, the County is applying a mitigation measure requiring

- Formatted: Font: Arial Narrow
- Formatted: List Paragraph, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"
- Formatted: Font: Arial Narrow
- Formatted: Font: Arial Narrow
- Formatted: Font: Arial Narrow
- Formatted: Font: Arial Narrow
- Formatted: Font: Arial Narrow
- Formatted: Font: Arial Narrow
- Formatted: Font: Arial Narrow
- Formatted: Font: Arial Narrow
- Formatted: Font: Arial Narrow

enclosure of the mechanical equipment which will reduce the amount of noise it currently makes in addition to ensuring that it will comply with noise standards in the future.

4. Kapolchok states that the RGD study failed to analyze an additional, unoccupied residence on the appellant's property which is located closer to the winery than the main residence. It is noted that RGD worked with the appellant on setting up noise measuring devices and at no point during that process did the appellant disclose to the County or RGD that the unoccupied second unit was intended to be used for residential purposes. The Salter study prepared by the appellant also fails to recognize this structure as a receiving residential use. Since Kapolchok first raised this point in December 2016, the County has investigated the history of this dwelling unit. There are no know building permits for this second unit but County addressing records confirm an address assignment for a secondary dwelling unit (addresses are not assigned to accessory uses such as garages, studios and quest cottages). Under current AP zoning regulations, secondary dwelling units are not allowed within this agricultural zoning district. Given that there is no known building permit and that an address has been assigned, in all likelihood the living unit was established prior to zoning regulations that now prohibit the use, and thus the use a pre-existing nonconformity. County Zoning permits nonconformities to continue provided that they were legally established, and have not been voluntarily abandoned. Legal status for nonconformities is determined by filing a discretionary Certificate of Legal Nonconformity (CLN) application, which is a discretionary land use action heard by the County Zoning Administrator. Until such time that a CLN is executed, the County cannot recognize the unit a legal residential land use. With that noted, for the purposes of CEQA impact evaluation, the County considers the unit as having the potential to be reoccupied and thus it is appropriate to ensure that winery noise levels comply with the receiving residential use standard. As such, all three mitigation measures listed below are applicable, and will attenuate noise to levels that meet County standards. Outdoor events, which take place on the north end of the building, have sufficient noise shielding for the main residence, but the second unit is located closer to Hopper Creek and more in a direct line with the outdoor events area. Mitigation Measure X.II.3 requires installation of a temporary sound curtain when outdoor events are occurring. The RGD report includes an exhibit of potential locations for the sound curtain.

5. Kapolchok asserts that the project description evaluated by RGD was incomplete and that the application materials fail to identify the whole of the project. A single example was given speculating that the proposed conversion of barrel storage to hospitality space will result in displaced winery operations outside. The project description is complete and was properly considered by RGD. No expansion of outdoor (or indoor) wine production spaces is proposed. Winery operations vary greatly between each business. Some wineries age wine off site. Some wineries stack barrels two or greater in height, where others do not stack barrels. The period for barrel aging varies greatly as well depending on varietal and wine making objectives. It is completely speculative to assume that winery operations will expand out of doors as a result of visitation space expanding indoors. In the event that outdoor wine making activities were proposed, it would be subject to a new discretionary use permit modification.

- e. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area nor is it within two miles of a public airport or private airstrip.
- f. The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Mitigation Measures: ~~None required.~~ Applicant shall comply with the following measures to reduce potential noise impacts to less-than-significant:

XII.1 – Prior to the issuance of any building permits to implement the expansion authorized by this use permit modification, the permittee shall submit building permit plans for enclosure of the mechanical equipment area on the south side of the building. Building permit plans shall include an acoustical analysis prepared by a qualified acoustics professional that demonstrates the enclosure complies with County noise standards. The enclosure shall be completed prior to issuance of a certificate of final occupancy permit to implement the expansion authorized by this use permit modification.

Mitigation Monitoring: County Planning Division Staff shall review building permit plans for compliance prior to issuance. County Building Inspection Staff will conduct inspections of the enclosure, and final occupancy of the enclosure will be performed by County Planning and Building Division staff.

XII.2 – Prior to the issuance of any building permits to implement the expansion authorized by this use permit modification, the permittee shall submit an operation plan for the bottling and outdoor work area which shall require the bottling truck to be oriented such that open trailer doors, bottling lines, glass and container staging areas are located in the west and north sides of the truck. A sound curtain shall be utilized on the southern and eastern portions of the work area and all work shall occur on the approved outdoor work area and crush pad. The operations plan shall be prepared under the direction of a qualified acoustics professional, and shall be subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.

Mitigation Monitoring: County Planning Division Staff shall review and approve the operations plan prior to issuance of building permit plans for the project. Planning Division staff will inspect the facility prior to final occupancy. County Code Enforcement Staff conduct winery use permit compliance audits, such that future use of the operations plan will be monitored. Code Enforcement staff will respond to any noise complaints.

XII.3 – Prior to the issuance of any building permits to implement the expansion authorized by this use permit modification, the permittee shall submit plans for a temporary sound curtain to be placed in the vicinity of the outdoor work area/crush pad which shall be used when outdoor events occur. The sound curtain shall be designed by a qualified acoustics professional, and shall be in substantial conformance with the

[Bell Wine Cellars Use Permit Modification](#)
[P13-00055Bell Winery: Use Permit P13-00055](#)

Formatted: Font: Arial Narrow

recommendations put forth in the RGD Acoustics study incorporated herein. Final design of the sound curtain is subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.

Mitigation Monitoring: County Planning Division Staff shall review and approve the sound curtain design prior to issuance of building permit plans for the project. Planning Division staff will inspect the facility prior to final occupancy. County Code Enforcement Staff conduct winery use permit compliance audits, such that future use of the sound curtain for outdoor events will be monitored. Code Enforcement staff will respond to any noise complaints.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial 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 housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed staffing for the winery is indicated as 11-24 employees. The water and waste disposal analysis reports prepared its analysis based on 15 employees at the facility. Based on the analyzed numbers, there would be an increase of nine employees, for a maximum 15 employees at this facility. The Association of Bay Area Governments' *Projections 2003* figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase some 23% by the year 2030 (*Napa County Baseline Data Report*, November 30, 2005). Additionally, the County's *Baseline Data Report* indicates that total housing units currently programmed in county and municipal housing elements exceed ABAG growth projections by approximately 15%. The additional employee positions proposed will lead to a some minor population growth in Napa County, but will not rise to a level of environmental significance. In addition, the project will be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs.

Cumulative impacts related to population and housing balance were identified in the 2008 General Plan EIR. As set forth in Government Code §65580, the County of Napa must facilitate the improvement and development of housing to make adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community. Similarly, CEQA recognizes the importance of balancing the prevention of environment damage with the provision of a "decent home and satisfying living environment for every Californian." (See Public Resources Code §21000(g).) The 2008 General Plan sets forth the County's long-range plan for meeting regional housing needs, during the present and future housing cycles, while balancing environmental, economic, and fiscal factors and community goals. The policies and programs identified in the General Plan Housing Element function, in combination with the County's housing impact mitigation fee, to ensure adequate cumulative volume and diversity of housing. Cumulative impacts on the local and regional population and housing balance will be less than significant.

- b/c. The one existing residence is not currently being used for living; only storage for the agricultural operations. This project will not displace a substantial volume of existing housing or a substantial number of people and will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. 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:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. Public services are currently provided to the project area and the additional demand placed on existing services would be marginal. Fire protection measures are required as part of the development pursuant to Napa County Fire Marshall conditions and there will be no foreseeable impact to emergency response times with the adoption of standard conditions of approval. The Fire Department and Engineering Services Division have reviewed the application and recommend approval as conditioned. School impact mitigation fees, which assist local school districts with capacity building measures, will be levied pursuant to building permit submittal. The proposed project will have little to no impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from any building permit fees, property tax increases, and taxes from the sale of wine will help meet the costs of providing public services to the property. The proposed project will have a less than significant impact on public services.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a/b. This application proposes an increase in tours and tastings by prior appointment, and marketing events. No portion of this project, nor any foreseeable result thereof, would significantly increase the use of existing recreational facilities. This project does not include recreational facilities that would have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system and/or conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-16, which seeks to maintain an adequate Level of Service (LOS) at signalized and unsignalized intersections, or reduce the effectiveness of existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-23, 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"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. The project is located on the east side of the State Highway 29 frontage road, Washington St., approximately 600 feet north of its intersection with Hoffman Lane and .5 miles south of the town of Yountville. Washington St. is the main access into Yountville from the controlled access off-ramp of State Highway 29, with an underpass to the other side of the highway. The project driveway entrance is approximately .9 miles south of this intersection. Although the winery property has frontage on Washington St., the winery driveway connects to a private road serving three other parcels paralleling the "flag" portion of the property 1200± feet from Washington St.

The project includes an expansion of the winery production capacity from 40,000 to 60,000 gallons/year; remodeling of the winery interior to expand hospitality areas; the expansion of approved visitation from 76/week (or 11 per day) to a maximum 420 per week (requesting maximum 100 per day), and the modification of the Marketing Program. The Marketing Plan proposes appointment only events for club members, trade, and wine education seminars, approximately 4-5 hours per event (depending upon morning or evening schedule), during the hours of 10:00 AM to 9:00 PM for 10-40 guests (average 20). Also proposed are changes to the four (4) large events such as Wine Auction-related or other major events such as the Napa Film Festival, where the proposed maximum number of persons is 200 (average 150 persons), occurring during the hours of 10:00 AM to 9:00 PM. The application also includes an on-site employee increase of 11-24 maximum.

Omni-means Engineering Solutions prepared "A Focused Traffic Analysis for the Proposed Bell Wine Cellars Use Permit Modification Project (dated December 12, 2014). The report states that based on new weekly visitation and employment supplied by the project applicant and the ADT counts conducted on the Bell Cellars Winery driveway, overall activity at the winery has increased beyond the permit levels. These levels represent existing uses. The winery currently averages approximately 45 visitors per day and 225 visitors per week. In addition, employment at the winery has weekend employees (4 full-time, 3 part-time). Employment reflects a combination of cellar, administrative and tasting room employees.

Both daily and peak hour traffic counts conducted for this study reflected these increases in "existing" employment and visitation levels occurring during today.

The study included intersection turning movement counts at the Washington St./Bell Wine Cellar driveway intersection and the Washington St./Hoffman Lane/State Route 29 intersection during a weekday PM peak commute period (4:00-6:00 PM) and the weekend peak period (1:00-3:00 PM). The traffic volume counts were conducted during the peak harvest/crush period for the Napa Valley (September/October,

2014) and reflect "peak month" volumes. Overall trip generation calculations were based on employee peaking factors and auto occupancy rates for event visitors and existing driveway volumes.

Traffic conditions on roads and at intersections are generally characterized by their "level of service" or LOS. LOS is a convenient way to express the ratio between volume and capacity on a given link or at a given intersection, and is expressed as a letter grade ranging from LOS A through LOS F. Each level of service is generally described as follows:

LOS A- Free-flowing travel with an excellent level of comfort and convenience and freedom to maneuver.

LOS B- Stable operating conditions, but the presence of other road users causes a noticeable, though slight, reduction in comfort, convenience, and maneuvering freedom.

LOS C- Stable operating conditions, but the operation of individual users is substantially affected by the interaction with others in the traffic stream.

LOS D- High-density, but stable flow. Users experience severe restrictions in speed and freedom to maneuver, with poor levels of comfort and convenience.

LOS E- Operating conditions at or near capacity. Speeds are reduced to a low but relatively uniform value. Freedom to maneuver is difficult with users experiencing frustration and poor comfort and convenience. Unstable operation is frequent, and minor disturbances in traffic flow can cause breakdown conditions.

LOS F- Forced or breakdown conditions. This condition exists wherever the volume of traffic exceeds the capacity of the roadway. Long queues can form behind these bottleneck points with queued traffic traveling in a stop-and-go fashion. (2000 Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board)

State Route 29 acts as the primary north-south regional route through the Napa Valley, and provides direct access to the project site via Hoffman Lane and Washington St. The State Highway 29 carries 30,500 ADT, and based on Napa County roadway segment level of service thresholds, these volumes are well within the carrying capacity of a four-lane rural throughway-arterial and represents LOS B. Field observations made during peak weekday/weekend data collection periods at the Hoffman Lane-Washington St./State Route 29 intersection indicate very stable-flow conditions in both directions with no vehicle congestion and motorists on State Route 29 are driving the speed limit.

Washington St. is classified by the County, as a rural two-lane collector street with a carrying capacity of 1,067 Average Daily Traffic (ADT) for LOS A operations. Based upon the collected ADT data, Washington St. is currently operating at LOS A with 675 daily vehicle trips.

Based on the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM 2010), the Bell Cellars Winery Driveway/Washington St. and the Hoffman Lane/Washington St. intersections (unsignalized, minor-street stop-sign controlled) are also operating at LOS A. The Hoffman Lane/State Route 29 intersection is operating a LOS F during the weekday PM peak hours (4:00 -6:00), and weekend PM peak hour (1:00-3:00). It is noted that this intersection LOS refers to the stop-sign controlled westbound (outbound movements) from Washington St. onto southbound State Route 29. At this time, none of the three intersections would qualify for peak hour signal warrants.

The report states that the proposed project would be expected to generate 115 daily weekday trips with 42 PM peak hour trips. During a typical weekend, the project would be expected to generate 120 daily trips with 31 mid-day peak hour trips. During harvest crush season, the proposed project is expected to generate an average of 109 daily trips. This would represent 100 visitors, 8 full-time and 4 part-time employees, 60,000 gallons of wine production and 340 tons of grape (on-haul). Based upon the largest marketing event, attendance of 200 persons (four times per year), there would be a total generation of 154 events.

Therefore, the proposed project would result in an increase of 98 daily trips with 36 trips during the weekday PM peak hour. On a weekend, the project would generate 104 daily trips with 27 trips during the mid-day peak hour. These trip totals represent the difference between the permitted levels and the proposed levels. With regard to the total increase in traffic volumes on the roadway network, the proposed project is expected to generate 50 daily trips with 19 trips during the weekday PM peak hour. On a weekend, the project would add 48 daily with 11 mid-day peak hour trips.

To determine the traffic conditions with the proposed project, total net new roadway trips were added to the existing volumes. Based on observed turning percentages, the project trips were distributed 70% to/from north on Washington St. and 30% to/from the south on Washington St.

The report concludes that the proposed project would add approximately 50 daily trips to the project driveway, Washington St., and State Route 29, representing an addition of less than 1% (0.002) to the daily volumes on the highway. The combined existing plus project volume of 28,050 daily trips would remain at LOS B operating conditions for a four-lane rural arterial highway based on established County thresholds. ADT on Washington Street would increase to 725 vehicles with the proposed project activity and would continue to operate at LOS A conditions. ADT on the Bell Cellars driveway access road would increase from 150 to 200 vehicles.

Cumulative (year 2030) volume projections on State Highway 29 from the Napa County General Plan Update EIR forecast an increase in volume-to-capacity ratio of 3.7% from the Year 2003 to Year 2030 between Oak Knoll Ave and California Dr. peak hour two-way volumes.

This yielded a future volume of 4,604 weekday PM peak hour vehicles on State Route 29 in the year 2030. Although cumulative volumes are conservative, the forecast volumes would yield acceptable LOS B conditions on State Route 29.

Cumulative projections were not available for Washington St.; however, by assuming the same conservative increases in traffic growth, existing ADT on Washington St. would increase from 675 trips to 1,073 daily trips, yielding an acceptable LOS B condition. With regard to weekday PM peak hour and weekend mid-day peak hour intersection operation under cumulative year 2030 conditions, the Bell Cellars private road driveway/Washington St. and Hoffman Street/Washington St. intersections would operate at acceptable conditions of LOS A-B or better.

The project would not cause a substantial increase in traffic in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system, and would not result in a substantial adverse impact to the level of service at the existing unsignalized intersections.

The project provides bicycle racks for visitors and surveys of existing daily and peak hour trip generations indicate significant use of transit services, specifically, "The Wine Trolley" and/or "hire car" (limousines, Escalades, etc.), helping to reduce vehicle trips generation and to increase the effectiveness of the existing transit services and bicycling.

- c. No air traffic is proposed and there are no new structures proposed for this project that would interfere with or require alteration of air traffic patterns.
- d. The traffic analysis prepared indicated that radar surveys conducted as a part of the study indicate the "critical vehicle speeds along Washington Street at the existing project driveway are 50 miles per hour or less during the weekday PM peak period and the Saturday afternoon peak period, which would require a sight distance of approximately 430 feet, measured along the travel lanes on Washington Street. As measured, existing vehicle sight distance to the south from the project driveway exceeds 430 feet (460-500 ft) and is adequate. The report indicates that the vehicle sight distance on the north is somewhat restricted due to existing vegetation located in the front yard of a residential home on the northeast quadrant of the intersection. The report indicated that trimming or pruning this vegetation would provide improved vehicle sight distance to/from the north on Washington St. at the project driveway/private road, however, the vegetation is on private property. The potential safety concern is less than significant, however, when upon further field investigation (February 4, 2015), it was noted that the north view is not totally obstructed by the shrubs and southbound vehicles could be seen.
- e. There are no proposed changes to the road that would substantially increase hazards and the existing road has adequate width and turn around area for emergency vehicle access.
- f. There are a total of 8 existing parking spaces existing, adjacent to the winery, and parking on the crush pad available in non-harvest time. The application statement indicates that there are 11 existing paved parking spaces with an additional five spaces available adjacent to the winery on a "grass-crete" hard surface. There are an additional 9 spaces available in the residence driveway circle and up to 80 spaces available in the vineyard along the side of the access road for overflow parking during larger events. The proposed use of additional parking adjacent to the road and in the vineyard will not impede emergency access. Visitors are currently using limousines and large vans to arrive at the facility, many from the hotels in Yountville. As previously discussed, these vehicles will utilize the existing passenger staging area on the north side of the parcel. A requirement for accommodation of the shuttle buses for larger events, as proposed by the applicant, will be added as a project-specific condition.
- g. There is no aspect of this proposed project that would conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation. The paved access road and parking area would facilitate access by bicyclists, and would not prevent bus access.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<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) Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and will not result in a significant impact on the environment relative to wastewater discharge. Wastewater disposal will be accommodated on-site and in compliance with State and County regulations. The project will not require construction of a new water well for compliance with the State regulations for a Transient Non-Community Water system, since the existing well will comply with the regulations. An expansion of the existing on-site wastewater treatment facilities is proposed to accommodate the project. In the report prepared by CAB Consulting Engineers (dated August 26, 2013), the engineer concluded that there is adequate water available to serve the systems. Since the wastewater disposal can be accommodated on-site in compliance with State and County regulations and since there is sufficient water on the site to support the system, the proposed project would not be expected to result in a significant impact to the environment.
- c. The project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, which will cause a significant impact to the environment.
- d. The project will require improvements to the domestic water system to install a backflow prevention device to insure the water quality complies with the requirements of a small water system under California Code. A Water System Technical Managerial and Financial Report was prepared by CAB Consulting Services, dated January 23, 2015, to support the additional visitation and Marketing Plan. The Phase I Water Availability Analysis indicates a total future demand of 6.14 af/yr, for the winery, vineyard, landscaping, and the domestic use related to the increase in visitation and production. The existing well #2 has an existing capacity of over 500 gallons per minute based upon well logs. The report indicates that during the irrigation season, a minimum of 6.2 gallons per minute sustained yield would be required to meet both the domestic and irrigation demands. The 500 gallon per minute capacity of the existing well exceeds that requirement by a factor of 74.
- e. Wastewater will be treated on-site and will not require a wastewater treatment provider.
- f. The project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the projects demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the project.
- g. The project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. 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 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, 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 Biological Resources section indicates that there is the possibility of state or federally protected species occurring in the vicinity of the site. No historic or prehistoric resources are anticipated to be affected by the proposed project. The project will not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, 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.

As indicated in the discussion, the project have a less than significant impact on the potential habitat of the foothill yellow-legged frog, a species of special concern, adjacent to Hooper Creek, since the project does not propose to disturb the creek or its riparian area and land disturbing activities for the primary septic pressure distribution field will occur well over fifty feet from the riparian corridor. No tree removal is proposed.

- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology, and traffic impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The project would also increase the demands for public services to a limited extent, increase traffic and air pollutions, all of which contribute to cumulative effects when future development in Napa Valley is considered. Cumulative impacts of these issues are discussed in previous sections of this Initial Study and would not be of significant impact. The General Plan EIR indicates that several roadway segments, including State Highway 29, are presently operating at unsatisfactory levels and additional roadways segments will reach unsatisfactory levels in the future. State Highway 29 in the vicinity of the project, between Oak Knoll Rd. and California Dr., is operating at a LOS B weekday PM peak period and Saturday afternoon peak period, aided by the highway access off-ramp, connecting the access road (California Dr.) serving the southern part of Yountville. State Highway 29 south of Yountville at Hoffman Lane, has improvements that include left turn lanes and right turn tapers, further assisting in the reduction of congestion on this portion of the highway. The cumulative (Year 2030) volume projections on State Highway 29 in this area plus the project traffic will result in a less than significant impact on the level of service on the highway.
- c. There are no environmental effects caused by this project that would result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, whether directly or indirectly. No hazardous conditions resulting from this project have been identified. The project would not have any environmental effects that would result in significant impacts.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

ATTACHMENTS:

- [Environmental Noise Assessment Use Permit Modification Bell Wine Cellars; Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc., August 3, 2015](#)
- [Bell Wine Cellars Noise Assessment; Charles M. Salter Associates, Inc., August 4, 2015](#)
- [Draft Environmental Noise Impact Report for: Bell Wine Cellars Use Permit Modification; RGD Acoustics; November 16, 2015](#)
- [Charles M. Salter Associates Inc. Letter Dated December 3, 2015](#)
- [J. Kapolchok & Associates Land Use Planning Urban Design Memo \(undated\) Titled: Bell Cellars Noise Study Peer Review](#)

Formatted: Left, Indent: Left: 0"