

# A Tradition of Stewardship A Commitment to Service

# COUNTY OF NAPA

CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND PLANNING DEPARTMENT 1195 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, Suite 210 Napa, Calif. 94559 707.253.4417

# Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration

# Project Title

Chappellet Winery Use Permit Application № P11-00138-UP

## **Property Owner**

Chappellet Winery, Inc., 1581 Sage Canyon Road, St. Helena, Calif., 94574

# County Contact Person, Phone Number and Email

Christopher M. Cahill, Planner, 707.253.4847, chris.cahill@countyofnapa.org

# Project Location and APN

The 10 acre existing (15 acres proposed) winery parcel is accessed via a private drive beginning 250 feet northeast of the intersection of Sage Canyon Road (State Highway 128) and Long Ranch Road within an AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district. Winery APN: 032-010-046. 1581 Sage Canyon Road, St. Helena, Calif., 94574. Additionally, roadway and water storage improvements are proposed on portions of APN: 032-010-053.

## Project Sponsor's Name and Address

Jon-Mark Chappellet, 1581 Sage Canyon Road, St. Helena, Calif., 94574

# General Plan Description

AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space)

## Zoning

AW (Agricultural Watershed)

#### **Project Description**

Use Permit to bring a pre-1974 winery under use permit including the following:

- recognize wine production of 150,000 gallons per year;
- recognize an existing 19,636 square foot winery building;
- alterations within the existing 19,636 square foot winery building to convert 4,431 of production space to office, wine tasting, retail, storage, and commercial kitchen uses;
- construction of a +/- 24,000 square foot barrel storage building;
- construction of a +/- 9,500 square foot delivery, ADA-parking, and truck turnaround area adjacent to the proposed barrel storage building;
- approval of a two-phase construction phasing plan as detailed in submitted materials;
- recognize 18 employees and add 6 additional employees, for a total of 24 employees;
- recognize 24 parking spaces and install 2 additional ADA-accessible spaces, for a total of 26 spaces;
- recognize hours of winery operation from 6 am to 6 pm daily with public visitation from 10 am to 5 pm;
- recognize open-to-the-public tours and tastings with a maximum of 40 visitors per day;
- add food and wine parings as a component of tours and tastings visitation;
- add Evans on-premise consumption in existing and proposed marketing areas within the 19,636 square foot winery building;

- add a marketing plan with four 40-person food and wine pairing events monthly, four 75-person wine club/open house events annually, one 125-person large event annually, and participation in Auction Napa Valley (all marketing events may include food service);
- roadway improvements on parcels 032-010-046 and 032-010-053 including the widening of an existing 12 to 14
  foot wide winery access road to 14 to 18 foot wide and construction of a new 20 foot wide driveway providing
  access to the proposed barrel storage building;
- domestic and process wastewater treatment improvements on parcels 032-010-046 and 032-010-053 including
  alteration of an existing off-stream reservoir to allow treated process wastewater storage with disposal via
  vineyard irrigation and conversion of an existing domestic/process waste disposal leachfield to dedicated
  domestic waste use;
- installation of a 60,000 gallon fire-flow water storage tank located on parcel 032-010-053; and
- grading including 10,000 cubic yards of net cut with spoils distributed within existing vineyard blocks on APN 032-010-053.

Road and Street Standards Exception to allow width reductions (18 feet required, 10 to 20 feet proposed) along the existing +/-1 mile entry drive (APNs: 032-010-078, 032-010-010, and 032-010-053).

Lot Line Adjustment to transfer lot area from parcel 032-010-053 to parcel 032-010-046, resulting in a net increase at parcel 032-010-046 from 10 acres to 15 acres and a net decrease at parcel 032-010-053 from 294 acres to 289 acres..

The project site is not located on the lists enumerated under Section 65962.5 of the Government Code, including, but not necessarily limited to lists of hazardous waste facilities.

# Preliminary Determination

Napa County's Director of Conservation, Development, and Planning has tentatively determined that the project analyzed in the attached initial study checklist would not have a significant effect on the environment and the County intends to adopt a mitigated negative declaration. Copies of the proposed mitigated negative declaration and all documents referenced are available for review at the offices of the Napa County Conservation, Development, and Planning Department, 1195 Third St., Suite 210, Napa, CA 94559 between the hours of 8:00 AM and 4:45 PM Monday through Friday (excepting holidays).

Christopher M. Cahill, Planner

date

Written Comment Period - July 18, 2011 through August 16, 2011

Please send written comments to the attention of Chris Cahill at 1195 Third St., Suite 210, Napa, CA. 94559, or via e-mail to chris.cahill@countyofnapa.org. A public hearing on this project is tentatively scheduled for the Napa County Conservation, Development, and Planning Commission at 9:00 AM or later on Wednesday August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2011. You may confirm the date and time of this hearing by calling (707) 253.4417.

# SITE TOPOGRAPHY MAP

REPRESENTS A PORTION OF THE USGS 7.5 MINUTE QUADRANGLE "YOUNTVILLE"
REPRODUCED FROM NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC TOPO!
OUTDOOR RECREATION MAPPING SOFTWARE



R. 5 W. JR. 4 W. 38°29.000' N 122°21.000' W 122°20.000' W 122°19,000' W



INCORPORATED

2074 West Lincoln Avenue Napa, CA 94558 (707) 320-4968 (707) 320-2395 Fax www.appliedclvil.com

# **CHAPPELLET WINERY**

1581 SAGE CANYON ROAD ST. HELENA, CA 94574 APN 032-010-053 & 032-010-046

RECEIVED

JUL 18 2011

NAPA CO. CONSERVATION

M. PLANNING DEPT.

Project Revision Statement & Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

# Chappellet Winery

Use Permit Application № P11-00138-UP Assessor's Parcel № 032-010-046 & 032-010-053 1581 Sage Canyon Road, St. Helena, Call. 94574

I hereby revise my request to include the mitigation measure(s) specified below:

#### **GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

Prior to County authorization of a building permit, the permittee shall submit a final geotechnical study report specifying design parameters for the proposed construction. Project construction shall comply with the recommendations and/or requirements of the final geotechnical study report to the satisfaction of the Building Official.

Method of Mitigation Monitoring: This Mitigation Measure requires submission of a final geotechnical report and recommendations prior to the issuance of a building permit. If the required report is not submitted, or lits requirements are not complied with, building permits and permit finals will not be issued. RESPONSIBLE AGENCY(IES)- Building Division, Planning Division

I understand and explicitly agree that with regards to all California Environmental Quality Act, Permit Streamlining Act, and Subdivision Map Act processing deadlines, this revised application will be treated as a new project, filed on the date this project revision statement is received by the Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department. For purposes of §66474.2 of the Subdivision Map Act, the date of application completeness shall remain the date this project was <u>originally</u> found complete.

Print Name

A.

# COUNTY OF NAPA

Conservation, Development, and Planning Department 1195 Third St., Suite 210 Napa, Calif. 94559 (707) 253-4416

# Initial Study Checklist

(form updated September 2010)

#### 1. Project Title:

Chappellet Winery Use Permit Application № P11-00138-UP

# Property Owner:

Jon-Mark Chappellet for Chappellet Winery, Inc., 1581 Sage Canyon Road, St. Helena, Calif., 94574

# County Contact Person, Phone Number and Email:

Christopher M. Cahill, Planner, 707.253.4847, chris.cahill@countyofnapa.org

#### Project Location and APN:

The 10 acre existing (15 acres proposed) winery parcel is accessed via a private drive beginning 250 feet northeast of the intersection of Sage Canyon Road (State Highway 128) and Long Ranch Road within an AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district. Winery APN: 032-010-046. 1581 Sage Canyon Road, St. Helena, Calif., 94574. Additionally, roadway and water storage improvements are proposed on portions of APN: 032-010-053.

#### 5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

Donna B. Oldford, 2620 Pinot Way, St. Helena, Calif., 94574, 707.963.5832, dboldford@aol.com

# 6. General Plan Description:

AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space)

# 7. Zoning:

AW (Agricultural Watershed)

## 8. Description of Project.

Use Permit to bring a pre-1974 winery under use permit including the following:

- recognize wine production of 150,000 gallons per year;
- recognize an existing 19,636 square foot winery building;
- alterations within the existing 19,636 square foot winery building to convert 4,431 of production space to office, wine tasting, retail, storage, and commercial kitchen uses;
- construction of a +/- 24,000 square foot barrel storage building;
- construction of a +/- 9,500 square foot delivery, ADA-parking, and truck turnaround area adjacent to the proposed barrel storage building;
- approval of a two-phase construction phasing plan as detailed in submitted materials;
- recognize 18 employees and add 6 additional employees, for a total of 24 employees;
- recognize 24 parking spaces and install 2 additional ADA-accessible spaces, for a total of 26 spaces;
- recognize hours of winery operation from 6 am to 6 pm daily with public visitation from 10 am to 5 pm;
- recognize open-to-the-public tours and tastings with a maximum of 40 visitors per day;
- add food and wine parings as a component of tours and tastings visitation;
- add Evans on-premise consumption in existing and proposed marketing areas within the 19,636 square foot winery building;
- add a marketing plan with four 40-person food and wine pairing events monthly, four 75-person wine club/open house events
  annually, one 125-person large event annually, and participation in Auction Napa Valley (all marketing events may include food
  service);
- roadway improvements on parcels 032-010-046 and 032-010-053 including the widening of an existing 12 to 14 foot wide winery
  access road to 14 to 18 foot wide and construction of a new 20 foot wide driveway providing access to the proposed barrel
  storage building;

- domestic and process wastewater treatment improvements on parcels 032-010-046 and 032-010-053 including alteration of an
  existing off-stream reservoir to allow treated process wastewater storage with disposal via vineyard irrigation and conversion of
  an existing domestic/process waste disposal leachfield to dedicated domestic waste use;
- installation of a 60,000 gallon fire-flow water storage tank located on parcel 032-010-053; and
- grading including 10,000 cubic yards of net cut with spoils distributed within existing vineyard blocks on APN 032-010-053.

Road and Street Standards Exception to allow width reductions (18 feet required, 10 to 20 feet proposed) along the existing +/- 1 mile entry drive (APNs: 032-010-078, 032-010-010, and 032-010-053).

Lot Line Adjustment to transfer lot area from parcel 032-010-053 to parcel 032-010-046, resulting in a net increase at parcel 032-010-046 from 10 acres to 15 acres and a net decrease at parcel 032-010-053 from 294 acres to 289 acres.

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

The project would affect two parcels, totaling 304 acres, which are located on Pritchard Hill, upslope and southerly of Lake Hennessey. The existing Chappellet Winery, which began operations in the late 1960's (prior to Napa County's requirement that wineries obtain use permits) is located on APN 032-010-046 ("winery parcel") with winery-accessory improvements such as roadways and wastewater treatment and disposal systems located on the larger surrounding APN 032-010-053 parcel ("vineyard parcel"). Access to the winery site is via the first mile of a more than two mile long private road which is to be partially realigned as a component of the recently-approved Continuum Winery project (Napa County Use Permit Modification № P10-00255). The unnamed private drive begins directly to the northeast of the intersection of Sage Canyon Road (State Highway 128) and Long Ranch Road, across from the City of Napa's Lake Hennessey boat dock. The APN 032-010-046 and 032-010-053 Chappellet properties ("subject parcels") rise from approximately 850 feet in elevation to more than 1800 feet along the hillsides that form the southern edge of Sage Canyon and Lake Hennessey. The winery parcel itself is relatively flat, with elevations ranging from 1,100 to 1,200 feet above sea level. An unnamed USGS blue-line stream, which eventually empties into Lake Hennessey, has its headwaters south of the subject parcels and crosses the vineyard parcel in a southeasterly to northwesterly direction. The entirety of the area surrounding the subject parcels is zoned AW (Agricultural Watershed) and General Plan designated AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space).

Based on Napa County environmental resource mapping and the *Soil Survey of Napa County, California* (G. Lambert and J. Kashiwagi, Soil Conservation Service), the project area includes soil classified as Sobrante Loam (5 to 30 percent slopes) and Sobrante Loam (30 to 50 percent slopes). The Sobrante Loam soil series is characterized by well drained soils on foot slopes and side slopes in uplands where permeability is moderate. Runoff from Sobrante Loam soils is generally medium with a slight to moderate erosion hazard. Native vegetation types in the project vicinity would have included annual grasslands with scattered oaks and Gray pines. According to geotechnical reports submitted in support of developments on neighboring properties, the topography of much of Pritchard Hill was created by a massive prehistoric landslide. The County's geological hazard mapping indicates that the subject parcels are located in a geologically complex area with numerous mapped landslides and faulting. A trace of the Atlas Peak-Foss Valley fault has been mapped some 700 feet north of the existing Chappellet Winery complex.

The 10 acre winery parcet is currently developed with a 19,636 square foot winery building, outdoor crush pad and work areas, winery-associated driveway and parking improvements, a large solar array, a residence, and about 3 acres of producing vineyard. The existing winery was constructed in, or about, 1969 and has undergone remarkably little exterior change since that time. The 294 acre vineyard parcel is currently developed with a combined domestic and process winery waste water treatment and disposal system, a two acre off-stream irrigation reservoir, three residential structures, residential- and winery-accessory roadway improvements, and approximately 80 acres of producing vineyard. Land uses in the area are dominated by open space uses, large lot residential properties, and smaller vineyards. Given the generally undeveloped hillside character of the surroundings, there are a surprising number of wineries located within a mile of the proposed relocated winery, including Bryant Family Winery (8,500 gallons per year), Harrison Vineyards (15,000 gallons per year), Sage Hill Vineyards (20,000 gallons per year), Neyers Vineyard Winery (40,000 gallons per year), Colgin Partners Winery (20,000 gallons per year), and Continuum Winery (28,000 gallons per year). As noted above, an unnamed private roadway provides access to both the subject parcel and a number of adjacent properties. The winery site is located about one mile southeast of the private road's intersection with Sage Canyon Road (alternately State Highway 128). Sage Canyon Road is a secondary east-west route connecting the Napa Valley to Lake Berryessa and from thence to the Central Valley, however no improvements in or near the Caltrans right of way are proposed at this time.

## 10. Baselining and the scope of this review.

Consistent with State CEQA Guidelines §15125(a) "the existing environmental setting should normally constitute the baseline against which agencies should assess the significance of project impacts." (Remy, Thomas, Moose, and Manly, Guide to CEQA, 11th Edition, Feb 2007) At the discretion of the Lead Agency, this remains the case even where a longstanding facility, operation, or use has never previously been subjected to environmental review under CEQA (see, for reference, Fat v. County of Sacramento (3d Dist. 2002) 97 Cal.

App. 4th 1270). The Chappellet Winery was established in the late 1960's, well in advance of the County's 1974 adoption of regulations requiring conditional use permit approval for new wineries within agricultural zoning districts. The present application represents the Winery's first attempt to expand facilities and winery development area beyond the legally existing bounds of the 1960's winery. As a result of that proposed expansion, the Winery Definition Ordinance (Napa County Ord. No. 947, 1990, as amended) obligates the Planning Commission to bring the entire facility under use permit through the recognition of the complete spectrum of proposed and legally pre-existing winery activities. To the extent that those activities, improvements, and/or environmental conditions existed legally at the time the present application was submitted to the County (April 15, 2011), they represent the existing environmental condition, or baseline, against which project-specific environmental changes are analyzed in this document.

Following a thorough review of evidence of existing conditions and winery operations, the Department of Conservation, Development, and Planning has determined, as Lead Agency, that the items "recognized" at item № 8 (Project Description), above represent existing, and therefore baseline, conditions. Where items are "constructed," "added," "approved," "altered," "installed," and the like, they represent changes to the baseline environmental condition and thereby become the subject of this review.

It is foreseeable that any eventual approval of this project will be conditioned on completion of the same access driveway improvements recently analyzed for CEQA purposes as a component of the Continuum Winery Use Permit Major Modification approval (Napa County Permit Major Project National Section 2014). Helena, Calif., 94574, Assessor's Parcel National National Section 2014-060 (032-030-043SFAP) & 032-010-061 (032-030-044SFAP)). Because those improvements are already the subject of a duly reviewed and adopted environmental document, they are not included in the scope of this review.

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

Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, Federal Taxation Trade Bureau

## **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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.

	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 EtR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EtR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.
Signat	Date 13, 2011

for Napa County Conservation, Development, & Planning

Chappellet Winery

Name: Christopher M, Cahill\_

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1.	AE	STHETICS. Would the project:				
	a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			$\boxtimes$	
	b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				
	c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				
	d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nightfime views in the area?			$\boxtimes$	

a.-c. Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms, geological features, water, trees and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of a beautiful or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken-in. As generally described in the Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses section, above, the Pritchard Hill area is defined by a mix of open space, watershed, vineyard, winery, and residential uses situated along the first low ridgeline east of the Napa Valley. Both the existing winery and the proposed improvements are carefully sited and designed to minimize off-site visual impacts. Neither the proposed barrel storage building nor any associated infrastructural development will be visible from Sage Canyon Road or the Silverado Trail. While portions of the access driveway may be visible from Sage Canyon Road, no driveway improvements are proposed on the City of Napa watershed property nearest the road. Where widening and other improvements are proposed (generally further upslope and to the south) the plans have been carefully designed to preserve the vast majority of existing mature trees along the driveway. Because State Highway 29 is quite distant and views to the site are generally obscured by topography and existing development on the Valley floor, the project is not subject to the County's Viewshed Protection Ordinance.

Vegetation removal associated with the project will be limited to the removal of approximately 14 trees (chiefly live oaks, blue oaks, and bays). None of the impacted trees are in, nor are they anywhere near, a state scenic highway. Standard Winery conditions of approval require replacement of the removed trees at a 2 to 1 ratio as follows;

No trees greater than 6" DBH shall be removed, except for those identified on the submitted site plan. Any trees that are removed shall be replaced elsewhere on the property in like kind on a 2 for 1 basis. Replaced trees shall be identified on the landscaping plan. Trees to be retained shall be protected during construction.

Seen as a whole, nothing in this project will substantially alter a scenic vista or substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site or its immediate surroundings. Impacts related to scenic resources will be less than significant.

d. Pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approval for wineries, outdoor lighting will be required to be shielded and directed downwards, with only low level lighting allowed in parking areas. The standard winery condition of approval relating to lighting states that;

All extenor lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward, shall be located as low to the ground as possible, shall be the minimum necessary for security, safety, or operations, and shall incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. No flood-lighting or sodium lighting of the bullding is permitted. Architectural highlighting and/or spotting are not allowed. Low-level lighting shall be utilized in parking areas as opposed to elevated high-intensity light standards. All lighting shall comply with the California Bullding Code.

With standard conditions of approval, this project will not create a substantial new source of light or glare.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

- a. Based on a review of Napa County environmental resource mapping, the subject parcets are located on land which has been mapped as Other Land and as Unique Farmland by the State farmland mapping program (Department of Conservation Farmlands, 2008 layer). Unique Farmland is defined as farmland on lesser quality soils used for the production of the state's leading agricultural crops; it is generally irrigated, though it may sometimes include dry-farmed orchards and vineyards. Other Land includes low density rural developments; brush, timber, wetland, and riparian areas not suitable for livestock grazing; confined livestock, poultry or aquaculture facilities; strip mines, borrow pits; and water bodies smaller than forty acres. This application does not propose a net removal of existing vineyard areas; all structural development would be located on land already developed for solar power generation. Additionally, the entirety of the proposed development will either be dedicated to active wine production or winery-accessory uses. General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use policies Ag/LU-2 and Ag/LU-13 recognize wineries, and any use consistent with the Winery Definition Ordinance and clearly accessory to a winery, as agriculture. As a result, this application will not result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use.
- b. As discussed at "a.," above, the proposed winery and associated improvements are consistent with the parcels' AW agricultural zoning. The subject parcels are not subject to a Williamson Act contract at this time.
- c. The subject parcels do not include timberland and are not subject to timberland or forestland zoning. The project will not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)
- d. Access driveway improvements associated with the project will result in impacts to 14 mature trees, of which 11 have been identified as live or blue oaks. "Forest land" is defined by the State as "land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits." (Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) The Napa County General Plan anticipates and does not preclude conversion of some "forest land" to agricultural use, and the program-level EIR for the 2008 General Plan Update analyzed the impacts of up to 12,500 acres of vineyard development between 2005 and 2030, with the assumption that some of this development would occur on "forest land." In that analysis specifically, and in the County's view generally, the conversion of forest land to agricultural use, including agricultural production facilities such as wineries, would constitute a potentially significant impact only if there were resulting significant impacts to sensitive species, biodiversity, wildlife movement, sensitive biotic communities listed by the California Department of Fish and Game, water quality, or other environmental resources addressed in this checklist. No such impacts have been identified. As a result, impacts on forest lands will be less than significant.
- e. As discussed at items "a." and "b.", above, the winery and winery accessory uses proposed in this application are defined as agricultural by the Napa County General Plan and are allowed under the parcel's AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning. Neither this project, nor any

foreseeable consequence thereof, would result in changes to the existing environment which would result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
151.		QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable to make the following determinations. Would the project:	e air quality managen	nent or air pollution	control district	may be relied
	a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				
	b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			$\boxtimes$	
	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)?			Ø	
	d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			$\boxtimes$	
	e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				

# Discussion:

- The proposed project will not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plan. Wineries as proposed here are a. not producers of air pollution in volumes substantial enough to result in an air quality plan conflict. The project site lies within the eastern foothills of the Napa Valley, which forms one of the climatologically distinct sub-regions (Napa County Sub-region) within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The topographical and meteorological features of the Valley create a relatively high potential for air pollution. Over the long term, emissions resulting from the proposed project would consist primarily of mobile sources, including production-related deliveries and visitor and employee vehicles traveling to and from the winery. The Bay Area Air Quality Management Plan states that projects that do not exceed a threshold of 2,000 vehicle trips per day will not impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guldelines, p. 24). The existing winery has 18 full-time employees, 31 busiest-day tours and tasting visitor vehicle trips, and potentially 2 busiest-day production pickups/deliveries, meaning that permitted baseline trip generation for the facility should approximate 89 trips on an average day. This application proposes to hold tours and tastings visitation constant while adding 6 additional employees; in reality, these are not new employees of the winery, they are employees who previously worked off-site and would now be relocated to the winery. The project would reduce truck trips to the extent that the new barrel storage facility will eliminate the need to haul barrels to and from the site. The 6 additional on-site employees would generate 18 ¼ trips daily, while on-site barrel storage will reduce truck trips by approximately ¼ trip daily; meaning that this project should account for 18 new daily trips on a day with no marketing events (this assumes 1.05 occupants per car for employees and 3.2 trips per day per employee - all per Napa County Winery Traffic Generation Characteristics). The subject application also proposes occasional marketing events, with up to 125 people at the largest event; at 2.6 persons per car that would add up to 48 additional trips on the day of a large marketing event. The resulting busiest day plus marketing total of 66 project-related trips is well below the established threshold of significance.
- b. Please see "a.", above. There are no projected or existing air quality violations in the area to which this proposal would contribute. The project will not result in any violations of applicable air quality standards.
- c. Please see "a.," above and "d.-e.," below. The proposed project will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. Standard conditions of approval for any Napa County construction project require dust control measures.

d.-e. Earthmoving and construction activities required for project construction may cause odors and a temporary degradation in air quality from dust and heavy equipment air emissions during the construction phase. While construction on the site will generate dust particulates in the short-term, the impact will be less than significant with dust control measures as specified in Napa County's standard condition of approval relating to dust;

Water and/or dust palliatives shall be applied in sufficient quantities during grading and other ground disturbing activities on-site to minimize the amount of dust produced. Outdoor construction activities shall not occur during windy periods.

Wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. Construction-phase pollutants will be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. The project will not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

IV.	вю	LOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	П	п	⋈	П
	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?			⊠	
	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?			$\boxtimes$	
	ď)	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?	П	П	×	П
	e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				⊠
	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?				

## Discussion:

a.-d. Napa County environmental resource mapping (Biological Critical Habitat Areas - California Red-legged Frog, Contra Costa Goldfields, and Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp; Vernal Pools; CNDDB; Plant Surveys; and CNPS layers) do not indicate the presence of candidate, sensitive, or special status species on the project site. However, the process wastewater treatment and disposal improvements proposed as a component of this project do include the utilization of an existing 20 acre-foot off-stream irrigation reservoir for the storage of treated waste water. According to the submitted wastewater feasibility report (Michael Muelrath, Applied Civil Engineering, Onsite Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study for the Chappellet Winery Use Permit, April 15, 2011), "the existing spillway at the westernmost corner of the reservoir will need to be filled in and lined to create a minimum of two feet of freeboard at all times to ensure that water does not spill out of the reservoir." Because aquatic vertebrates such as the Northwestern Pond Turtle are known to live in irrigation reservoirs in and around the Napa Valley, Planning staff requested a focused biological resources survey addressing potential impacts on special status aquatic vertebrates from the construction at, and wastewater storage proposed in, the existing reservoir.

The submitted survey was completed by Daniel Kjeldsen of Kjeldsen Biological Consulting in Spring 2011 (Kjeldsen Biological Consulting, Reservoir Review and Northwestern Pond Turtle Survey, Chappellet Vineyards, 1581 Sage Canyon Road, Napa County, May 3, 2011). The survey report is based on a field reconnaissance undertaken on March 27, 2011 "in the afternoon under conditions, which would favor basking, [sic] by the pond turtles if present." According to submitted survey;

The reservoir (is lined and) is proposed to receive approximately three acre-feet of treated winery wastewater for holding purposes. Surveys were conducted to determine if any aquatic species (with specific emphasis on the Northwestern Pond Turtle) would be negatively impacted by the additional water input to the reservoir. Specifically surveys were conducted to determine if turtles, [sic] frogs are using the reservoir and what effect treated wastewater would potentially have on aquatic vertebrates if found to inhabit the reservoir."

According to the submitted survey, while there is some seasonal amphibian use of the reservoir, no special status species were identified and the areas proposed to be impacted do not have significant foraging or other habitat value for special status species. Quoting from the Kjeldsen study;

Our review of the project and the site indicates no presence of Northwestern Pond Turtles in or around the study site. Pond Turtles most likely cannot overwinter in the reservoir due to the pond liner.

It is our opinion that the fluctuating water levels and the reservoir liner are not suitable for supporting populations of the Northwestern Pond Turtle.

It is our professional opinion based [sic] the site conditions and our field survey that there are no Northwestern Pond Turtles in the reservoir.

If the site should be occupied by Northwestern Pond Turtles there is no reason to believe that the addition of treated wastewater would significantly impact turtles, it is not uncommon for turtles to occupy sites such as cattle ponds with high levels of biological oxygen demand.

The reservoir at present does provide winter breeding habitat for Western Toads, [sic] and Chorus Frogs. Non-native bullfrogs also may inhabit the reservoir. Native frogs and toads will exit the reservoir in the spring and do not use the reservoir year round.

It is our professional opinion based [sic] the site conditions and our field survey that there is no reason to believe that the addition of treated wastewater would significantly impact aquatic vertebrates i.e. Frogs and Toads in the reservoir.

As analyzed in the submitted biological survey and as noted above, the project will not 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. The submitted study identifies no impacts to riparian resources. Impacts to wetlands, riparian habitats, and other sensitive natural communities will be less than significant. The project will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, their corridors, or their nursery sites.

- e. While Napa County does not have a tree preservation ordinance, General Plan Policy CON-24 requires the County to "maintain and improve oak woodland habitat." Standard winery conditions of approval, discussed at AESTHETICS above, require replacement of removed trees at a two-to-one ratio, resulting in a requirement that more than 28 native trees be planted in the project area. The project will not conflict with any local policy or ordinance protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.
- f. 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 Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?				$\boxtimes$
p)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines§15064.5?				$\boxtimes$
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?				$\boxtimes$
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				
D'					

- a. According to Napa County Environmental Resource Mapping (historic sites layer), no historic resources are known to be located on or in the direct vicinity of the project site. Neither this project nor any foreseeable resulting ministerial activity will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource.
- b. According to Napa County Environmental Resource Mapping (archaeology surveys, archeology sites, archeologically sensitive areas, and archeology flags layers), the project area is not part of any known archeologically sensitive area. As a result, neither this project nor any resulting ministerial activity will foreseeably cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource.
- c. No unique paleontological or geological features are known to be located on or in the vicinity of the project site. As a result, neither this project nor any foreseeable resulting ministerial activity will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a paleontological or geological resource.
- d. No formal cemeteries are known to exist within the project area and, as noted above, no significant evidence of historic and/or prehistoric Native American settlement was found in the project area. Public Resources Code §5097.98, Health and Safety Code §7050.5, and CEQA §15064.5(e) detail the procedures to follow in case of the accidental discovery of human remains, including requirements that work be stopped in the area, that the County Coroner be notified, and that the most likely descendents be identified and notified via the Native American Heritage Commission. Foreseeable project-specific impacts to human remains are less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

				Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI,	GE	OLOG	GY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
	a)		ose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including 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.			⊠	
		ii)	Strong seismic ground shaking?		$\boxtimes$		
		iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			$\boxtimes$	
		iv)	Landslides?			$\boxtimes$	
	b)	Res	cult in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			$\boxtimes$	

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?			$\boxtimes$	
d) e)	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?  Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or			$\boxtimes$	
c)	alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				$\boxtimes$

ai.-aii. The most recent Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault map shows no known faults on the project site, however Napa County Environmental Resource Mapping (faults layer) indicates the potential presence of a concealed fault crossing the vineyard parcel, some 800 feet to the north of the existing winery building. As a result, the Planning Division requested that the applicant submit a geotechnical analysis. The applicant contracted with RGH Consultants of Napa, who submitted a May 4, 2011 summary letter entitled Geologic Consultation, Fault Rupture and Landslide Hazard, Chappellet Winery Expansion, 1581 Sag Canyon Road, St. Helena, California. The submitted summary letter, which was drafted by Jared Pratt (California Engineering Geologist № 2453) and Eric Chase (California Registered Professional Engineer № 2628), includes the following:

A trace of the Atlas Peak-Foss Valley lineament has been mapped 700 to 800 feet north of the winery improvements (U.S. Geological Survey, California Geological Survey, 2006, Quaternary fault and fold database for the United States, accessed April 2001, from USGS web site: <a href="http://earthquake.usgs.gov/hazards/gfaults/">http://earthquake.usgs.gov/hazards/gfaults/</a>). The fault database differentiates the age of fault activity and shows these faults as different colors... The Atlas Peak-Foss Valley lineament is shown to be Quaternary in age and displayed as being younger than 1.6mA.

...Numerous bedrock lineaments, faults and folds have been mapped and identified as part of the complex geologic history that formed the greater Bay Area. Much of that happened during a different geologic regime than the processes taking place today.

Based on our experience and reliance on the research of USGS and CGS scientists, we judge the risk of reactivation and surface fault rupture of the subject fault to be very low. We further conclude that design mitigation measures or avoidance of the fault is unnecessary and not required... Design parameters for shaking will be provided in our report and will be the controlling seismic hazard for this site. (emphasis added)

Based on the above analysis, it would appear that the project, as currently proposed, would not pose a significant risk to life or property either from the rupture of a known fault. As strong seismic ground shaking is possible at the site, a mitigation measure requiring submittal of a final geotechnical report and site-specific design specifications as necessary prior to the issuance of a building permit is incorporated below. Impacts related to fault rupture will be less than significant. Impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking will be less than significant as mitigated.

- aiii. No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that would indicate a high susceptibility to liquefaction or associated seismic-related ground failure. Napa County Environmental Resource Mapping (liquefaction layer) indicates that the project area is generally subject to a "very low" tendency to liquefy. The proposed construction must comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction, including the California Building Code, which will reduce any potential impacts related to liquefaction to a less than significant level.
- aiv. According to geotechnical reports submitted in support of developments on neighboring properties, the topography of much of Pritchard Hill was created by a massive prehistoric landslide. The May 4, 2011 RGH summary letter cited above addresses the threat of landslides as follows;

The site is... mapped within a large landslide feature (Bezore, S.P., 2005 Geologic Map of the Yountville 7.5' Quadrangle, Napa County, California: A Digital Database, California Geological Survey, Scale 1:24,000 and Dwyer, M.J., Noguchi, N., and O'Rourke, J., 1976, Reconnaissance Photo-Interpretation Map of Landslidesin 24 Selected 7.5-Minute Quadrangles in Lake, Napa, Solano, and Sonoma Counties, California: U.S. Geological Survey OFR 76-74, 25 Plates, Scale 1:24,000). The landslide

feature is very large and appears relatively old. We did not observe young, active landslides at the site. Based on the nominal new loading of the planned structures in comparison with the significant size of the geologic feature, it is our opinion that the winery improvements will not adversely impact the stability of the site.

As analyzed in the submitted RGH geotechnical analysis, impacts related to landslides will be less than significant.

- b. Based on Napa County environmental resource mapping and the Soil Survey of Napa County, California (G. Lambert and J. Kashiwagi, Soil Conservation Service), the project area includes soils classified as Sobrante Loam (5 to 30 percent slopes) and Sobrante Loam (30 to 50 percent slopes). The Sobrante Loam soil series is characterized by well drained soils on foot slopes and side slopes in uplands where permeability is moderate. Runoff from Sobrante Loam soils is generally medium with a slight to moderate erosion hazard. The proposed project will require incorporation of best management practices and will be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance, which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable, to ensure that development does not impact adjoining properties, drainages, and roadways.
- c.-d. Bedrock undertays the surficial soits in the project area. Based on Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Mapping (*liquefaction* layer) the project site has a "very low" liquefaction predilection. Construction of the facility will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction, including the California Building Code, which will function to reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- e. The Napa County Department of Environmental Management has reviewed this application and recommends approval based on the submitted wastewater feasibility report and septic improvement plans. Soils on the property have been determined to be adequate to support the proposed septic improvements. Please see the HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY section, below, for a discussion of proposed wastewater treatment improvements.

## Mitigation Measures:

Prior to County authorization of a building permit, the permittee shall submit a final geotechnical study report specifying design parameters
for the proposed construction. Project construction shall comply with the recommendations and/or requirements of the final geotechnical
study report to the satisfaction of the Building Official.

Method of Mitigation Monitoring: This Mitigation Measure requires submission of a final geotechnical report and recommendations prior to the issuance of a building permit. If the required report is not submitted, or if its requirements are not complied with, building permits and permit finals will not be issued. RESPONSIBLE AGENCY(IES)- Building Division, Planning Division

VII.	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Generate a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions in excess of applicable thresholds adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District or the California Air Resources Board which may have a significant impact on the environment?			$\boxtimes$	
b)	Conflict with a county-adopted climate action plan or another applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			$\boxtimes$	

#### Discussion:

a. Construction and operation of the project analyzed herein will contribute to overall increases in Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions by generating emissions associated with transportation to and from the site, emissions from energy used within buildings, and emissions from the use of equipment. In addition, the project will marginally decrease baseline carbon sequestration through the removal of 14 trees. The project-specific increase in GHG emissions would be relatively modest, given the estimated 18 new vehicle trips on an average day, and increasingly stringent Title 24 energy conservation requirements imposed as part of the building permit process.

#### Chappellet Winery

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has established a significance threshold of 1,100 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents per year and screening criteria related to greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) for new development. While the District's screening table does not specifically address wineries, it suggests that "quality restaurants" less than 9,000 square feet in size and "warehousing" uses less than 64,000 square feet in size would not generate GHG in excess of the significance criterion (BAAQD Air Quality Guidelines, Table 3.1). The proposed barrel storage building includes approximately 24,000 square feet of floor area related to wine production, which has been deemed equivalent to warehousing uses for purposes of GHG analysis. Since the proposed 24,000 square foot barrel storage building has a floor area far below the District's 64,000 square foot warehousing screening level, it is clear that the proposed winery will not generate GHG above the significance threshold established by the District, and further analysis (and quantification) of GHG emissions is not warranted.

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

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

During our ongoing planning effort, the County requires project applicants to consider methods to reduce GHG emissions consistent with Napa County General Plan Policy CON-65(e). The applicants intend to have the building LEED Gold (or better) certified and have incorporated extensive GHG reduction methods including (without limitation): bicycle parking, solar panels, recycled-water irrigation with zero potable water use, landscaping with native plants, and high efficiency HVAC systems.

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, because this initial study assesses a project that is consistent with an adopted General Plan for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was prepared, it appropriately focuses on impacts which are "peculiar to the project," rather than the cumulative impacts previously assessed. The relatively modest increase in emissions expected as a result of the project will be well below the significance threshold suggested by BAAQMD, and in compliance with the County's General Plan efforts to reduce emissions described above. For these reasons, project impacts related to GHG emissions are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

VIII.	HA	ZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Millgation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			$\boxtimes$	
	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?			$\boxtimes$	
	c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				$\boxtimes$
	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?	П			$\square$
	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?			_	_ ⊠

			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?				$\boxtimes$
	g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				
	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?			$\boxtimes$	
Discuss	ion:					
ab.	win	Razardous Materials Management Plan will be required by the Department ery facility. Such plans provide information on the type and amount of haza ject will not result in a significant risk of release of hazardous materials into	ardous materials sto			
C.		ere are no schools located within ¼ mile of the project site; the closest schooled approximately 4½ miles to the west.	ool is the St. Helena	Cooperative Nurs	sery School, wi	nich is
d.		pa County environmental resource mapping (hazardous facilities layer) ind ardous material sites.	icates that the subje	ect property is not	on any known	list of
ef.	The	e project site is not located within two miles of any airport, be it public or pr	ivate, and is not sub	ject to any Airport	Land Use Place	າ.
g.		e project has been designed to comply with emergency access and respon partments responsible for emergency services; it will not have a negative in				a County
h.	dry Fire	e hillside chaparral which dominates the landscape surrounding the project season. Standard conditions related to fire protection and adequate fire five Department's approval memorandum and exposure of persons or structus than significant.	ow capacity will be i	ncorporated consi	stent with the (	County
Mitigat	ion M	easures: No mitigation measures are required.				
IV	IIV.	DDOLOGY AND WATER CHALITY Would be project.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX.	пт	DROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY, Would the project:	_	_	_	_
	a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				$\boxtimes$
	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)?	0	0		$\boxtimes$
	c)	Substantially after the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including				

would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

 $\boxtimes$ 

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?			$\boxtimes$	
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?			$\boxtimes$	
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			$\boxtimes$	
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?				$\boxtimes$
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				
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?			$\boxtimes$	
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				$\boxtimes$

a. The proposed project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The applicant has submitted a project Septic Feasibility Report, which evaluates the feasibility of installing a wastewater system to treat and re-use winery process waste for vineyard irrigation and to convert the existing combined process/domestic wastewater treatment and subsurface dispersal system to dedicated domestic use (Michael Muelrath, Applied Civil Engineering, Onsite Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study for the Chappellet Winery Use Permit, April 15, 2011). Mr. Muelrath proposes that process wastewater, which should account for approximately 10,000 gallons of wastewater per day on a peak day, be treated with a Lyve Wastewater Systems package plant aerobic treatment system, stored in the existing vineyard parcel reservoir (which will be re-engineered to allow additional freeboard), and ultimately used to irrigate approximately 77 acres of existing vineyard on the vineyard and winery parcels. The reservoir will be managed to maintain a minimum of 4 feet of freeboard year round. The proposed 4 feet of freeboard will be adequate to ensure that, even in a 100-year storm event, forecasted rain volumes will not cause the reservoir to overtop and no treated wastewater will be discharged into creeks draining to Lake Hennessey.

Because the proposed barrel storage building will necessitate the removal of existing septic tanks, Mr. Muelrath's report proposes the installation of 4,000 gallons of new septic tanks along with a new sump tank. Treated domestic waste would then be disposed of through the existing vineyard parcel leachfield. The Napa County Department of Environmental Management has reviewed the proposed domestic and process wastewater systems and recommends approval as conditioned. Additionally, the applicant will be required to obtain all necessary permits from the Napa County Department of Public Works, including a Stormwater Pollution Management Permit. Said permit will provide for adequate on-site containment of runoff during storm events through placement of siltation measures around the development area. Consistent with General Plan Policy CON-50c, submitted post-construction stormwater runoff documentation indicates that there will be no net increase in post-construction peak runoff during 2-, 10-, 50-, and 100-year storm events.

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. In this case, a proposed lot line adjustment would alter the lot area of both the vineyard and winery parcels; submitted application materials include water use calculations for each and every stage of this process. The below calculations address post-lot line adjustment water use on the affected winery parcel. Reflecting the fact that the requested use permit fargely memorializes existing legal uses (the barrel building itself will not increase water usage), water use will remain constant on all properties and in all cases, and will likewise remain below "fair share" volumes.

Based on the submitted *Phase One* water availability analysis, the 15 acre post lot line adjustment APN 032-010-046 winery parcel has a mountain-area water availability calculation of 7.5 acre feet per year (af/yr), which is arrived at by multiplying its ultimate 15 acre size by a

½ af/yr/acre fair share water use factor. According to the applicant, existing water usage on the parcel is approximately 4.5 af/yr, including .5 af/yr for residential use and 4 af/yr for winery water use associated with 150,000 gallons per year of annual production. No water use associated with the irrigation of existing vineyards is shown because the vineyard is irrigated using surface water pursuant to Division of Water Rights permits 14275 and 6960. This application proposes no additional water use. As a result of the foregoing, annual water demand for this parcel would remain at 4.5 af/yr. Based on these figures, the project would be below the established threshold for groundwater use on the property. The County is not aware of, nor has it received any reports of, groundwater shortages near the project area. The project will not result in any new or additional water use and will not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater level.

- c.-e. There are no existing or planned stormwater systems that would be affected by this project. As the project will tikely result in disturbance to more than one acre of land, the permittee will be required to comply with the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board addressing stormwater pollution during construction. The area surrounding the project is pervious ground that is planted to vineyards and has the capacity to absorb runoff.
- f. There is nothing included in this proposal that would otherwise substantially degrade water quality. As discussed in greater detail at, "a.," above, the Department of Environmental Management has reviewed the proposed wastewater improvements and has found the system adequate, as conditioned, to meet the facility's septic and process wastewater treatment and disposal needs. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality.
- g. This project proposes no housing development. No housing will be placed within a mapped flood zone.
- h.-i. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (Flood Zones and Dam Levee Inundation layers), the project site is not located within a mapped floodplain or dam levee inundation area. This project will not expose people or structures to significant risks associated with flooding.
- j. In coming years, higher global temperatures are expected to raise sea level by expanding ocean water, melting mountain glaciers and small ice caps, and causing portions of Greenland and the Antarctic ice sheets to melt. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change estimates that the global average sea level will rise between 0.6 and 2 feet over the next century (IPCC, 2007). However, the project area is located at approximately 1,100 feet in elevation and there is no known history of mud flow in the vicinity. The project will not subject people or structures to a significant risk of inundation from tsunami, seiche, or mudflow.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

X.	LAI	ND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) b)	Physically divide an established community?  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				$\boxtimes$
		purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				$\boxtimes$
	c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				$\boxtimes$

# Discussion:

- a. The proposed project is located in an area dominated by agricultural, residential, and open space uses and the improvements proposed here are in support of ongoing agricultural uses county-wide, as they provide a market for grapes grown within Napa County. This project will not divide an established community
- b. The subject parcel is located in the AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district, which allows wineries and winery-accessory uses subject to use permit approval. The project would be fully compliant with the physical limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance. The

#### Chappellet Winery

County has adopted the Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO) to protect agriculture and open space and to regulate winery development and expansion in a manner that avoids potential negative environmental effects.

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

The proposed use of the property for the "fermenting and processing of grape juice into wine" (NCC §18.08.640) supports the economic viability of agriculture within the county consistent with General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-4 ("The County will reserve agricultural lands for agricultural use including lands used for grazing and watershed/ open space...") and General Plan Economic Development Policy E-1 ("The County's economic development will focus on ensuring the continued viability of agriculture...").

The General Plan includes two complimentary policies requiring that new wineries, "...be designed to convey their permanence and attractiveness." (General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-10 and General Plan Community Character Policy CC-2). The buildings proposed here are generally of a high architectural quality and are in keeping with the primary agricultural character of the site and its surroundings. The proposed winery structures will convey the required permanence and attractiveness.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impaci		
XI.	MIN	ERAL 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?				$\boxtimes$		
	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?						
Discussi	on:							
аЪ.	ab. Historically, the two most valuable mineral commodities in Napa County in economic terms have been mercury and mineral water. More recently, building stone and aggregate have become economically valuable. Mines and Mineral Deposits mapping included in the Napa County Baseline Data Report indicates that there are no known mineral resources nor any locally important mineral resource recovery sites located on the project site (Mines and Mineral Deposits, Napa County Baseline Data Report, Figure 2-2). The nearest known resource is the former McGill Rock and Sand Company operation, which was located in Conn Creek, to the south.							
Mitigatio	on Me	easures: No mitigation measures are required.						
VII	NO	CE Would the project result in	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact		
XII.	MOI	SE. Would the project result in:						

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact			
established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			$\boxtimes$				
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			$\boxtimes$				
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			$\boxtimes$				
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			$\boxtimes$				
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?				$\boxtimes$			
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?				$\boxtimes$			
Discussion:							
limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles; and, as a result, noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. The proposed project would not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts. Construction activities would generally occur during the period between 7 am and 7 pm on weekdays- normal waking hours. All construction activities will be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (N.C.C. Chapter 8.16).  Noise from winery operations is generally limited; however, the proposed marketing plan could create additional noise impacts. The submitted marketing plan includes a number of annual events, one of which would include up to 125 visitors. The Napa County Exterior Noise Ordinance, which was adopted in 1984, sets the maximum permissible received sound level for a rural residence as 45 db between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. While the 45 db limitation is strict (45 db is roughly equivalent to the sound generated by a quiet conversation), much of the area around the proposed winery is given over to agricultural uses and standard winery conditions of approval are designed to minimize noise impacts on neighboring properties associated with outdoor amplified music by requiring;  There shall be no amplified sound system or amplified music utilized outside of approved, enclosed, winery buildings.  In addition, continuing enforcement of Napa County's Exterior Noise Ordinance by the Department of Environmental Management and the Napa County Sheriff, including a separate and reinforcing prohibition against outdoor amplified music, will ensure that marketing events and other winery activities do not create a significant noise impact.							
ef. The project site is not subject to an airport land use plan nor is it located within	two miles of a pub	lic airport or private	e airstrip,				
Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.							
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING, Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact			
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)?			$\boxtimes$				

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
	b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				$\boxtimes$	
	c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				$\boxtimes$	
Discuss	on:						
a.	The Association of Bay Area Governments' <i>Projections 2009</i> figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase some 7.2% by the year 2035, while county-wide employment is projected to increase by 29% in the same period (Metropolitan Transportation Commission, <i>Superdistrict and County Summaries of ABAG's Projections 2009 - 2000-2035 Data Summary</i> , September 2009). The new employee positions which are part of this project may lead to some population growth within Napa County, though in reality they are simply existing off-site positions which will be moving on-site. In addition, the project will be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs. Relative to the county's projected low to moderate growth rate and overall adequate programmed housing supply, any resulting population growth does not rise to a level of environmental significance.  Cumulative impacts related to population and housing balance were identified in the 2008 General Plan EIR. As set forth in Government Code §65580, the County of Napa must facilitate the improvement and development of housing to make adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community. Similarly, CEQA recognizes the importance of balancing the prevention of environmental damage with the provision of a "decent home and satisfying living environment for every Californian." (See Public Resources Code §21000(g).) The 2008 General Plan sets forth the County's long-range plan for meeting regional housing needs, during the present and future housing cycles, while balancing environmental, economic, and fiscal factors and community goals. The policies and programs identified in the General Plan Housing Element function, in combination with the County's housing impact mitigation fee, to						
bс.	bala The	ture an adequate cumulative volume and diversity of housing. Cumulative ance will be less than significant, a winery parcel currently houses an occupied single family residence and the sum of the sidence and the sidence are sidence as the siden	he vineyard parcel h	ouses three reside	ences. None of	these	
		ating residences will be removed, converted, or otherwise affected by this existing housing or a substantial number of people and will not necessitate				l volume	
Mitigati	on M	easures: No mitigation measures are required.					
XIV.	DITE	BLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
7817	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?			$\boxtimes$		
		Police protection?			$\boxtimes$		
		Schoots?			$\boxtimes$		
		Parks?			$\boxtimes$		

	Other public facilities?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Discus	sion;				
a. Mitiga	Public services are currently provided to the subject parcel and, as a result from the project, which amounts to little more than the construction of a bar positions on-site, and the memorialization of a marketing plan that closely measures are required as part of the development pursuant to Napa Cour impact to emergency response times with the adoption of standard condit reviewed the application and recommend approval as conditioned. School capacity building measures, will be levied pursuant to building permit substructure resulting from building permit fees, property tax increases, and tax meet the costs of providing public services to the facility. The proposed proton Measures: No mitigation measures are required.	arrel storage building, the parallels existing legal only Fire Marshall conditions of approval. The Fill impact mitigation fees, mittal. Impacts to parks axes from the sale of with the sale of the sale of with the sale of t	ne relocation of appactivities, will be mons and there will be and Public Word, which assist local will be limited-to-ne and wine-relate	proximately 6 e harginal, Fire p be no foreseea ks Department school district onexistent. Co d products will	employee rotection able is have s with unty help
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV.	RECREATION. Would the project:		incorporation	mpact	
	a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or oth recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facil would occur or be accelerated?				
	b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physic effect on the environment?				$\boxtimes$
Discus	sion:				
<b>a</b> ,	This application proposes use permit recognition of an existing legally-cre facilities and systems. No portion of this project, nor any foreseeable resurecreational facilities.				
b.	This project does not include new recreational facilities of any description.				
Mitigat	tion Measures: No mitigation measures are required.				
VI.II	YD ANC DOTTATION CODATE IC Manual the province	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI.	TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
	a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existitraffic load and capacity of the street system and/or conflict with General Pt-Policy CIR-16, which seeks to maintain an adequate Level of Service (LOS) signalized and unsignalized intersections, or reduce the effectiveness existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities?	an at 🔲			
	b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, be not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or oth standards established by the Napa County Transportation and Planni Agency for designated roads or highways?	ner 🔲			

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?			$\boxtimes$	
f)	Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-23, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?				
g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				⊠

a.-b. The project site is located approximately one mile up a private road which begins at Sage Canyon Road (Highway 128) roughly 250 feet northeast of the intersection of Long Ranch Road, Sage Canyon Road, and the entrance to the Lake Hennessey boat dock parking lot. Sage Canyon Road does not have an existing turn-lane at its intersection with the project driveway and no changes to the project driveway/ Sage Canyon Road intersection are proposed as a component of this project. Roadway improvements proposed here are limited to: 1.) the widening of an existing 12 to 14 foot wide winery access road to a finished width of 14 to 18 feet on the Chappetlet-owned winery and vineyard parcels and 2.) the construction of approximately 400 linear feet of new 20 foot wide driveway, primarily located on the winery parcel, providing access to the proposed barrel storage building.

As noted at "Description of Project" and "BaselInIng and the scope of this review," above, the proposed Chappellet Winery use permit largely recognizes existing conditions at the legal existing winery. No increase in daily tours and tastings visitation is proposed and while the project includes 6 additional on-site employees, the proposed barrel storage building would allow the winery to move 100% of its barrel storage on-site, appreciably reducing truck trips to and from the facility. Baseline traffic conditions and roadway function on the shared private driveway and at its intersection with Highway 128 were recently analyzed in the subsequent mitigated negative declaration for the neighboring Continuum Winery, which was adopted by the Planning Commission on April 20, 2011. (Continuum Winery Use Permit Major Modification approval № P10-00255, 1683 and 1677 Sage Canyon Road, St. Helena, Calif., 94574, Assessor's Parcel №s. 032-010-060 (032-030-043SFAP) & 032-010-061 (032-030-044SFAP)). The analysis included in that document is as valid here as there and provides the basis for much of what follows.

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

- LOS A- Free-flowing travel with an excellent level of comfort and convenience and freedom to maneuver.
- LOS B- Stable operating conditions, but the presence of other road users causes a noticeable, though slight, reduction in comfort, convenience, and maneuvering freedom.
- LOS C- Stable operating conditions, but the operation of individual users is substantially affected by the interaction with others in the traffic stream.
- LOS D- High-density, but stable flow. Users experience severe restrictions in speed and freedom to maneuver, with poor levels
  of comfort and convenience.
- LOS E- Operating conditions at or near capacity. Speeds are reduced to a low but relatively uniform value. Freedom to
  maneuver is difficult with users experiencing frustration and poor comfort and convenience. Unstable operation is frequent, and
  minor disturbances in traffic flow can cause breakdown conditions.
- LOS F- Forced or breakdown conditions. This condition exists wherever the volume of traffic exceeds the capacity of the
  roadway. Long queues can form behind these bottleneck points with queued traffic traveling in a stop-and-go fashion. (2000
  Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board)

According to traffic counts conducted during the summer of 2009 for the Continuum Winery application (Nickelson, George, P.E, Traffic Analysis for a Winery Expansion Project at #1677 Sage Canyon Road- State Route 128 (SR 128) in Napa County (Approximate Postmile 10.62), July 29, 2010), Sage Canyon Road sees a traffic volume of 140 two-way peak hour trips on both a summer Friday and a summer Saturday afternoon. Because these traffic counts are "somewhat lower than the expected peak day peak hour flow based on Caltrans data," Mr. Nickelson adjusted baseline traffic flows up by 15% to arrive at a simulated existing traffic rate of 160 peak hour two-way vehicle trips; an existing level of operation on the State Highway which the Continuum traffic study characterizes as being in the A-B LOS range. According to the submitted study, the project driveway, which provides access to a number of existing wineries and residences, currently operates at LOS A for outbound driveway traffic onto Sage Canyon Road.

The Chappellet project would result in 6 additional on-site employees, generating approximately 18 trips on a weekday, while the conversion to 100% on-site barrel storage will reduce traffic loading by at least 75 trips annually. It is conservatively assumed that 5 of the 6 daily outbound employee trips will occur during the weekday PM peak hour. The project will not result in any additional weekend trips as hospitality-related employment is not proposed to increase.

Based on traffic flow patterns as modeled in the Continuum traffic study, 95% of the trips to and from wineries located on Pritchard Hill arrive eastbound and depart westbound on Highway 128. The 5 additional weekday PM peak hour trips proposed in this application would add less than ½ of 1% to existing daily volumes. This change in traffic would not be measurable within typical daily fluctuations in traffic flows. At the proposed project driveway, outbound baseline plus project traffic will operate at LOS A during both the weekday and Saturday peak hours.

While baseline plus project levels of service are likely to remain in the good to excellent range in the mid-term, year 2030 cumulative buildout projections for Sage Canyon Road which were developed as part of the 2008 Napa County General Plan Update indicate there may be as much as a ten-fold increase in traffic levels along the SR 128 corridor by 2030. The George Nickelson Continuum Winery traffic study indicates that this would result in an F LOS for outbound driveway traffic during the weekday peak hour and an LOS of E during the Saturday peak. However, the Nickelson study concludes that, "it is doubtful that SR 128 volumes would actually reach these high levels." In either case, the project's 5-trip PM peak hour traffic signature would, when added to the 10-trip signature of Continuum, represent significantly less than 1% of the modeled 1,600 2030 peak hour trips (the 1% increase standard has been Napa County's traditional threshold for finding cumulatively significant impacts to intersections which are, or will be, operating at unacceptable levels of service), making impacts less than considerable cumulatively.

As analyzed above, this project will not result in a significant increase in traffic or a decrease in the existing roadway level of service either individually or cumulatively. Impacts to signalized and unsignalized intersections will be less than significant. There will be no impact to existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities

- The proposed project will not result in any change to air traffic patterns.
- d.-e. As discussed at item "a.-b.", above, no changes are proposed at the existing intersection of the unnamed private access road and Sage Canyon Road. The Chappellet site is located about 1 mile from Highway 128, up a 2 ½ (total) mile access road which also serves the approved Continuum Winery and other residential/vineyard parcels. The roadway width is generally 18-22 feet from Highway 128 to the Chappellet Winery, though the road narrows to approximately 15 feet just before Chappellet. From the shared access drive to the Chappellet Winery (along the Chappellet Winery driveway) sightlines are generally good, but widths range from 12 to 14 feet.

Improvements to the shared access drive to mitigate width and sightline issues were analyzed for CEQA purposes and incorporated into the Planning Commission's approval of the neighboring Continuum Winery and Public Works and Fire reviewers have indicated to the author that they will condition any approval for Chappellet on the same improvements. As analyzed in the Continuum subsequent mitigated negative declaration, with improvements proposed in the Continuum project and/or mitigated through that project's negative declaration, impacts related to traffic safety along the shared private road will be less than significant.

This project proposes widening the Chappellet winery drive (not a part of the Continuum project) to 14 to 18 feet. With the proposed widening, the Fire Marshal and the Department of Public Works have identified no significant safety issues. They are recommending approval of the requested Road and Street Standards exception.

With regard to the intersection of the access driveway with Sage Canyon Road, George Nickelson's Continuum traffic study (ibid.) concludes that:

The primary issues for access design are the vehicle visibility and operation relative to vehicles travelling on SR 128 and vehicles turning in/out of the winery access. The required vehicle visibility or "corner sight distance" is a function of the travel speeds on

SR 128. Caltrans design standards indicate that for appropriate comer sight distance, "a substantially clear line of sight should be maintained between the driver of a vehicle waiting at the cross road and the driver of an approaching vehicle in the right lane of the main highway." Caltrans design guidelines also indicate that at private access intersections or at public intersections, "where restrictive conditions exist," the minimum comer sight distance "shall be equal to the stopping sight distance."

Based on radar surveys conducted as a part of this study, the "critical" vehicle speeds (85% of all surveyed vehicles travel at or below the critical speed) along SR 128 at the proposed winery were measured on a weekday and a Saturday. The eastbound and westbound speeds were about 33 mph and 40 mph. Based on Caltrans design standards, these vehicle speeds require sight distances of about 250 feet to the west and 300 feet to the east, measured along the travel lanes on SR 128. Field measurements indicate sight distances of about 250 feet to the west and 600 feet to the east-these distances are satisfactory for the measured speeds.

The County Fire Marshall and the Department of Public Works have reviewed the project inclusive of the requested exception to the Road and Street Standards and recommend approval with conditions addressing road design, signage, and sightlines. Project impacts related to traffic hazards and emergency access will be less than significant.

- f. The Chappellet Winery currently has 24 parking spaces and this project includes the addition of 2 new ADA-accessible spaces. The winery currently has 18 employees and 6 additional employees are proposed to move on-site as a component of this project. Existing tours and tastings visitation averages 24 persons per day, with a maximum of 40, and marketing event visitation of up to 125 people is proposed at the largest annual event. Given those figures, and the ready access to informal overflow parking throughout the large surrounding vineyard parcel, the 26 existing and proposed parking spaces should be ample. Standard conditions of approval disallowing parking in rights-of-way and requiring the shuttling of special event visitors from off-site where special marketing event visitation exceeds parking capacity will guarantee adequate parking during the largest 125 person special marketing event. The project will not conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-23 so as to cause potentially significant environmental impacts.
- g. There is no aspect of this proposed project that will conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation. The project is not reasonably accessible by bike given the length and steepness of the property's access drive.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI.	UII	LITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
	a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				$\boxtimes$
	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?			$\boxtimes$	
	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?			$\boxtimes$	
	d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			$\boxtimes$	
	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?				⊠
	f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				$\boxtimes$

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	9)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				$\boxtimes$
Discus	sion:					
a.	res	e project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements as establishe ult in a significant impact on the environment relative to wastewater discha compliance with State and County regulations.				
b.	des the ong wat	is application proposes a new process wastewater system and minor alter- scribed at HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY, above. The Napa Count proposed domestic and process wastewater systems and recommends a going monitoring of the facility's wastewater systems by the Department of ter quality to less than significant levels. The new process wastewater treat not result in significant environmental impacts over permitted baseline levels.	ity Department of En pproval as condition Environmental Man Itment and disposal:	vironmental Mana ed. Required wellt agement should re	gement has re nead setbacks educe any imp	and acts on
C.		e project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drudd cause a significant impact to the environment.	ainage facilities or a	n expansion of exi	sting facilities v	which
d.		discussed at the HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY section, above, eas well below the property's fair share volume. No new or expanded entitle			ted by this pro	ect at
e.		mestic wastewater will be treated on-site and will not require a wastewater ated and disposed of on-site consistent with the requirements of the Napa				e be
f.		e project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the proj posal of solid waste generated by the project.	ect's demands. No s	significant impact v	will occur from	the
g.	The	e project will comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulatio	ns related to solid w	aste.		
Mitigat	ion M	easures: No miligation measures are required.				
			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII.	MA	NDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
	a)	Ooes 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?	П	П	П	⋈

# Discussion:

Chappellet Winery

Use Permit, Road and Street Standards Exception, and Lot Line Adjustment № P11-00138

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)?

c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

 $\boxtimes$ 

 $\boxtimes$ 

- a. The project will have a less than significant impact on wildlife resources. No sensitive resources or biologic areas will be converted or affected by this project. Also as analyzed above, the project will not result in a significant loss of native trees, native vegetation, or important examples of California's history or pre-history.
- b. As discussed above, and in particular under Air Quality, Transportation/Traffic, and Population and Housing, the proposed project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- c. There are no environmental effects caused by this project that would result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, whether directly or indirectly. No hazardous conditions resulting from this project have been identified. The project will not have any environmental effects that will result in significant impacts.

Mitigation Measures: No additional mitigation measures are required.

ATTACHED: APRIL 28, 2011 KJELDSEN BIOLOGICAL SURVEY

RECEIVED

NAPA CO. CONSERVATION

# KIELDSEN BIOLOGICAL CONSULTING

DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPT. Chris K. Kjeldsen Ph.D., Botany Daniel T. Kjeldsen B.S, Natural Resource Management 923 St. Helena Ave. Santa Rosa, CA 95404

April 28, 2011

To:

Conservation Division Napa Co. CDPD

1195 Third St., Suite 210 176 Main Street Suite B St. Helena, CA 9457

Re:

Northwestern Pond Turtle Survey

Project:

Chappellet Vineyards 1581 Sage Canyon Road St Helena, CA 94574

# Introduction

At the request of Jon-Mark Chappellet, we conducted surveys for the presence or potential for Northwestern Pond Turtle and or aquatic vertebrates within a reservoir on the property at 1581 Sage Canyon Road. The lined reservoir was built and permitted for vineyard irrigation. The reservoir is proposed to receive approximately three-acre-feet (during the year) of treated winery wastewater for holding purposes.

Surveys were conducted to determine if any aquatic species (with specific emphasis on the Northwestern Pond Turtle) would be negatively impacted by the additional water input to the reservoir. Specifically surveys were conducted to determine if turtles, frogs are using the reservoir and what effect treated wastewater would potentially have on aquatic vertebrates if found to inhabit the reservoir.

The study site is in Napa County, east of the city of St Helena with access from Sage Canyon Road. The site in the Yountville USGS Quadrangle.

# Methods

The reservoir was surveyed from a distance by scanning the perimeter of all suitable habitats with binoculars followed by a search of the edge conducted by foot. The survey was conducted on March 27, 2011 in the afternoon under conditions, which would favor basking, by the pond turtles if present.

Northwestern pond turtles overwinter in both aquatic and terrestrial habitats. Aquatic refugia consist of rocks, logs, mud, submerged vegetation, and undercut areas along banks. Terrestrial overwintering habitat consists of burrows in leaf litter or soil. The duff layer can also be an area for overwintering habitat.

Northwestern pond turtles are most conspicuous within ponds during the spring and summer months with conditions of warm sunny conditions that favor basking or surface activities. Frogs and toads can be observed during the day as larvae or as adults along the edge of the shore.

# **Findings**

# Northwestern Pond Turtle and Other Vertebrates

- No Northwestern Pond Turtle were observed within or outside of the study area. Vineyard staff reports that they have never seen a turtle in the reservoir. We found no evidence of tracks or slides in the mud along the edge of the reservoir or any visual sightings.
- Larvae (tadpoles) of western toads were observed in significant numbers along the shore of the reservoir. No adult frogs or toads were observed within or outside of the study area.
- Mosquito fish were present and common.
- The reservoir is completely lined with an impermeable liner with dirt banks covering some of the liner edge. We are told that the reservoir fluctuates considerably as water is drawn out during the growing season exposing the liner.
- The winery wastewater will be treated and the Biological Oxygen Demand BOD reduced to levels that will not impact any resident vertebrates.



Photo 1. View of reservoir.



Photo 2. View habitat around the reservoir at high water.

# Summary

Our review of the project and the site indicates no presence of Northwestern Pond Turtles in or around the study site. Pond Turtles most likely cannot overwinter in the reservoir due to the pond liner.

It is our opinion that the fluctuating water levels and the reservoir liner are not suitable for supporting populations of the Northwestern Pond Turtle.

It is our professional opinion based the site conditions and our field survey that there are no Northwestern Pond Turtles in the reservoir.

If the site should be occupied by Northwestern Pond Turtles there is no reason to believe that the addition of treated wastewater would significantly impact turtles, it is not uncommon for turtles to occupy sites such as cattle ponds with high levels of biological oxygen demand.

The reservoir at present does provide winter breeding habitat for Western Toads, and Chorus Frogs. Non-native bullfrogs also may inhabit the reservoir. Native frogs and toads will exit the reservoir in the spring and do not use the reservoir year round.

It is our professional opinion based the site conditions and our field survey that there is no reason to believe that the addition of treated wastewater would significantly impact aquatic vertebrates i.e. Frogs and Toads in the reservoir.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us at: telephone (707) 544-3091, Email kjeldsen@sonic.net, or by fax (707) 575-8030.

Sincerely,

Kjeldsen Biological Consulting