



A Tradition of Stewardship
A Commitment to Service

COUNTY OF NAPA

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, BUILDING, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

1195 3rd Street, Second Floor

Napa, Calif. 94559

707.253.4417

Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration

Project Title

Araujo Estate Winery Use Permit Major Modification and Road and Street Standards Exception Application № P12-00412

Property Owner

2155 Pickett Road Partners, 2155 Pickett Road, Calistoga, Calif., 94515

County Contact Person, Phone Number and Email

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

Project Location and APN

The 162 acre project parcel is located on the east side of Pickett Road, approximately 1/3 mile north of its intersection with the Silverado Trail, within the AP (Agricultural Preserve) and AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning districts. APN⁰: 020-340-030, 2155 Pickett Road, Calistoga, Calif., 94515

Project Sponsor's Name and Address

Donna Oldford, Plans4Wine, 2620 Pinot Way, St. Helena, Calif., 94574, 707.963.5832, dboldford@aol.com

General Plan Description

AR (Agricultural Resource) and AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space)

Zoning

AP (Agricultural Preserve) and AW (Agricultural Watershed)

Project Description

Major Modification to Use Permit **U-91-13**, as previously modified by **93049-MOD**, **P05-0353-VMM**, and **P11-00009-VMM** to further modify the approved and operating 20,000 gallon per year winery as follows:

- no new structural development;
- no increase in wine production;
- increase in by-appointment tours and tastings visitation from a maximum of 25 per week to a maximum of 18 per day;
- a revised and enlarged marketing plan including food and wine pairings with four 24-person events per month but not exceeding 12 such events per calendar year, two 80-person events per year, one 125-person auction-related event per year, and participation in Auction Napa Valley;
- addition of food and wine pairings to tours and tastings visitation;
- addition of Evans Bill (AB2004) on-premise consumption adjacent to the existing caves and winery structure;
- expansion of tours and tastings hours of operation from 10am-4pm to 10am-6pm;
- recognition of winery production hours of operation from 6am-6pm;
- increase in on-site employment from 3 FT and 2 PT employees to 12 FT and 2 PT employees; and
- expansion of and modifications to an existing domestic/process wastewater treatment and disposal system to accommodate additional employees and visitation as requested hereby.

Road and Street Standards exception to allow the continuing use of an existing 12' wide winery access driveway and its conversion into a commercial one-way loop road with turnouts as required.

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 Planning, Building, and Environmental Services 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 the **negative declaration**. Copies of the proposed **negative declaration** and all documents referenced therein are available for review at the offices of the Napa County Department of Planning, Building, and Environmental Services, 1195 Third St., Second Floor, Napa, Calif. 94559 between the hours of 8:00 AM and 4:45 PM Monday through Friday (excepting holidays).

C. M. Cahill, Planner

date

Written Comment Period - June 27, 2013 through July 16, 2013

Please send written comments to the attention of C.M. Cahill at 1195 Third St., Second Floor, 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 Planning Commission at 9:00 AM or later on Wednesday July 17th, 2013. You may confirm the date and time of this hearing by calling (707) 253-4417.

COUNTY OF NAPA
 Department of Planning, Building, and Environmental Services
 1195 Third St., Second Floor
 Napa, Calif. 94559
 (707) 253-4416

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated September 2010)

1. **Project Title:**
 Araujo Estate Winery Use Permit Major Modification and Road and Street Standards Exception Application № P12-00412
2. **Property Owner:**
 2155 Pickett Road Partners, 2155 Pickett Road, Calistoga, Calif., 94515
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and Email:**
 Christopher M. Cahill, Planner, 707.253.4847, chris.cahill@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and APN:**
 The 162 acre project parcel is located on the east side of Pickett Road, approximately 1/3 mile north of its intersection with the Silverado Trail, within the AP (Agricultural Preserve) and AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning districts. APN^o: 020-340-030, 2155 Pickett Road, Calistoga, Calif., 94515
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**
 Donna Oldford, Plans4Wine, 2620 Pinot Way, St. Helena, Calif., 94574, 707.963.5832, dboldford@aol.com
6. **General Plan Description:**
 AR (Agricultural Resource) and AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space)
7. **Zoning:**
 AP (Agricultural Preserve) and AW (Agricultural Watershed)
8. **Description of Project.**
 Major Modification to Use Permit **U-91-13**, as previously modified by **93049-MOD**, **P05-0353-VMM**, and **P11-00009-VMM** to further modify the approved and operating 20,000 gallon per year winery as follows:
 - no new structural development;
 - no increase in wine production;
 - increase in by-appointment tours and tastings visitation from a maximum of 25 per week to a maximum of 18 per day;
 - a revised and enlarged marketing plan including food and wine pairings with four 24-person events per month but not exceeding 12 such events per calendar year, two 80-person events per year, one 125-person auction-related event per year, and participation in Auction Napa Valley;
 - addition of food and wine pairings to tours and tastings visitation;
 - addition of Evans Bill (AB2004) on-premise consumption adjacent to the existing caves and winery structure;
 - expansion of tours and tastings hours of operation from 10am-4pm to 10am-6pm;
 - recognition of winery production hours of operation from 6am-6pm;
 - increase in on-site employment from 3 FT and 2 PT employees to 12 FT and 2 PT employees; and
 - expansion of and modifications to an existing domestic/process wastewater treatment and disposal system to accommodate additional employees and visitation as requested hereby.

Road and Street Standards exception to allow the continuing use of an existing 12' wide winery access driveway and its conversion into a commercial one-way loop road with turnouts as required.
9. **Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses.**

The project is proposed on a single 162 acre parcel, split zoned AP and AW, located on the east side of Pickett Road, just north of its intersection with Rosedale Road. As the crow flies, it is about ¼ mile east of the City of Calistoga. The property presently includes a +/-8,750 square foot winery approved to produce at up to 20,000 gallons per year, +/-10,000 square feet of caves, several barns and outbuildings, two residences, a guest cottage, two sports courts, several irrigation reservoirs, a one acre olive grove, and approximately 38 acres of producing vineyard. The property dips to as low as 370 feet in elevation along its Pickett Road frontage and then proceeds upslope into the eastern foothills of the Napa Valley, where a series of undeveloped ridgelines and hilltops reach as much as 870 feet in elevation. Simmons Canyon Creek crosses the lower portion of the parcel, running north-south, parallel to and approximately 250 feet east of Pickett Road. Vineyard areas adjacent to Simmons Canyon Creek are located within the 100-year floodplain, though this project proposes no structural development in the inundation zone.

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 Pleasanton Loam (0 to 2 percent slopes), Bale Clay Loam (2 to 5 percent slopes), Cortina Very Gravelly Loam (0 to 5 percent slopes), and Forward-Kidd Complex (50 to 75 percent slopes) in upslope areas. The Pleasanton Loam series is characterized by well drained soils on alluvial fans at elevations ranging from 50 to 600 feet; it consists of alluvium derived from sedimentary rock. Runoff from Pleasanton soils is slow and the threat of erosion is slight. Pleasanton Loam at 0 to 2 percent slopes is a class I soil. Bale Clay Loam is characterized by somewhat poorly drained soils on alluvial fans, flood plains, and low terraces where permeability is moderate and temporary ponding is common during periods of high rainfall. Runoff from Bale soils is slow and the threat of erosion is slight. Cortina Very Gravelly Loam (0 to 5 percent slopes) soils consist of excessively drained soils on flood plains and alluvial fans, formed from recently stratified alluvium. The permeability of this soil type is rapid, with an available water capacity of 2 to 5 inches. Runoff is slow and the threat of erosion is slight. Finally, the Forward-Kidd Complex consists of very steep soils on uplands where permeability is moderately rapid. Forward-Kidd soils formed in material weathered from rhyolite and have an effective rooting depth of 20 to 40 inches. Runoff is very rapid and the threat of erosion is very high. Native vegetation types in the project vicinity would have included annual grasslands and scattered oaks in flat lower elevation areas and a mixed forest Douglas fir, Madrone, scrub oak, and bay trees in uplands. The County's geological hazard mapping indicates that the subject parcel is located in a fairly stable geologic zone with no known faulting, landslides, or other identified slope stability issues.

Land uses in the general vicinity of the project are a mix of residential uses, active vineyard operations on lots ranging (generally) from 5 to 50 acres, a few scattered wineries with production ranging from 10,000 to 20,000 gallons annually, and upslope open space. There are two wineries located within ½ mile of the project area, including Venge Vineyards (20,000 gallons per year) and Pavitt Family Vineyards (10,000 gallons per year). A cluster of residences near the corner of Rosedale and Pickett Roads includes approximately 10 single family homes on lots averaging slightly more than one acre in size; residential uses in the area are otherwise quite diffuse. The City of Calistoga and a number of its major resort hotels are located less than a mile to the west of the Araujo property; the Silver Rose Hotel is located on Rosedale Road, approximately ½ mile away from Araujo, and Solage Resort is located on the Silverado Trail about ¼ mile beyond that. The subject property is split zoned AP (Agricultural Preserve) and AW (Agricultural Watershed) and split General Plan designated AR (Agricultural Resource) and AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space). Valley floor areas to the north, west, and south of the property are generally zoned AP and designated AR, while upland areas to the east are zoned AW and General Plan designated AWOS.

10. **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:

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 described herein and/or listed in the file, comments received, conversations with knowledgeable individuals; the preparer's personal knowledge of the area; and, where necessary, a visit to the site. For further information, see the environmental background information contained in the permanent file on this project.

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Name: C.M. Cahill for Napa County Planning, Building, and Environmental Services

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

Discussion:

- a.-d. 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 noted in the project description, above, this project proposes no new structural development. There will be no visible change to the facility and no impact on scenic resources, light, or glare.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Discussion:

- a. Based on a review of Napa County environmental resource mapping, portions of the subject property are designated as Prime Farmland while others are Farmland of Statewide Importance (*Department of Conservation Farmlands, 2008* layer), however, the land on which the winery and most of its associated improvements are located is not designated as special status farmland. The project will not result in the removal of any existing grape vines. 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 is consistent with the parcel's AP and AW agricultural zoning (winery areas are zoned AP). The parcel is subject to and fully consistent with Williamson Act contract № 169/77 as amended.
- 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 §12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code §4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code §51104(g).
- d. The subject parcels include neither forestland nor timberland and are not subject to timberland zoning. No trees will be removed.
- e. As discussed at "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 parcels' AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning. Neither this project, nor any foreseeable consequence thereof, would result in changes to the existing environment which would result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

On March 5, 2012 the Alameda County Superior Court issued a judgment finding that the Air District had failed to comply with CEQA when it adopted the thresholds. The court did not determine whether the 2011 thresholds were valid on the merits, but found that their adoption was a project under CEQA. The court issued a writ of mandate ordering the District to set aside the thresholds and cease their dissemination until the Air District had complied with CEQA. The Air District has redacted the thresholds from their published Guidelines but is appealing the Superior Court's decision.

In view of the above, the Air District is no longer recommending that the 2011 thresholds be used as a generally applicable measure of the significance of a given project's air quality impacts, instead the Air District recommends that lead agencies rely on project-specific evidence and their 1999 thresholds of significance (*CEQA Guidelines – Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans*, BAAQMD, December 1999). While the Air District can no longer recommend the 2011 thresholds, Napa County has found that their application provides substantial evidence that a local project will or will not have a substantial impact on air quality and has chosen to use the thresholds of significance provided in **Table 3-1** (Criteria Air Pollutants & Precursors Screening Levels Sizes) when evaluating projects in Napa County.

The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plan. Wineries as proposed here are not producers of air pollution in volumes substantial enough to result in an air quality plan conflict. The project site lies within the northern portion 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 area create a relatively high potential for air pollution. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from construction activities. As construction related to this project will be limited to minor trenching in already-disturbed areas to allow for modifications to the septic disposal system, it would not have construction related impacts such as dust generated during grading and other construction activities, exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles, and relatively minor emissions from paints and other architectural coatings.

Over a longer 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 (1999 *Guidelines*, p. 24). The use permit proposed here includes up to 12 full-time employees, 2 part-time employees, 18 busiest-day tours and tasting visitors, and potentially 1 busiest-day production pickup/delivery; meaning that this project should account for 47 maximum daily trips on a weekday with no marketing events (see Nickelson, George, P.E, Omni-Means Engineering, *Focused Traffic Analysis for the Proposed Araujo Estate Winery Project Located at 2155 Picket (sic) Road in Calistoga, Napa County*, May 2, 2013). The subject application also proposes occasional marketing events, with up to 125 people at the largest event; which would add 109 additional trips on the day of a large marketing event. The resulting theoretical busiest day plus marketing total of 156 project-related trips is well below the established 2,000 vehicle trip threshold of significance.

While the District's Air District's 2011 Guidelines Table 3-1 threshold of significance does not specifically address wineries, it suggests that "quality restaurants" less than 47,000 square feet in size and "light industrial" uses less than 541,000 square feet in size would not generate criteria pollutants in excess of the significance criterion (BAAQD Air Quality Guidelines, Table 3.1). This project proposes no new structural development, so the 2011 Table 3-1 thresholds are not applicable.

The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

- d.-e. While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known operational producers of offensive odors or pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. There will be no foreseeable construction-phase impacts as no new development is proposed. The project will not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a.-e. As noted in the project description, above, this project proposes no new structural development. Earth disturbing activity would be limited to trenching in already-developed areas to marginally expand an existing septic disposal field. No work is proposed in or near required stream setbacks. The project would not result in any foreseeable impact on biological or riparian resources.
- 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.

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

Discussion:

- 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. Archeological evidence indicates that human occupation of California began at least 10,000 years ago. Early occupants appear to have had an economy based largely on hunting, with limited exchange, and social structures based on the extended family unit. Later, milling technology and an inferred acorn economy were introduced. This diversification of economy appears to have evolved along with the development of more permanent settlements, population growth, and expansion. Sociopolitical complexity and status distinctions based on wealth are also observable in the archeological record, as evidenced by an increased range and distribution of trade goods such as shell beads and obsidian tool stone, which are possible indicators of both status and increasingly complex exchange systems. At the time of European settlement, Napa County was primarily settled by people speaking Southern Wappo and Patwin dialects. The Patwin and Southern Wappo were hunter-gatherers who lived in rich environments that allowed for dense populations with complex social structures. They settled in large permanent villages which were surrounded by a great many seasonal camps and other task-specific sites. Primary village sites were occupied throughout the year and other sites were visited in order to procure particular resources that were especially abundant or available only during certain seasons. Sites often were situated near fresh water sources and in areas where plant and animal life was diverse and abundant.

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 descendants 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. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D4829.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- ai. There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault map. As such, the proposed facility would not result in the rupture of a known fault.

- a. All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. The proposed improvements, if any, must 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.
- a.iii. No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that would indicate a high susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Napa County Environmental Resource Mapping (*liquefaction* layer) indicates that the project area is generally subject to a “low” to “moderate” tendency to liquefy. As no new structural development is proposed, the project would result in no new or additional exposure to liquefaction.
- a.iv. Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (*landslide line, landslide polygon, and landslide geology* layers) do not indicate the presence of landslides or slope instability on the property.
- 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 soil classified as Pleasanton Loam (0 to 2 percent slopes), Bale Clay Loam (2 to 5 percent slopes), Cortina Very Gravelly Loam (0 to 5 percent slopes), and Forward-Kidd Complex (50 to 75 percent slopes) in upslope areas. The Pleasanton Loam series is characterized by well drained soils on alluvial fans at elevations ranging from 50 to 600 feet; it consists of alluvium derived from sedimentary rock. Runoff from Pleasanton soils is slow and the threat of erosion is slight. Pleasanton Loam at 0 to 2 percent slopes is a class I soil. Bale Clay Loam is characterized by somewhat poorly drained soils on alluvial fans, flood plains, and low terraces where permeability is moderate and temporary ponding is common during periods of high rainfall. Runoff from Bale soils is slow and the threat of erosion is slight. Cortina Very Gravelly Loam (0 to 5 percent slopes) soils consist of excessively drained soils on flood plains and alluvial fans, formed from recently stratified alluvium. The permeability of this soil type is rapid, with an available water capacity of 2 to 5 inches. Runoff is slow and the threat of erosion is slight. Finally, the Forward-Kidd Complex consists of very steep soils on uplands where permeability is moderately rapid. Forward-Kidd soils formed in material weathered from rhyolite and have an effective rooting depth of 20 to 40 inches. Runoff is very rapid and the threat of erosion is very high. 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. Late Pleistocene-Holocene fan deposits underlay the soils in the project area. Based on Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Mapping (*liquefaction* layer) the project site has a “low” to “moderate” liquefaction predilection. Construction of any future improvements must 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 Division of Environmental Health has reviewed this application and recommends approval based on the submitted wastewater feasibility report and septic improvement plans. Soils on the property have been determined to be adequate to support the proposed septic improvements. Please see the **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY** section, below, for a discussion of proposed wastewater treatment improvements.

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

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

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

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)**. Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines §15183, because this initial study assesses a project that is consistent with an adopted General Plan for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was prepared, it appropriately focuses on impacts which are "peculiar to the project," rather than the cumulative impacts previously assessed.

The applicant proposes to incorporate GHG reduction methods including: employee carpool and alternative transportation incentives, several employees living on site, local food production, and use of 70/80% cover cropping. In addition, the project proposes no structural development and limited increases in vehicle trips beyond the existing, very low, baseline condition.

GHG Emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the CalGreen Building Code, tightened vehicle fuel efficiency standards, and more project-specific on-site programs including those winery features noted above would combine to reduce emissions by 8% below "business as usual" level in 2020. The increase in emissions expected as a result of the project will be relatively modest and the project is in compliance with the County's efforts to reduce emissions as described above. For these reasons, project impacts related to GHG emissions are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a.-b. A Hazardous Materials Management Plan is on file for this facility. Such plans provide information on the type and amount of hazardous materials stored on the project site. The proposed project will not result in a significant risk of release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- c. There are no schools located within ¼ mile of the project site; the closest school is Calistoga Elementary School, which is located approximately 1 ½ miles to the west.
- d. Napa County environmental resource mapping (*hazardous facilities* layer) indicates that the subject property is not on any known list of hazardous material sites.
- e.-f. The project site is not located within two miles of any airport, be it public or private, and is not subject to any Airport Land Use Plan.
- g. The project has been designed to comply with emergency access and response requirements and has been reviewed by the Napa County departments responsible for emergency services; it will not have a negative impact on emergency response planning.
- h. The project is located in an area dominated by intensive irrigated agriculture. Risks associated with wildland fire in the direct vicinity are quite low; and to the extent they exist they are primarily associated with smoke related damage to wine grapes (smoke taint) and not with risks to life or structures. The Napa County Fire Marshal has reviewed this application and believes there is adequate fire service in the area. This project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The applicant has submitted a project Septic Feasibility Report (Paul Bartelt, *Use Permit Modification for Araujo Estate Wines, 2155 Pickett Road, Calistoga, CA, APN 020-340-030*, June 2013) which proposes connecting the existing process wastewater disposal field to the existing domestic septic field and making several other minor changes to the system such that it is capable of disposing of 1,830 gallons of wastewater per day.

The Environmental Health Division has reviewed the proposed combined domestic and process wastewater system and recommends approval as conditioned. Additionally, the applicant will be required to obtain all necessary permits from the Engineering Services Division, including a Stormwater Pollution Management Permit. Said permit(s) 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** ("The County will take appropriate steps to protect surface water quality and quantity, including... requiring... discretionary projects to meet performance standards designed to ensure peak runoff in 2-, 10-, 50-, and 100-year events following development is not greater than predevelopment conditions"), is not relevant to this review as the project will not result in any new structural development or the addition of anything beyond token areas of new hardscape. 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. Any project which reduces water usage or any water usage which is at or below the established threshold, is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels.

Based on the submitted *Phase One* water availability analysis, the 162.23 acre subject valley floor-area property has a water availability calculation of 162.23 acre feet per year (af/yr), which is arrived at by multiplying its 162.23 acre size by a 1 af/yr/acre fair share water use factor. According to the applicant, existing water usage on the parcel is approximately 25.65 af/yr, including 1.3 af/yr for residential uses, .6 af/yr for winery water use, 5 af/yr for landscape and orchard irrigation, and 18.75 af/yr for irrigation of established vineyards. No new water use is proposed hereby. 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 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. The project will; dsturb far less than one acre of land and will not be subject to the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The area surrounding the project is pervious ground that is planted to vineyards or left in a natural wooded state and has the capacity to absorb runoff.

Araujo Estate Winery

Use Permit Major Modification and Road and Street Standards Exception N° P12-00412

- f. There is nothing included in this proposal that would otherwise substantially degrade water quality. As discussed in greater detail at, "a.," above, the Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the 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), while portions of the property are located within the 100-year floodplain, no portion of the winery is to be 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 375 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.

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

Discussion:

- 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 winery development area on the subject parcel is located in the AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning district, which allows wineries and uses accessory to wineries subject to use permit approval. The project is fully compliant with the physical limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance. The County has adopted the Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO) to protect agriculture and open space and to regulate winery development and expansion in a manner that avoids potential negative environmental effects.

Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy **AG/LU 1** of the 2008 General Plan states that the County shall, "preserve existing agricultural land uses and plan for agriculture and related activities as the primary land uses in Napa County." The property's General Plan land use designation is 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...").

- 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 Impact
XI.	MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a.-b. Historically, the two most valuable mineral commodities in Napa County in economic terms have been mercury and mineral water. More recently, building stone and aggregate have become economically valuable. Mines and Mineral Deposits mapping included in the Napa County Baseline Data Report 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). There will be no impact on mineral resources.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Discussion:

- a.-d. 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 Environmental Health Division 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.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Discussion:

a. The Association of Bay Area Governments' *Projections 2009* 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, *Superdistrict and County Summaries of ABAG's Projections 2009, 2000-2035 Data Summary*, September 2009). The new employee positions which are part of this project may lead to some population growth within Napa County, however, 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 ensure an adequate cumulative volume and diversity of housing. Cumulative impacts on the local and regional population and housing balance will be less than significant.

b.-c. The winery parcel currently houses three residential structures. None of these existing residences will be removed, converted, or otherwise affected by this project. This application will not displace a substantial volume of existing housing or a substantial number of people and will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in:				
a) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Discussion:

- a. This application proposes new on-site employment, tours and tasting by appointment, and a number of marketing events. No portion of this project, nor any foreseeable result thereof, would significantly increase the use of existing recreational facilities.
- b. This project does not include new recreational facilities of any description.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Discussion:

- a.-b. The site is located on Pickett Road, approximately ¼ mile north of its intersection with the Silverado Trail and ¼ mile east of the City of Calistoga. Pickett Road is a two-lane rural collector street with a width of approximately 20 feet in the vicinity of the existing Araujo driveway. There is no center-left turn lane on the Silverado Trail at its intersection with Pickett Lane. As a component of this application, the applicants are proposing to convert the existing "U" shaped winery driveway, which has a nonconforming width for a two-lane drive, into a conforming one-way loop road. That conversion requires an exception from the County's Road and Street Standards.

The applicant has submitted a traffic study describing existing and proposed traffic conditions in the project vicinity, it provides the basis for this analysis (Nickelson, George, P.E, Omni-Means Engineering, *Focused Traffic Analysis for the Proposed Araujo Estate Winery Project Located at 2155 Pickett (sic) Road in Calistoga, Napa County*, May 2, 2013).

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 counts conducted by the traffic consultant during March 2013, in the vicinity of the winery Pickett Road sees 88 average daily trips on a weekday and 36 average daily trips on the weekend while Silverado Trail sees 4,715 average daily trip on a weekday and 4,245 average daily trips on the weekend. Week day peak hour trips on Pickett Road are approximately 28 on Pickett Road in the vicinity of the winery and 487 on the Silverado Trail at its intersection with Pickett. Weekend peak hour trips are generally lower.

Nickelson states that the existing function of the parcel's driveway intersection with Pickett Road is LOS A while the Pickett Road/Silverado Trail intersection operates at LOS B. According to the Nickelson study, the proposed winery would generate 47 daily trips on a typical weekday, 54 daily trips on a peak Saturday, and 55 typical daily trips during the eight week harvest season. At a 20% peaking rate, these traffic volumes would result in 15 trips during the typical weekday afternoon peak hour and 16 trips during the weekend peak hour. At these predicted traffic volumes, the project would not alter existing levels of service at either the Pickett Road/Araujo driveway intersection or the intersection of Pickett Road and the Silverado Trail.

Quoting the Nickelson study regarding the need for turn lanes;

Based on (Caltrans) peak hour signalization warrant criteria, the Pickett Road/Silverado Trail intersection would not qualify for signalization under existing plus project or near-term plus project conditions. Minor street volumes on Pickett Road are too low to meet the minimum volume criteria for signalization. In addition, peak hour volumes are far too low at both the Rosedale Road and Araujo Driveway intersections with Pickett Road to qualify for signalization.

The Pickett Road/Silverado Trail intersection was evaluated for a right-turn lane warrant from Silverado Trail onto Pickett Road. Based on traffic volume guidelines for the design of right-turn lanes, the intersection would not qualify for a right-turn lane with the combined through/right-turn approach volume of 357 vehicles with 11 right-turn movements.

The submitted traffic study also analyzed foreseeable cumulative traffic conditions, including 2030 General Plan buildout models and recently approved projects such as the Silver Rose redevelopment, an entitled but presently unbuilt 84-room hotel and spa, restaurant, 10,000-case winery, 6-acre vineyard, and 21 home project to be located on Rosedale Road within the City of Calistoga. According to the study, under cumulative scenarios;

... study locations would operate at acceptable levels with the Pickett Road/Silverado Trail (intersection) operating at LOS C (no project) and LOS D (with project) during the worst case weekday PM peak hour. Using historical volume growth rates along Silverado Trail, it is likely that intersection operation would be improved from County (derived) volumes. All remaining study intersections would operate at LOS B or better based on the likelihood of future development along Pickett Road. ...The project's 47-55 new daily trips would represent 0.007% of the forecast cumulative average daily trip volumes on Silverado Trail.

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.

c. The proposed project will not result in any change to air traffic patterns.

d.-e. Sight distances and the project's likely impacts on roadway safety were evaluated in the Nickelson traffic study. Quoting from that report;

Both the Araujo project driveway at Pickett Road and Pickett Road at Silverado Trail are located on primarily straight roadways with good site distance. Field observations indicate the sight distance from Pickett Road at Silverado Trail is approximately 900-1,000 feet to the east and at least 1,000+ feet to the west, which would exceed the minimum Caltrans standards based on vehicle speeds of 49-55 mph. At the Araujo project driveway the sight distance to the north on Pickett Road is 1,000+ feet while sight distance to the south is approximately 600-700 feet. Both of these distances would exceed Caltrans standards based on vehicle speeds of 25 mph or less.

The Engineering Services Division has reviewed project access and is supportive of the requested Road and Street Standards exception allowing the creation of a one way loop drive on the Araujo property. They recommend approval with standard conditions related to driveway improvements. The Napa County Fire Marshall has reviewed this application and has identified no significant impacts related to

emergency vehicle access provided that standard conditions of approval are incorporated. Project impacts related to traffic hazards and emergency access are expected to be less than significant.

- f. This application proposes no new or additional parking spaces beyond the approximately 10 spaces which presently exist. Employee parking spaces are not individually identified, though the large property seems to provide ample informal parking space for current operations in locations which are both not visible from the road and do not impede traffic along driveways. As noted above, this application proposes 12 FT employees, 2 PT employees, and 18 busiest-day by-appointment tours and tasting visitors. Given those figures, the facility would appear to be somewhat underparked. Standard conditions of approval disallowing parking in the right-of-way and requiring the shuttling of special event visitors from off-site where visitation exceeds parking capacity should, however, adequately address this potential parking shortfall. 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 property owner has committed to providing bike racks and the property is readily accessible by bike and by foot.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Discussion:

- a. The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements as established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and will not result in a significant impact on the environment relative to wastewater discharge. Wastewater disposal will be accommodated on-site and in compliance with State and County regulations.
- b. This application proposes alterations to an existing domestic/process wastewater treatment and disposal system as described at **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**, above. The Napa County Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the proposed domestic and process wastewater system and recommends approval as conditioned. Required wellhead setbacks and ongoing monitoring of the facility's wastewater systems by the Division should reduce any impacts on water quality to less than significant levels. The new wastewater treatment and disposal system will not result in significant environmental impacts over permitted baseline levels.
- c. The project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or an expansion of existing facilities which would cause a significant impact to the environment.

- d. As discussed at the **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY** section, above, groundwater usage will remain unchanged, well below the property's fair share volume. No new or expanded entitlements are necessary.
- e. Domestic and process wastewater will be treated on-site and will not require a wastewater treatment provider consistent with the requirements of the Napa County Division of Environmental Health.
- f. The project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the project's demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the project.
- g. The project will comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- 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 foreseeably 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, Biological Resources, 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.