

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

Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration

1. **Project Title:** Napa County Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment (P09-00344 ZOA) Mansfield Winery Use Permit (P09-00171 UP)
2. **Property Owner and applicant:** Richard and Leslie Mansfield, (707)363-1987, richard@mansfieldwinery.com
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Kirsty Shelton, Planner, (707) 253-4417, kshelton@co.napa.ca.us
4. **Project location and APN:** The project site is located on the west side of Conn Valley Road, approximately 1.5 miles south of its intersection with Howell Mountain Road, which is 1 mile east of its intersection with Silverado Trail, on a \pm 2 acre site within an Agricultural Watershed (AW) Zoning District; designated Assessor's Parcel Number: 025-180-017. The site that contains the replaced wastewater treatment is across the street on the west side of Conn Valley Road, address 1291 Conn Valley Road, designated Assessor's parcel Number 025-180-029, also located within the AW Zoning District.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Juliana Inman, Architect, 2133 First Street, Napa, California 94559
6. **Hazardous Waste Sites:** The above referenced property is not on any of the lists of hazardous waste sites enumerated under Government Code §65962.5.
7. **Project Description:** Request to amend the text of Section 18.104.245 of the County Code to allow for reestablishment of "pre-prohibition" historic wineries (Ghost Wineries) located on parcels that do not meet the 5-acre minimum parcel size. This text amendment will allow Ghost wineries to be reestablished on a minimum parcel size of 2 acres, so long as **compliance with** Environmental Health Department requirements and all other qualifying conditions and standards are met. Research¹ indicates that this property is most likely the only winery that could be re-established as a result of this Ordinance change.

Upon adoption of the Ordinance amendment, the subsequent request is to approve a Use Permit (P09-00171) to allow a 20,000 gallon per year, Ghost winery pursuant to Section 18.104.245 as amended of the Napa County Code (exceptions for pre-prohibition wineries). This proposal requests the renovation and reconstruction of a two and three story existing 13,034 sq. ft. winery structure/ruins, a 2,054 sq. ft. existing barn, new construction of a 600 sq. ft. mechanical building, the installation of a new waste water treatment system, a 2,230 sq. ft. subsurface drip disposal field, the abandonment of an existing septic tank, the demolition of approximately 7,500 sq. ft. of additional structures not subordinate to the historic winery features, improvement of the two existing driveways to a 20 foot width all season paving, the construction of 11 new parking spaces, and the installation of a new septic system located at 1291 Conn Valley Road (APN 025-180-029).

The marketing plans includes: a maximum of 20 visitors per day, not to exceed 120 visitors per week open 6 days per week from 10am-4pm; five (5) private food and wine events for trade with a maximum of 36 guests per year, 12 private winemaker's dinners with a maximum of 12 guests per year, participation in the wine auction events not to exceed 150 guests, and one release party per year not to exceed 150 guests. The operations will include two full-time and one part-time employee.

Water serves the operations via an existing well and installation of a water storage tank will be constructed at the northeast section of the property to provide adequate fire storage volume.

¹ Provided by Meg Scantlebury, dated July 2009

PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION:

The Conservation, Development and Planning Director of Napa County have tentatively determined that the following project would not have a significant effect on the environment and the County intends to adopt a **Mitigated 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: August 26, 2009

BY: Kirsty Shelton, Planner III

WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD: August 26-September 16, 2009

Please send written comments to the attention of Kirsty Shelton at 1195 Third St., Room 210, Napa, California 94559, or via e-mail to kshelton@co.napa.ca.us. A public hearing on this project is tentatively scheduled for the Napa County Planning Commission at 9:00 AM or later on Wednesday, September 16, 2009. You may confirm the date and time of this hearing by calling (707) 253-4416.

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)

1. **Project Title:** Napa County Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment (P09-00344 ZOA); Mansfield Winery Use Permit (P09-00171 UP)
2. **Property Owner:** Richard and Leslie Mansfield, (707)363-1987, richard@mansfieldwinery.com
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Kirsty Shelton Planner III, (707) 253-4417, kshelton@co.napa.ca.us
4. **Project location and APN:** The project site is located on the west side of Conn Valley Road, approximately 1.5 miles south of its intersection with Howell Mountain Road, which is 1 mile east of its intersection with Silverado Trail, on a ± 2 acre site within an Agricultural Watershed (AW) Zoning District; designated Assessor's Parcel Number: 025-180-017. The site that contains the replaced wastewater treatment is across the street on the west side of Conn Valley Road, address 1291 Conn Valley Road, designated Assessor's parcel Number 025-180-029, also located within the AW Zoning District.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Juliana Inman, Architect, 2133 First Street, Napa, California 94559
6. **General Plan description:** Zoning Text Amendment could be applicable throughout the unincorporated Napa County
The Mansfield's property is located within the AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space)
7. **Zoning:** Zoning Text Amendment could be applicable throughout the unincorporated Napa County
The Mansfield's property is located within the AW (Agricultural Watershed)
8. **Project Description:** Request to amend the text of Section 18.104.245 of the County Code to allow for reestablishment of "pre-prohibition" historic wineries (Ghost Wineries) located on parcels that do not meet the 5-acre minimum parcel size. This text amendment will allow Ghost wineries to be reestablished on a minimum parcel size of 2 acres, so long as **compliance with** Environmental Health Department requirements and all other qualifying conditions and standards are met. Research² indicates that this property is most likely the only winery that could be re-established as a result of this Ordinance change.

Upon adoption of the Ordinance amendment, the subsequent request is to approve a Use Permit (P09-00171) to allow a 20,000 gallon per year, Ghost winery pursuant to Section 18.104.245 as amended of the Napa County Code (exceptions for pre-prohibition wineries). This proposal requests the renovation and reconstruction of a two and three story existing 13,034 sq. ft. winery structure/ruins, a 2,054 sq. ft. existing barn, new construction of a 600 sq. ft. mechanical building, the installation of a new waste water treatment system, a 2,230 sq. ft. subsurface drip disposal field, the abandonment of an existing septic tank, the demolition of approximately 7,500 sq. ft. of additional structures not subordinate to the historic winery features, improvement of the two existing driveways to a 20 foot width all season paving, the construction of 11 new parking spaces, and the installation of a new septic system located at 1291 Conn Valley Road (APN 025-180-029).

The marketing plans includes: a maximum of 20 visitors per day, not to exceed 120 visitors per week open 6 days per week from 10am-4pm; five (5) private food and wine events for trade with a maximum of 36 guests per year, 12 private winemaker's dinners with a maximum of 12 guests per year, participation in the wine auction events not to exceed 150 guests, and one release party per year not to exceed 150 guests. The operations will include two full-time and one part-time employee.

Water serves the operations via an existing well and installation of a water storage tank will be constructed at the northeast section of the property to provide adequate fire storage volume.

² Provided by Meg Scantlebury, dated July 2009

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

Napa County has a unique environment in which historic resources such as pre-prohibition wineries co-exist with current agriculture and winery projects. This Ordinance amendment will provide the County the mechanisms in which to reuse and restore significant historical resources on parcels with a minimum of two acres.

This property is accessed from Conn Valley Road, which is within a heavily wooded and serene Conn Valley that eventually opens up to the north access of Lake Hennessy. Conn Valley Road dead-ends into a walking path just over one mile from the property access about a quarter mile from the north end of the Lake. The small, 2-acre site is currently developed with a dilapidated two and three story 13,034 sq. ft. winery ruin constructed circa 1880 with an approx. 7,500 sq.ft single pitched addition constructed circa 1934, a 2,054 sq. ft. barn structure, and two access roads. The historic uses of the property include the original Franco-Swiss Winery, operated by G. Crochat and company, which produced 100,000 gallons per year up until 1916 and from 1934-1962 the historic winery was the location for industrial perlite production.

The property to the north is planted with vineyards, to the south and east is the Seavy Vineyards and Winery located on a 143 acre parcel, across the street to the west is an old farmhouse residence that sits on an approximately 40 acre parcel. The property has approximately 278 linear feet of street frontage and is basically a rectangle with a riparian corridor of Conn Creek about 200 feet from the east property line. The site has a slope range of 6-9%, with an average of 8%.

There are no changes to the existing square footage of the historic structures besides the demolition of the 7,500 sq. ft. addition as it compromises the historic intent.

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

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

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

Discussion:

Zoning Text Amendment

- a.-d. The proposal to reduce the minimum lot size for ghost wineries does not authorize any physical change. Any pre-prohibition winery requesting reestablishment would do so through the use permit process. The use permit process will review each project in regards to the physical and aesthetic changes. There is a historic report, prepared by Meg Scantlebury, an Architectural Historian provided on July 2009 that indicates that the Mansfield property is most likely the only property in Napa County that this amendment could be applied to; based on the information, County Staff agrees on the findings. The application of this change to the Mansfield property would in effect allow the restoration and preservation of a historic resource that would otherwise not be permitted, and would substantially elevate the historic significance and visual aesthetics of the surrounding area and the property reducing any impacts to less than significant.

Mansfield Winery Use Permit

- a.-d. The proposed project is located within an interior valley commonly known as *Conn Valley* and is only visible from Conn Valley Road. There are no scenic vistas seen from this site or impeding visibility of such. This site is relatively flat and has already been graded for the previous development and business activities. The site includes two historic structures³ which are significantly deteriorated however they retain historic integrity, specifically the aspects of location, setting, design, materials, and feeling. The new facility will result in a minor increase in the nighttime lighting. In accordance with County standards, all exterior lighting will be the minimum necessary for the operational and security needs. Light fixtures will be kept as low to the ground as possible and include shields to deflect the light down. Avoidance of highly reflective surfaces will be required, as well as standard county conditions to prevent light from being cast skyward. As designed, and as subject to standard conditions of approval, the project will have less than significant impacts to the environment.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

³ Determined eligible on the National Register of Historic Places, based on the March 5, 2009 Architectural Resources Group.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. 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 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) 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:

Zoning Text Amendment

- a.-c. The proposal to reduce the minimum lot size for ghost wineries does not impact existing prime agricultural land. Any new winery would be proposed to be re-established in existing structures and due to the size of the lots will not remove any farmland. Zoning and Williamson Act contracts will be evaluated for each new use permit application. Establishment of new, small historic wineries is consistent with and supports the goals of the Napa County General Plan. Furthermore, wineries are considered an agricultural use and support vineyards.

Mansfield Winery Use Permit

- a.-c. No conversion of farmland will result from this project. No new structures are proposed. Wineries are permitted in the AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district, and the project would not conflict with a Williamson Act contract. This property does not have an agricultural contract on it. The proposal seeks to support the agriculture found within the region and would not result in any changes to the environment that would result in a loss of agricultural land.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 dust or odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Green House Gas Emissions

In 2006, the State Legislature enacted Assembly Bill 32, requiring the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to design measures and rules to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions statewide to 1990 levels no later than 2020. The measures and regulations to meet the 2020 target are to be put in effect by 2012, and the regulatory development of these measures is ongoing. In August 2007, the Legislature enacted Senate Bill 97, which among other things, directed the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to propose new CEQA regulations for the evaluation and mitigation of GHG emissions. SB 97 directs OPR to develop such guidelines by July 2009, and directs the state Resources Agency (the agency responsible for adopting CEQA regulations) to certify and adopt such regulations by January 2010. This effort is underway; however, to date no formal CEQA regulations relating to GHG emissions have been adopted. In September 2008, the Legislature enacted Senate Bill 375, which established a process for the development of regional targets for reducing passenger vehicle GHG emissions. Through the SB 375 process, regions throughout the state will develop plans designed to integrate development patterns and transportation networks in a manner intended to reduce GHG emissions. Neither the State nor Napa County has adopted explicit thresholds of significance for GHG emissions. While some might argue that *any* new emission would be significant under CEQA, pending amendments to the State CEQA guidelines suggest that agencies may consider the extent to which a project complies with requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions.

The Napa County General Plan calls on the County to complete an inventory of green house gas emissions from all major sources in the County by the end of 2008, and then to seek reductions such that emissions are equivalent to year 1990 levels by 2020. The General Plan also states that "development of a reduction plan shall include consideration of a 'green building' ordinance and other mechanisms that are shown to be effective at reducing emissions." Overall increases in GHG emissions in Napa County were assessed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the Napa County General Plan Update and certified in June 2008. GHG emissions were found to be significant and unavoidable despite adoption of mitigation measures that incorporated specific policies and action items into the General Plan.

Napa County is currently developing an emission reduction plan, and in the interim requires project applicants to consider methods to reduce GHG emission and incorporate permanent and verifiable emission offsets, consistent with Napa County General Plan Policy CON-65(e). The current project applicant has incorporated the following reduction methods and offsets into their project by replanting native, drought tolerant vegetation and limiting the amount of non-pervious materials, building on a degraded site, using existing materials, and improving the energy efficiency of the operations.

Construction and operation of the proposed project analyzed in this initial study would contribute to the overall increases in GHG emission by generating emissions associated with transportation to and from the site, emissions from energy used within buildings, and emissions from the use of equipment. However, the project would positively affect carbon sequestration by modifying vegetation on the site by maintaining the existing footprints of the structures, planting eleven (11) new native trees and native landscaping, and providing permeable/non asphalt pavement. Changes in sequestration would also be modest due to the fact that this property is only 2 acres. The project specific increase in GHG emissions would be relatively modest, given the estimated

number of 27 new vehicle trips per day, and increasingly stringent Title 24 energy conservation requirements imposed as part of the building permit process.

In light of these efforts, the relatively modest increase in emissions expected as a result of the project is considered less than significant. Also, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, because this initial study assesses a project that is consistent with and adopted General Plan for which an EIR was prepared, it appropriately focuses on impacts which are "peculiar to the project," rather than the cumulative impacts previously assessed.

Zoning Text Amendment

- a.-e. The proposal to reduce the minimum lot size for ghost wineries would not impact air quality. Any new winery would be proposed to be re-established in existing structures, on small lots, and limited to a 20,000 gallon per year production. It is not anticipated that there will be any significant impacts to air quality with this amendment. Additionally, any project specific impact will be evaluated as part of the use permit process.

Mansfield Winery Use Permit

- a.-c. The proposed facilities and limited earthwork would not result in significant adverse impacts to air quality. The project site is located in Napa County, which forms one of the climatological sub-regions (Napa County Subregion) within the San Francisco Bay Area 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, which are included in this project.

The BAAQMD has determined that land uses that generate fewer than 2,000 trips per day do not generally require detailed air quality analysis, since these land uses would not generally be expected to have potentially significant air quality impacts (specifically, they would not be expected to generate over 80 pounds per day of Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)). Although the building and earthwork will create construction traffic, when completed the project is designated for a modest amount of guests, with a maximum of 120/week and warehouse uses which typically have very low traffic generation rates per square foot under roof. Given the relatively small amount of traffic generation, including temporary construction and routine operations, the consequent auto/truck emission when compared to the size of the affected air basin, the incremental increase in vehicles emissions from this project will not effectively change existing conditions. Therefore, the project's potential to impact air quality is considered less-than-significant.

- d.-e. The BAAQMD defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact. The project site is not located in close proximity to any odor-sensitive receptors. The nearest off-site residence is 350 feet, located on the other side of a riparian corridor that acts as a buffer. During project construction, the project has the potential to generate substantial amounts of dust or other construction-related air quality disturbances. As a standard practice for County development projects, application of water and/or dust palliatives are required in sufficient quantities during grading and other ground disturbing activities on-site to minimize the amount of dust produced. The property was previously used for industrial purposes. One known use was perlite production. State law mandates that the property owner immediately contact the Napa County Department of Environmental Management upon the discovery of any contamination, hazardous substances, and/or underground storage tanks. These Best Management Practices will reduce potential temporary changes in air quality to a less than significant level. Any changes in operation would be subject to County Code §18.104.350(B), which requires that "no obnoxious off-site odors shall be produced."

Mitigation Measure(s): none.

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
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, and 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Zoning Text Amendment

- a.-f. The proposal to reduce the minimum lot size for ghost wineries would not impact biological resources. Any new winery would be proposed to be re-established in existing structures and due to the size of the lots will not impact undisturbed or undeveloped areas.

Mansfield Winery Use Permit

- a.-f. A review of the CNPS and special biological species layers in the County GIS maps resulted in no records of special status animal or plant species. This site has been previously disturbed by agricultural processing facilities. Further, there are no sensitive plant communities listed by DFG on the project sites; therefore the project would result in a less than significant impact. The project as proposed is more than 200 feet from Conn Creek; both pre and post construction requirements will be a condition of project approval; therefore a less than significant impact is anticipated. County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Watershed Overlay) does not indicate the presence of any wetlands or potential wetlands within the project boundary. The project would result in no substantial impacts to federally protected or potentially sensitive wetlands and therefore no impact is expected. The project does not lie within any established migration patterns and would not 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. Further, no further fencing is proposed and therefore no impact is anticipated. As proposed the project is not within the setback of Conn Creek. The proposal requires the removal of three large (<32" DBH) Eucalyptus trees, and to off-set any potential impacts from removal of these unprotected trees, the applicant has proposed to plant eleven native "California Bay"

and four native "California Live oak" trees. This site plan will be approved as an exhibit to the Use Permit, and the landscaping will be required as a Condition of project approval to be installed prior to final occupancy. The County of Napa does not have a tree removal ordinance for trees other than Oak woodlands; therefore a less than significant impact is expected. 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; there are no plans applicable to the subject parcel and therefore no impact.

Mitigation Measure(s):

None.

	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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:

Zoning Text Amendment

- a.-d. The proposal to reduce the minimum lot size for ghost wineries does not propose any physical changes, but will allow consideration of additional uses other than those that are currently allowed. Any pre-prohibition winery requesting reestablishment would do so through the use permit process. The use permit process will review each project in regards to its individual impacts on cultural, historical, and archeological impacts. There is a historic report⁴ that indicates that the Mansfield property is most likely the only property in Napa County that this amendment could be applied to. The application of this change to the Mansfield property would in effect allow the restoration and preservation of a historic resource that would otherwise not be permitted, and would substantially elevate the historic significance and visual aesthetics of the surrounding area.

Mansfield Winery Use Permit

- a.-d. The structure within which the winery is proposed to be located has been identified⁵ as one that would be eligible for nomination as a California Historic Resource, and is defined as Pre-prohibition winery/Napa Valley Ghost Winery per County Code § 18.104.245. Building plans will be evaluated by a historic architect for its conformance with the *Secretary of Interiors Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. Since the majority of new construction is planned to be inside, the exterior will be rehabilitated but the exterior of the structure will not substantially changed, and will in fact restore the structure to its original uses, the project would not result in a significant impact to the historic integrity of the building or the site. In order to ensure that there are no significant impacts with regards to cultural resources, **Mitigation Measure #1** described below has been incorporated into the project.

County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Archaeological Resources Overlay) indicated that there are no archaeological sites in the project vicinity and therefore no impact. There are no known archaeological resources in the development area. As per the

⁴ Provided by Meg Scantlebury, dated July 2009

⁵ Determined eligible on the National Register of Historic Places, based on the March 5, 2009 Architectural Resources Group.

standard Conditions of Project Approval, 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. 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. 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):

1. All site work including rehabilitation, restoration, and re-use of the exterior of the historic structure shall comply with *The Secretary of Interiors Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines for Preserving, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings*.

	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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Zoning Text Amendment

- a.-e. The proposal to reduce the minimum lot size for ghost wineries does not propose any physical changes, but will allow consideration of additional uses other than those that are currently allowed. Any pre-prohibition winery requesting reestablishment would do so through the use permit process, which includes any additional CEQA review. Any future development involving land disturbing activities on slopes over 5% would be subject to the County's Conservation Regulations regarding the incorporation of erosion control measures into any development project, *County Stormwater Ordinance and Post-construction Runoff Management Requirements*, and to any all applicable building permits.

Mansfield Winery Use Permit

- a.-e. The proposed project is not located within any Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zone. While seismic activity is endemic to the Bay Area, all structural improvements must be constructed to current California building code requirements; therefore a less than significant impact is anticipated. According to the United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Soil Survey of Napa County, California, about three-fourths of the project will occur on the soil designation of Forward gravelly loam on relatively flat land, with a slope of 2-5%. The remainder of the soils on the east portion of the site is designated as Bale Clay Loam soils and also has a 2-5% slope. The soils on site are characterized by medium runoff with moderate erosion potential. The project is required and included as a condition of approval, to submit a site development plan, including implementation of pre and post construction storm water and erosion control Best Management Practices under the standards developed in the *Napa County Stormwater Ordinance and Post-construction Runoff Management Requirements*. Due to the previous industrial uses, **Mitigation Measure #2 & #3** have been included if during demolition and construction the presence of asbestos and/or an underground fuel tank exists. Therefore, the potential for impacts is considered less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation.

The project site is located on soil that is designated as having a very low and low liquefaction potential and it is not known that it would become unstable as a result of the project. The soil type is not considered to be expansive, as defined in table 19.1B of the UBC creating substantial risks to life or property, as required by State Law, the applicant will provide the requirements for building permit submittal for the improvements which includes structurally engineered plans according to the soils type. The wastewater system is proposed to be combined sanitary and process waste water and will be treated and disposed of on site in a subsurface drip type septic system. There is an existing seepage pit that currently is fed from the neighboring property across the street (1291 Conn Valley Road) via an underground pipe under Conn Valley Road. The abandonment of this and the relocation of a new system will located across the street, off-site adjacent to the three bedroom home. The new system will include a 300 linear foot chamber type leach lines and the adequate site evaluations and approvals from Napa County Environmental Management has been obtained, **Mitigation Measure # 4** reduces this impact to less-than-significant.

Mitigation Measure(s):

2. Should the presence of asbestos be expected or discovered during the renovation, a contractor certified in Asbestos abatement shall be utilized to abate the asbestos. In the event it is discovered permits and or notifications with BAAQMD shall be obtained.
3. If during excavation contaminated soils and/or underground fuel tanks are discovered. The property owner shall immediately notify Environmental Management and obtain the required permits.
4. The waste water treatment for 1291 Conn Valley Road shall be installed and the existing seepage area shall be abandoned with the adequate approvals from the Napa County Environmental Management prior to site demolition work.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. 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"/>

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

Discussion:

Zoning Text Amendment

- a.-h. The proposal to reduce the minimum lot size for ghost wineries does not propose any physical changes, but will allow consideration of additional uses other than those that are currently allowed. Any pre-prohibition winery requesting reestablishment would do so through the use permit process, which includes CEQA review. Any future development involving hazards and hazardous materials would be subject to extensive review and would be evaluated project specifically.

Mansfield Winery Use Permit

- a.-h. The proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than typical amounts used for normal winery operations. A Business Plan will be filed with the Department of Environmental Management should the amount of these materials reach reportable levels. In the event a future use involved 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 County Zoning Ordinance prior to establishment of the use. During construction of the project some hazardous materials, such as building coatings, adhesives, paints, etc. will be utilized. However, given the quantities of hazardous material and the limited duration, and the implementation of **Mitigation Measures 2 & 3** should they find any hazards during construction, it would result in a less than significant impact. There are no schools located within one-quarter

mile from the proposed project site. The proposed site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites. The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The new winery use would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project. The access road that serves the project will be improved to comply with County road standards. The design of this project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Public Works Department and found acceptable as conditioned and determined that the design of the road will not impair emergency access or egress. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires because the project will incorporate fire safety equipment and measures as required by the California Department of Forestry/County Fire Marshal memorandum and required as conditions of approval.

Mitigation Measure(s):

None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. 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"/>

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

Discussion:

Zoning Text Amendment

- a.-j. The proposal to reduce the minimum lot size for ghost wineries does not propose any physical changes, but will allow consideration of additional uses other than those that are currently allowed. Any pre-prohibition winery requesting reestablishment would do so through the use permit process, which includes any additional CEQA review. Any future development involving land disturbing activities within any riparian corridor or within the floodplain will be evaluated on a case-by-case scenario and will be subject to any all applicable Ordinances and be required to obtain the required building permits.

Mansfield Winery Use Permit

- a.-j. The proposed water demand for the winery operations is 0.53 acre foot per year and given the size and the location of the project the allowable water allotment is 1.0 acre foot per year. The project as proposed is in compliant with the County's groundwater threshold and is not anticipated to deplete the ground water supplies and therefore will be a less than significant impact. The proposed project will not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off site because the project is developing on already disturbed areas and does not propose any substantial grade changes. Further, the applicant is proposing to re-landscape a major portion of the undisturbed areas and use permeable paving materials. The project will incorporate erosion control measures appropriate to its maximum slope to manage onsite surface drainage and erosion of onsite soils during construction and winter months (October to April). By incorporating erosion control measures, this project would have a less than a significant impact. No substantial alteration of existing drainage is anticipated to occur. There will be an increase in the overall impervious surface resulting from the new building, pavement and sidewalks. However, given the size of the drainage basin, the increase in impervious surfaces will not discernibly change the amount of groundwater filtration or discernibly increase surface runoff from that which currently existing on site. This project would therefore result in a less than significant impact. The project is required to submit a site development plan, including implementation of storm water and erosion control Best Management Practices under the standards developed in the County's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Phase II Stormwater Permit, which is required by County Code and is a standard practice on all County development projects. Since there will be more than one acre of disturbed area for the project, the County requires a pre and post construction Storm Water Pollutant Elimination Permit (SWPP). With the implementation of Best Management Practices the impact will be a less than significant impact. There are no other factors in this project that would otherwise degrade water quality. The project site is not located within a designated 100-year floodplain. The project site is located within an interior valley, Conn Valley, and the potential for tsunami is considered less-than-significant. Neither this project nor any directly foreseeable result will violate water quality or waste discharge requirements, degrade water quality, have any significant impact on groundwater usage or recharge, or alter drainage or runoff patterns. No other development is proposed, and no other development could directly and foreseeably result from this project which would expose people or structures to hazards associated with flooding or inundation by tsunami or mudflow.

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"/>

Discussion:

Zoning Text Amendment

- a.-c. The proposal to reduce the minimum lot size for ghost wineries does not propose any physical changes, but will allow consideration of additional uses other than those that are currently allowed. Any pre-prohibition winery requesting reestablishment would do so through the use permit process, which includes any additional CEQA review. Because this amendment actually reduces the lot size potential for re-establishment of pre-prohibition wineries, it is not expected that this amendment has the capacity to physically divide and established community. Further, all applicable land use plans, habitat conservation plans, and natural community plans will absolutely be evaluated as part of the CEQA review for the specific property on a case-by-case basis.

Mansfield Winery Use Permit

- a.-c. The project would not result in adverse land use impacts. There are no habitat or conservation plans adopted by the County. The County has designated the site for agricultural development and, as proposed, the project is consistent with both the AWOS general plan designation and AP zoning, and potentially as amended Section 18.104.245(Exceptions to winery setback and minimum parcel size for pre-prohibition wineries.)

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. 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:Zoning Text Amendment

- a.-b. The proposal to reduce the minimum lot size for ghost wineries does not propose any physical changes, but will allow consideration of additional uses other than those that are currently allowed. Any pre-prohibition winery requesting reestablishment would do so through the use permit process, which includes any additional CEQA review. Any future development involving land disturbing activities that would result in the loss of availability of mineral resources would be evaluated as party of the review.

Mansfield Winery Use Permit

- a.-b. The proposed project would not result in impacts to mineral resources per the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity maps (Soil Type, Surficial Deposits Overlays). The project site does not contain any known mineral resources. The project site is not designated as a locally important mineral resources recovery site. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. 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 ground borne vibration or ground borne 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:Zoning Text Amendment

- a.-f. The proposal to reduce the minimum lot size for ghost wineries does not propose any physical changes, but will allow consideration of additional uses other than those that are currently allowed. Any pre-prohibition winery requesting reestablishment would do so through the use permit process, which includes any additional CEQA review. Any potential noise generation or location that would put people in exposure would be evaluated as part of the review.

Mansfield Winery Use Permit

- a.-f. The project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during the construction of the facility. Future construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to

be significant with the implementation of County Code requirements and given the remote, rural nature of the site. There is only one residential use within close proximity to the project and it is currently occupied by the applicant. The other neighboring property is significantly buffered from the Conn Creek riparian corridor and will not be affected; regardless temporary construction noise will be in compliance with County noise standards. Construction activities may result in ground borne vibrations and short-term noise levels. However, given the lack of proximity of the construction site to neighboring properties; the potential for impact is less-than-significant. The anticipated noise levels following the completion of construction would be minimal, typical of winery and agricultural processing and rural uses, and are considered less-than-significant. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan of a public airport or 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. 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 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"/>

Discussion:

Zoning Text Amendment

- a.-c. The proposal to reduce the minimum lot size for ghost wineries does not propose any physical changes, but will allow consideration of additional uses other than those that are currently allowed. Any pre-prohibition winery requesting reestablishment would do so through the use permit process, which includes any additional CEQA review.

Mansfield Winery Use Permit

- a. – c. The project will involve the rehabilitation of a total 15,088 square feet (both the winery and barn structures), and the new construction of a 600 square foot mechanical building, for a total of 15,688 square feet. The project is located adjacent to agricultural land and will not displace any housing or divide any established communities. The project will result in two new full-time and one part-time employees. This increase in jobs will not contribute significantly to a cumulatively considerable increase in the demand for housing units within the communities of Napa County and the general vicinity. The County has adopted a housing impact fee to provide funds for constructing affordable housing. This fee is charged to all new non-residential development based on the gross square footage of building area multiplied by the applicable fee by type of use listed in Chapter 15.60.100 Table A and it is required it to be paid prior to release of building permit and is considered to reduce housing inducement impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

XIII. **PUBLIC SERVICES.** 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 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:

Zoning Text Amendment

- a. The proposal to reduce the minimum lot size for ghost wineries does not propose any physical changes, but will allow consideration of additional uses other than those that are currently allowed. Any pre-prohibition winery requesting reestablishment would do so through the use permit process, which includes any additional CEQA review. The proposed zoning text changes do not affect public service standards. Any specific future project will be subject to separate environmental review relative to its impacts on the provision of public services. The proposed project will not have a substantial adverse physical impact or create a need associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities.

Mansfield Winery Use Permit

- a. The proposed project would not result in potentially significant adverse impacts on public services. According to Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Resource Maps (Fire Hazard Zones –CDF overlay), the site is not located within the California Department of Forestry designated “High” Fire Hazard Zone. The Napa County Fire Marshal stated that if specific fire protection measures addressing building construction, minimum water flow, on-site fire safety equipment, fire apparatus access roads, barricades and fire safety plans are incorporated into the project, fire safety concerns could be mitigated. No substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services would result, therefore, potential project impacts would be less than significant. School impact mitigation fees will be levied and collected with the building permit application. Those fees assist schools with capacity building measures. The project will have little impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from building permit fees, property tax revenue and taxes from the sale of wine will help meet the costs of providing public services to the property.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Zoning Text Amendment

- a.-b. The proposal to reduce the minimum lot size for ghost wineries does not propose any physical changes, but will allow consideration of additional uses other than those that are currently allowed. Any pre-prohibition winery requesting reestablishment would do so through the use permit process, which includes any additional CEQA review and specifics in regards to the impacts on recreation will be evaluated.

Mansfield Winery Use Permit

- a.-b. The project would not significantly increase the use nor result in significant adverse impacts on existing recreational facilities; therefore the impact is less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. 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 (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 result in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>

Discussion:

Zoning Text Amendment

a.-g. The proposal to reduce the minimum lot size for ghost wineries does not propose any physical changes, but will allow consideration of additional uses other than those that are currently allowed. Any pre-prohibition winery requesting reestablishment would do so through the use permit process, which includes any additional CEQA review, potentially addressing traffic impacts, emergency access, traffic hazards, parking capacity, and consistency with adopted alternative policies.. No new development or increase in usage level is proposed. Future potential ghost winery applications will be fully subject to the environment performance standards of Chapter 18.104 of the County Code, which function to reduce potential environmental impacts to a less than significant impact.

Mansfield Winery Use Permit

a.-g. According to traffic information provided by the applicant, the maximum anticipated number of visitors and employees to the site would be no more than 20 invited guests per day plus two full and one part time employees resulting in 23 trips per typical day and up to 41 maximum trips during marketing events.

The County has established that a significant traffic impact would occur if increases in traffic from a project would cause intersections or two-lane highway capacity to deteriorate to be worse than LOS E, or at intersections or two-lane highway where base case (without project) is LOS F, a significant impact is considered to occur if a project increases the base volumes by more than one percent. Napa County utilizes a one percent significance threshold for the identification of significant adverse traffic impact during peak hours to travel. This threshold was determined the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency and has been used consistently as the significance determination for all recent EIR and CEQA documents.

There is only three additional employees that will contribute to peak period traffic generated from the project and this will contribute less than 1% to traffic levels on local roadways and intersections. This less than 1% increase is considered a less-than-significant level. The project does not have any impact on air traffic patterns. The project will not result in any changes to levels of service or cause any new safety risks. The project as conditioned for the parking standards and the improvement of eleven new parking spaces spread out between the two structures will not result in inadequate parking. 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. 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>
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:

Zoning Text Amendment

- a.-g. The proposal to reduce the minimum lot size for ghost wineries does not propose any physical changes, but will allow consideration of additional uses other than those that are currently allowed. Any pre-prohibition winery requesting reestablishment would do so through the use permit process, which includes any additional CEQA review and will be reviewed for the adequacy of utility and service systems.

Mansfield Winery Use Permit

- a.-g. The project will occur in an isolated rural area and requires a new on-site waste water system that has been reviewed by the Napa County Environmental Management Department (NCEMD), and found consistent with Regional Water Quality Board (RWQB) standards. The project will not exceed waste water treatment standards established by the RWQCB. The project will allow construction of winery and related facilities on land that includes less than a 15% slope and will require minimal grading and therefore will result in a less than significant impact to the environment. The proposed structures are well beyond the County setbacks and comply with the County's Conservation Regulations. Best Management Practices for erosion control would be required as part of the project by the Public Works Department. No new construction of storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities would result from the project which could cause any significant environmental effects. According to the information sheet provided by the applicant, the proposed facilities would require .53 acre feet of water, below the 1-acre foot threshold for this property. The residence across the street is on a 40-acre undeveloped parcel and well within the 20-acre foot allotment. The project will be served by the Upper Valley Waste Management Authority. The project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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:

Zoning Text Amendment

- a.. The proposal to reduce the minimum lot size for ghost wineries does not propose any physical changes, but will allow consideration of additional uses other than those that are currently allowed. As analyzed above, the project will not result in a significant loss of native trees, vegetation, or important examples of California history, it will actually increase the protection and preservation of such valuable resources.
- b. Although the historic report on file indicates the Mansfield property is the only parcel with the opportunity to re-establish a ghost winery on a reduced lot size, it is considerable that there could be other viable properties. We foresee little if no impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable.
- c. There are no environmental effects caused by this amendment 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.

Mansfield Winery Use Permit

- a.. The project site does not contain any known listed plants or animal species. The project as conditioned 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. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, traffic and housing impacts are discussed in their respective sections above. The project as proposed does not pose any substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.
- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- c. The project would not result in any environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.