

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

Initial Study Checklist

1. **Project Title:** Markham Vineyards, Use Permit Major Modification P14-00100.
2. **Property Owner:** Markham Vineyards, PO Box 636, St. Helena, CA 94574; (707) 302-2034
3. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** David W. Flanary, PO Box 636, St. Helena, CA 94574; (707) 302-2034
4. **Representative:** Jeffrey Redding, 2423 Renfrew Street, Napa, CA 94558; (707) 255-7375
5. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Shaveta Sharma; (707) 299-1358; shaveta.sharma@countyofnapa.org
6. **Project location and APN:** The project is located on a 9.97 acre site at 2812 St. Helena Highway, St. Helena, approximately 300 feet north of its intersection with Deer Park Road, designated Assessor's Parcel Number: 022-200-008.
7. **General Plan description:** Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space designations (AWOS) and Agricultural Resource (AR).
8. **Zoning:** Agricultural Preserve (AP).
9. **Background/Project History:** The 9.97 acre parcel consists of a winery building, accessory and equipment and storage buildings totaling approximately 59,800 square feet. The existing winery was originally constructed in the 1870s. Post Prohibition the winery was used as a co-op by the Allied Grape Growers until its purchase by United Vintners in 1969. In 1978, the winery was purchased by H. Bruce Markham and has been operational since that time under the same name.

February 1979- Use Permit #U-157879 was approved by the Conservation, Development, and Planning Commission to expand an existing winery with a 3,200 square foot addition to accommodate a tasting room, case storage, retails sales, offices, tours and public tastings, and allow production of up to 300,000 gallons per year.

March 1989- Use Permit #U-28889 was approved by the Conservation, Development, and Planning Commission to allow demolition of 24,670 square feet of existing structures, reroof of the existing stone cellar for use in barrel aging, construction of a new crush area, fermenting room, and aging cellar and bottling facility. No increase in floor area, production, or visitation and marketing was permitted.

March 1990- Use Permit #U-89-33 and Variance V-98-5 was approved by the Conservation, Development, and Planning Commission to construct a 36,700 square foot addition to the existing winery of 16,000 square feet for case goods handling and storage, including a loading dock, a 7,700 square foot barrel aging room, and a 13,000 square foot office/employee facility. No increase in floor area, production, or visitation and marketing was permitted.

October 1996-Use Permit #96075-MOD and was approved by the Conservation, Development, and Planning Commission to install five (5) outdoor wine storage tanks (two 50,000 and three 25,000 gallon tanks). No increase in floor area, production, or visitation and marketing was permitted.

October 2003—Use Permit #03205-UP was approved by the Conservation, Development and Planning Commission for a combined wastewater system serving Markham Vineyards, The Culinary Institute, Freemark Abbey and the Wine Country Inn to allow for the system to be expanded from 9.985 million gallons per year to 16.07 million gallons per year.

Existing Winery characteristics: The winery in 2013 processed 350,148 gallons of wine; has a total of 59,800 square feet of winery structures; employs 22 full-time employees and four part-time employees; tours and tastings for an average of 450 weekly

visitors [and a maximum of 300 visitors](#) per day; and holds 81 annual marketing events with an average attendance of 5 persons, and a maximum attendance of 390 persons.

10. **Project Description:** Approval to modify the previous project approvals (Use Permit #U-157879, Use Permit #U-28889, Use Permit #U-89-33, and Use Permit #96075-MOD) for an existing Winery to allow an increase production from 300,000 gallons per year up to 429,000 gallons per year, [and a request for on premise consumption of wines produced on site within the outdoor patio in accordance with AB 2004](#). No expansion or increase in floor area, visitation, and number of employees, parking spaces, visitation or marketing is proposed. No change is requested to Use Permit #03205-UP as additional production can be accommodated within the existing combined wastewater treatment system. The winery buildings can accommodate the increase in production through use of gondolas in place of marco bins and longer work days. The five (5) outdoor wine storage tanks approved in 1995 are sufficient to accommodate the increased wine production. As such, no change to floor plan or increase in building size is needed to accommodate the increased production. The increase in production can be accommodated from the Winery's existing vineyards throughout Napa County. The Winery was included in the 2010 Winery Audit and all facets of the operation were found to be in compliance with the winery's approved Use Permits.

11. **Environmental setting and surrounding land uses:**
The rectangle-shaped lot is relatively level (0 to 2 percent slopes) and is located on the valley floor trending from west to east toward the Napa River which is located approximately ¼ mile east of the site. The entirety of the project site is within the 100 year floodplain. Vegetation on site is entirely ornamental, with no native species remaining. The majority of the site is developed with buildings, paving, and other improvements, as well as two large wastewater ponds, no vineyards are located on the subject property. Surrounding land uses are rural residential, vineyards, and wineries (Ballentine Winery, Revana Winery, Freemark Abbey, Grace Family Winery, Vineyard 29, St. Clements Vineyards, William Cole Winery, Charles Krug Winery, Fantesca Estate, and Morlet Family Estate). The nearest off site residence is approximately 700 feet away from the winery building. Water service for domestic and emergency use is provided by the City of St. Helena for approximately 50% of total water use, an on-site well provides the remaining 50% of water for operation of the winery.

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

The project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County, including but not limited to the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, & Firearms.

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies
City of St. Helena

Other Agencies Contacted
Federal Trade and Taxation Bureau
Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

The conclusions and recommendations contained herein are professional opinions derived in accordance with current standards of professional practice. They are based on a review of the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps, the other sources of information listed in the file, and the comments received, conversations with knowledgeable individuals; the preparer's personal knowledge of the area; and, where necessary, a visit to the site. For further information, see the environmental background information contained in the permanent file on this project.

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

Shaveta Sharma, Planner III
Napa County Planning, Building, and Environmental Services

Date

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:

- This project's increase in production of wine will not add any new structures to the site, as processing will be accommodated in the existing structures. The site is located about 300 feet north of Deer Park Road. St. Helena Highway is a designated "Scenic Roadway" listed in the *Community Character Element* of the Napa County General Plan. The project will not create any impacts to a scenic vista.
- This project does not involve the conversion of a scenic resource. The project is not subject to Napa County Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 18.106 (*Viewshed Protection Ordinance*) since no new structures are proposed as part of this project.
- The proposed project includes no new structures and consequently will not degrade the exiting character of the site and its surroundings.
- The project would not result in any increase in night-time lighting. As proposed, and as subject to standard conditions of approval, the project would not have a significant impact from light or glare.

All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward, shall be located as low to the ground as possible, and shall be the minimum necessary for security, safety, or operations and shall incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. No flood-lighting or sodium lighting of the building is permitted, including architectural highlighting and spotting. Low-level lighting shall be utilized in parking areas as opposed to elevated high-intensity light standards. Lighting utilized during harvest activities is not subject to this requirement. Prior to issuance of any building permit for construction of the winery, two (2) copies of a detailed lighting plan showing the location and specifications for all lighting fixtures to be installed on the property shall be submitted for Planning Division review and approval. All lighting shall comply with California Building Code.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.¹ Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a/b/e. The proposed project will not convert any Farmland to a non-agriculture use. The proposed project would continue the existing agricultural uses, and will not conflict with any agriculture use. The winery uses the grapes from vineyards on adjacent parcels in its production of wine. The proposed project would not result in any removal of any vineyard. The project site is zoned as Agricultural Preserve (AP). The project site is not designated Prime Farmland and would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Important as shown on the Napa County Important Farmland Map 2002 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural 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.				
c/d. The project site is zoned Agricultural Preserve (AP), which allows wineries and modifications to wineries upon grant of a use permit. According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps (based on the following layers – Sensitive Biotic Oak Woodlands, Riparian Woodland Forest and Coniferous Forest) the project site does not contain Coniferous Forest- Ponderosa Pine or Douglas Fir species specifically. No construction or physical improvements are proposed as part of the project. As a result there would be no removal of any Ponderosa Pines or Douglas Firs from the property. Therefore, the proposed project				

¹ "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 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 Wildlife, water quality, or other environmental resources addressed in this checklist.

will not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

Discussion:

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

On March 5, 2012, the Alameda County Superior Court issued a judgment finding that the Air District had failed to comply with CEQA when it adopted the thresholds. On August 12, 2013, the Court of Appeal reinstated the District's thresholds of significance provided in Table 3-1 (Criteria Air Pollutants & Precursors Screening Levels Sizes) and they are applicable for evaluating projects in Napa County.

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

The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plan. Wineries typically are not producers of air pollution in volumes substantial enough to result in an air quality plan conflict. The project site lies within the Napa Valley, which forms one of the climatologically distinct sub-regions (Napa County Sub region) within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The topographical and meteorological features of the Valley create a relatively high potential for air pollution. Over the long term, emissions resulting from the proposed project would consist primarily of mobile sources, including production-related deliveries and visitor and employee vehicles traveling to and from the winery. The resulting addition of 9.3 two-way trips during a typical weekday as a result of the increase in production is well below the threshold of significance. The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from increased truck trips to accommodate the winery's production, as there are no structures proposed as part of this proposal the impact would be less than significant.

While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. The project will not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

Discussion:

- a. According to Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Watershed layer), the winery site is not located in any designated habitat areas of any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. No exterior construction will take place as part of the project; as a result this project would result in no impacts on any special-status species.
- b. There are no existing creek-crossings on the site. No encroachments or construction is proposed as part of this project that could have impacts on designated riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities. Therefore the project has no impact on riparian habitats or sensitive communities.
- c. Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Watershed Overlay) and the Baseline Data Report (Chapter 15. Surface Water Hydrology, Map 15-6, Land Cover) do not indicate the presence of any wetlands or potential wetlands within the project boundary. The project would not result in substantial impacts to federally protected or potentially sensitive wetlands.
- d. The project takes place on an already-disturbed winery site and would not interfere 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.
- e. The project takes place on an already-disturbed winery site and would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.
- f. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans. There are no plans applicable to the subject parcel.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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-c. According to Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Archaeological Resources Layer, historical site, points & lines), The Markham Winery building, specifically the middle stone portion is a known historically sensitive site or structure, archaeological or paleontological resource, site or unique geological feature within the project site. There is no aspect of the project that would create any impact or degrade the historic nature of the building, which has received seismic and building retrofits and is in use for daily operations. In the event archaeological artifacts are encountered on the project site, a qualified archaeologist will be

retained by the applicant to record and evaluate the resources. This is considered a less-than-significant impact because the project site has been previously developed and no new construction is necessary, nor is there any expansion of the on-site wastewater system proposed as part of the project. However, in the case of encountering any remains a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval:

"In the event that archeological artifacts or human remains are discovered during any subsequent construction in the project area, work shall cease in a 50-foot radius surrounding the area of discovery. The permittee shall contact the Planning, Building, and Environmental Services Department for further guidance, which will likely include the requirement for the permittee to hire a qualified professional to analyze the artifacts encountered and to determine if additional measures are required. If human remains are encountered during the development, all work in the vicinity must be, by law, halted, and the Napa County Coroner informed so that the Coroner can determine if an investigation of the cause of death is required, and if the remains are of Native American origin. If the remains are of Native American origin, the nearest tribal relatives as determined by the State Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted by the permittee to obtain recommendations for treating or removal of such remains, including grave goods, with appropriate dignity, as required under Public Resources Code Section 5097.98."

- d. No human remains have been encountered on the property and no information has been encountered that would indicate that this project would encounter human remains. However, if resources are found a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard condition of approval noted above.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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:

- a. The proposed project site is not located within any designated Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zone. According to Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Soil Types, Landslides), Bale Clay loam (0 to 2 percent slopes) soil is located on the project site and has high liquefaction potential. As part of previous standard conditions of approval for the existing winery structures, a geo-technical report was prepared by a licensed geologist/engineer for the existing winery building site, including review of liquefaction potential. Geo-technical report recommendations were incorporated as part of final winery building design. While seismic activity is endemic to the Bay Area, the structures that will be utilized as part of this project have been designed and constructed in accordance with geo-technical recommendations and there will be no impact to people or structures.
- b. The soils on site are characterized by medium runoff with low erosion potential. The project is required to submit a site development plan despite no new construction being proposed, including implementation of storm water and erosion control Best Management Practices under the standards developed in the County's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Phase II Stormwater Permit, which is required by County Code and is a standard practice on all County development projects. Therefore, the potential for impacts is considered less than significant.
- c. According to Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Liquefaction Overlay), the project is located in an area with a "High" liquefaction potential. As part of previous standard conditions of approval for the existing winery structures, a geo-technical report was prepared by a licensed geologist/engineer for the winery building, including review of liquefaction potential. Geo-technical report recommendations were incorporated as part of the final winery building design.
- d. The soil types located on the site are not considered to be expansive, as defined in table 18.1B of the California Building Code and would not create substantial risks to life or property.
- e. Based on the applicant's information provided and verified by the Napa County Environmental Health Division the existing wastewater treatment ponds can accommodate the project 's process and wastewater flows based on available area, soil types and depths. The current joint agreement for the wastewater treatment ponds can accommodate 16.07 million gallons per year for treatment, of which Markham Vineyards is permitted to contribute 2.4 million gallons per year. The increase in production will raise Markham Vineyards discharge into the ponds from 1.7 million gallons to 2.2 million gallons. No improvements to existing systems are proposed as part of this project, the existing wastewater treatment ponds were designed by a licensed engineer and reviewed and approved by the Napa County Environmental Health Division.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

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

The applicant has incorporated and will continue to incorporate GHG reduction methods in the winery's operations including: energy conserving lighting; water efficient fixtures, connection to recycled water, recycle 75% of waste; implement a sustainable purchasing and shipping programs, certified "Napa Green Winery", certified, "Napa Green Land", use 70-80% cover crop, retain biomass on site.

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

The increase in emissions expected as a result of the project will be relatively modest and the project is in compliance with the County's efforts to reduce emissions as described above. For these reasons, project impacts related to GHG emissions are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts normally used for winery operations. A Business Plan will be filed with the Environmental Health Division should hazardous materials reach reportable levels.
- b. The project would not result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site.
- d. The proposed site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.

- e. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area or within two miles of any public airport or public use airport.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.
- g. No construction is proposed as part of this project. All previous construction was reviewed and approved by CalFire, and meets their requirements for driveway widths and truck turn around. The increase in production changes to the winery will not negatively impact or hinder emergency vehicle access. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division and found acceptable as conditioned.
- h. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. The project already complies and will continue to comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

On January 14, 2014 Governor Jerry Brown declared a drought emergency in the state of California. That declaration was followed up on April 1, 2015 when the Governor directed the State Water Resources Control Board to implement mandatory water reductions in cities and towns across California to reduce water usage by 25 percent. These water restrictions do not apply to agricultural users. At this time the County of Napa has not adopted or implemented mandatory water use restrictions. The County requires all Use Permit applicants to complete necessary water analyses in order to document that sufficient water supplies are available for the proposed project. On June 28, 2011 the Board of Supervisors approved creation of a Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee (GRAC). The GRAC’s purpose was to assist County staff and technical consultants with recommendations regarding groundwater, including data collection, monitoring, well pump test protocols, management objectives, and community support. The County completed a county-wide assessment of groundwater resources (Napa County Groundwater Conditions and Groundwater Monitoring Recommendations Report (Feb. 2011)) and developed a groundwater monitoring program (Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2013 (Jan. 2013)). The County also completed a 2013 Updated Hydrogeologic Conceptualization and Characterization of Groundwater Conditions (Jan. 2013).

In general, recent studies have found that groundwater levels in the Napa Valley Floor exhibit stable long-term trends with a shallow depth to water. Historical trends in the Milliken-Sarco-Tulucay (MST) area, however, have shown increasing depths to groundwater, but recent stabilization in many locations. Groundwater availability, recharge, storage and yield is not consistent across the County. More is known about the resource where historical data have been collected. Less is known in areas with limited data or unknown geology. In order to fill existing data gaps and to provide a better understand of groundwater resources in the County, the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan recommended 18 Areas of Interest (AOIs) for additional groundwater level and water quality monitoring. Through the well owner and public outreach efforts of the Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee (GRAC), approximately 40 new wells have been added to the monitoring program within these areas.

Groundwater Sustainability Objectives were also developed by the GRAC and adopted by the Board of Supervisors. These recommendations include the goal of developing sustainability objectives, provide a definition of groundwater sustainability, and explain the shared responsibility for groundwater sustainability. They go on to review the important role of monitoring as a means to achieving groundwater sustainability and the principles underlying the sustainability objectives. For projects on the Napa Valley Floor and in the MST, water use criteria shall be 1 acre-foot per acre per year and .3 acre-feet per acre per year respectively. All other areas of the County undergo a parcel-specific WAA. Projects on the Napa Valley Floor and in the MST that meet the Tier 1 screening criteria are considered to be in compliance with the standards of the WAA, unless other substantial evidence in the record indicates the need for further evaluation. Projects in “All Other Areas” shall complete Tier 1, and then proceed to Tier 2.

Tier 2 well interference criterion is presumptively met if there are no non-project wells located within 500 feet of the existing or proposed project well(s). For those projects with neighboring wells located within 500 feet of the project well(s), additional evaluation will be required to assess the potential drawdown in those existing wells resulting from project well operation relative to the Tier 2 criterion described below. Potential interference is determined based on data including the distance between the project well(s) and the neighboring non-project well(s), the hydrogeologic setting, and well construction information and operational configurations for the project well(s). Tier 3 analysis is only conducted when substantial evidence in the record determines the need for such an analysis.

[\(revised consistent with State CEQA guidelines § 15073.5\(c\)\(4\)\).](#)

a-b. The project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements nor substantially deplete local groundwater supplies. The applicant submitted a Wastewater Feasibility Report (Summit Engineering, Inc., dated [June 4, 2015](#) ~~March~~

20, 2014) with the application. The report concludes that the proposed increases in wastewater flows can be accommodated with the existing combined wastewater management system (CWMS) which additionally serves Wine Country Inn, Freemark Abbey, and the Culinary Institute. The proposed production increase will the process wastewater flows to 1.93 million gallons (mgal), while the joint agreement allows Markham to discharge up to 2.445 million gallons. The joint agreement among the four users allows Markham Vineyards to discharge up to 16.07 million gallons of combined sanitary and process wastewater, the current flows total 11.89 mgal and will increase to 13.3 mgal. The project would increase, not impact the sanitary flows, from which will remain the same at 0.24 million gallons to 0.32 million gallons.

The existing water system is sufficiently sized to accommodate the needed potable water supply connection points. The existing well produces flow rate of 100 gallons per minute, which is capable producing the peak daily demand of 7,231 gpd in a period of 17.5 minutes. The report concludes that the proposed increase in production is not expected to affect the ability for the existing public water system to meet the demands of the site.

A Water Availability Analysis was prepared for the project by Summit Engineering, Inc.. The threshold for this valley floor parcel is 9.97 af/yr, which is calculated by applying a rate of 1.0 af/yr multiplied by the acreage of the site Valley Floor portion of the site. As noted above, the findings of the Napa Valley Groundwater Monitoring Plan confirmed that the 1.0 af/yr valley floor threshold has proven to be a sustainable limit for groundwater resources. The report indicates the total water demand on the parcel from the existing winery and associated improvements is 7.43 af/year, specifically:

	Demands (af/yr)	
	300,000 gal Wine	429,000 gal Wine
	Existing	Proposed
Winery Water Demand		
Winery Processing @ 4.5 gal PW/gal wine based on historical data	4.14	5.93
Winery Landscaping	0.50	0.5076
Employees	0.4650	0.4650
Visitors	0.2217	0.2217
Events	0.32064	0.3264
acres vineyard irrigation only	0	0
TOTAL	5.64	7.43

NOTE: City of St. Helena will supply the site with 1.97 af/yr with the remaining water supplied by groundwater (5.45 ac-ft).

Water service for domestic and emergency use is provided by the City of St. Helena and is currently approximately 50% of total water use, the remaining 50% of the water is provided by the on-site well. The City has provided a will serve letter that they will continue to deliver water to the site with the ratio of City to groundwater decreasing with this project. The City has agreed to continue to provide 1.97 af/yr of water to the site. Existing water usage totals 5.64 af/yr for the winery. Projected water use from the increased production will result in an annual water demand of 7.43 af/yr resulting in a 1.79 af/yr increase. The total amount of water use from the existing well on site is 5.45 af/r. This figure is below the maximum water allotment of 9.97 and no further analysis is necessary. Based on these figures, the project will not result in substantial depletion of 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. The current well on site produces at a rate of 100 gpm. The well can produce the additional demand of 1.97 af/yr with an additional 30 minutes of pumping the well daily.

Additionally, if the City did limit water to the site in the future the project has sufficient groundwater to accommodate the proposed project, based on the findings of the Napa Valley Groundwater Monitoring Plan which confirmed that the 1.0 af/yr valley floor threshold has proven to be a sustainable limit for groundwater resources. Since the applicant is proposing to use an amount of water that is less than its fair share factor of 1.0 af/yr the project will not result in the depletion of groundwater resources. The County is not aware of any groundwater problems in the vicinity and does not expect this project to contribute towards any groundwater deficiencies. Markham Vineyards has not experienced any issues with their on-site well.

- c-d. The project will not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off the existing winery site.
- e. The project uses private storm drain facilities that will not negatively affect any nearby creeks. These existing facilities have been sized appropriately to accommodate the increased production which would ensure that there is a less than significant impact.
- f. There are no other factors in this project that would otherwise degrade water quality.
- g- h. The entirety of the project site is located within the FEMA-designated 100-year floodplain. No new winery structures are proposed and thus there will be no impact from the proposed project.
- i-j. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. The project site is located on level land with minimal slopes. Potential for tsunami, seiche, or mudflows is considered less-than-significant.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	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. – c. The project would not occur within an established community, nor would it result in the division of an established community. The project complies with the Napa County Code and all other applicable regulations. The subject parcel is located in the AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning district, which allow wineries and uses accessory to wineries subject to use permit approval. The proposed project is compliant with the physical limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance. The County has adopted the Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO) to protect agriculture and open space and to regulate winery development and expansion in a manner that avoids potential negative environmental effects.

Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-1 of the 2008 General Plan states that the County shall, “preserve existing agricultural land uses and plan for agriculture and related activities as the primary land uses in Napa County.” The property’s General Plan land use designations are Agricultural Watershed and Open Space (AR) and Agricultural Resource (AR), which allow “agriculture, processing of agricultural products, and single-family dwellings.” More specifically, General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-2 recognize 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 by increased wine production 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...).

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

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

Discussion:

a/b. Historically, the two most valuable mineral commodities in Napa County in economic terms have been mercury and mineral water. More recently, building stone and aggregate have become economically valuable. Mines and Mineral Deposits mapping included in the Napa County Baseline Data Report (*Mines and Mineral Deposits*, BDR Figure 2-2) indicates that there are no known mineral resources nor any locally important mineral resource recovery sites located on or near the project site.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-d. Noise from winery operations is generally limited as all production activities take place within enclosed buildings. The Napa County Noise Ordinance, which was adopted in 1984, sets the maximum permissible 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), the area surrounding the subject property is developed, with a scattering of homes located in the immediate vicinity and directly adjacent to the site with the nearest residences located to the north. The existing winery building is set approximately 700 feet from the nearest residence. No noise complaints have been received by County staff for the existing operations. Continuing enforcement of Napa County's Noise Ordinance by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff, should ensure that winery activities do not create a significant noise impact. The project will result in minimal increases in noise levels due to the increase in production activities. Furthermore, no construction activities are proposed as part of this project.
- e-f. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

Discussion:

- a. – c. The project will not displace any housing or divide any established communities. No new employees will be added as a result of this project. The project will not contribute significantly to a cumulatively considerable increase in the demand for housing units within the communities of Napa County and the general vicinity. No individuals will be displaced as a result of this project.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. Public services are currently provided to the project area and would not be increased as a result of the project. The Fire Department and Engineering Services Division have reviewed the application and recommend approval as conditioned. The proposed project will have little to no impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from any building permit fees, property tax increases, and taxes from the sale of wine will help meet the costs of providing public services to the property. The proposed project will have no impact on public services.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

Discussion:

- a-b. The project would not significantly increase the use of recreational facilities, nor does the project include recreational facilities that may have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	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 (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-b. The 9.97 acre project site is located on the east side of Highway 29 approximately 300 feet north of Deer Park Road. The project includes an increase in production from 300,000 gallons annually to 429,000 gallons annually. Access to the existing winery is served from both directions of Highway 29. The existing winery driveway meets the County Standards of a minimum of 20 feet in width.

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 Napa County's Baseline Data Report traffic database the LOS for the nearest intersection is classified as LOS "C". According to the application, up to 76 people will be on-site on a daily basis during the peak season, including 22 full-time and four (4) part-time employees, and up to 50 visitors. The proposed project's increased production would result in approximately 0.8 additional daily trips which would not discernibly change the level of service or traffic volumes on St. Helena Highway or Deer Park Road. However it is important to note that this is assuming a constant rate of truck deliveries, while the grapes deliveries will be concentrated during harvest. This would result in a daily trip that is more accurately represented as an increase of 9.6 daily truck trip for a one month period.

c. The project does not have any impact on air traffic patterns.

d -f. Access to the winery is from St. Helena Highway into the site. The project would result in no significant off-site circulation system operational impacts nor any sight line impacts at the proposed project driveway. The project site has a total of 35 parking spaces, including one ADA space and loading zone. Parking spaces for the winery are sufficient to accommodate parking needs during normal business days for employees and visitors. Additional parking for the larger marketing events are currently being provided via valet and/or shuttle services on other suitable areas on or near the site. No parking is or will be permitted within the right-of-way of St. Helena Highway.

g. There is no aspect of this proposed project that would conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.

Mitigation Measure(s): None

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 comply with Napa County Environmental Health requirements for its expanded, privately-maintained wastewater treatment ponds, consistent with Regional Water Quality Control Board standards.
- b. The project will not require construction of any new water or wastewater treatment facilities that will result in a significant impact to the environment. The existing system was designed by a licensed engineer and reviewed and approved by the Division of Environmental Health. The current joint agreement for the wastewater treatment ponds can accommodate 16.07 million gallons per year for treatment, of which Markham Vineyards is permitted to contribute 2.4 million gallons per year. The increase in production will raise Markham Vineyards discharge into the ponds from 1.7 million gallons to 2.2 million gallons. No improvements to existing systems are proposed as part of this project, the existing wastewater treatment ponds were designed by a licensed engineer and reviewed and approved by the Napa County Environmental Health Division.
- c. The project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, which will cause a significant impact to the environment.
- d. The project has sufficient water supplies to serve projected needs. The current use on the project site is 5.64 AF/YR. The projected water use for the project is 7.43 AF/YR. Napa County has established a threshold of 9.97 AF/YR for this parcel; therefore the estimated water demand of 7.43 AF/YR is below the threshold established for the parcel. Furthermore approximately 50% of total water use, the remaining 50% of the water is provided by the on-site well. The City has provided no indication that they will be limiting water delivery to the site and the ratio of City to groundwater use is expected to remain the same with this project. In the event that City water supply is limited or unavailable the project can rely on groundwater resources wholly, without adverse effects on groundwater levels. No further analysis is required.
- e. Wastewater will be treated on-site and will not require a wastewater treatment provider.
- f. The project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the projects demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the project.
- g. The project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

- The project as proposed will not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
- The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, water, and traffic impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The project would not increase the demands for public services or increase traffic and air pollution, all of which contribute to cumulative effects when future development in Napa Valley is considered. Cumulative impacts of these issues are discussed in previous sections of this Initial Study and would not be of significant impact.
- There are no environmental effects caused by this project that would result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, whether directly or indirectly. No hazardous conditions resulting from this project have been identified. The project would not have any environmental effects that would result in significant impacts.

Mitigation Measures: None Required.