

“D”

Initial Study/Negative Declaration

Regusci Winery, Major Modification to Use Permit P16-00307
& Request for Exception to Road and Street Standards
Planning Commission Hearing Date, November 15, 2017

COUNTY OF NAPA
PLANNING, BUILDING AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT
1195 THIRD STREET SUITE 210
NAPA, CA 94559
(707) 253-4417

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated October 2016)

1. **Project Title:** Regusci Winery Use Permit Major Modification, P16-00307 – MOD
2. **Property Owner:** Regusci Simone Ranch Limited Partnership
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Dana Ayers, Planner III; phone number (707) 253-4388; email address dana.ayers@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel No. (APN):** 5584 Silverado Trail, Napa, CA 94558; APN 039-030-023
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** George H. Monteverdi, Monteverdi Consulting, P.O. Box 6079, Napa, CA 94581
6. **General Plan description:** Agricultural Resource; and Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space
7. **Zoning:** AP (Agricultural Preserve) and AW (Agricultural Watershed) Districts

8. **Background/Project History:**

The 162.6-acre property at 5584 Silverado Trail was initially developed as a winery in 1878 by Terrell L. Grigsby, a local winemaker in the early years of wine production in the Napa Valley. The original buildings on the property included: 1) a 58-foot wide by 112-foot long, three-story, lava stone winery and cellar building, constructed partially into the hillside so as to allow climate-controlled wine storage and to use natural topography to provide access to each building floor; and 2) a single-story distillery building constructed to the south of the winery building, also constructed of lava stone. These buildings remain on the property (labeled on the project plans as Buildings D and E, respectively) and are currently used for wine production and accessory uses.

Grigsby produced wine on the property following construction of the winery buildings but in subsequent years was severely impacted by a combination of national financial panic, unsuccessful investments, and the Phylloxera pest infestation of the 1870s and 1880s. Grigsby died in 1892. Grigsby's heirs retained ownership of the property until 1932, when James and Livia Regusci purchased the property. Following their purchase of the land, the Regusci family constructed a hay/feed barn, a holding pen/stock barn and a slaughterhouse to facilitate their cattle ranching and processing operation on-site. These later buildings also remain today, though each has been modified, and they are labeled as Buildings A, B and C, respectively, on the current project plans. Although the Regusci family continues to own the property, the family ceased operation of the cattle ranching and processing business on the property in 1974.

Members of the Regusci family began to produce limited quantities of wine from estate vineyards on the property as early as 1970, re-introducing to the property the winemaking operations that had been originally conducted on the property in the late 19th century by Grigsby. In 1972, Clos du Val leased the Winery Building (Building D) from the property owner to produce, age and bottle a portion of its production quantity, on a larger scale than the Regusci family had done. Later, on May 15, 1996, Regusci Winery obtained from the Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Commission, use permit approval to operate a winery (Use Permit No. 95550-UP). The two wineries, Clos du Val and Regusci Winery, both continued to operate on the property until 1999, after which Regusci Winery became the sole winemaking establishment on-site. Regusci Winery still operates on-site today and currently uses Building D for wine production, aging and storage.

The current use permit entitlement for the Regusci Winery (Use Permit No. 95550-UP) allows the winery to produce up to 25,000 gallons of wine per year (averaged over any consecutive three-year period, with production in any year not exceeding 30,000 gallons). The approved use permit allows one custom production operation to utilize up to 5,000 gallons of the

winery's permitted annual production capacity and no more than 20 percent of the winery's storage area. Visitation and marketing of wine produced at the winery are limited to an average of 10 visitors per week and no more than three visitors on any day. Wine tasting currently occurs in a covered area attached to the northern wall of Building E, that the winery operators enclosed in 1998 to convert use of the area from storage to hospitality purposes (Building Permit No. B98-00081). The property is also subject to a Williamson Act contract (Contract No. 17-69), which was approved in 1969 and gives to the property owner tax relief in exchange for limiting use of the property to certain agricultural and residential uses as specified in the contract.

9. **Description of Project:**

The current application (P16-00307 – MOD) is a request to modify the use permit (95550 – UP) for the existing Regusci Winery to include all of the following:

- a) An increase in permitted annual wine production from 25,000 to 50,000 gallons per year.
- b) Deletion of a condition of approval of 95550 – UP that allows one custom production operation utilizing 5,000 gallons of the production capacity and no more than 20 percent of the winery's storage area.
- c) An increase in visitation from 10 to 400 visitors to the winery per week, with no more than 150 guests on any day.
- d) Addition of opportunities for visitors to consume wine purchased on-site (Business and Professions Code Sections 23358, 23390 and 23396.5), in: i) the uncovered area west of Building D; ii) the existing lawn area southeast of the winery garden and northwest of a bank of existing visitor parking stalls; iii) in a wooded area just southeast of Building E; and iv) the grass area northwest of the winery garden, adjacent to a proposed recycled water storage pond.
- e) Addition of a marketing program that includes food and wine pairings (one per day, up to four days per week) for up to 12 guests per day, plus 10 events annually for up to 50 guests, five events annually for up to 150 guests and one event annually for up to 200 guests, with some events to occur outdoors in the four locations for which on-site wine consumption is requested. Marketing events would be scheduled so as not to begin or end during peak hours of traffic (between 4:30 p.m. and 5:30 p.m. on weekdays and between 1:45 p.m. and 2:45 p.m. on weekend days). Marketing events may or may not have amplified sound as a part of the event. Tours and tastings visitation would be suspended on any day when a 150-person or 200-person marketing event is held that begins before 6:00 p.m.
- f) An increase in employment from one full-time to 16 full-time and part-time staff members.
- g) Recognition of 2,330 square feet of administrative employee areas inside of an existing building, labeled as Building C on the use permit plans, that was not approved under prior use permit.
- h) Recognition of approximately 730 square feet of food preparation space inside of Building C, which area was not approved under prior use permit.
- i) Approval of a public water system.
- j) Recognition of 17 on-site, employee and visitor vehicle parking spaces where the prior use permit authorized 10.
- k) Replacement of four, 10,000-gallon aboveground tanks with one, maximum 15-foot tall steel tank for storage of between 65,000 and 100,000 gallons of water for fire suppression purposes.
- l) Grading and excavation on a portion of an approximately 0.6-acre vacant area northwest of the winery buildings, for purposes of installation of a pond for storage of up to one acre-foot of recycled process wastewater to be reused for vineyard irrigation.
- m) Installation of various other changes to utilities and facilities on-site, including installation of a fire hydrant; a pond infiltration and pumping system; a Lyve wastewater treatment system with related aboveground equipment and tanks; and directional traffic markings and signage on existing the existing paved access road to inform drivers of one-way traffic movements.

The project includes widening of the winery's private access road from Silverado Trail to 20 feet of asphalt-paved width. The approvals requested with the project include a request for an exception to Napa County Road and Street Standards (RSS) to remove the requirement for a two-foot wide gravel shoulder in each location where the private road abuts an existing walnut tree, as further described in the June 28, 2017, memorandum from Delta Consulting and Engineering.

Due to the winery's business success, the winery has increased its employment and has periodically exceeded the visitation levels in its approved use permit (Use Permit No. 95550-UP). Components of the major modification request related to parking and accessory uses, summarized in items c, f, g, h and j, above, are being requested to bring the winery into permit compliance while also facilitating future growth of employment and hospitality services in a compliant manner.

Though certain elements of the winery's current operation are out of compliance with its zoning approvals, the traffic study submitted with the use permit modification request considers the impacts of the project compared against a baseline of the winery's permitted conditions, rather than its current operations. For consistency with the applicant's approach to traffic analysis of the project, analysis of the other topic areas in this initial study also uses the permitted condition as the baseline.

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

The property at 5584 Silverado Trail is located on the east side of Silverado Trail, approximately two miles east of the town of Yountville. As explained above, the 162.6-acre property is currently developed with a winery. There are also approximately 36 acres of vineyard, a three-acre footprint vineyard irrigation pond for storage of water supplied by the Yountville wastewater treatment plant, a vineyard management operation, three single-family residences and a farm labor dwelling on the property, all of which fall outside the scope of the current request, as they are not proposed to be modified in structure or use with this major modification request.

The winery is accessed by a generally flat, approximately 0.4-mile long access stem extending northeastward from Silverado Trail. From the access stem, the majority of the property has varied topography, with the shallowest slopes of five to 15 percent along the western side of the property and increasing grades to 30 or more percent toward the eastern side of the property. The winery buildings and existing residences are located in that area of the property east of the access stem where grades are generally shallower (five to 15 percent).

The property is approximately 4.5 miles northeast of the West Napa fault and is outside of any Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone designated by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. The property is underlain by three soil types. The majority of the existing and proposed winery facilities are located in the central part of the site, where the soil type is Boomer-Forward-Felta complex, 5-30 percent slopes. The soil under the winery is characterized as a mixture three soil series generally consisting of gravelly loam, loam and clay soils. Uphill of the winery facilities is undeveloped woodlands underlain by the Rock outcrop-Hambright complex, 50-75 percent slopes, and approximately 30 acres of vineyards is planted south of the winery facilities, on soil designated as Bale Clay loam, 2-5 percent slopes.

Like the subject site, surrounding adjacent properties are zoned AP and/or AW districts and have General Plan land use designations of Agricultural Resource (AR) and/or Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space (AWOS). Land uses on properties in the immediate and general vicinity of the site are also primarily agricultural and include residential, as described below:

North: Three parcels border the site to the north, with the smallest parcel at 10 acres in size and the other two parcels at 40 acres in size. All parcels are predominantly undeveloped woodland areas on steep slopes; one of the larger parcels has two residences. All three parcels are zoned AW District. General Plan land use designations vary among the three, with the 40-acre residential parcel designated fully as AWOS and the other two undeveloped parcels designated as AWOS and AR.

South: Two parcels border the site to the south. At 137 acres, the larger of the two parcels is site of the Chimney Rock Winery, is zoned AW District, and has a General Plan land use designation of AR. At approximately 40 acres, the smaller of the two parcels is planted with vineyards and has a single-family residence, is also zoned AW District, and has General Plan land use designations of AWOS and AR.

West: All properties to the west of the property are zoned AP District and have a General Plan land use designation of AR. Two of the properties immediately adjoining the Regusci Winery parcel are 48 and 72 acres in size, are also owned by the applicant, and are exclusively planted with vineyards. Silverado Trails borders the western property line of these and the subject parcel. A 355-acre parcel on the opposite side of Silverado Trail from the Regusci properties is also planted with vineyards and includes two residences.

East: Two parcels, both approximately 40 acres in size, are east of the subject site. One parcel is undeveloped woodland, and the other is largely undeveloped but does include some vineyard area and a single-family residence. Both parcels are zoned AW District. Approximately seven acres of the southern vineyard/residential parcel has a General Plan land use designation of AR; the remaining acreage of both parcels is designated AWOS.

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

The proposed project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County, including but not limited to building, grading and encroachment permits. Permits may also be required by the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms.

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies
None required.

Other Agencies Contacted
Taxation Trade Bureau
California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control

12. **Tribal Cultural Resources.** Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

On November 8, 2016, county staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to three Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. Members of the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation and Middletown Rancheria, by letters dated October 17 and December 9, 2016, respectively, responded to the county's letter but did not request formal consultation on the proposed project. On March 21, 2017, county staff sent a follow-up letter to all three Native American tribes, confirming that consultation proceedings would not be initiated for the current proposal.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



Signature

September 26, 2017
Date

Name, Title: Dana Ayers, Planner III

Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services
Department

	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The proposed project, if approved, would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista nor substantially damage scenic resources or the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings.

a-c. The terrain on the site is varying, with the shallowest slopes (under five percent) along the southwestern portion of the property and the steepest slopes (in excess of 30 percent) characterizing the eastern, roughly half of the site. The existing winery and residential structures are in an area of the parcel where the slope transitions from five to 15 percent, up to 30 percent in some locations.

The proposed use permit modification request consists primarily of operational changes (annual wine production, visitation, employment). Existing buildings on the property would not be wholly or partially demolished, nor would there be any additions or other changes to the exterior appearance of any structure on-site. The most notable of the site changes is the proposed construction of a recycled water storage pond on a portion of an approximately 0.6-acre, vacant area just northwest of the existing garden on the property. According to County geographic information systems (GIS) maps, the pond is proposed to be built in a portion of the property where the slope does not exceed 15 percent, so that the proposed new pond construction is not subject to the requirements of Napa County Code Chapter 18.106 (Viewshed Protection Program). Additionally, the pond would involve excavation of soil but no vertical construction; rather, the pond would be an at-grade and below-grade site modification that would not result in a significant change to the appearance of the site as seen from public rights-of-way. Similarly, the installation of additional asphalt for roadway widening would be an at-grade improvement that would not significantly change the appearance of the property. There are no trees that would be removed to facilitate construction of the pond or other private driveway improvements.

There is no State highway proximate to the site. The existing winery lies well over 2,000 feet away from Silverado Trail (a County-maintained public road) and well outside of the 600-foot winery building setback from the road as established by Napa County Code Section 18.104.230.A.1. With the entirety of the 2,000-foot setback planted in grape vines on an adjacent parcel, the appearance of the property as seen from the public right-of-way of Silverado Trail would not change significantly with the project. Other aboveground tanks for storage of water and process waste water would be as tall as 15 to 16 feet above grade but, like the winery buildings, would be over 2,000 feet away from Silverado Trail. With their substantial setback from the road, small footprint (approximately 1,000 square feet for each respective utility installation) and location behind existing tree canopies of 13 to 20 feet tall, the tanks would not be highly noticeable from the road right-of-way and would not be subject to further review under the County's Viewshed Protection Program (County Code Section 18.106.040.B). Under an alternative scenario, the wastewater tanks would be installed inside of existing silos on the property and would be screened by the walls of those existing structures.

With no modifications to the exterior of existing structures, and with other site improvements consisting of at-grade components or utility equipment installed behind existing screening, the appearance of the winery property from perspectives on Silverado Trail, the nearest public right-of-way, would not change significantly if the use permit modification is approved.

d. Hours of operation of the winery are currently 9:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. (daily, excluding harvest season) and are not proposed to be changed with this modification. Thus, late, nighttime lighting (after 6:00 p.m.) would not occur for most months of the year. If

the use permit modification is approved, the winery would be subject to the County's standard conditions of approval for wineries that limits outdoor lighting to the minimum necessary for operational and security needs. Up-lighting of buildings and landscaping is prohibited. The winery operators must keep lighting fixtures as low to the ground as possible and include shields to deflect their light downward. Avoidance of highly reflective surfaces would be required, as well, by the standard County conditions. These conditions would apply to all winery activities (excluding harvest activities), including any events that would occur outdoors, and the permittee would be required to demonstrate compliance with the condition in his or her submittal of a building permit application:

6.3 *LIGHTING – PLAN SUBMITTAL*

- a. *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 the CBC.*
- b. *All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward, shall be located as low to the ground as possible, shall be the minimum necessary for security, safety, or operations; on timers; and shall incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. All lighting shall be shielded or placed such that it does not shine directly on adjacent properties or impact vehicles on adjacent streets. 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 exempt from this requirement.*

6.5 *COLORS*

The colors used for the roof, exterior walls and built landscaping features of the winery shall be limited to earth tones that will blend the facility into the colors of the surrounding site specific vegetation. The permittee shall obtain the written approval of the Planning Division in conjunction with building permit review and/or prior to painting the building. Highly reflective surfaces are prohibited.

Ongoing operations of the winery would also be subject to compliance with the following standard condition of approval:

4.16 *GENERAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE – LIGHTING, LANDSCAPING, PAINTING, OUTDOOR EQUIPMENT STORAGE, AND TRASH ENCLOSURE AREAS*

- a. *All lighting shall be permanently maintained in accordance with the lighting and building plans approved by the County. Lighting utilized during harvest activities is exempt from this requirement.*
- b. *All landscaping and outdoor screening, storage, and utility structures shall be permanently maintained in accordance with the landscaping and building plans approved by the County. No stored items shall exceed the height of the screening. Exterior winery equipment shall be maintained so as to not create a noise disturbance or exceed noise thresholds in the County Code.*
- c. *The colors used for the roof, exterior walls and built landscaping features of the winery shall be limited to earth tones that will blend the facility into the colors of the surrounding site specific vegetation. The permittee shall obtain the written approval of the Planning Division prior to any change in paint colors that differs from the approved building permit. Highly reflective surfaces are prohibited.*
- d. *Designated trash enclosure areas shall be made available and properly maintained for intended use.*

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/e. The California Department of Conservation maps the 162.6-acre parcel as Prime Farmland, a designation that identifies those lands with an optimal combination of physical and chemical features, micro-climate and water supply to produce high crop yields. The applicant's plans indicate that currently, approximately 36 acres of the 162.6-acre parcel is in agricultural use as vineyards; another, approximately 0.4 acres is planted as an ornamental and edible plant garden. Modification of the winery's use permit entitlements would not have the effect of reducing existing on-site vineyard acreage. Consistent with the General Plan definition of "agriculture" (Policy AG/LU-2), continuation of the processing of agricultural products (in this case, grapes into wine) and expansion of the related, accessory uses (such as sales and marketing of agricultural products) are agricultural uses of land. Thus, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact with respect to conversion of farmland.
- b. The County's zoning of the property is AP (Agricultural Preserve) and AW (Agricultural Watershed) Districts, and the General Plan land use designation of the property is also divided between Agricultural Resource and Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space. The proposed winery is consistent with the property's zoning, as Napa County Code Sections 18.16.030 and 18.20.030 list wineries and related, accessory uses as conditionally permitted in the AP and AW Districts, respectively. General Plan Policies AG/LU-20 and AG/LU-21 also identify processing of agricultural products (grape crushing/winemaking) as a use that is consistent with the Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space and Agricultural Resource land use designations. The Williamson Act contract that is applicable to this property identifies raising of crops, processing of agricultural products and accessory and incidental uses (that are compatible with and necessary to the operation of specified permitted uses) as permitted uses under the terms of the contract. The contract, executed in 1969, remains in effect to date, and the current uses on-site (vineyard plus winery) are consistent with the terms of the contract.
- c/d. As previously noted, the site has been in agricultural use for several decades and is currently planted with vineyards. There are no forest resources on the site.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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.

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 odors affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) Board of Directors unanimously adopted Thresholds of Significance (Thresholds) to assist local agencies in the nine-county Bay Area in the review of projects' potential environmental impacts pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Thresholds were designed to establish the level at which the BAAQMD believed air pollution emissions would cause significant air quality and climate impacts in the region; were posted on the BAAQMD website; and were incorporated into the BAAQMD's updated CEQA Guidelines (updated May 2012). The Thresholds are advisory, and local agencies may follow them at the agencies' discretion.

The Thresholds were challenged in court. Following litigation in the trial court, the court of appeal, and the California Supreme Court, all of the Thresholds were upheld. However, in an opinion issued on December 17, 2015, the California Supreme Court held that CEQA does not generally require an analysis of the impacts of locating development in areas subject to environmental hazards unless the project would exacerbate existing environmental hazards. The Supreme Court also found that CEQA requires the analysis of exposing people to environmental hazards in specific circumstances, including the location of development near airports, schools near sources of toxic contamination, and certain exemptions for infill and workforce housing. The Supreme Court also held that public agencies remain free to conduct this analysis regardless of whether it is required by CEQA.

In view of the Supreme Court's opinion, local agencies may rely on Thresholds designed to reflect the impact of locating development near areas of toxic air contamination where such an analysis is required by CEQA or where the agency has determined that such an analysis would assist in making a decision about the project. However, the Thresholds are not mandatory, and agencies should apply them only after determining that they reflect an appropriate measure of a project's impacts. These Guidelines may inform environmental review for development projects in the Bay Area but do not commit local governments or BAAQMD to any specific course of regulatory action.

BAAQMD published a new version of the Guidelines dated May 2017, which includes revisions made to address the Supreme Court's opinion. The May 2017 Guidelines update does not address outdated references, links, analytical methodologies or other technical information that may be in the Guidelines or Threshold Options and Justification Report. The Air District is currently working to revise any outdated information in the Guidelines as part of its update to the CEQA Guidelines and thresholds of significance.

The requested entitlement consists of various operational changes to the existing winery, including increase in the winery's employment and production levels, and expansion of its tours and tastings and marketing programs. No new structures are proposed, although on-site grading would occur for access road improvements and construction of a recycled process wastewater storage pond on a vacant area northwest of the winery buildings.

a-d. Over the long term, sources of emissions from the winery consist primarily of mobile sources, including customer vehicles, employee vehicles, vineyard equipment and delivery vehicles, with secondary stationary sources that include emissions from energy use, well

pumping and wastewater treatment. As the vineyard operations currently exist, this initial study considers the requested changes to the currently permitted condition, with consideration limited to: 1) the increase in trips related to the recognition of a visitation program to approximately 3,000 square feet inside of and adjacent to Building E; 2) the increase in emissions associated with additional wine production; and 3) grading associated with the construction of the on-site recycled water pond. The BAAQMD's screening criteria (2017) includes a variety of land uses and corresponding square footages for which a project would be anticipated to have a significant impact, based on the BAAQMD's thresholds. There is not a land use in the BAAQMD's guidance that directly correlates to the combination of production, administration and visitation uses typically programmed in a winery in Napa; similar land use categories to the winery office and wine tasting components of the winery include "general office building" and "quality restaurant," respectively. Of these similar land use categories, "quality restaurant" has the lower screening criteria of 47,000 square feet, and so it is applied as a conservative guideline for determining potential air quality impacts of the proposed project. Applying this criterion, the guidelines suggest that a potentially significant air quality impact would occur if the winery's hospitality facility addition consisted of 47,000 or more square feet (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2017, pages 3-2 & 3-3). Given the size of the requested area to be used for wine tasting (approximately 3,000 square feet compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47,000 square feet), the requested use permit modification and its associated ongoing operations and customer and employee vehicle trips, would not contribute a significant amount of air pollution to the region and thus, would not have a significant air quality impact. It is further noted that the "new" hospitality areas are within existing conditioned spaces inside of existing, previously-entitled wine production buildings, and that any tenant improvements required for code compliance modifications inside of these existing buildings would not cause significant construction emissions, as might occur with projects that would require new grading prior to commencement of vertical construction.

In 2010, the BAAQMD adopted an updated Clean Air Plan that outlines a regional program and a set of measures to reduce ozone, ozone precursors, particulate matter, greenhouse gas emissions, and other sources of air pollution. As noted in the Clean Air Plan, the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area as a region is in non-attainment status for achievement of federal standards for emissions of ozone and particulate matter (PM). Sources of ozone and PM include combustion (e.g., burning of fossil fuels or vegetation), fugitive dust from earth-moving activities, and vehicle use (including engine combustion and tire and brake pad wear).

The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Wineries in general are not producers of air pollution in quantities substantial enough to result in an air quality plan conflict. Over the long term, emissions resulting from the proposed use permit modification would consist primarily of mobile sources, including emissions associated with vehicle trips to and from the site.

As noted above, the combustion process of engines in passenger and heavy duty vehicles is a source of air pollutants, including particulate matter as well as carbon dioxide and nitrogen dioxide, two precursors to formulation of ozone. In general, existing truck trip emissions will decrease over time due to tighter regulations. More specifically, the 2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan notes that emissions from heavy duty vehicles are regulated by standards of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and California Air Resources Board, and that as those standards have intensified, emissions (particularly nitrogen oxides and particulate matter) from these types of vehicles have and will continue to decrease (3-29, 3-30). U.S. Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics data demonstrates this downward trend in heavy duty vehicle emissions since 1990. In the case of the specific project and its included request for a production increase, post-entitlement emissions from heavy duty on-road vehicles (freight trucks) are anticipated to decrease, as grapes currently off-hauled to other properties would instead be processed into wine on-site, reducing existing trips on and emissions from the road network to transport fruit during harvest and crush seasons.

The project proponent identified in the use permit application measures listed in the 2010 Clean Air Plan with which the existing and proposed winery operations are consistent, including intent to install a system of photovoltaic panels on the property for on-site generation of power to the winery (Napa County Greenhouse Gas [GHG] checklist, Best Management Practice [BMP] 1), which is consistent with the Clean Air Plan's Stationary Source Measure (SSM) 15 and Energy and Climate Measure (ECM) 2. While certain components of the requested use permit would implement elements of the Clean Air Plan, other measures would not be implemented as they are more generally applicable to heavy industrial rather than winery and hospitality uses. As such, the proposed modification would not obstruct implementation of the applicable Clean Air Plan for the San Francisco region.

In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from earthmoving and construction activities required for construction of the recycled water storage pond and access road improvements. Although there are no schools or healthcare facilities within one mile of the proposed winery, there are existing residences within a half-mile (at the closest point) of construction of the new roadway. Earthmoving and construction emissions would be short-term, consisting mainly of dust generated during grading activities and exhaust emissions from construction-related equipment and vehicles during the estimated four weeks of site grading and addition to the asphalt paving of the existing private roadway between the winery and Silverado Trail. The area of disturbance for these site improvements would be smaller than one acre. The short duration of the work and compliance with

standard conditions would not cause a substantial increase in particulate matter and therefore, would result in a less than significant construction impact related to the region's current non-attainment status for particulate matter.

The applicant's engineer estimates that site grading and construction associated with the project would occur over four weeks. With an estimated 1,300 cubic yards of earthwork estimated to occur for construction of the reclaimed water pond and access road surfacing; applying the heavy- and light-duty construction equipment exhaust emission factors of the BAAQMD (see 1999 CEQA Guidelines, table 7); and an estimated 20-day timeframe for grading and construction, the emissions from vehicles used in the construction of the project site improvements are estimated as follows. For information and comparison, the table includes the thresholds of significance for construction and operations emissions from a project (see the 2017 CEQA Guidelines, table 2-1) in the summary below. Average daily emissions in pounds are converted to kilograms (where one pound equals 0.45 kilograms), for consistency in the units across the table:

Contaminant	Emission Factor (grams/yard ³)	Total Estimated Project Emissions (kilograms, kg)	Daily Emissions Estimated for Project (kg)	Daily Emissions, Threshold of Significance
Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)	9.2	12	0.6	24.5 kg (54 pounds)
Oxides of Nitrogen (NO _x)	42.4	55	2.8	24.5 kg (54 pounds)
Coarse Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	2.2	3	0.2	37.2 kg (82 pounds)

In addition to the PM₁₀ estimated to be generated from vehicles associated with earthwork, dust generated from grading activities within the areas of the access road and pond (in total, approximately a half-acre of land) is estimated to generate another 26 pounds (11.8 kg) of PM₁₀ per day for the estimated four weeks of site grading and construction.

The BAAQMD recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction-related air quality impacts, and with application of these measures, indicates that air pollutant emissions from construction activities would be considered a less than significant impact. These measures are incorporated into the County's standard conditions of project approval and include the following. It is noted that the estimated project emissions per day summarized in the above table are considered to be conservative estimates, as they represent uncontrolled emissions (i.e., activities occurring without inclusion of any of the control measures listed below):

7.1.c AIR QUALITY

During all construction activities, the permittee shall comply with the most current version of BAAQMD Basic Construction Best Management Practices including but not limited to the following, as applicable:

- A. *Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. The BAAQMD's phone number shall also be visible.*
- B. *Water all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) two times per day.*
- C. *Cover all haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site.*
- D. *Remove all visible mud or dirt tracked onto adjacent public roads by using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.*
- E. *All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour.*
- F. *All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.*
- G. *Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes (as required State Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.*
- H. *All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator. Any portable engines greater than 50 horsepower or associated equipment operated within the BAAQMD's jurisdiction shall have either a California Air Resources Board (ARB) registration Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) or a BAAQMD permit. For general information regarding the certified visible emissions evaluator or the registration program, visit the ARB FAQ http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/perp/perpfaq_04-16-15.pdf or the PERP website <http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/portable.htm>.*

Furthermore, while earthmoving and construction on the site will generate dust particulates in the short-term, the impact would be less than significant with dust control measures as specified in Napa County's standard condition of approval relating to dust:

7.1.b **DUST CONTROL**

Water and/or dust palliatives shall be applied in sufficient quantities during grading and other ground disturbing activities on-site to minimize the amount of dust produced. Outdoor construction activities shall not occur when average wind speeds exceed 20 miles per hour.

With the project proponent's adherence to these relevant best management practices identified by the BAAQMD and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts are considered to be less than significant. The temporary duration of the work would not cause a substantial increase in particulate matter (PM), and compliance with standard conditions would reduce to less than significant the proposed project's significant construction impact related to the region's current non-attainment status for this criteria pollutant.

- e. The BAAQMD defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact. However, land uses that are more commonly known generators of offensive odors typically include landfills and transfer stations, wastewater treatment plants, refineries, and heavy industrial and manufacturing plants. Production of wine and storage of wine barrels are not land uses that are typically associated with generation of offensive odors comparable to these types of industrial uses. Consistent with General Plan Policy AG/LU-15, odors that are associated with production of wine and other food and beverage production facilities are considered acceptable elements of the County and its agricultural development goals.

Mitigation Measures: None 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 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-e. That portion of the property on which the winery and its associated infrastructure is located is generally flat or gently sloping, with slopes increasing to over 15 percent on the undeveloped portion of the property east of the wine production facilities. A blue-line stream crosses the northwestern corner of the property over 200 feet away from the proposed reclaimed water pond, though the stream's alignment appears to have been previously modified to accommodate agricultural (vineyard) activities on the adjoining property, and the stream does not extend into any areas of disturbance proposed on the property. There are no natural wetlands on the property, and the property's predominant underlying soil type in the vicinity of the winery improvements (Boomer-Forward-Felta complex) generally provides poor potential for establishment of wetland plants and wildlife.

The Napa River is just under one-half mile southwest of the point of intersection of Silverado Trail and the winery access driveway, and just over one mile southwest of the wine production facilities and associated parking areas. The existing winery buildings and pond are and would remain well outside of the required 45-foot minimum setback established under the water quality and riparian area Conservation Regulations identified in County Code Chapter 18.108. Additional asphalt paving of the private access road would be installed proximate to a drainage ditch that runs parallel to the road, decreasing in depth to less than two feet as it approaches Silverado Trail from the east; as the ditch provides drainage for the agricultural property (County Code Section 18.108.030), improvements to the proximate access road would be exempt from the stream setback requirements of Chapter 18.108. Other than foundations for new wastewater system tanks, which are estimated at under 1,000 square feet, no new impervious surfaces are proposed with the project.

As summarized in the Background/Project History section of this initial study, the subject property has been in agricultural and/or residential use since the late 19th century, and with the exception of undeveloped woodland area to be retained on that portion of the property uphill and east of the winery, the property's native habitat has long been removed to accommodate ornamental landscaping, introduced wine grape vines, agricultural buildings and residences. Construction of proposed, new site infrastructure, including improvements to the private access road and a recycled process wastewater storage pond, would occur in areas on the parcel that have been previously disturbed in association with the existing vineyard, residential or winery uses. County GIS data indicate no presence of sensitive plant or animal species on or in the vicinity of the winery parcel.

- f. There is no habitat conservation plan (HCP) or natural community conservation plan (NCCP) that has been adopted or is being implemented in unincorporated Napa County.

Mitigation Measures: None 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 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 dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Three of the existing buildings on-site – Buildings C, D and E as labeled on the project plans – are associated with winery operations. Building C includes a farm labor dwelling, winery administrative offices and kitchen used as part of the winery's hospitality services; Building D is used by the winery for wine production, aging and storage; and Building E encompasses the winery's tasting room and main grape processing areas. Two other buildings, labeled as Buildings A and B on the project plans, are associated with the property owner's vineyard management company, and thus are outside the scope of the proposed use permit modification.

An analysis of Buildings C, D and E, conducted by Seth Bergstein of PAST Consultants, concluded that all three of the buildings currently used in winery operations potentially have historical significance due to their age of over 50 years (Building C was built in 1933, and Buildings D and E were built in 1878). Buildings D and E also have affiliation with Terrell L. Grigsby, a locally prominent winemaker in the early years of wine production in the Napa Valley, and as the two buildings he commissioned for his own winery in the late 19th century, are a visual reminder of the evolution of the California Napa Valley as a wine production region. While the PAST report describes how Building C has been modified to such an extent as to have lost its historic integrity, the report concludes that Buildings D and E, though each has also been modified, remain in their original locations and include enough unmodified, original, character-defining features as to

continue to communicate their historic significance. The report suggests that each of these buildings meets the criteria for eligibility for the California Register of Historical Resources (23).

a-d. Neither Building D nor E is proposed for demolition or modification as a result of the current use permit modification request; thus, those structures would retain their historic integrity if the present use permit request were to be approved. During a visit to the site, Planning staff observed no unique geological features on the property, which has been significantly disturbed through past construction and grading activities associated with the existing buildings and prior winery and ranching uses of the site. There are no known archaeological resources on the property; however, if resources are found during any earth-disturbing activities associated with the utilities improvements proposed with the project, construction is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist must be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval:

7.2 ARCHEOLOGICAL FINDING

In the event that archeological artifacts or human remains are discovered during construction, work shall cease in a 50-foot radius surrounding the area of discovery. The permittee shall contact the PBES 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 project development, all work in the vicinity must be 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 permittee shall comply with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

Mitigation Measures: None 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Discussion:

a-c. The property is approximately 4.5 miles northeast of the West Napa fault and is outside of any Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone designated by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. Although no fault zone underlies the property, the site is generally located within a region of active fault zones, including those of the West Napa, Concord, Great Valley, North Hayward, Hunting Creek-Berryessa, Mayacama, Calaveras, Rodgers Creek and San Andreas faults. Movement along any of these faults is anticipated to result in intensities of VI to VIII on the Modified Mercalli Scale at the project site; these "moderate" to "very strong" to "severe" intensities would be felt by most people and are likely to result in some damage to well-built structures. Due to the requirement for new structures to comply with the seismic standards of the California Building Code and Occupational Health and Safety Administration regulations (i.e., bracing of barrel storage racks), damage to any newly-built structures on the property is anticipated to be minor and would not expose people to substantial hazards related to ground shaking during an earthquake. With location of the property in a seismically-active region and on soils considered to have "moderate susceptibility" to liquefaction (based on regional mapping), some structural damage to the existing structures on-site could also occur, though it is noted that the property owner reports that none of the buildings on-site experienced any significant damage during the recent 2014 West Napa earthquake, and the older winery buildings on the property have withstood several major and minor earthquakes since their construction in the late 19th century.

The property is underlain by three soil types. The majority of the existing and proposed winery facilities are located in the central part of the site, where the soil type is Boomer-Forward-Felta complex, 5-30 percent slopes. The soil under the winery is characterized as a mixture of three soil series generally consisting of gravelly loam, loam and clay soils. Uphill of the winery facilities is undeveloped woodlands underlain by the Rock outcrop-Hambright complex, 50-75 percent slopes, and approximately 36 acres of vineyards is planted south of the winery facilities, on soil designated as Bale Clay loam, 2-5 percent slopes.

The portion of the property upon which most of the existing winery facilities have been built is underlain by the Boomer-Forward-Felta complex, 5-30 percent slopes. As described in the *Soil Survey of Napa County, California (1978)*, this soil series generally has low shrink-swell potential and slight to moderate erosion potential. Runoff from this soil type is medium. East of the winery buildings, the property is underlain by Rock outcrop-Hambright complex, 50-75 percent slopes. The *Soil Survey* characterizes this soil type as having rapid runoff and very high erosion potential; however, other than a new water tank, no new winery or agricultural facilities are proposed to be constructed in this steeper area east of the winery. Existing slopes and vegetation would be retained, grading would occur only within the footprint of the approximately 28-foot diameter tank, and no new irrigated plantings are proposed in this area. With only minimal disturbance to the ground surface, no significant waterways (such as a river or seashore) and no introduced surface water source (such as an irrigation system) to exacerbate natural stormwater runoff on these steep slopes, the potential for substantial adverse soil movement effects resulting from the proposed project is considered to be less than significant.

d. As mentioned above, the Boomer-Forward-Felta complex, 5-30 percent slopes, soil type that underlies the majority of the winery improvements has a low potential for shrinking and swelling. Additionally, no new buildings or structures for human occupancy are proposed to be constructed with the proposed modification.

e. The soils under the winery property and surrounding vineyards have moderate to severe limitations for septic systems, due primarily to slow percolation or steep slopes. However, the wastewater treatment system proposed with the modification request is not a traditional treatment/subsurface discharge system that is reliant on soil quality. The proposed winery improvements include installation of a wastewater tanks and a Lyve wastewater treatment system that is capable of treating and disinfecting both process and domestic wastewater to California Title 22 standards for recycled water. Wastewater treated in the system is proposed to be discharged via surface drip to irrigate vineyards surrounding the winery buildings. The proposed pond will also be used for storage of up to one acre-foot of recycled water treated in the Lyve system. The Lyve system includes continuous monitoring and is regulated by the State Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	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:

Greenhouse gases (GHGs) are the atmospheric gases, including carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and synthetic fluorinated gases, whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for global warming and that contribute to climate change, a widely accepted theory/science explaining human effects on the atmosphere. Carbon dioxide (CO₂) is the principal GHG being emitted by human activities, and whose concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity. Agricultural sources of carbon emissions include forest clearing, land use changes, and burning of fossil fuels related to goods movement and gas and diesel-powered vehicles and farm equipment (<https://www3.epa.gov/climatechange/science/causes.html>). CO₂ also serves as the reference gas against which other greenhouse gases are compared. The effect that each unit of the other GHGs (methane, nitrous oxide and synthetic fluorinated gases) has on causing the global warming effect is exponentially greater than the impact of a unit of CO₂, to the degrees of tens to tens of thousands of times. Thus, GHG emissions are measured in "carbon dioxide equivalents." Carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e) is a unit of measurement of GHG emissions that uses carbon dioxide as a common denominator, and is a way to get one number that approximates total emissions from all the different gases that contribute to GHG emissions (BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2012). CO₂e are measured in units of metric tons, equal to approximately 2,204 pounds.

Napa County has been working to develop a Climate Action Plan (CAP) for several years. In 2012, a Draft CAP² (March 2012) was recommended using the emissions checklist in the Draft CAP, on a trial basis, to determine potential GHG emissions associated with project development and operation. At the December 11, 2012, Napa County Board of Supervisors (BOS) hearing, the BOS considered adoption of the proposed CAP. In addition to reducing Napa County's GHG emissions, the proposed plan was intended to address compliance with CEQA for projects reviewed by the County and to lay the foundation for development of a local offset program. While the BOS acknowledged the plan's objectives, the BOS requested that the CAP be revised to better address transportation-related GHG, to acknowledge and credit past accomplishments and voluntary efforts, and to allow more time for establishment of a cost-effective local offset program. The Board also requested that best management practices be applied and considered when reviewing projects until a revised CAP is adopted to ensure that projects address the County's policy goal related to reducing GHG emissions.

In July 2015, the County re-commenced preparation of the CAP to: 1) account for present day conditions and modeling assumptions (such as but not limited to methods, emission factors, and data sources); 2) address the concerns with the previous CAP effort as outlined above; 3) meet applicable State requirements; and 4) result in a functional and legally defensible CAP. On April 13, 2016, the County, as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP, released Final Technical Memorandum No. 1: *2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016*³. This initial phase included updating the unincorporated County's community-wide GHG emissions inventory to 2014 and preparing new GHG emissions forecasts for the 2020, 2030, and 2050 horizon years. Table 1 of the Technical Memorandum indicates that two percent of the County's GHG emissions in 2014 were a result of land use change.

The final draft of the CAP was released on June 5, 2017, for public review and for considerations of recommendation by the Planning Commission and adoption by the Board of Supervisors. Additional information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or online at <http://www.countyofnapa.org/CAP/>.

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

² County of Napa, March 2012, Napa County Draft Climate Action Plan, Prepared by ICF International. Sacramento, CA

³ Supersedes February 2, 2016, version.

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.

As referenced in the Air Quality section of this Initial Study, the BAAQMD incorporated into its 2017 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors & GHG Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, including GHG emissions. The BAAQMD's threshold of significance for proposed projects' potential GHG emissions was set at 1,100 metric tons of CO₂e (MTCO₂e) per year. Agencies may choose to use the threshold or other available data source as best available information. For this analysis, the GHG threshold of 1,100 MTCO₂e, based on the analysis in the BAAQMD's "Threshold Options and Justifications Report," is considered the best available information and is considered an appropriate threshold against which to measure the potential GHG impacts of the proposed project.

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.)

For the purposes of this analysis, potential GHG emissions associated with winery "construction" and with "operational" winery activities are discussed. One-time construction emissions associated with the winery development project include: i) the carbon stocks that are lost (or released) when existing vegetation is removed and soil is disturbed in preparation for new winery improvements; and ii) emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area for the proposed improvements, including construction equipment and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as "equipment emissions"). These emissions also include underground carbon stocks (or soil carbon) associated with existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed. In addition to the one-time construction emissions, operational emissions of the winery are also considered and include ongoing emissions from the energy used to maintain and operate the winery, including vehicle trips associated with employee and visitor trips. (See Section XVI, Transportation/Traffic, for anticipated number of operational trips.) Operational emissions from the proposed winery would be the primary source of emissions over the long-term when compared to one-time construction emissions.

Air quality and GHG emission impacts associated with vineyard maintenance and winery operation is an existing condition that would continue (albeit without vehicle trips of most of the requested number of visitors and employees), regardless of whether the current use permit request is approved.

The proposed project would recognize an increase in the winery's permitted number of employees, from one to 16 staff members; would recognize an increase in visitation from 10 to 400 visitors per week; and would allow an increase in the quantity of wine currently permitted to be produced, from 25,000 gallons to 50,000 gallons per year. No expansions of winery buildings are proposed, as hospitality spaces are identified inside of and adjacent to the existing and historic winery Building E. While no new conditioned spaces would be created with the project, other site changes including improvement of the existing access road and wastewater treatment system, as well as construction of a recycled water storage pond, are proposed with the project. These outdoor improvements would require energy and generate emissions from their initial construction but on an ongoing basis, would be unconditioned areas without energy demands that generate GHG from heating or cooling. Thus, the primary sources of operational GHG emissions that would result from approval of the request are primarily attributed to the 15-person increase in winery employment and 390-person increase in weekly visitation, which is expected to occur within the approximately 3,000 square foot hospitality area of Building E.

Applying the "quality restaurant" land use as a best fit category, as explained in additional detail in the Air Quality discussion of this initial study, a project with 9,000 square feet of hospitality area would potentially generate more than 1,100 MTCO₂e annually from operations and associated vehicle trips, and would be considered to have a potentially significant impact on the environment. The approximately 3,000 square feet inside of and adjacent to Building E, that is requested to be recognized as visitation space, falls below this screening criterion, and thus, no significant GHG impact is anticipated from the proposed project.

During construction, the combustion process of engines in heavy duty vehicles would be a source of air pollutants, including particulate matter, carbon dioxide and nitrogen dioxide. Emissions from heavy duty off-road vehicles (e.g., construction equipment) would increase as a result of those vehicles' use in earthwork associated with the road and pond grading encompassed within the project scope. Although the use of these vehicles would increase emissions in the vicinity of the site, the 2010 Bay Area Clean Air

Plan notes that emissions from heavy duty and industrial vehicles are regulated by standards of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and California Air Resources Board, and that as those standards have intensified, emissions (particularly nitrogen oxides and particulate matter) from these types of vehicles have and will continue to decrease (3-29, 3-30). U.S. Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics data demonstrates this downward trend in heavy duty vehicle emissions since 1990. It is again noted that use of these vehicles would be temporary, generating GHG in the property vicinity for the estimated four weeks of construction but not thereafter, and that emissions from large trucks for transport of fruit grown on-site would be reduced due to the increased production requested and opportunity for the winery/property owner to process fruit grown on-site and on adjacent parcels under the same ownership.

- b. The County of Napa does not have an adopted climate action plan, though the project proponent's intent to install photovoltaic array, as described in Air Quality, above, is consistent with adopted General Plan goals (CON-68, CON-70) that encourage the County and permittees to pursue use of renewable energy sources. Other measures that the applicant implements, and that have the effect of reducing the winery's emissions of GHGs, include composting of garden material; implementation of a recycling program, including reuse of reclaimed water from the town of Yountville for vineyard irrigation; and a program for installation of water-efficient plumbing and landscaping and energy-efficient lighting fixtures.

The increase in emissions anticipated as a result of approval of the project is estimated to be less than significant, and the project is consistent with the County's efforts to reduce GHG emissions, further as described above. Accordingly, the proposed project's GHG impacts would be 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. The proposed project involves the use and transport of those hazardous materials typically used in agricultural maintenance and winery operations. The project proponent and winery operator is required to file a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) and to maintain a Hazardous Waste permit with the Napa County Environmental Health Division and is subject to periodic inspection by County staff every three years or more frequently as needed to confirm ongoing compliance with State regulations for management of hazardous materials. The Regusci Winery facility was most recently inspected in January 2015. The property has no outstanding violations of its HMBP or Hazardous Waste permit.
- c. The winery and proposed modifications thereto would not affect schools within one-quarter mile. The school closest to the subject property is Yountville Elementary School, which is over two miles northwest of the Regusci Winery parcel.
- d. The Regusci Winery property is not on any State agency list of identified hazardous materials sites (Government Code Section 65962.5).
- e/f. The winery is neither within the boundaries of an airport land use compatibility planning area nor within two miles of any public or private airport or airstrip. The St. Helena Hospital private heliport, Angwin Airport/Parrett Field (a public use airport owned by Pacific Union College), and the Napa County Airport (public use airport managed by Napa County) are all more than 12 miles north or south of the winery property. A fourth, permitted, private use heliport on Rutherford Road is over six miles northwest of the winery.
- g. The Napa County Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) outlines procedures, including establishing leadership roles and responsibilities of various agency staff, that guide local preparedness, response, recovery and resource management efforts associated with occurrence of a natural disaster, significant emergency, or other threat to public safety. All improvements proposed by the project proponent would occur on the winery property. No component of the winery operational changes would result in permanent closure or obstruction of adjacent public rights-of-way, and no component of the implementation of the EOP would otherwise be impaired by the proposed modification of the winery use permit.
- h. Undeveloped woodlands are the predominant landcover on-site, covering over 110 acres of the 162.6-acre parcel. However, development on the property is low in intensity, with buildings limited to winery buildings and four residences located on a central, approximately 12-acre area on the parcel. Though bordered on the east side by woodlands, the developed winery area on the property is otherwise bordered by vineyards to the north, west and south. With the low intensity of development on the property, coupled with the large acreage of proximate vineyards, the project site is considered to have a low to moderate potential for damage of wildland fires, as depicted on General Plan Figure SAF-2. Regional hazard mapping by the Association of Bay Area Governments similarly identifies the general area outside of any area of urban-wildland interface fire threat, likely because of the general area's low density of development. In an emergency, evacuation of the property could reasonably be achieved using the property's exclusive private drive from the winery and residential buildings to Silverado Trail.

Mitigation Measures: None 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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:

a/c/d/e.

The requested modification includes an increase in the quantity of wine currently permitted to be produced at the site, from 25,000 to 50,000 gallons of wine per year and thus, would result in a corresponding increase in the quantity of process-related wastewater generated at the winery. The winery facilities are currently equipped with a manual diversion valve located in the area of the crush pad, which allows the winery operator to divert stormwater runoff from the storm drain system to the process wastewater treatment system during crush and following the first rains of the season, so as to minimize contamination to the storm drain system. To comply fully with current regulations for stormwater quality preservation, the winery operator is required to maintain its Industrial General Permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board in order to ensure that winery operations, including maintenance and operation of the manual diversion valve, meet minimum water quality standards at all times.

The proposed project includes new asphalt and cement concrete surfaces for widening of the existing private access road and as foundations below proposed new tank installations on the property. As the existing access road is currently surfaced with compacted gravel, the asphalt is not considered to be a new impervious surface, so the new impervious surfaces proposed with the project are limited to the foundations planned for the new water and wastewater system tanks, which areas are estimated at fewer than 2,000 square feet. (This area would be reduced roughly by half, in the event that the wastewater system tanks are installed inside of the existing silos on the property rather than on new concrete foundations.) Due to their small size, these new foundations could drain runoff into their respective, surrounding vegetated areas, and with fewer than 2,500 square feet of new impervious surface associated with the project, no specific stormwater quality or control measures are required.

- b. 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. On April 7, 2017, Governor Jerry Brown signed an executive order lifting California's drought emergency in all but four counties (Fresno, Kings, Tulare, and Tuolumne). The County of Napa had not adopted or implemented any additional 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 and to implement water saving measures to prepare for periods of limited water supply and to conserve limited groundwater resources.

To better understand groundwater resources, on June 28, 2011, the Napa County 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 retained Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE), who completed a County-wide assessment of groundwater resources (*Napa County Groundwater Conditions and Groundwater Monitoring Recommendations Report*, February 2011); developed a groundwater monitoring program (*Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2013*, January 2013); and also completed a *2013 Updated Hydrogeologic Conceptualization and Characterization of Groundwater Conditions* (January 2013).

Groundwater Sustainability Objectives were recommended by the GRAC and adopted by the Board of Supervisors. These objectives acknowledged the important role of monitoring as a means to achieving groundwater sustainability and the principles underlying the sustainability objectives. In 2009, Napa County began a comprehensive study of its groundwater resources to meet identified action items in the County's 2008 General Plan update. The study, conducted by LSCE, emphasized developing a sound understanding of groundwater conditions and implementing an expanded groundwater monitoring and data management program as a foundation for integrated water resources planning and dissemination of water resources information. The 2011 baseline study by LSCE, which included over 600 wells and data going back over 50 years, concluded that the groundwater levels in Napa County are stable, except for portions of the MST (Milliken Sarco Tulocay) district. Most wells elsewhere within the Napa Valley Floor with a sufficient record indicate that groundwater levels are more affected by climatic conditions, are within historical levels, and seem to recover from dry periods during subsequent wet or normal periods. The LSCE study also concluded that, on a regional scale, there appear to be no current groundwater quality issues except north of Calistoga (mostly naturally occurring boron and trace metals) and in the Carneros region (mostly salinity). LSCE prepared the 2014 Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report, presented to the Napa County Board of Supervisors on March 3, 2015, and presented a follow-up report to the Board on April 18, 2017.

Thresholds for water use have been established by the Napa County Department of Public Works, using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS), the GRAC recommendations, and the LSCE reports. 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 and LSCE. The County has concluded that the annual one acre-foot of water per parcel acre criteria on the Valley Floor has proven to be both scientifically and operationally adequate. Any project that reduces water usage or any water usage that is at or below the established threshold is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels.

Concurrently with submittal of the use permit major modification application, the project proponent submitted a water availability analysis that includes: i) identification of existing wells on the property; ii) characterization of the geologic conditions on the property; iii) estimates of anticipated groundwater demands of the proposed project; and iv) estimates of groundwater recharge during normal and dry years, based on the underlying geologic conditions.

The Regusci Winery currently produces wine on the property and is entitled to produce up to 25,000 gallons per year (on average within any three-year period) and to host up to 10 visitors per week. Water to the winery operations is currently provided by two functioning wells. The primary well from which most of the winery's water is drawn is located at the base of the adjacent slope, approximately 700 feet southeast of the winery buildings; and a secondary, back-up well is located approximately 600 feet uphill and northeast of the winery buildings. Groundwater (GW) demand estimated for the winery, as currently entitled, is summarized below:

Winery Groundwater Demand – Current Entitlement

Winery Activity	Quantity	Demand Factor	Estimated Annual GW Demand
Wine Production	25,000 gallons/year	12 gallons per gallon of wine	300,000 gallons
Employees	1 person/day	15 gallons per person per day	5,475 gallons
Tasting Room Visitors	520 persons/year	3 gallons per person	1,560 gallons
TOTAL			307,035 gallons = 0.9 acre-feet

The proposed modification would increase wine production from 25,000 to 50,000 gallons of wine per year; would allow increased visitation from 10 to 400 visitors per week; would allow the increase in employees from one to 16 employees; and would introduce a marketing program consisting of food and wine pairings four days each week for up to 12 guests per day, plus 10 events annually for up to 50 guests, five events annually for up to 150 guests and one event annually for up to 200 guests. Groundwater (GW) demand estimated for the property includes these requested modifications and is summarized below:

Winery Groundwater Demand – Requested Entitlement

Winery Activity	Quantity	Demand Factor	Estimated Annual GW Demand
Wine Production	50,000 gallons/year	12 gallons per gallon of wine	600,000 gallons
Employees (Mon-Fri)	16 persons/day	15 gallons per person per day	62,400 gallons
Employees (Sat-Sun)	7 persons/day	15 gallons per person per day	11,025 gallons
Tasting Room Visitors	20,800 persons/year	3 gallons per person	62,400 gallons
Food/Wine Pairing	2,496 persons/year	5 gallons per person	12,480 gallons
Marketing Event Guests	1,450 persons/year	8 gallons per person	11,600 gallons
TOTAL			759,905 gallons = 2.3 acre-feet

Winery water demand is added to existing, permitted residential and agricultural activities that are not within the scope of the permit but are mentioned here to provide a complete description of groundwater demands of the property:

Groundwater Demand – Permitted Uses Outside Scope of Use Permit Request

Activity/Land Use	Quantity	Demand Factor	Estimated Annual GW Demand
Vineyard Management	18 persons/weekday	15 gallons per person per day	70,200 gallons
Farm Labor Dwelling	4 bedrooms	150 gallons per bedroom per day	219,000 gallons
Residence	3 bedrooms	150 gallons per bedroom per day	164,250 gallons
Residence	2 bedrooms	150 gallons per bedroom per day	109,500 gallons
Residence	2 bedrooms	150 gallons per bedroom per day	109,500 gallons
Vineyard Irrigation	<i>(average of reported actual use, 2013 - 2015)</i>		4,098,808 gallons
Other Landscape Irrigation	<i>(actual annual use reported from years 2013 - 2015)</i>		477,720 gallons
TOTAL			5,248,978 gal. = 16.1 acre-feet

The requested use permit modification represents an increase in groundwater demand of an estimated 1.4 acre-feet per year compared to existing entitlements. With the requested modification, and including permitted uses, total groundwater use estimated for the property is 18.4 acre-feet per year.

The water availability analysis that accompanied the application submittal estimates annual rainfall at the property at 29 inches (2.4 feet), based on an average from three different data sources that indicate rainfall levels in the vicinity of the site to be between 29 and 30 inches (Memorandum from Richard C. Slade Associates to Mr. Jim Regusci, June 2016, pages 11-13). Thus, with approximately 162.6 acres within the property boundaries, an estimated average of 390 acre-feet of rain falls on the property annually. Conservatively assuming that 10 percent of rainfall percolates to groundwater, based on the underlying geology of the wells located in areas mapped as Sonoma Volcanics, then approximately 39 acre-feet of rainfall percolates through the ground to recharge the groundwater aquifer each year. Estimated groundwater demand for the property (including the requested use permit modification and permitted uses) is 18.4 acre-feet annually and is less than the estimated recharge rate.

The data sources that informed the average annual rainfall numbers span the years from 2000 through present, 1981 through 2010 and 1900 to 1960. While droughts have occurred within each of these periods, and the estimated rainfall is considered to reflect the averaging of wet, normal and dry (drought) years, the availability analysis submitted with the application included discussion of the effects of drought on groundwater levels. Drought years are categorized as those years wherein total annual precipitation is less than the long-term average annual precipitation. The report notes that, in periods of drought that have occurred within the last 100 years, average annual rainfall has ranged from 70 to 82 percent of average, with the most severe drought occurring in 1975-1977, when average annual rainfall was 48 percent of average. Adjusting annual rainfall (29 inches) to reflect the reduced rainfall rates from drought periods of the last 100 years, estimated rainfall in drought years would range from approximately 27 to 32 acre-feet per year, to as low as 19 acre-feet when adjusted to relate to the driest two years in the past century, and would still be greater than the property's estimated demand of 18.4 acre-feet of water per year.

In the table above, water usage related to irrigation reflects an existing agreement between the property owner and the town of Yountville for reception of recycled, treated wastewater from the town. The property owner is currently in the process of re-negotiating that agreement to increase the quantity of recycled water received from Yountville for irrigation purposes, but those negotiations are not final. If the property owner is successful in increasing that quantity of recycled water it receives from the town, then irrigation numbers noted in the table above would correspondingly decrease the total water demand from the estimated 18.4

acre-feet per year. The proposed recycled water storage pond would have capacity to store another acre-foot of recycled process wastewater, and with installation of the Lyve system, would also help facilitate reduction of current vineyard irrigation water use.

- g-i. No new residences are proposed with this modification. According to Napa County's environmental resource mapping (Floodplain and Dam Levee Inundation layers), that portion of the property where winery structures and existing residences have been built is outside of the 100-year as well as the 500-year floodplains, as well as, dam failure inundation areas. Approximately 500 feet of the private driveway extending from Silverado Trail is within the flood zone of the Rector Creek and Conn dams; however, no buildings have been placed on this portion of the property, and no new structures are proposed to be placed there as part of this use permit modification. While planted grapevines on the parcel might incur damage as a result of flooding of the Napa River or failure of the Rector Creek or Conn dams, all of the winery's occupied structures (such as winery production and accessory use buildings) are be outside of 100- and 500-year floodplains, would not be damaged, and would not, therefore, have the potential to impede, redirect or otherwise alter flooding potential in the general vicinity.
- j. In coming years, higher global temperatures are purported 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 National Research Council and California Coastal Commission estimate that the sea level along the central and southern California coast will rise between one and six feet between the year 2000 and 2100.

The subject property is located well inland of the Pacific Ocean coast and the shores of the San Pablo Bay where risk of inundation by seiche or tsunami in the Bay Area is greatest. The property is also approximately 75 to 200 feet above mean sea level and as such, is not anticipated to be affected by projected rises in sea level. Thus, the parcel has minimal risk for damages or injuries related to seiches or tsunamis.

As noted in the discussion of Geology and Soils, above, that portion of the property upon which most of the existing winery facilities have been built is underlain by the Boomer-Forward-Felta complex, 5-30 percent slopes, which has slight to moderate erosion potential with medium runoff. The Rock outcrop-Hambright complex, 50-75 percent slopes, east of the winery buildings has rapid runoff and very high erosion potential; however, other than a new water tank, no new winery or agricultural facilities are proposed to be constructed in this steeper area east of the winery. Existing slopes and vegetation would be retained, grading would occur only within the footprint of the approximately 28-foot diameter tank, and no new irrigated plantings are proposed in this area. With only minimal disturbance to the ground surface, no significant waterways (such as a river or seashore) and no introduced surface water source (such as an irrigation system) to exacerbate natural stormwater runoff on these steep slopes, the potential for substantial adverse soil movement effects resulting from the proposed project is considered to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan (HCP) or natural community conservation plan (NCCP)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would integrate with the property's surroundings rather than divide an existing, established community. The site is currently developed with vineyards and residential structures (not a part of the project), and a winery, an agricultural use as defined in the Napa County General Plan (Policy AG/LU-2). Surrounding land uses, as described in Section 10 of this initial study, are also predominantly agricultural and rural residential and would not be physically modified (as by demolition of an existing

structure or division of land). As such, the existing vineyard, winery and residential uses are consistent with the development pattern of the properties surrounding the site. The proposed project would permit modifications to the operation of the existing winery, facilitating the winery's ongoing operations but not introducing any new, non-agricultural use to the property.

- b. By continuing to facilitate use of the property for agricultural use, inclusive of agricultural product processing (winemaking from grapes) and related, accessory uses, the requested use permit modification is generally consistent with the uses envisioned and as described in General Plan Goal AG/LU-1 and Policies AG/LU-1, AG/LU-2. The proposed project is also consistent with General Plan Policy AG/LU-9, which was specifically adopted by the Board of Supervisors as a mitigation measure of the General Plan environmental impact report (EIR), and is intended to prioritize preservation of farmland in the County. Napa County Code Sections 18.16.030 and 18.20.030 also identify wineries as conditionally permitted uses within the AP and AW Districts where the site is located.

Water demand generated by the proposed permit modification would be in line with General Plan goals supporting prioritization of groundwater for agricultural purposes (Goal CON-11). Without taking deductions for use of reclaimed process wastewater for irrigation from the proposed pond, both existing and projected water use would serve an agricultural use on the property and are anticipated to be within groundwater recharge rates estimated for normal and drought years (Also see discussion under Hydrology and Water Quality section of this Initial Study.)

As discussed in the Cultural Resources section of this initial study, existing winery Buildings D and E, both of which are over 100 years old, retain sufficient original, character-defining features that communicate their historic significance as late 18th century wine production buildings. Neither building's exterior would be modified or changed with the proposed project. Maintenance of these original winery structures would be consistent with General Plan Community Character Policies CC-19 and CC-24, which encourage the County to identify and promote historic resources as a means to enhance the County's identity as the nation's premier wine country. Lastly it is noted that the applicant's long-term objective of installing a photovoltaic array, as indicated in the "Voluntary Best Management Practices Checklist for Development Projects," is consistent with adopted General Plan goals (CON-68, CON-70) that encourage the County and permittees to pursue use of renewable energy sources as a means to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

- c. Not applicable. There is no HCP or NCCP that has been adopted or is being implemented in unincorporated Napa County.

Mitigation Measures: None 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. There are no impacts anticipated to occur with respect to mineral resources as a result of the proposed modification of the winery on the subject site. As described in Chapter 2 of the Napa County Baseline Data Report (BDR; 2005), mineral resources mostly occur in the southern and northern areas of the County, generally at higher elevations than the valley floor where the subject site is primarily located. BDR Figure 2.2 identifies no mineral mining resources on or in the vicinity of the proposed winery site.

The proposed use permit modification would continue the agricultural use of the site, including agricultural product processing (winery) and expanded accessory uses (increase visitation and marketing), and it would not result in permanent, full conversion of the agricultural property to urban development and land uses. Thus, the proposed project would have no impact on known mineral resources.

Mitigation Measures: None 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 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/b. The proposed project would cause a temporary increase in noise levels as a result of construction of the building and site modifications, including grading for the recycled water storage pond. Examples of construction equipment that would be associated with site improvements include bulldozers for grading of the pond, along with smaller-scale equipment necessary for installation of directional signage posts. Noise levels generated from such equipment has been measured as high as 90 decibels at 50 feet from the source (https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/handbook/handbook09.cfm). With a six-decibel reduction in noise levels per doubling of distance from the source, and with the County's noise threshold of 75 A-weighted decibels (dBA, a measurement of sound that mimics human hearing by de-emphasizing low- and very-high frequency sound) during daytime hours for construction noise effects on residential uses (County Code Section 8.16.080), a residence located within 400 feet of the location of construction activities could potentially be affected by construction noise generated by grading or construction activities associated with the project. The closest receptors (off-site residences) are over 1,800 feet west from where grading would occur for the proposed recycled water storage pond, and thus, construction-related noise impacts of the project are within County Code limits and considered less than significant. Nonetheless, the project would be subject to standard conditions of development in Napa County that are intended to reduce to acceptable levels the potential impacts of construction-related noise on neighboring uses, by requiring mufflers on construction equipment, prohibiting operation of noise-disturbing construction tools or equipment between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., and limiting construction noise levels measured at property lines to 75 dBA between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m.:

7.3 CONSTRUCTION NOISE

Construction noise shall be minimized to the greatest extent practical and feasible under State and local safety laws, consistent with construction noise levels permitted by the General Plan Community Character Element and the County Noise Ordinance. Construction equipment muffling and hours of operation shall be in compliance with the County Code. Equipment shall be shut down when not in use. Construction equipment shall normally be staged, loaded, and unloaded on the project site, if at all practicable. If project terrain or access road conditions require construction equipment to be staged, loaded, or unloaded off the project site (such as on a neighboring road or at the base of a hill), such activities shall only occur daily between the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

c/d. The application includes a request to allow winery accessory activities to occur outdoors. Such activities include on-site consumption of wine purchased on the property, as well as some of the winery's marketing events, which are proposed to host as many as 200 people and end as late as 10:00 p.m. As described in the Project Description, above, the proposed outdoor consumption and marketing areas include: i) the uncovered area west of Building D; ii) the existing lawn area southeast of the

winery garden and northwest of a bank of existing visitor parking stalls; iii) in a wooded area just southeast of Building E; and iv) the grassy area northwest of the winery garden, adjacent to the proposed recycled water storage pond.

The proposed project involves changes to the approved marketing program that have the potential to generate higher noise levels as a result of the proposed occurrence of winery accessory activities outdoors. Additional regulations contained within County Code Chapter 8.16 establish exterior noise criteria for various land uses in the County. As described in Project Setting, above, land uses that surround the Regusci Winery parcel are predominantly agricultural (vineyard) and rural residential uses on large parcels of 10 or more acres. Based on the standards in County Code Section 8.16.070, noise levels may not exceed 50 decibels during daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) or 45 decibels during nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) at the exterior of a residential structure or residential use on a portion of a larger property. Given the predominant land uses around both parcels, noise impacts of a proposed project would be considered bothersome and potentially significant if sound generated by it had the effect of creating volume exceedances more than 50 percent of the time (i.e., 30 minutes in any hour).

As also noted above, the nearest residence to the winery's proposed outdoor activities (in this case, the area identified for on-site consumption adjacent to the banks of the recycled water storage pond) is over 1,800 feet west of that outdoor accessory area. Under the proposed project, the largest outdoor activities that would occur at the Regusci Winery would be a marketing event with an expected attendance of up to 200 people.

Noise sampling performed under County authority, as part of the analysis for the Bell Winery use permit modification (P13-00055), measured sound from an 85-person event with amplified music, using a meter placed 123 feet from the sound source (marketing event). Measurements taken from that sound meter indicated that noise levels from the event exceeded 56 decibels 50 percent of the time, while equivalent (average) noise level was 60 decibels. It is noted that the size of the largest marketing event proposed to occur at the Regusci Winery (200 people) is approximately two and half times the size of the 85-person event monitored at Bell Winery. Applying: 1) a six-decibel reduction per doubling of distance from the noise source; and 2) a three-decibel increase per doubling of noise sources (number marketing event guests) as described in that noise study, it is projected that exterior noise experienced at the nearest residence on Silverado Trail approximately 1,800 feet west of the winery would be at 46 decibels for half of the event duration, and an average of 42 decibels for the duration of the event. These estimated noise levels would not exceed the County Code standard of 50 decibels during 50 percent of daytime hours. Events would not occur during nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. until 7:00 a.m.) Additionally, all events would be subject to the following standard condition with respect to amplified sound:

4.10 **AMPLIFIED MUSIC**

There shall be no amplified sound system or amplified music utilized outside of approved, enclosed, winery buildings.

e/f. The winery and proposed modifications thereto would not expose people to excessive noise levels associated with air traffic. No private landing facility is proposed with the requested modification, and the winery is neither within the boundaries of an airport land use compatibility planning area nor within two miles of any public or private airport or airstrip. The St. Helena Hospital private heliport, Angwin Airport/Parrett Field (a public use airport owned by Pacific Union College), and the Napa County Airport (public use airport managed by Napa County) are all more than 12 miles north or south of the winery property. A fourth, permitted, private use heliport on Rutherford Road is over six miles northwest of the winery.

Mitigation Measures: None 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 proposed use permit modification would facilitate ongoing operation of an existing winery. Other than on-site wastewater treatment and recycled water improvements to serve exclusively the winery's operations, no new infrastructure is proposed that might induce growth by extending service outside of the boundaries of any of the winery owner's properties. The existing three single-family residences and farm labor dwelling on the property are not within the scope of the modification request and would be retained with or without the project. Thus, no residents would be displaced as a result of the proposed use permit modification.

Mitigation Measures: None 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:				
i) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a. The property is located within the service areas of both the Napa County Sheriff's Department (Beat 4) as well as the Napa County Fire Department. The proposed winery improvements, if approved, would be inspected by County building inspectors and fire officials in order to ensure that construction occurs in accordance with current Building and Fire Codes applicable at the time of submittal of any requisite building permit application. If approved, the requested use permit would facilitate the continued operation and expansion of an existing winery on-site of an existing vineyard. The proposed project scope does not include construction of any new residential units nor accompanying introduction of new residents that would utilize existing parks or potentially increase student enrollment in schools located in the area of the winery. No new parks or other public recreational amenities or institutions are proposed to be built with the proposed use permit. Also see discussion under Section XV, below.

Mitigation Measures: None 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. The proposed project is a request for modification to the existing Use Permit allowing operation of the Regusci Winery. If approved as proposed, the modification would allow operational changes that include expansion of the currently permitted hospitality program, addition of a marketing program to the winery operations, an increase in the number of employees and gallons of wine produced, and various other site and utility changes, including installation of a recycled water storage pond. While the three existing residences and the farm labor dwelling on the winery property would be retained, the proposed project includes no new residential units nor accompanying introduction of new residents that would utilize existing parks in the area, potentially accelerating those recreational facilities' deterioration. The proposal would increase the number of employees on and visitors to the property, some of whom might visit recreational facilities in the area during breaks, before or after work, or on the way to or from other wineries. However, given that the purpose of employees' and guests' trips are to and from the winery as the primary destination, such visits to area recreational facilities are anticipated to be infrequent and would not drastically accelerate the deterioration of the park amenities. No new parks or other public recreational amenities are proposed to be built with the proposed winery.

Mitigation Measures: None 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. The existing winery has its sole access to the County road network via an approximately half-mile long private driveway that intersects Silverado Trail, a two-lane, north-south, public arterial County roadway. Existing property frontage improvements within the right-of-way of Silverado Trail near the site access include: 1) a left-turn pocket providing access onto the winery driveway from the southbound lane of Silverado Trail; and 2) class 2 on-street bicycle lanes on both sides of Silverado Trail. Drivers intending to travel westward from the winery property can utilize northbound Silverado Trail to Yountville Cross Road or southbound Silverado Trail to Oak Knoll Avenue. Both Yountville Cross Road and Oak Knoll Avenue are two-lane roadways that provide access to State Route 29 west of the winery property. State Route 29 is a State-managed public roadway that, like Silverado Trail, extends north-south through the Napa Valley but on the opposite (west) side of the valley from Silverado Trail. State Route 29 is approximately 1.5 miles west of Silverado Trail in the vicinity of the winery property.

No off-site improvements are proposed with the requested use permit modification. On-site, the existing private access road is currently a 12- to 20-foot wide asphalt and gravel drive but is proposed to be widened to 20 feet of asphalt-paved surface with two-foot wide gravel shoulder for the majority of its length, in accordance with current Napa County Road and Street Standards (RSS). To accommodate and retain existing mature walnut trees, the project proponent is requesting an exception to the RSS to eliminate the required two-foot of gravel shoulder in each location where the roadway is immediately adjacent to a walnut tree.

As noted the Project Description above, approval of the requested modification would entitle an existing but unpermitted increase in the number of winery employees, up to a maximum of 16, as well as an existing but unpermitted increase in the number of winery tours and tastings visitors, up to a maximum of 400 per week. The winery is also proposing introduction of a marketing program consisting of food and wine pairings for up to 12 guests per day, four days each week, plus another 16 events per year for 50 to 200 guests. Tours and tastings would be suspended on any day when a 150- or 200-person marketing event is held that begins before 6:00 p.m. The increase in visitors and employees would result in an increase in the number of vehicle trips to and from the winery. Applying the trip generation factors on page 15 of the County's use permit application, and applying the project proponent's expectation that visitation on a weekday is not more than 50 people (one-third of that which is expected on a typical weekend day), the winery's requested employment and visitation and marketing programs generate:

1. an estimated 85 weekday trips, of which 32 occur within the peak hour between 4:30 p.m. and 5:30 p.m.; and
2. an estimated 133 typical weekend day trips, of which 34 occur within the peak hour between 1:45 p.m. and 2:45 p.m.; and
3. an estimated 142 harvest/crush season Saturday trips, of which 36 occur within the peak hour between 1:45 p.m. and 2:45 p.m.

Traffic impact analysis prepared by Omni-Means Engineering Solutions, the applicant's consultant, described existing roadway conditions within the vicinity of the project site and projected near-term and long-term impacts to the circulation system in the vicinity of the winery, under scenarios both with and without traffic from the requested use permit modification. As the project proponent is currently operating outside the scope of the winery's use permit entitlements, the trips associated with the requested modification are currently on the roadway network. However, for informational purposes, and in an effort to disclose the potential impacts of the modification had it been requested in advance of increasing employment and visitation, the traffic consultant's analysis utilizes the permitted condition (i.e., without increased employment and visitation) as the "baseline" of the traffic analysis.

The traffic study evaluated the "project" impacts to the winery access road at Silverado Trail, as well as the intersections of Yountville Cross Road/Silverado Trail north of the winery and Oak Knoll Avenue/Silverado Trail south of the winery. Each intersection is unsignalized, with traffic controlled by a stop sign on the minor approach (Yountville Cross Road and Oak Knoll Avenue). Additionally, the study evaluated impacts to the Silverado Trail arterial segment south of the Regusci Winery.

Level of service standards for roads in the unincorporated areas have been established by the County in its General Plan (2008). As described on page CIR-15 of the General Plan, "[l]evel of service (LOS) is a measure of how well an intersection or roadway is able to carry traffic. LOS is usually designated with a letter grade A-F, where 'A' is best and 'F' is worst." General Plan policy CIR-16 establishes the County's desired LOS on all County roadways as LOS D, as measured during the weekday peak hour. LOS D represents "[t]he level where traffic nears an unstable flow. Intersections still function, but short queues develop and cars may have to wait through one cycle during short peaks" (CIR-15).

Trip counts used for the analysis were taken on Wednesday through Saturday in a single week in January 2017, and were adjusted downward to re-create the winery's permitted condition. To extrapolate September harvest conditions, the adjusted trip counts were then increased by 15 percent. Volumes taken during this timeframe indicated that the peak hours of traffic were

between 4:30 p.m. and 5:30 p.m. on weekdays (“Weekday PM peak hour”) and between 1:45 p.m. and 2:45 p.m. on Saturday (“Saturday PM peak hour”).

The segment and intersection impacts, with and without the project, are summarized below. For the Silverado Trail road segment, the number following the letter designation indicates the number of vehicles on the roadway during the peak hour of traffic. For the intersections, the number indicates the seconds that a driver would have to wait on the minor approach before making a turning movement onto Silverado Trail during the peak hour:

Weekday PM Peak Hour Level of Service

Facility	Existing Condition		Near Term Horizon (2020)		Cumulative Condition (2030)	
	Without Project	With Project	Without Project	With Project	Without Project	With Project
Silverado Trail Segment	D 1,719	D 1,751	D 1,804	D 1,836	E 2,420	E 2,452
Yountville Cross Rd / Silverado Trl	D 29.6	D 30.1	D 32.1	D 32.5	F 275.4	F 280.2
Regusci Winery Access/Silverado Trl	C 19.0	C 24.4	B 13.6	D 25.7	D 31.9	E 49.7
Oak Knoll Ave / Silverado Trl	E 39.1	E 40.7	E 43.6	E 45.7	F 198.2	F 214.9

Saturday PM Peak Hour Level of Service

Facility	Existing Condition		Near Term Horizon (2020)		Cumulative Condition (2030)	
	Without Project	With Project	Without Project	With Project	Without Project	With Project
Silverado Trail Segment	B 808	C 842	C 867	C 901	C 1,137	C 1,171
Yountville Cross Rd / Silverado Trl	B 11.4	B 11.4	B 13.1	B 13.2	C 15.5	C 19.5
Regusci Winery Access/Silverado Trl	B 12.2	B 12.6	B 12.5	B 13.0	B 14.4	C 15.0
Oak Knoll Ave / Silverado Trl	B 14.5	B 14.8	C 16.6	C 15.5	C 19.7	C 20.2

None of the studied intersections are signalized or controlled in all directions by stop signs. Under current General Plan policy (CIR-16), the desired road segment level of service is LOS D during the weekday peak hour of traffic, “except where maintaining this desired level of service would require the installation of more travel lanes than shown on the Circulation Map.” Thus, where additional travel lanes would be necessary to maintain LOS D, but where such lane additions are not specified in General Plan Circulation Element Figure CIR-1, it follows that LOS E or F is considered acceptable. It also follows from the policy that, for intersections or road segments that operate at acceptable levels (LOS A, B, C or D) during weekday peak hours under existing conditions, project proponents would be required to mitigate with lane or signal installations if their projects’ impacts would have the effect of deteriorating the LOS of the intersection or road segment to an unacceptable level (LOS E or F) or would trigger peak hour warrants for installation of a traffic signal. For unsignalized intersections, the General Plan does not identify a desired level of service but recommends that each intersection be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to determine if signal warrants are met.

As summarized above, the traffic study indicates that all intersections and the studied road segment operate and would continue to operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS B or C) during the weekend peak hour in the near-term (2020) and long-term (2030) horizons, both with and without the project.

Addressing the weekday peak hour, the study indicates that Oak Knoll Avenue/Silverado Trail, an unsignalized intersection with stop-sign control on the minor approach of Oak Knoll Avenue, would operate at LOS E during the weekday peak hour without the project, and meets signal warrants, also without the project. The study indicates that, based on traffic modeling, the proposed project has the effect of adding two left-turn movements to the stop-sign approach of Oak Knoll Avenue, where current volume is 90 vehicles during the peak hour. This addition represents just over two percent of existing volume at the minor approach, and an increase in delay of two seconds that a driver on the minor approach would experience, and is considered a less-than-significant impact to the weekday peak hour level of service in the near-term horizon. Yountville Cross Road and the studied segment of Silverado Trail would operate at LOS D in the near-term horizon, with and without the project.

In the long-term, cumulative horizon, all three studied intersections and the studied road segment are anticipated to operate at level of service D, E or F during the weekday peak hour of traffic. With weekday peak hour trips on the studied segment of

Silverado Trail projected to increase from 1,719 (without the project) to 2,452 (cumulatively, with the project), and with the project's estimated contribution of 32 peak hour trips to the road network, the proposed project would contribute 4.4 percent to the cumulative condition on Silverado Trail and thus would represent less than five percent of the traffic volumes in the cumulative scenario. It is also re-iterated that General Plan Policy CIR-16 suggests that LOS E or F is acceptable on roads for which the General Plan does not recommend addition of lanes (including Silverado Trail).

The traffic analysis also indicates that total traffic volumes within the long-term horizon are estimated to increase from 86 trips to 96 trips on the Yountville Cross approach to Silverado Trail; of these additional 10 trips, the project would add one trip. Likewise, traffic volumes within the long-term horizon are estimated to increase from 90 trips to 103 trips on the Oak Knoll Avenue approach to Silverado Trail; of these additional 13 trips, the project would add two trips. The third studied intersection is the applicant's winery driveway, which would experience an increase in trips directly as a result of the project but provides no access to any other properties, thereby causing no impacts to non-project-related travelers. General Plan Policy CIR-16 does not specify a desired LOS for unsignalized intersections (including Yountville Cross Road and Oak Knoll Avenue) but calls for case-by-case evaluation. For the proposed project, the additional trips would have the individual impacts of increasing delay at the intersections by 0.5 to two seconds under current conditions, a minor and likely unnoticeable increase in delay experienced by drivers. With daily project trips estimated at 10 and 13 at the Yountville Cross Road and Oak Knoll Avenue intersections with Silverado Trail, project trips would constitute fewer than three percent of total cumulative volumes at each intersection and therefore, would have a less-than-significant impact in the long-term cumulative scenario. No mitigation necessary for cumulative level of service impacts is therefore required for the proposed project. In the cumulative scenario, the delay resulting from these one to two trips increases to five to 15 seconds, indicating that the increase in delay is the result of additional traffic on Silverado Trail, where, as noted above, LOS E and F are considered acceptable.

- c. The proposed modification includes no tall structures, uplighting, or air travel component that would affect air traffic.
- d/e. In 1971, Napa County adopted its initial iteration of the Napa County Road and Street Standards (RSS). The intent of the RSS was to establish a uniform set of standards for public and private roads that strive to preserve the natural landscape and water quality, minimize impacts to environmentally sensitive areas and native habitats, and provide adequate safety and service in the interest of protecting public health and welfare. As further described in the RSS Objectives, the RSS "attempt to meet the related interests of several other agencies, including the Resource Conservation District, Cal Fire, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department, and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife" (5). The RSS has since been amended to reflect changes in the best practices and regulations of the respective agencies, with the most recent amendment occurring in November 2016.

The winery would continue to be accessed by garbage collections trucks, emergency response trucks, and delivery and box trucks, as well as passenger vehicles driven by employees and visitors to the winery. As referenced in prior sections of this initial study, the proposed project site currently has direct access to and from Silverado Trail via an existing private access road that extends from Silverado Trail to the winery buildings and residences. The proposed project includes no off-site changes but includes on-site changes that include widening of the existing roadway to have a 20-foot wide asphalt surface, as required by the RSS. The proposed modification includes a request for an exception to the RSS to allow the two-foot wide gravel shoulder (also a requirement of by the RSS) not to be built wherever the road abuts an existing walnut tree along the road alignment, in order to preserve the root health of those mature trees. With the RSS exception, however, the minimum width of the paved road surface, as described above, would still be expanded, thereby improving the driveway to provide two full travel lanes (one per direction) for consistent access to the winery.

Only minor circulation and signage changes are proposed to be made to other service and production areas on-site, which can currently accommodate movement of large vehicles around the areas, and stormwater runoff from the additional pavement on the access road would sheet flow into the vineyard rows. In accordance with Section 4.11 of the County's standard conditions of approval, "All road improvements on private property required per Engineering Services shall be maintained in good working condition and in accordance with the Napa County Roads and Streets Standards."

The traffic study prepared for the proposed project also evaluated safety of the existing winery access point from Silverado Trail. Given posted and observed speeds along the relatively flat roadway, the study concluded that there was adequate sight and vehicle stopping distances (800 or more feet where stopping sight distance of approximately 580 feet is necessary) at the existing driveway. As previously noted, southbound traveling vehicles on Silverado Trail have an exclusive left-turn lane at the winery driveway, where they can wait in a sheltered location to make the left-turn movement toward the winery.

- f. The major modification request includes a request for the County to recognize an increase in the number of permitted parking stalls on-site, from 10 permitted parking stalls to 17 existing stalls. The requested increase in parking corresponds with the increase in employee and visitor presence on the property. The requested increase in the number of parking stalls would not have environmental impacts to water or water quality. The additional employee stalls requested to be recognized have been striped on existing, entitled impervious surfaces near the winery building. Although the proposed parking additions would not have significant environmental effects, the Planning Commission will be asked to determine whether the increase requested with the modification is consistent with General Plan policy CIR-23, which discourages permit applicants from providing unnecessary or excessive quantities of parking stalls for their uses, as part of the Commission's evaluation of the merits of the proposed use permit modification.
- g. There is currently no bus service on Silverado Trail and no long-term plans to provide such service. Existing on-street improvements at the property frontage include class 2 bike lanes on both sides of Silverado Trail, consistent with the Napa Countywide Bicycle Plan adopted by the Napa County Board of Supervisors in June 2012. The proposed project would not modify nor have any impacts on the existing bicycle facility.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII.	TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
	a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. As discussed in Section V and the background summary of this initial study, there are existing structures (Buildings D and E) on the parcel that have historic value, but neither building is proposed for demolition or modification as a result of the current use permit modification request; thus, those structures would retain their historic integrity if the present use permit request were to be approved. The County has no record of other known cultural resources on the site, and the property has a history of disturbance related to agricultural (vineyard and cattle ranching) and residential development. Invitations to representatives of local Native American tribes who have a cultural interest in the area in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 did not result in initiation of consultation and did not result in identification of any previously unknown resources on the site or in the immediate area of the proposed project site (see Section 12 of in the introductory pages of this initial study). As discussed in section V of this initial study, if any resources not previously uncovered during this prior disturbance are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the proposed project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist must be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard County conditions of approval.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b/e. As described in the Hydrology and Water Quality section of this initial study, the requested modification includes an increase in the quantity of wine currently permitted to be produced at the site, from 25,000 to 50,000 gallons of wine per year and thus, would result in a corresponding increase in the quantity of process-related wastewater generated at the winery. The proposed project includes installation of aboveground wastewater tanks and a new Lyve treatment system, as also described in Section VI of this initial study, that can provide treatment and disinfection of both process and domestic wastewater. The Lyve system is capable of treating wastewater to California Title 22 standards for recycled water, and wastewater treated in the system is proposed to be discharged via surface drip to irrigate vineyards surrounding the winery buildings. The proposed pond will also be used for storage of up to one acre-foot of recycled wastewater treated in the Lyve system. Because the property utilizes and would continue to utilize on-site facilities for on-site treatment of wastewater, no determination of service or will-serve letters from the wastewater treatment provider is necessary for the proposed project. Permitting of any modifications to the on-site septic system would be conducted by the County Environmental Health Division. The Lyve system includes continuous monitoring and is regulated by the State Regional Water Quality Control Board. The volume of wastewater generated by the requested uses would not exceed limits that would trigger permitting of the wastewater treatment system by the State Regional Water Quality Control Board.

c/d. The winery facilities are currently equipped with a manual diversion valve located in the area of the crush pad, which allows the winery operator to divert stormwater runoff from the storm drain system to the process wastewater treatment system during crush and following the first rains of the season, so as to minimize contamination to the storm drain system. To comply fully with current regulations for stormwater quality preservation, the winery operator is required to maintain its Industrial General Permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board in order to ensure that winery operations, including maintenance and operation of the manual diversion valve, meet minimum water quality standards at all times. New impervious surfaces proposed with the project are limited to the foundations planned for the new water and wastewater system tanks, which areas are estimated at fewer than 2,000 square feet. (This area would be reduced roughly by half, in the event that the wastewater system tanks are installed inside of the existing silos on the property rather than on new concrete foundations.) Due to their small size, these new foundations could drain runoff into their respective, surrounding vegetated areas, and with fewer than 2,500 square feet of new impervious surface associated with the project, no specific stormwater quality or control measures are required, and no significant stormwater quality impacts are anticipated to occur as a result of the project. (See also Section VI, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this initial study, and Section III, Air Quality, for discussion of potential environmental impacts and standard conditions related to project construction.)

d. As discussed in additional detail in Section IX, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this initial study, water usage under the requested use permit modification is estimated to increase from 0.9 acre-feet to 2.3 acre-feet of water per year. Combined with existing

permitted uses on the property, groundwater demands of the winery's modification are estimated to be within normal and drought year groundwater recharge rates, before accounting for any potential reductions in water demands as a result of reuse of treated process wastewater for vineyard irrigation, and potentially, import of an increased quantity of reclaimed water from the town of Yountville. The winery, as proposed with this modification request, would utilize existing wells for potable and irrigation water; no new wells would be drilled in association with this use permit modification request.

f/g. Non-recyclable and non-organic waste generated by winery operations is and will continue to be collected by the Upper Valley Disposal Service and ultimately deposited at the Clover Flat Landfill located in Calistoga. According to information on the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (www.calrecycle.ca.gov), Clover Flat has adequate capacity remaining to accommodate any non-recyclable and non-organic waste generated from the businesses. More specifically, the landfill has a permitted capacity of 4.9 million cubic yards, and as of 2014, had over 40 percent of its permitted capacity remaining with an anticipated closure date in 2047. The Greenhouse Gas Best Management Practices checklist that the applicant submitted with the use permit modification indicated that the winery operator intends to reduce its waste stream from typical operations by striving to recycle 75 percent of all waste, and that the operator will continue to compost 75 percent of food and garden material (Napa County GHG Checklist BMP-17 and BMP 18).

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. The Regusci Winery property has been previously developed and disturbed with winery buildings, residential and accessory structures, and vineyards. Expansion of development into the undeveloped portions of the property is limited to installation of a water tank on the hillside east of the winery buildings. Other improvements, including widening of the access driveway and installation of a recycled water pond, would occur within the footprint of previously graded and disturbed areas on the winery property. The currently-proposed project generally includes a request for the County to allow an increase in annual wine production; recognize an existing, noncompliant, winery employee count; recognize a noncompliant visitation program; and re-purpose existing winery production spaces for winery accessory uses, none of which require significant physical changes to the winery facilities other than striping of new parking stalls and on-site circulation signage improvements. As previously described, none of the proposed site modifications would be subject to creek setbacks nor likely to disturb any sensitive species, as no building demolition or native tree or habitat removal is associated with the project. Existing, 19th century historic structures on the property reflect the wine history of the Napa Valley and would be retained with the proposed project.
- b. The proposed project would have the effect of increasing water usage of the winery, although estimated water usage would continue to support winemaking activities and the overall continued use of the property for agricultural purposes, and estimated water use is not anticipated to exceed groundwater recharge rates during normal and dry years. Likewise, the approval of the requested modification would permit continuation of existing traffic generation from the winery's current, though unpermitted employee and visitation numbers. The project's traffic contributions to studied road segments and intersection minor approaches, other than the project access drive, would not exceed five percent of projected traffic volumes in the long-term horizon and so, would be cumulatively less than significant. Noise and air quality impacts associated with construction of building and site improvements

would be temporary in nature, and so would also be less than significant. Operational noise and air quality impacts are also anticipated to be less than significant due to the limited scope of new on-site construction, the distance to the closest sensitive receptors (off-site single-family residence), and the small size of the winery's hospitality facilities.

- c. There are no schools, hospitals or residences housing potentially sensitive receptors within a half-mile of any of the proposed improvements (access road and recycled water pond) associated with the winery's requested modification. Noise from construction that would occur with installation of the proposed site improvements would be temporary, lasting approximately four weeks; would be limited to day time hours, in accordance with standard County conditions of approval; and would be subject to best management practices intended to limit fugitive dust and protect stormwater quality, also in accordance with standard conditions. Ongoing operations of the winery and its events are also anticipated to have less than significant noise impacts on nearby residences, due to distance between those residences and the proposed outdoor tasting areas and with compliance with project-specific and standard County conditions of approval imposing restrictions on design and utilization of exterior lighting. (See Sections I and VII of this initial study.)

Mitigation Measures: None required.
