

**COUNTY OF NAPA**  
**CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPARTMENT**  
**1195 THIRD ST., SUITE 210**  
**NAPA, CA 94559**  
**(707) 253-4416**

**Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration (Revised)**

1. **Project Title:** Bennett Lane Winery, Use Permit Modification #P07-00299-MOD
2. **Property Owner:** Lynch Family Vineyards, LLC.
3. **County Contact Person:** John McDowell, Deputy Planning Director, [jmcdowel@co.napa.ca.us](mailto:jmcdowel@co.napa.ca.us)
4. **Project Location and APN:** 3340 State Highway 10128 approximately 1,000 ft. south of Bennett Lane, Assessor's Parcel #017-160-002, Calistoga.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** M. Michael Smith, Esq. for Bennett Lane Winery, 4640 Admiralty Way, Suite 500-17, Marina del Rey, CA 90292.
6. **Hazardous Waste Sites:** The project is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.
7. **Project Description:** Approval of a Major Modification to Use Permit #92452-UP to expand the existing winery structures and expand visitation and marketing as follows: (1) remodel the existing approximate 8,900 sq. ft. winery building including expansion of the office (2) construct a new approximately 3,650 sq. ft. tasting room with offices; (3) construct a new approximately 5,000 sq. ft. barrel storage building with commercial kitchen (4) add an enclosed courtyard between buildings; (5) relocate and expand the customer parking lot to 22 parking spaces; (6) increase tours and tasting by appointment only to 32 visitors per day, with 168 visitors average per week; (7) a marketing plan with 48 private wine, food and harvest events per year with a maximum of 40 people per event, and 4 Industry Open House events with a maximum of 50 people per event; and (8) three Wine Auction-related events per year with a maximum of 125 people per event. No changes in the annual production limit of 50,000 gals/year are requested.

**PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION:**

The Conservation, Development and Planning Director of Napa County has tentatively determined that the following project would not have a significant effect on the environment and the County intends to adopt a **Negative Declaration**. Documentation supporting this determination is contained in the attached Initial Study Checklist and is available for inspection at the Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department Office, 1195 Third St., Room 210, Napa, California 94559 between the hours of 8:00 AM and 4:45 PM Monday through Friday (except holidays).

DATE: November 26, 2008

\_\_\_\_\_  
BY: John McDowell

**WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD:** November 27, 2008 to December 16, 2008

Please send written comments to the attention of Ronald Gee at 1195 Third St., Room 210, Napa, California 94559, or via e-mail to [jmcdowel@co.napa.ca.us](mailto:jmcdowel@co.napa.ca.us). A public hearing on this project is tentatively scheduled for the Napa County Planning Commission on Wednesday, December 17, 2008. You may confirm the date and time of this hearing by calling (707) 253-4417.

**COUNTY OF NAPA**  
CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
1195 THIRD ST., SUITE 210  
NAPA, CA 94559  
(707) 253-4416

**Initial Study Checklist**  
(reference CEQA, Appendix G)

**Revised**

*This initial study was originally circulated for comments on June 25, 2008 and considered in public hearings before the Napa County Planning Commission on July 16, 2008, and again on August 18, 2008. Based on comments received, additional information has been included in this initial study in order to augment and clarify the public record and the document is being re-circulated for public review. Additional text shown as underlined. New attachments consist of an August 15, 2008 letter from Dennis Jackson, hydrologist; and several letters and a technical memorandum from October, 2008 from the project's licensed civil engineer, Riechers Spence Associates.*

1. **Project Title:** Bennett Lane Winery, Use Permit Modification #P07-00299-MOD
2. **Property Owner:** Lynch Family Vineyards, LLC.
3. **County Contact Person and Phone Number:** John McDowell, Deputy Planning Director, [jmcdowel@co.napa.ca.us](mailto:jmcdowel@co.napa.ca.us)
4. **Project Location and APN:** 3340 State Highway 128 approximately 1,000 ft. south of Bennett Lane, Assessor's Parcel #017-160-002, Calistoga.
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** M. Michael Smith, Esq. for Bennett Lane Winery, 4640 Admiralty Way, Suite 500-17, Marina del Rey, CA 90292.
6. **General Plan description:** Agricultural Resource, *Napa County General Plan, June 2008*
7. **Zoning:** AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning district
8. **Description of Project.**

Approval of a Major Modification to Use Permit #92452-UP to expand the existing winery structures and expand visitation and marketing as follows: (1) remodel the existing approximate 8,900 sq. ft. winery building including expansion of the office (2) construct a new approximately 3,650 sq. ft. tasting room with offices; (3) construct a new approximately 5,000 sq. ft. barrel storage building with commercial kitchen (4) add an enclosed courtyard between buildings; (5) relocate and expand the customer parking lot to 22 parking spaces; (6) increase tours and tasting by appointment only to 32 visitors per day, with 168 visitors average per week; (7) a marketing plan with 48 private wine, food and harvest events per year with a maximum of 40 people per event, and 4 Industry Open House events with a maximum of 50 people per event; and (8) three Wine Auction-related events per year with a maximum of 125 people per event. No changes in the annual production limit of 50,000 gals/year are requested.

The project consists of building expansions and marketing changes to an existing winery north of Calistoga. The original Bennett Lane Winery was constructed in 1995 (Use Permit 92452-UP – Charter Oak Winery) with an annual production capacity of 20,000 gallons. In 2003, after a change in ownership, the Planning Commission approved an expansion in the annual production capacity to 50,000 gallons (Use Permit Major Modification 02638-MOD), but there were no changes to visitation, marketing or existing buildings. The current proposal will result in the construction of two new buildings and remodeling of a portion of the existing building increasing the winery's enclosed square footage from approximately 8,900 sq. ft. to approximately 17,750 square feet. The existing building will continue to house production and aging, but the existing tasting and office areas will be remodeled to be dedicated solely to offices. A new tasting building will be constructed south of and in front of the existing building, and a new barrel aging building with a kitchen and events space will be located west of the existing building.

Several site improvements will occur with the project as well. An outdoor courtyard enclosure will be created between the three buildings which includes a fountain. The existing customer parking lot will be relocated and expanded from 14 spaces to 22 spaces. Several rows

---

of vines will be removed to accomplish this. No improvements to the project access road are proposed or required. The driveway connection to Highway 128 will remain in its current state as well. It was improved to Caltrans standards in 2003 as part of the approved production increase.

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

The project site is located in the far northern (northwestern) portion of the Napa Valley on essentially level terrain. The subject property is planted in vineyards and contains the existing winery building which was constructed in 1995. The winery building is located on the northern portion of the site and borders an unnamed year-round creek that straddles the property's northern property line. Aerial photos indicate that this creek has been highly disturbed by agricultural activities dating back to the 1940's. It is channelized and does not contain any native vegetation other than in the channel itself and intermittent scatterings of oak trees. The 10 acre site is long and narrow and divided by the existing winery access road.

Surrounding properties are all planted with vineyards with several residences located on adjoining properties. To the north and east of the site across the unnamed creek are several large vineyards. West of the site is a smaller vineyard with a house and barn. The barn is located approximately 250 ft. from the winery and the house is approximately 400 ft. from the winery. South and west of the winery are two additional smaller properties that front on Highway 128 and contain residences. These residences are approximately 850 ft. and 1,000 ft. from the winery. South of the winery property is Highway 128 with open pasture land beyond. South and east of the winery is another vineyard with an estate home located approximately 650 ft. from the winery.

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

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

Other Agencies Contacted

California Department of Transportation, District IV

**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

\_\_\_\_\_  
November 26, 2008

\_\_\_\_\_  
John McDowell, Deputy Planning Director

\_\_\_\_\_  
Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department

## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

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

### Impact Discussion:

- a-d. The site of the proposed winery is not located on a scenic vista or skyline. The project will not damage scenic resources, including trees, rock outcroppings or historic buildings within a state scenic highway. There are no scenic resources on or adjacent to the property. The proposed winery expansion is greater than 600 feet from the centerline of State Route 128. The design of the buildings feature stucco and stone siding with architecture characteristic of wine country, resulting in less than significant impacts to the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings. The project site would not result in damage to scenic resources and is consistent with the goals and policies of the Scenic Highways Element in the Napa County General Plan because the project complies with the 600 ft. winery setback and is of a high quality design consistent with General Plan policy concerning the design of wineries. The project will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and surrounding area. The proposed winery will utilize minimal lighting for security and evening operations during harvest. Exterior lights will be limited to those necessary for security purposes and shielded and directed downward pursuant to County standard conditions of approval for winery developments. Incorporating these project components will ensure the potential for the project to introduce new sources of light which would affect nighttime views would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. <b>AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.</b> In determining impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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"/>

### Impact Discussion:

- a-c. The project site is designated by the Napa County General Plan as "Agricultural Resource". This designation supports agriculture and processing of agricultural products. The proposed winery additions and parking lot expansion will be constructed in an area currently planted in vines. Approximately 0.2 acres of vineyard will be removed to construct the winery addition, however, the project does not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. The proposed winery project is considered an agricultural use and further supports utilization of the existing agricultural resources (vineyard) on site. The proposed project would result in less than significant adverse impacts to agricultural resources. The project site is not currently under Williamson Act contract.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. <b>AIR QUALITY.</b> 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"/>
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"/>

#### Impact Discussion:

- a-c The project site is located in the northern end of the Napa Valley of Napa County, which forms one of the climatological subregions (Napa County Subregion) within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin, and is consequently subject to the requirements of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The project would not be in conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Ozone Maintenance Plan, Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan or the Bay Area 1991 Clean Air Plan, under the Federal Clean Air Act. BAAQMD regard emissions of PM-10 and other pollutants from construction activity to be less than significant if dust and particulate control measures are implemented.

According to the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, motor vehicles traveling to and from a project represent the primary source of air pollutant emissions associated with project implementation. Motor vehicles can emit ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) creating compounds. In implementing these Guidelines, the BAAQMD further states that the District generally does not recommend a detailed air quality analysis for projects generating less than 2,000 vehicle trips per day.

This project will generate minor increases (less than 20 cars per day) in passenger vehicle trips throughout the year, a combination which is below the BAAQMD threshold. Because this project will not generate a significant number of trips relative to the BAAQMD threshold, the project traffic meets BAAQMD screening guidelines for a less than significant impact.

Construction related emissions are generally short-term in duration, but may still cause adverse air quality impacts. According to the BAAQMD Guidelines, fine Particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> [PM]) is the pollutant of greatest concern with respect to construction activities. PM emissions can result from grading, excavation, and vehicle travel on unpaved surfaces, and vehicle and equipment exhaust. Construction related emissions can cause substantial increases in localized concentrations of PM, and lead to adverse health effects and nuisance concerns. The BAAQMD has identified the following Best Management Practices which are now employed at construction sites throughout the Air Basin as a set of feasible PM control measures and which are incorporated into the project applicant's proposed construction activities to reduce any potential impact to levels of less than significance:

- Water all active construction areas at least twice daily.
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials *or* require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
- Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.
- Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.
- Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.

By adhering to these Best Management Practices, construction activities will have a less than significant impact. Further, with low traffic volumes, the temporary nature of construction activities, and adherence to the Best Management Practices, the project will not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment (Ozone [O<sub>3</sub>] and Particulate Matter [PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>]) under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard ([http://www.baaqmd.gov/pln/air\\_quality/ambient\\_air\\_quality.htm](http://www.baaqmd.gov/pln/air_quality/ambient_air_quality.htm)). Therefore, this project will not have a cumulative air quality impact.

- d-e The project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or create objectionable dust or odors affecting a substantial number of people. The BAAQMD defines exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants and risk of accidental

releases of acutely hazardous materials (AHMs) as potential adverse environmental impacts. Examples of sensitive receptors include schools, hospitals, convalescent facilities and residential areas with children. There are no sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site. The closest offsite residence is approximately 400 feet away. Further, this project will not create odors inconsistent with the surrounding agricultural setting. Project construction components described above will ensure dust control. Therefore, the project impact on pollutants, dust or odors will remain less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure(s):** None.

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

#### **Impact Discussion:**

a-d. The site is previously disturbed, planted in vines and contains an existing winery. According to Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Natural Diversity Database, California Native Plant Society and Watershed Overlays), the site is not located in any designated habitat areas of 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. An un-named, year-round creek is located north of the winery a minimum of 45 ft. away. The creek has been highly altered by decades of agricultural use, and other than the occasional oak tree, there is no native vegetation located outside the banks of the drainage for the entire reach until it makes its way into the hills to the north. Aerial photo reconnaissance indicates that the creek has been in essentially this non-native state since at least the 1940's. The current project adheres to County Conservation Regulations creek setback regulations which require setbacks of at least 35 ft. from top of bank. The proposed project will be constructed south of the existing winery building and away from the creek. Construction activities are required to comply with County standards which prevent such activities and staging from occurring within creek setbacks. No new fencing is proposed. Therefore, the project is considered to have no potential to 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. This project would result in less than significant impacts on any special-status species.

e. The proposed project is not subject to any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. The County does not have a tree protection ordinance. No trees or vegetation is proposed for removal.

f. According to Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Natural Diversity Database, California Native Plant Society and Watershed Overlays), there are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans applicable to the subject project site.

**Mitigation Measure(s):** None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. <b>CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

**Impact Discussion:**

- a. County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Archaeological Resources Overlay) indicate there are no known historically sensitive sites or structures located within the project site.
- b. There are no known archaeological resources in the development area and earthmoving or grading would occur in areas previously disturbed by vineyard planting. In the event archaeological artifacts are encountered during construction of the project, all work would cease to allow a qualified archaeologist to record and evaluate the resources. This is considered a less-than-significant impact because the project site has been previously graded. All projects involving earth disturbing activities are subject to a standard condition of approval requiring work to cease if remains or culture resources are discovered during construction.
- c. The subject site does not contain any known paleontological resources or unique geologic features and therefore is not anticipated to result in any significant adverse impacts to such resources.
- d. The presence of any formal cemeteries is not known to occur within the project area and therefore the proposed project is not anticipated to result in any significant adverse impacts on any such resources.

**Mitigation Measure(s):** None

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. <b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### Impact Discussion:

- a. The proposed project is not located within any Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zone. The site is generally level with a 0% to maximum 5% slope. According to Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Alquist-Priolo Fault, Soil Types and Liquefaction layers), soil types located on the project site have high liquefaction potential. While seismic activity is endemic to the Bay Area, the project is required to conform with California Uniform Building Code, which contains minimum building design standards for property with high liquefaction potential.
- b. According to the United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Soil Survey of Napa County, California, the site consists of equal amounts of Bale loam (0%-2% slopes) and Bale clay loam (2%-5% slopes), both with medium liquefaction potential. No substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil will result from the project because the project will be subject to County and State sediment retention requirements and stormwater pollution prevention requirement (see discussion under Section viii, Hydrology and Water Quality).

The project will occur at an existing winery/vineyard property with gently-sloping terrain with less than 2% slopes. Since there will be less than one acre of disturbed area for the project, no Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan is required for storm water and erosion control and Best Management Practices under the standards developed in the County's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Phase II Stormwater Permit,. Therefore, the potential for impacts is considered less than significant.

- c. The project site is not known to 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 or collapse.
- d. The soil type is not considered to be expansive, as defined in table 19.1B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property.
- e. The existing project includes a below ground septic system for wastewater management which was installed and inspected as complete in 2004. The system has been found by County Environmental Management to be sufficient to accommodate the proposed increases in visitation. The soil on the property is capable of supporting the designed system, and will result in a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. <b>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> 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"/>

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

**Impact Discussion:**

- a. The proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials. A business activity plan for the winery will be required of the winery by the Department of Environmental Management should the amount of these materials reach reportable levels.
- b. The project would not result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- c. The project will not have significant quantities of potentially hazardous materials, and is not located in close proximity to any school.
- 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 a public airport and is outside any airport compatibility zones.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airport. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard.
- g. The proposed project will not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan.
- h. The property is not located in an area identified as a high wildfire risk.

**Mitigation Measure(s):** None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. <b>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b> 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Impact Discussion:

- a. The project proposes to increase the amount marketing and visitation at the facility but no increases in approved production. The existing winery process wastewater treatment system has the capacity to handle the increased flows resulting from the additional visitation in conformance with all applicable State and local water quality standards. The system was upgraded in 2004 as part of the previous approval to increase capacity from 20,000 gals/year to 50,000 gals/per.
- b. 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 project which is at or below the established threshold is assumed not to have a significant effect on ground water levels. The allowable allotment of water for the project parcel is 1.0 acre-foot per acre per year. The current water demand is 4.96 acre-feet per year. The project site is 10 acres allowing under County Ordinance for an allotment of 10 acre-feet per year to the parcel. The estimated new total water demand for the site (existing winery/vineyard plus proposed winery expansion and visitation expansion) is estimated to have a demand of 4.83 acre-feet per year, based on the information contained in the updated Phase 1 Water Analysis provided by the applicant and dated October 1, 2008.

In response to water availability issued raised at the hearing and in the August 15, 2008 Dennis Jackson letter, the project's licensed civil engineer prepared a new water availability analysis which is attached and included as part of this initial study. The update analysis changed the water demand calculation from 4.96 acre-feet per year to 4.83 acre-feet per year. This decrease in water demand was the result of factoring in increased visitation offset by the removal of approximately .5 acres of vineyards. Projected water demand on the property will be reduced as a result of the project. Vineyards on the property presently use 3.16 acre-feet of water per year, and have existed on the site since at least the early 1990's. The winery was originally 20,000 gallon per year winery was constructed in the mid-1990's, and its capacity was increased in 2003 to 50,000 gallons per year. This existing winery uses 1.05 acre-feet of water per year. As a result of the proposed increased visitation, winery related water demand will increase by .09 acre-feet of water per year, whereas vineyard water use will reduce by .22 acre-feet per year as a result of .5 acres of vineyards being removed.

The County has not received any comments or complaints that existing ground water use from the property has affected any neighboring wells during the prior history of the project. The applicant has indicated that their well has not had any performance issues. The Dennis Jackson letter asserts that a 72-hour constant-discharge aquifer test should be performed to demonstrate that the project does not impact neighboring wells and can produce fire suppression water. However, the letter does not appear to account for the long-standing existing water use that has occurred on the property, nor contemplate that fire suppression water is provided from on-site storage tanks which are filled at the on-set of the project (see discussion in section xiii – Public Services). Given that the property has an established history of groundwater use without apparent issue to any neighbor wells or the property itself, and given that the proposed project is projected to result in a net reduction of ground water demand, there is no justification for the County to require a discharge test as suggested by Mr. Jackson. As a standard condition of all new use permit and use permit modification approvals, the County requires the permittee to monitor ground water usage. The applicant has agreed to monitor requirement on August 20, 2008. Therefore, the proposed project will decrease ground water demand and consequently has a less-than-significant potential to impact ground water resources.

- c-f. Attached and included as part of this initial study is an Oct 7, 2008 letter and October 6, 2008 Stormwater Technical Memorandum prepared by the project's licensed civil engineer, Riechers Spence Associates. The report evaluates the project's potential to alter drainage patterns and surface runoff, and details stormwater pollution prevention design aspects and regulatory controls. The report was prepared in response to an August 15, 2008 letter from Dennis Jackson, Hydrologist, which raised questions about the project's potential

to increase sediment and stormwater runoff in the Napa River basin. This letter is attached and included as part of this initial study for reference.

The project is located adjacent to an unnamed tributary of Blossom Creek. The site is level (less than 1% slope) and is presently developed with vineyards and the existing winery. Surface drainage flows away from the unnamed tributary toward State Highway 128. The existing winery is located approximately 45 ft. from the top of the bank of the unnamed stream. The proposed project will expand the winery in areas currently planted in vines. The current winery improvement and proposed project comply with County-established creek setbacks.

The project will not encroach into the stream setback or alter the existing stream. An existing 8 inch diameter outfall pipe enters the stream from the subject property south of the proposed project. This pipe is the terminus of an existing vineyard drain tile system that was installed over 10 years ago. The existing outfall pipe will not be modified by this project.

The attached Stormwater Technical Memorandum indicates that impervious surfaces on the property will increase from 1.65 acres to 2.11 acres, and hydrologic modeling calculates that un-attenuated stormwater runoff would increase by .57 cubic feet per second. As detailed in the attached report, this amount of increase falls within the classification of a Standard Project as defined by County and State Post-Construction Management Requirements and will be required to implement standard County and State established Site Design Best Management Practices to ensure that post-development runoff volume does not exceed pre-development runoff volume. As recommended by the project's engineer, this requirement has also been included as a recommended condition of approval by the County Public Works Department. Therefore, as a result of project being subject to standard County and State requirements requiring not post-development increase in stormwater runoff, the project does not have a significant potential to substantially increase stormwater run-off, nor will the project make a considerable contribution to any potential cumulative stormwater run-off increase. In addition, as a result of no net increase in stormwater runoff leaving the site, the project does not have a significant potential, either individually or cumulatively, to contribute to off-site risk of flooding due to increase peak stormwater flow either locally or to the Napa River.

The report materials from the project engineer also address the project's potential to affect stream sedimentation and pollution. The technical memorandum indicates that the project will disturb approximately 53,000 sq. ft. of site area triggering the need for a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. The report details that Best Management Practices that are required to be implemented prior to, and through the duration of construction, that ensure sediment and construction-related pollution does not leave the construction area. Given the level terrain (less than 1% slope), and the successfully established sediment and pollution prevention Best Management Practices that the project is required to implement, the project has a less than significant potential to result in off-site sediment and pollution increase. The County has successfully implemented this Best Management Practices on other similar winery development proposals throughout the County over the last several years. As such, the project has a less-than-significant potential to substantially contribute to cumulatively significant impacts to the Napa River.

- g-j. According to the Napa County GIS Floodplain Management layer, no portion of the site is located within a designated floodplain. The Napa River 500-year Flood Zone is located, at its closest point to the northeast property line, approximately 2,000 feet east of the project site.
- i-j. According to the Napa County GIS Dam Levee Inundation layer, no portion of the site is located within the designated Dam inundation areas located, at its closest point to the northeast property line, approximately 2,000 feet east of the project site. No expose of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding would result from the failure of a levee or dam. No inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow will occur given the site's mid-valley floor location.

**Mitigation Measure(s):** None.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX.	LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a)	Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Impact Discussion:**

a-c. The project is an increase in building sizes, visitation and marketing at an existing winery and will not divide an established community. The proposal is a conditional use allowed in the AP (Agricultural Preserve ) zoning district and Agricultural Resource designation in the *Napa County General Plan*. According to Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Natural Diversity Database Overlay), there are no Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plan applicable to the project site that would be affected.

**Mitigation Measure(s):** None.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X.	<b>MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> 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"/>

**Impact Discussion:**

- a. According to Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Geology Overlay), the project site does not contain any known mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.
- b. The project site is not designated as a locally important mineral resources recovery site.

**Mitigation Measure(s):** None.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI.	<b>NOISE.</b> 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 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 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"/>

**Impact Discussion:**

- a-d The project is located in a rural setting. The nearest residence not owned by the applicant is located approximately 400 feet away to the west. Other residences are located to the south ranging from approximately 600 ft. to 1,000 ft. away. Given the relatively sparsely populated agricultural and rural residential setting, there is some potential that temporary construction-related noise may impact neighbors. However,

once constructed, operation of the winery would be limited primarily to daytime hours and not exceed noise levels in excess of the General Plan established limits. There will be no outdoor events at the facility beyond the enclosed courtyard. Marketing event hours and visitation hours will be limited in accordance with County Code and are required to comply with County noise standards. Construction activities associated with the new building and access roads will result in a temporary, less than significant increase in noise levels in the project vicinity. Furthermore, construction activities will be limited to the hours of 7 am – 7 pm, Monday – Saturday. The project will not create significant ground borne vibrations. The project is not located in the vicinity of a public or private airstrip. Therefore, this project will result in less than significant impacts to noise.

- e. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan nor is it within two miles of a public airport. This project does not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

**Mitigation Measure(s):** None.

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

**Impact Discussion:**

- a-c. The project does not propose any increase in employees over what is currently authorized and will not require the addition of new housing.

**Mitigation Measure(s):** None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. <b>PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> Would the project result in:				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Impact Discussion:** The proposed project would not result in potentially significant adverse impacts on public services.

- a. The project site resides within the unincorporated area of Napa County. The site is currently served by the Napa County Fire Department and Napa County Sheriff's Department. No new facilities or public services would be required as a result of approval of this project. Prior to commencing construction, the project will be subject to the payment of building permit fees which pay for the time and services provided by the County to review and inspect the project. The project is also subject to payment of a housing impact fee, and the assessed value and correspond property tax assessment of the property will be raised based on the valuation of the project increasing the projects fair share contribution toward the provision of public services

Neighbor comments and the Dennis Jackson letter of August 15, 2008 raise concerns about the project's compliance with Fire Department requirements. The project has been reviewed on several occasions by the County Fire Marshall, and the Fire Marshall has concluded that the project, as proposed, will comply with all County fire safety requirements. The project will be subject to a detailed Uniform Fire Code analysis prior to issuance of a building permit. At the conclusion of the building permit process, the project will be required to include all fire safety features including the provision of sufficient, permanent water storage to ensure that the required fire suppression sprinkler system will meet minimum flow requirements for the duration specified in the Uniform Fire Code. Neighbor have raised a concern that the applicant's engineer has underestimated the amount of required water storage and that it may result in additional demand being placed on ground water resources. The Fire Marshall has indicated that a building permit cannot be issued until the applicant complies with the standard, and that the permittee simply must provide the required amount of water in storage tanks. The tanks are filled by ground water (or other source) prior to the occupancy of the project and the testing of the fire system. After the one-time filling of the sealed tanks, ground water resources are no longer needed, and are not relied upon during any fire event.

**Mitigation Measure(s):** None.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV.	<b>RECREATION.</b> 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"/>

**Impact Discussion:**

The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts on recreation facilities.

- a-b. The project would not significantly increase the use of existing recreational facilities.

**Mitigation Measure(s):** None.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV.	<b>TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</b> 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 (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### Impact Discussion:

- a-b. Access to the site project will continue to come from an existing driveway on State Highway 128. In 2004, when the winery was approved for a production increase, the project was required to improve the driveway to current Caltrans standards. The current project will add buildings, visitation and marketing events, but no increases in production will occur. 2005 average daily traffic counts for State Highway 128 just north of Tubbs Lane was 3,850 vehicles. In comparison, Highway 128 south of Tubbs Lane is 9,200 average daily vehicles (source: Caltrans). The existing project generates on average approximately 21 trips per day consisting of employees, deliveries, trucks, and visitors. With the proposed increases in visitation and marketing, the average number of visits per week is expect to rise from 110 per week to 168 per week, and maximum day visitation/marketing is expected to raise from 75 visitors per day to 125 visitors per day. Increases in the number of vehicles accessing the site will consist solely of visitors for by-appointment tastings/tours and for pre-arranged marketing events. This increase in visitation is expected to generate fewer the 5 cars per day, but on heaviest days could represent as much as 20 cars per day (50 additional persons on site averaging 2.5 persons per vehicle). As required by County code, and as suggested by the applicant, scheduling of tastings and events will occur off peak traffic periods. Given that the current roadway segment operates at a high level-of-service, and given the relatively minor increase in vehicles entering and existing the site, there is adequate roadway capacity to accommodate the additional trips associated with the winery expansion. The additional vehicles arriving at the site throughout the day would not result in a noticeable increase in traffic, and as such will result in a less than significant impact individually or cumulatively to the surrounding street capacity, traffic load or level of service.
- c. The project will not 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.
- d. There are no proposed changes to the existing driveway encroachments onto State Highway 128 as part of this project. In 2004, the project's driveway connection to State Route 128 was improved to Caltrans standards. The changes to visitation levels are minimal and do not warrant installation of any new improvements beyond those previously required.
- e-f. The proposed parking spaces will be adequate to accommodate all existing production, visitation and employees.
- g. The proposed project does not conflict with any known policies or plans supporting alternative transportation.

Mitigation Measure(s): none

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. <b>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>



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

**Impact Discussion:**

a.-g. All wastewater generated by the project will be directed to an existing approved wastewater disposal systems. A sewage disposal feasibility report has identified a standard septic system and a pre treatment/sub-surface drip system for management of domestic and process water is adequate to serve the existing and proposed winery production and visitation. The system update was installed in 2004 as part of the approved production increase for the winery from 20,000 gallons per year to 50,000 gallons per year. In new feasibility report has also been prepared to analyze the currently proposed visitation increases. The project has contracted with the local disposal company who has access to a landfill with sufficient capacity to accommodate the projects solid waste disposal needs and ensure compliance with solid waste regulations. This project will have no impact on utilities or service systems.

**Mitigation Measure(s):** None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>				
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"/>

**Impact Discussion:**

- a) The project has no significant 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.
- b) The project has no impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. Neither this project nor any project nearby will result in cumulative air quality impacts or reduction in Levels of Service for nearby roadways. Further, groundwater usage is within County guidelines. As such, the project as proposed will not have a cumulative effect on the environment.
- c) The project does not pose any substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.