

“C”

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative
Declaration

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

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated October 2016)

1. **Project Title:** Aloft Winery, Use Permit P16-00429 and Exception to the Napa County Road & Street Standards
2. **Property Owner:** Cold Springs Limited Partnership; C/O Peter Mondavi Jr.; P.O. Box 191; St. Helena, CA 95474
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Charlene Gallina, Supervising Planner; (707) 299-1355; charlene.gallina@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and APN:** The project is located on two parcels that are approximately 58.58 acres combined on the west side of the terminus of Cold Springs Road about one-half mile south of its intersection with Las Posadas Road. 430 Cold Springs Road, Angwin, CA 94558; APN 024-340-010 (50.07 acres) & APN 024-340-011 (8.51 acres)
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Janice & Marc Mondavi; P.O. Box 342; St. Helena, CA 94574; (707) 481-4323; Janicemondavi@gmail.com
6. **Representative:** Donna Oldford, Plans4Wine; 2620 Pinot Way; St. Helena, CA 94574; (707) 963-5832; DBOldford@aol.com
7. **General Plan description:** Agriculture, Watershed, & Open Space (AWOS)
8. **Zoning:** Agricultural Watershed (AW)
9. **Background/Project History:**

APN 024-340-011 is approximately 8.51 acres and is currently developed with two residences, a garage, and a pond and provides access to the larger parcel (APN 024-340-010) through an existing easement and gravel access varying in slopes and widths approximately 3,200 feet long. There is a channelized stream within the area, which flows into the pond located on this parcel. An existing well and wastewater dispersal system is located on this parcel and currently serves the existing residences. The existing well and dispersion system will remain separate from the proposed winery wastewater system(s) and are not proposed to be modified as part of this permit.

APN 024-340-010 is approximately 50.07 acres and is currently developed with 23.2+/- acres of vineyards, access roads, and three storm water infiltration/detention basins. An existing well is located on this parcel for vineyard irrigation purposes.

On May 9, 2005, Timber Harvest Plan 1-03-187 NAP and Timber Conversion Permit No. 525 was approved by the California Department of Forestry and Fire (CDF) Protection for the conversion of timberland into a 31.44-acre vineyard. A Mitigation Negative Declaration prepared by CFD was adopted for this approval.

On May 20, 2005, ECP 03454 was approved by the Conservation, Development and Planning Department as part of a phased vineyard, which consisted of 23.12 acres (Phase 1).

On October 19, 2005, Use Permit P05-00157-UP was approved by the Planning Commission to permit an 8.43 acre vineyard and associated improvements with Erosion Control Plan P05-0158-ECPA (Phase 2) totaling 31.55 acres for APN 024-340-010. Through this approval the additional vineyard was also granted an exception to the County Conservation Regulations to allow the vineyard project to exceed the vegetation retention requirements. Section 18.108.027B requires retention of 60% of tree canopy cover existing on the subject parcel as it was configured on June 1, 1993. In 1993, the subject parcel, then known as APN 024-340-008 was 57.8 acres in size. Based upon this approval, the total conversion of 31.55 acres resulted in the retention of only 45% of the tree canopy existing on the 57.8-acre parcel configuration allowing 55% of the existing tree canopy to be converted to vineyard. The County utilized the MND and the mitigation monitoring and reporting program adopted by CFD for this approval.

10. **Project Description:**

Approval of a Use Permit to allow the construction of a new 50,000-gallon winery with the following characteristics:

- a) Construction of an approximately 5,562 sf hospitality building (West portal, built into the hillside with access to the cave) including a

- commercial kitchen;
- b) Construction of an approximately 28,107 sf cave for wine production and storage;
- c) Construction of an approximately 3,888 sf South Portal Structure/Mechanical/Equipment Structure (includes a 630 sf outdoor covered crush pad);
- d) Construction of a 3,000 sf outdoor patio area;
- e) Installation of 12 parking spaces;
- f) Tours and tastings by appointment only with a maximum of 20 visitors per day and a weekly maximum of 80 visitors, food and wine pairings to be included;
- g) An annual marketing program of two (2) events per month with a maximum of 40 persons, four (4) events per year with a maximum of 75 persons, and two (2) events per year with a maximum of 125 persons. Events to be scheduled between 10 am and 6 pm, or from 6 pm to 10 pm;
- h) On premise consumption of wines produced on-site within the outdoor patio area and hospitality building designated tasting areas in accordance with Business and Professions Code Sections 23358, 23390 and 23396.5 (AB2004-Evans Bill);
- i) Six (6) full-time and two (2) part-time employees; two (2) seasonal (harvest) employees;
- j) Hours of operation daily 6 am – 6 pm (Non-harvest production hours) and 10 am – 6 pm (Visitation);
- k) Installation of a wastewater system;
- l) Installation of a public water system;
- m) Installation of a stone winery sign and steel framed-wood entry gate;
- n) Installation of a 100,000 gallon fire protection storage tank, a 80,000 and a 20,000 gallon domestic water storage tank; and
- o) All project spoils and rocks generated from construction activities to be disposed on-site through stockpiling and/or integrated into project design features.

The project also includes an exception to the Napa County Roads & Street Standards (NCRSS) to allow for a reduced commercial driveway width for 305 feet of the driveway located at approximately STA 8+75 to STA 11+80. All other portions of the driveway will be improved to conform to the commercial roadway requirements as outlined in the NCRSS. An existing wood frame cottage will be demolished for installation this driveway.

11. Environmental setting and surrounding land uses:

The 58.58 acre combined parcel is located within the AW zoning district is located on the west side of the terminus of Cold Springs Road about one-half mile south of its intersection with Las Posadas Road and approximately eight miles northeast of St. Helena. APN 024-340-011 is currently developed with two residences, a garage, and a pond and provides access to the larger parcel (APN 024-340-010) through an existing easement and gravel access varying in slopes and widths approximately 3,200 feet long. An existing well and wastewater dispersal system is located on this parcel and currently serves the existing residences. The existing well and dispersion system will remain separate from the proposed winery wastewater system(s), and not proposed to be modified as part of this permit. APN 024-340-010 is currently developed with 23.2+/- acres of vineyards, which yields approximately 24% of the grapes for wine production which represents approximately 14 out haul grape trucks per year, access roads, and three storm water infiltration/detention basins. An existing well is located on this parcel for vineyard irrigation purposes.

The project site is situated on moderately sloping land. Where underdeveloped, vegetation includes scrub oak, bay trees, Douglas-fir, and madrone. The project site is located in a High Fire Hazard Severity zone and is within the State Responsibility Area (SRA). The geology of the area consists of pumiceous ash-flow tuff from the Sonoma Volcanics Group. This geologic deposit dates to the Miocene (23-5.3 million years ago) and Pliocene (5.3-2.5 million years ago) epochs. Soils types are Forward gravelly loam nine to 30 percent slopes and 30 to 75 percent slopes. The closest named water source is Conn Creek, which is located approximately 853 feet west of the site. There is a channelized stream within the area, which flows into the pond located on APN 024-340-011. Both parcels are located within the Lake Hennessey drainage, which is designated as a sensitive domestic water supply. Given this designation, proposed development is subject to Section 18.108.027 – Sensitive Domestic Water Supply Drainages of the County Conservation Regulations. The project site is not a FEMA designated flood zone.

The property is surrounded by open space, rural residential, winery, and agricultural (vineyards) uses. It should be noted that the County is currently processing an Erosion Control Plan (P14-00410) and preparing a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the LeColline, LLC property located on APNs 024-300-070, 024-300-071, 024-300-072 and 024-340-001. The project involves development of approximately 25 net acres of vineyard within 33.8 gross acres on the approximately 92-acre property. Furthermore, a Timber Harvest Plan (THP) and a Timber Conversion Plan (TCP) for the proposed project will be prepared by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE).

The nearest residence to the project site is approximately 861.6 feet to the east of the proposed hospitality building (West portal, built into the hillside with access to the cave) and 805 feet east of the South Portal/Mechanical/Equipment Structures. Furthermore, the nearest residence to the proposed driveway is approximately 218 feet to the north.

12. **Other agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).
The project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County, including but not limited to building permits, grading permits, waste disposal permits, and an encroachment permit, in addition to CalFire. Permits may also be required by the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, & Firearms.

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
California Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW)
Regional Water Quality Control Board
California Department of Forestry and Fire (CDF)

Other Agencies Contacted

Federal Trade and Taxation Bureau
Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control

13. **Tribal Cultural Resources. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?**

On November 21, 2017, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to 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. One response was received on December 13, 2017 from the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation requesting a copy of the cultural resource study and historical resources study which was sent on February 26, 2018 with a request for additional information or further discussion by close of business March 28, 2018. Staff did not receive a response within that time and forward a letter on April 4, 2018 identifying that the consultation proceedings with the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation had concluded. On April 12, 2018, the County received a letter dated April 5, 2018 from the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation indicating that they were not aware for any known cultural resources near the project site and a cultural monitor was not needed. However, it was recommended that a cultural sensitivity training for any pre-project personnel be provided by the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation prior to start of project construction.

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.

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.

Charlene Gallina

Charlene Gallina, Supervising Planner
Napa County Planning, Building, and Environmental Services

August 2, 2018

Date

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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:

a-c. Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms, geological features, water, trees and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of a beautiful or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken-in. As generally described in the **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses** section, above, this area is defined by rural residential uses within forested areas and vineyards.

The project would not result in a substantial damage to scenic resources or substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The project site is currently developed with vineyards, which yields approximately 24% of the grapes for wine production. Approximately 47 trees will be removed as a result of relocating the driveway off Cold Springs Road (approximately 18 trees), widening a portion of the road approximately 10 feet (approximately 15 trees and brush) and removing some trees within the existing vineyard (approximately 14 trees). Of the trees proposed to be removed, seven (7) trees have been identified as either Black Oak (three) or Live Oak (four) trees. The remaining 40 trees are as follows: one Bay, 26 Douglas Fir, 11 Madrone, 1 Maple and 1 Pine. Through construction of the winery, the vineyard area will be reduced from 23.2+/- acres to approximately 20.9+/- acres. There are no rock outcroppings visible from the road or other designated scenic resources on the property. Cold Springs Road is not identified as a Viewshed Road. However, the County's Viewshed Protection Program is not applicable to the proposed project as no construction is proposed on slopes in excess of 15 percent. Because there is minimal visual impact from the road or neighboring residences, there is a less than significant impact to a scenic vista.

d. Hours of operation of the winery for visitation purposes are proposed 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., seven days a week. Evening marketing events will commence no earlier than 6:00 p.m. and will be concluded by 10:00 p.m. The closest off-site sensitive receptor (a residence) to light and glare is approximately 861 feet from the proposed hospitality building and 805 feet from the production building of the winery. Vineyards will be located between the proposed winery and the residence thereby providing a screen barrier to any off-site views, thus, the project will not have a significant potential to result in lighting impacts. The proposed winery use, if approved, would be subject to the County's standard condition of approval for wineries that limits the amount of 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 as low to the ground as possible and include shields to deflect the light downward. Avoidance of highly reflective surfaces would be required, as well, by the County's standard condition. This condition would apply to all winery activities (excluding harvest), including any events that would occur within the outdoors patio and/or parking areas. Pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approval for wineries, outdoor lighting would be required to be shielded and directed downwards, with only low-level lighting allowed in parking areas. As subject to the standard conditions of approval, below, the project would not have a significant impact resulting from new sources of outside lighting.

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.

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.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b/e. The project site is designated as "Prime Farmland," "Farmland of Statewide Importance," and "Other Land." However, the proposed improvements would occur within the portion of the site designated as "Other Land." Accordingly, implementation of the project would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on the Napa County Important Farmland Map 2002 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. There is no existing Williamson Act agricultural contract on the property. There are no other changes included in this proposal that would result in the conversion of Farmland. General Plan designation Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space and Land Use policies AG/LU-2 and AG/LU-13 recognize wineries, and any use consistent with the Winery Definition Ordinance and clearly accessory to a winery, as agriculture. As a result, this application would not result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use.

c/d. The project site is zoned AW, which allow wineries upon grant of a use permit. According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps (based on the following layers – Sensitive Biotic Oak Woodlands, Riparian Woodland Forest and Coniferous Forest) the project site contains no sensitive woodland or forested areas. In 2005, a Timber Harvest Plan and Timber Conversion was approved by the California Department of Forestry and Fire (CDF) Protection, as well as, an Erosion Control Plan and an exception to the Conservation Regulations

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.

was approved by the Napa County for the conversion of timberland into a 31.55-acre vineyard. Based upon this approval, the total conversion of 31.55 acres resulted in the retention of only 45% of the tree canopy existing on the 57.8-acre parcel configuration allowing 55% of the existing tree canopy to be converted to vineyard. As proposed, a total of 47 additional trees will be removed from both parcels as a result of winery construction and driveway access improvements. Through construction of the winery, the vineyard area will be reduced from 23.2+/- acres to approximately 20.9+/- acres. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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's (BAAQMD) Board of Directors unanimously adopted thresholds of significance to assist in the review of projects under the California Environmental Quality Act. These Thresholds are designed to establish the level at which BAAQMD believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA and were posted on BAAQMD's website and included in BAAQMD's updated CEQA Guidelines (updated May 2012). The Thresholds are advisory and may be followed by local agencies at their own 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 Thresholds 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.

a-c. The mountains bordering Napa Valley block much of the prevailing northwesterly winds throughout the year. Sunshine is plentiful in Napa County, and summertime can be very warm in the valley, particularly in the northern end. Winters are usually mild, with cool temperatures overnight and mild-to-moderate temperatures during the day. Wintertime temperatures tend to be slightly cooler in the northern end of the

valley. Winds are generally calm throughout the county. Annual precipitation averages range from about 24 inches in low elevations to more than 40 inches in the mountains.

Ozone and fine particle pollution, or PM2.5, are the major regional air pollutants of concern in the San Francisco Bay Area. Ozone is primarily a problem in the summer, and fine particle pollution in the winter. In Napa County, ozone rarely exceeds health standards, but PM2.5 occasionally does reach unhealthy concentrations. There are multiple reasons for PM2.5 exceedances in Napa County. First, much of the county is wind-sheltered, which tends to trap PM2.5 within the Napa Valley. Second, much of the area is well north of the moderating temperatures of San Pablo Bay and, as a result, Napa County experiences some of the coldest nights in the Bay Area. This leads to greater fireplace use and, in turn, higher PM2.5 levels. Finally, in the winter easterly winds often move fine-particle-laden air from the Central Valley to the Carquinez Strait and then into western Solano and southern Napa County (BAAQMD, *In Your Community: Napa County*, April 2016).

The impacts associated with implementation of the project were evaluated consistent with guidance provided by BAAQMD. Ambient air quality standards have been established by state and federal environmental agencies for specific air pollutants most pervasive in urban environments. These pollutants are referred to as criteria air pollutants because the standards established for them were developed to meet specific health and welfare criteria set forth in the enabling legislation. The criteria air pollutants emitted by development, traffic and other activities anticipated under the proposed development include ozone, ozone precursors oxides of nitrogen and reactive organic gases (NOx and ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO2), and suspended particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5). Other criteria pollutants, such as lead and sulfur dioxide (SO2), would not be substantially emitted by the proposed development or traffic, and air quality standards for them are being met throughout the Bay Area.

BAAQMD has not officially recommended the use of its thresholds in CEQA analyses and CEQA ultimately allows lead agencies the discretion to determine whether a particular environmental impact would be considered significant, as evidenced by scientific or other factual data. BAAQMD also states that lead agencies need to determine appropriate air quality thresholds to use for each project they review based on substantial evidence that they include in the administrative record of the CEQA document. One resource BAAQMD provides, as a reference for determining appropriate thresholds, is the *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines* developed by its staff in 2010 and as updated through May 2017. These guidelines outline substantial evidence supporting a variety of thresholds of significance.

As mentioned above, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Operational-Related Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursors Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017.

Because approximately 5,562 sf hospitality building, a 3,888 sf production/mechanical/equipment structure, and a 28,107 sf cave is proposed when compared to the BAAQMD's screening criteria of 541,000 sf for general industrial, and compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47,000 sf for high quality restaurant, the project would not significantly impact air quality and does not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2017 Pages 3-2 & 3-3.) Given the size of the entire project, which is approximately 37,557 sf of proposed enclosed floor area (hospitality, winery building and cave) compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47ksf (high quality restaurant) and 541ksf (general light industry) for NOx (oxides of nitrogen), the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. (Please note: a high quality restaurant is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, but grossly overstates emissions associated with other portions of a winery, such as office, barrel storage and production, which generate fewer vehicle trips. Therefore, a general light industry comparison has also been used for other such uses.)

The project falls well below the screening criteria as noted above, and consequently will not significantly affect air quality individually or contribute considerably to any cumulative air quality impacts.

- d. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from earthmoving and construction activities required for project construction. Earthmoving and construction emissions would have a temporary effect, consisting mainly of dust generated during grading and other construction activities, exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles, and relatively minor emissions from paints and other architectural coatings. The Air District recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction impacts. If the proposed project adheres to these relevant best management practices identified by the Air District and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts are considered less than significant:

7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

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:

1. 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.
2. Water all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) two times per day.
3. Cover all haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site.
4. Remove all visible mud or dirt traced onto adjacent public roads by using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
5. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
6. 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.
7. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting off equipment when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five (5) minutes (as required by State Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
8. 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/perpfact_04-16-15.pdf or the PERP website <http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/portable.htm>.

Furthermore, while earthmoving and construction on the site would 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 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

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 mph.

- e. While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. The nearest residence to the project site is approximately 855 feet to the northeast of the existing winery structures and operations and approximately 861.6 feet to the east of the proposed hospitality building (West portal, built into the hillside with access to the cave) and 805 feet east of the South Portal/Mechanical/Equipment Structures. Furthermore, the nearest residence to proposed driveway improvements would be approximately 218 feet to the north and may result in a short-term impact to this neighbor during construction activities. Construction-phase pollutants would be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. The project would not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. 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
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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/b. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers - plants California Native Plant Society (CNPS) points & polygons, plant surveys, red legged frog core area and critical habitat, vernal pools & vernal pool species, Spotted Owl Habitat – 1.5 mile buffer and known fish presence) the only known candidate, sensitive, or special status species identified as occurring near or within the project boundaries are the Napa False Indigo special status plant and the northern spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis caurina* or NSOs).

According to the biological resources assessment prepared for the project (*Special-Status Plant Review, dated June 2017 and Replanting and the Mitigation Plan Napa False Indigo dated January 8, 2018 both prepared by Kjeldsen Biological Consulting*) revealed that Napa False Indigo (*Amorpha californica var. napensis*) is present on the property. Napa False Indigo is a CNPS List 1B, which are rare throughout their range with the majority endemic to California. The plants were found along the existing entrance road specifically on a north-facing slope where the access road is required to be widened adjacent to the pond to meet Napa County Roads & Street Standards. The assessment also identified that there are significant populations on the property outside of the proposed project site and survey area. It is estimated that approximately 0.5% of the population (approximately five plants) on the property would be directly impacted as a result of the road being widened adjacent to the pond located on APN 024-340-011. As indicated in the *Replanting and the Mitigation Plan False Indigo dated January 8, 2018*, "A goal of not net loss is proposed. Mitigation for the loss of Napa False Indigo is proposed to be accomplished by seed harvest and plant salvage. It is proposed that seed be gathered and plants be salvaged from the project site." As identified in this Plan, the salvaged plants will be replanted on the slope above the project area and the harvested seed was gathered on October 26, 2017. This seed will be scattered on the cut bank of the project site. The alternative of acquiring nursery stock or germinated seed stock would extend the replacement-planting establishment for at least one year. The biological assessment revealed that there were no other sensitive or special status species associated with the pond or channelized stream located on the property (APN 024-340-011). Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-1 would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level of less than significant.

Furthermore, an assessment for the Northern Spotted Owls (NSO) was prepared for the project was prepared by Forest Ecosystem Management, dated April 28, 2017 and revised July 24, 2018 as a result of proposed tree removal and further refined in the Tree Removal Exhibit prepared by Bartelt Engineering on November 2017. Approximately 47 trees and brush will be removed as a result of relocating the driveway off Cold Springs Road (Site 1 – Road Relocation; approximately 18 trees), widening a portion of the road approximately 10 feet (Site 2 – Road Widening; approximately 15 trees and brush) and removing some trees within the existing vineyard (Site 3 – Winery Location; approximately 14 trees). Of the trees proposed to be removed, seven (7) trees have been identified as either Black Oak (three) or Live Oak (four) trees. The remaining 40 trees are as follows: one Bay, 26 Douglas Fir, 11 Madrone, 1 Maple and 1 Pine. The NSO assessment revealed that the closest known northern spotted owl habitat is within ¼ mile (or over 3,000 feet) from the project site, specifically Site 3 – Winery Location.

As for Site 1, this area was classified as nesting/roosting NSO habitat, however, due to numerous houses, Cold Springs Road, surrounding vineyards, and size of forested patch this area was classified as a marginal NSO roosting habitat, as long as tree removal was completed by February 1, 2019. Site 2 was classified as a not suitable habitat area due to the proximity to the road, however, beyond the project site, the habitat would be classified as marginal foraging habitat, as long as tree removal was completed by February 1, 2019. Lastly, the assessment revealed that Site 3 should be subject to seasonal restrictions (February 1, 2018 - July 7, 2018) "due to unsuitable habitat within the site, but suitable habitat within ¼ mile but current NSO surveys", as long as tree removal has been completed by February 1, 2019. If operations have not been completed by February 1, 2019, either surveys would be required or seasonal restrictions would apply

again. Therefore, any tree removal beyond this date should be subject to additional surveys. Implementation of mitigation measure BIO-2 would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level of less than significant.

c/d. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – water bodies, vernal pools & vernal pool species) there are no wetlands on or near the property that would be affected by this project. The project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or within their corridors or nursery sites. As mentioned above, the project site is primarily developed with vineyard and exhibits little quality habitat.

e. The proposed project is subject to and as conditioned would comply with Section 18.108.27(B) of the Napa County Zoning Code (Sensitive domestic water supply drainages – Vegetation Clearing), which require a minimum of 60% of the tree canopy and a minimum of 40% of the grass/brush cover existing on the parcel in 1993 is required to be retained as part of the project. In 1993, the subject parcel, then known as APN 024-340-008 was 57.8 acres in size. On October 19, 2005, Use Permit P05-00157-UP was approved by the Planning Commission to permit an 8.43 acre vineyard and associated improvements with Erosion Control Plan P05-0158-ECPA (Phase 2) totaling 31.55 acres for APN 024-340-010. Through this approval, the additional vineyard was also granted an exception to the County Conservation Regulations. Based upon this approval, the total conversion of 31.55 acres resulted in the retention of only 45% of the tree canopy existing on the 57.8-acre parcel configuration allowing 55% of the existing tree canopy to be converted to vineyard. The Aloft Project Engineer submitted a 60/40 Exhibit providing a summary of the actual tree canopy approved as part of the parcel's vineyard development, existing conditions as of 2017 and proposed canopy to be removed as part of the proposed winery. This analysis revealed that 54.6% (or 31.55+/- acres) was actually approved with the ECP authorization. After vineyard development, it was calculated that 54.2% (or 31.34+/- acres) of the tree canopy was actually converted to vineyard, which has the effect of leaving a balance of approximately 0.4 acres of tree canopy. With implementation of the winery project, 0.16+/- acres or 0.03% of the tree canopy will be removed resulting in a total of 54.5% (or 31.50+/- acres) to be removed from the project site. Through construction of the winery, the vineyard area will be reduced from 23.2+/- to approximately 20.9+/- acres. Given this analysis, the proposed removal of an additional 0.16 acres of tree canopy is within the 55% authorized for removal and under the Use Permit Exception to the Conservation Regulations. Therefore an exception to the Conservation Regulations to allow for the removal of the additional 0.16 acres of tree canopy is not require. Of the trees proposed to be removed, seven (7) trees have been identified as either Black Oak (three) or Live Oak (four) trees. The remaining 40 trees are as follows: one Bay, 26 Douglas Fir, 11 Madrone, 1 Maple and 1 Pine.

According to the proposed landscape plans, the replacement program consists of a variety of trees, bushes, and ground cover. Of the tree varietal, 22 Blue Oak trees (24 inches box), 10 Swan Hill Olive trees (15 inch box) and 8 Pinemat Manzanita trees (15 inch box) will be planted on-site near the winery. Based upon this replacement plan for removal of the project site trees, including Oak trees, the project is designed to adhere to the Napa County's 2:1 replacement ratio for replacement of lost oak woodlands or preservation of like habitat when retention of existing vegetation is found to be infeasible consistent with General Plan Policy CON-24(c). Furthermore, any removal of conifer trees on this project would require the submittal of a less than 3 acre Conversion Exemption Application with the California Department of Forestry and Fire (CDF) Protection. Therefore, a condition of approval will be placed on the project requiring verification of final action on this application prior to the issuance of grading or building permit. Therefore, implementation of mitigation measure BIO-3, the applicant's proposed tree replacement program and submittal of verification from CDF would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level of less than significant.

f. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans because there are no plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures:

MM BIO-1: Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit for conducting any ground-disturbing activities associated with the road being widen adjacent to the pond located on APN 024-340-011, the *Replanting and Mitigation Plan for the Napa False Indigo, dated January 8, 2018 as prepared by Kjeldsen Biological Consulting*, shall be implemented. Other locations of the Napa False Indigo populations located on APN 024-340-010 and in close proximity to project construction activities shall be clearly identified in the field by staking, flagging or fencing.

Monitoring: To ensure a successful revegetation effort, all transplants shall be monitored and maintained as necessary for a minimum of five years. If the mitigation fails, a search for nursery potted stock will be secure as replacement. A report shall be filed with the Napa County Planning Division at the end of each monitoring period. Monitoring shall be conducted in the fall a year following planting. Monitoring reports should be submitted to the Napa County Planning Division by November 1 of each year.

MM BIO-2: Tree removal for protection of the Northern Spotted Owl (NSO) shall occur as follows: Site 1 (Road Relocation) shall be completed by February 1, 2019; Site 2 (Road Widening) shall be completed by February 1, 2019; and Site 3 (Winery Location) shall be completed by and subject to seasonal restrictions (February 1, 2019 - July 7, 2019). If operations have not been completed by February 1, 2019, additional surveys shall be completed.

Monitoring: If trees are to be removed outside of the dates listed above, the pre-construction Northern Spotted Owl (NSO) survey in conjunction the Protocol for Surveying Proposed Management Activities That May Impact Northern Spotted Owls dated February 2, 2011, as Revised January 9, 2012 shall be submitted to Planning Division staff prior to issuance of the grading permit.

MM BIO-3: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, a final tree removal plan shall be prepared by a certified arborist.

Monitoring: The final tree removal plan shall be submitted for review and approval to Planning Division staff with recommendations prior to issuance of the grading permit.

	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:

a-c. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology surveys, sites, sensitive areas, and flags) no historic sites have been identified on the property. Based on the Historical Resources Study of the Property, dated May 19, 2017 and conducted by Tom Origer & Associates, one isolated obsidian biface was identified and determined not to be a significant resource. Furthermore, a single room cinderblock/stone building, a swimming pool and a small tank house, which was likely built around the 1960's and 1970's was identified and determined not to be a significant resource. Furthermore, a Historical Review was prepared for the project by Juliana Inman, Architect, dated September 7, 2017 to determine whether or not the wood frame cottage on APN 024-340-011 (the 8.51 acre residential parcel) qualified as a historical resource and whether the structure retained integrity under CEQA regulations, since the existing structure will be demolished for the installation of the project driveway. The historical review concluded that the existing structure did not qualify as a historic resource and recommended that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Building should not be applied to this site.

Should cultural resources be found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would 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.

- d. No human remains have been encountered on the property and no information has been encountered that would indicate that this project would encounter human remains. Most construction activities would occur on previously disturbed portions of the site given the planting of existing vineyard. However, if resources are found during project grading, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard condition of approval noted above. 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
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"/>
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.
- i.) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.
 - ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project would be required to comply with the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
 - iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.
 - iv.) According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) there are known landslide areas (scarps) located in the southwest corner of the subject site. A Landslide Hazard Evaluation and a Geotechnical Engineering Study was prepared by Condor Earth Technologies, Inc., dated December 11, 2015 and September 22, 2016, respectively and concluded that the proposed winery development and road improvements would not be impacted by this landslide area.

- b. The proposed improvements would occur on slopes of five percent to 15 percent. The project would require incorporation of best management practices and would be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance, which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c/d. The following soil types are present at the subject site: (1) Forward gravelly loam 9 to 30 percent slopes, and (2) Forward gravelly loam 30 to 75 percent slopes. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the improvements are proposed for an area which has a very low susceptibility for liquefaction. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. According to the Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study prepared by Bartelt Engineering in May 2017, the project site and proposed system has adequate disposal capacity to serve the project. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings. 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
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:

Napa County has been working to develop a Climate Action Plan (CAP) for several years. In 2012, a Draft CAP (March 2012) was recommended using the emissions checklist in the Draft CAP, on a trial basis, to determine potential greenhouse gas (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 greenhouse gas, 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: i) account for present day conditions and modeling assumptions (such as but not limited to methods, emission factors, and data sources), ii) address the concerns with the previous CAP effort as outlined above, iii) meet applicable State requirements, and iv) 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 #1: 2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016. This initial phase included: i) updating the unincorporated County's community-wide GHG emissions inventory to 2014, and ii) preparing new GHG emissions forecasts for the 2020, 2030, and 2050 horizons. Additional information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or <http://www.countyofnapa.org/CAP/>.

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

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

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

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

For the purposes of this analysis potential GHG emissions associated with winery ‘construction’ and ‘development’ and with ‘ongoing’ winery operations have been discussed.

GHGs are the atmospheric gases whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for the greenhouse effect, including carbon dioxide, methane, ozone, and the fluorocarbons, that contribute to climate change (a widely accepted theory/science explain human effects on the atmosphere). Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) gas, the principal greenhouse gas (GHG) being emitted by human activities, and whose concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity, also serves as the reference gas to compare other greenhouse gases. Agricultural sources of carbon emissions include forest clearing, land-use changes, biomass burning, and farm equipment and management activity emissions (http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/glossary/letter_c.html). Equivalent Carbon Dioxide (CO₂e) is the most commonly reported type of GHG emission and a way to get one number that approximates total emissions from all the different gases that contribute to GHG (BAAMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2017). In this case, carbon dioxide (CO₂) is used as the reference atom/compound to obtain atmospheric carbon CO₂ effects of GHG. Carbon stocks are converted to carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e) by multiplying the carbon total by 44/12 (or 3.67), which is the ratio of the atomic mass of a carbon dioxide molecule to the atomic mass of a carbon atom (<http://www.nciasi2.org/COLE/index.html>).

One time “Construction Emissions” associated with a winery development project include: i) the carbon stocks that are lost (or released) when existing vegetation is removed and soil is ripped in preparation for a new winery structure and associated infrastructure; and ii) emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area and construct a winery, 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 any proposed existing vegetation to be removed. As previously stated, this project includes minimal vineyard removal, construction of a hospitality building (west portal, built into the hillside with access to the cave), a cave, the south portal production/mechanical/equipment building, as well as, improvements to an existing private driveway to access Cold Springs Road.

In addition to the one time Construction Emissions, “Operational Emissions” of the winery are also considered and include: i) any reduction in the amount of carbon sequestered by existing vegetation that is removed as part of the project compared to a “no project” scenario (hereinafter referred to as Operational Sequestration Emissions); and ii) ongoing emissions from the energy used to maintain and operate the winery, including vehicle trips associated with employee and visitor trips (hereinafter referred to as Operational Emissions). 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.

As discussed in the Air Quality Section of this Initial Study, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 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, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. Because approximately 5,562 sf hospitality building (west portal, built into the hillside with access to the cave), a 3,888 sf south portal production/mechanical/equipment structure, and a 28,107 sf cave is proposed when compared to the BAAQMD’s GHG screening criteria of 121,000 sf for general industrial, and compared to the BAAQMD’s screening criterion of 9,000 sf. for high quality restaurant, the project was determined not to exceed the 1,100 MT of CO₂e/yr GHG threshold of significance.

Furthermore, the applicant proposes to implement the following voluntary GHG reduction methods with the project: installation of rooftop solar panels; planting of additional new trees and vegetation; exceed Title 24 energy efficient standard building to Calgreen Tier 2; implementation of a Transportation Demand Management Plan; installation of solar hot water heating system; installation of energy conserving lighting; installation of a cool/green roof; installation of water efficient fixtures; application of low impact development; installation of water efficient landscape in compliance with the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (WELO); implementation of a program that recycles 75% of all waste and composts 75% food and garden material; implementation of a sustainable purchasing and shipping program; incorporate the planting of shade trees into project landscaping; and install electric vehicle charging stations. Through design of the project, the applicant has limited the amount of grading and tree removal to the maximum extent feasible, as well as, oriented and designed the site to optimize conditions for natural heating, cooling and day lighting of interior space to maximize winery winter sun

exposure, including proposing the construction of a cave. As part of this project, the applicant intends to become certified as a Napa Green Winery and Napa Green Land, as well as, implement the use of recycled materials, provide education to staff and visitors on sustainable practices, use 70-80% cover crop, and retain biomass removed via pruning and thinning by chipping the material and reusing versus burning on-site.

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

As indicated above, the County is currently preparing a CAP and as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP has released Final Technical Memorandum #1 (2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016). Table 1 of the Technical Memorandum indicates that 2% of the County's GHG emissions in 2014 were a result of land use change.

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
	a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts utilized in typical winery operations. A business plan would be filed with the Environmental Health Division should hazardous materials reach reportable levels. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. Hazardous materials such as diesel, maintenance fluids, and paints would be used onsite during construction. Should they be stored onsite, these materials would be stored in secure locations to reduce the potential for upset or accident conditions. The proposed project consists of a new 50,000-gallon winery that would not be expected to use any substantial quantities of hazardous materials. Therefore, it would not be reasonably foreseeable for the proposed project to create upset or accident conditions that involve the release of hazardous materials into the environments. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the existing winery building. According to Google Earth, the nearest schools to the project site is Pacific Union College (PUC) Elementary School, located at 135 Neilsen Court approximately 1 mile to the northwest and Discoveryland Preschool, located at 85 Cold Springs Road approximately 0.66 miles to the northwest at the intersection of Cold Springs Road and La Posadas Road. No impacts would occur.
- d. Based on a search of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control database, the project site does not contain any known EPA National Priority List sites, State response sites, voluntary cleanup sites, or any school cleanup sites. No impact would occur, as the project site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.
- e-f. Parrett Field, a private landing strip, which is located as part of the Pacific Union College within the unincorporated community of Angwin which is located approximately 1.25 miles to the northwest of the project site. Based upon review of the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the proposed project will not result in a safety hazard for people working at the winery and/or the project will impact the operation of this airstrip, thereby, requiring further view associated with airport land use plan provisions for this private airstrip.
- g. The project includes an exception to the Napa County Roads & Street Standards (NCRSS) to allow for a reduced commercial driveway width for 305 feet of the driveway located at approximately STA 8+75 to STA 11+80. All other portions of the driveway will be improved to conform to the commercial roadway requirements as outlined in the NCRSS. Therefore, the project would not obstruct emergency vehicle access. The Fire Marshal and Engineering Services have reviewed the proposed exception request to the private community drive, and finds that the proposed design as conditioned provides sufficient emergency access as designed.
- h. The proposed project site is located within a high fire severity zone and the SRA district, which will increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. The Napa County Fire Marshall has reviewed this application and recommends approval of the project subject to conditions of approval which requires a minimum of 100 feet of defensible space out from all portions of the structure, 10 feet of defensible space fire hazard reduction on both side of all roadways of the facility, and other conditions to ensure that fire apparatus will have access to all buildings, including emergency responder radio coverage in new buildings, as well as, recommends approval of the Road & Street Standards Exception, subject to conditions. Therefore, the potential for impact is considered less-than-significant.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

On January 14, 2014, Governor Jerry Brown declared a drought emergency in the state of California. That declaration was followed up on April 1, 2015, when the Governor directed the State Water Resources Control Board to implement mandatory water reductions in cities and town across California to reduce water usage by 25 percent. These water restrictions do not apply to agricultural users. However, 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.

In general, recent studies have found that groundwater levels in the Napa Valley Floor exhibit stable long-term trends with a shallow depth to water. Historical trends in the Milliken-Sarco-Tuluca (MST) area, however, have shown increasing depths to groundwater, but recent stabilization in many locations. Groundwater availability, recharge, storage and yield are not consistent across the County. More is known about the resource where historical data have been collected. Less is known in areas with limited data or unknown geology. In order to fill existing data gaps and to provide a better understand of groundwater resources in the County, the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan recommended 18 Areas of Interest (AOIs) for additional groundwater level and water quality monitoring. Through the well owner and public outreach efforts of the (GRAC) approximately 40 new wells have been added to the monitoring program within these areas. Groundwater Sustainability Objectives were developed and recommended by the GRAC and adopted by the Board. The recommendations included the goal of developing sustainability objectives, provided a definition, explained the shared responsibility for Groundwater Sustainability and the important role monitoring as a means to achieving groundwater sustainability.

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, by Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (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 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). The subject property is located within the Angwin subarea of Napa County according to the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2015. The County has no record of problems or complaints of diminished groundwater supplies at the project site or in the general vicinity. The applicant has not experienced any issues with the availability of groundwater.

Minimum thresholds for water use have been established by the Department of Public Works using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS). These reports are the result of water resources investigations performed by the USGS in cooperation with the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. Any project, which reduces water usage or any water usage, which is at or below the established threshold is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels. The project is categorized as "all other areas" based upon current County Water Availability Analysis policies and therefore water use criteria is parcel specific based upon a Tier 2 analysis. In May 2017, a Tier 2 Water Availability Analysis (WAA) was completed by Bartelt Engineering, which included a parcel specific recharge evaluation. According to the recharge evaluation, the property yields 15.3 AF during an average rainfall years and 9.0 AF during dry rainfall years.

a/b. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements nor substantially deplete local groundwater supplies. According to the Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study prepared by Bartelt Engineering in May 2017, the project site and proposed system has adequate disposal capacity to serve the project. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings,

Water sources for the project site consists of an active well on the winery parcel (APN 024-340-010) located northwest of the proposed winery facility which currently supplies irrigation water, and one on the APN 024-340-010 which supplies the residential parcel. The residence well will not be utilized for the proposed winery project. The project well was constructed in 2005 to a depth of 670 feet with a 62 foot cement annular seal with an estimated yield of 150 gallons per minute after eight hours of continuous pumping. The existing water demand for the property is estimated at 7.75 AF (Vineyard). The proposed water demand for the project is estimated at 8.35 AF (winery processed water - 1.08 AF, domestic and landscaping - 0.25 AF, and vineyard irrigation - 7.02 AF) representing a 0.60 AF increase of the existing water demand of 7.75 AF. Through construction of the winery, the vineyard area will be reduced from 23.2+/- acres to approximately 20.9+/- acres.

The parcel water demand can be met with the existing project wells. Therefore, the impacts from the project would be less than significant and no further analysis is needed. Below is a table that details each source of existing and proposed groundwater use:

Usage Type	Existing Usage	Proposed Usage
Vineyard Irrigation	7.75	7.02
Winery		
Wine Production	0	1.08
Domestic & Landscape Irrigation	0	0.25
Heat & Frost Protection	0	0
Net Use (Acre-Feet per Year)	7.75	8.35

The estimated groundwater demand of 8.35 AF represents an increase of 0.60 AF over the existing condition. The winery, as part of its entitlement would include the County's standard condition of approval requiring well monitoring as well as the potential to modify/alter permitted uses on site should groundwater resources become insufficient to supply the use. It should be further noted that the treated winery process wastewater (300,000 gallons/year or 0.92 AF) proposes to be beneficially reused as a source for vineyard irrigation. Reusing treated process wastewater for vineyard irrigation would reduce the proposed water demand to 7.43 AF and be below the existing water demand of 7.75 AF. (Source: Onsite Wastewater Dispersal Feasibility Study prepared by Bartelt Engineering, dated May 2017.)

In response to regional drought and the general statewide need to protect groundwater resources, the Governor enacted new legislation requiring local governments to monitor and management groundwater resources. Napa County's prior work on the Napa Valley Groundwater Management Plan provides a strong foundation for Napa County to comply with this State mandated monitoring and management objective. As a direct result, the project site is now subject to this new legislation requiring local agencies to monitor groundwater use. Assembly Bill - AB 1739 by Assembly member Roger Dickinson (D-Sacramento) and Senate Bills 1168 and 1319 by Senator Fran Pavley (D-Agoura Hills) establish a framework for sustainable, local groundwater management for the first time in California history. The legislation requires local agencies to tailor sustainable groundwater plans to their regional economic and environmental needs. The legislation prioritizes groundwater basin management Statewide, which includes the Napa Valley/Napa River Drainage Basin, and sets a timeline for implementation of the following:

- By 2017, local groundwater management agencies must be identified;
- By 2020, overdrafted groundwater basins must have sustainability plans;
- By 2022, other high and medium priority basins not currently in overdraft must have sustainability plans; and
- By 2040, all high and medium priority groundwater basins must achieve sustainability.

The State has classified the Napa River Drainage Basin as a medium priority resource. Additionally, the legislation provides measurable objectives and milestones to reach sustainability and a State role of limited intervention when local agencies are unable or unwilling to adopt sustainable management plans. Napa County supports this legislation and has begun the process of developing a local groundwater management agency which is anticipated to be in place and functioning within the timeline prescribed by the State.

The proposed project would result in a modest increase on the demand of ground water supplies and therefore would not interfere with groundwater recharge or lowering of the local groundwater level. A well interference analysis was conducted as part of the Tier II WAA to review the project's potential impacts on neighboring wells within 500 feet from the property wells. Based upon review of the neighboring property records at the County, there were no neighboring wells located within 500 feet of the proposed project well. No spring interference would also occur. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Water Deficient Areas/Storage Areas*), the project site is not located within a water deficient area and the County is not aware of, nor has it received any reports of groundwater deficiencies in the area. According to the WAA prepared by Bartelt Engineering in May 2017, there is sufficient ground water for both irrigation and domestic water purposes to be provided by the existing project well. Impacts would be less than significant as there is sufficient water supply available to serve the proposed project.

- c-d. The project would not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. The preliminary grading and drainage plan for the project proposal has been reviewed by the Engineering Division and recommended for approval. As conditioned, impacts would be less than significant.
- f. A review of all parcels within 500-feet of the subject site's property line was conducted to identify any potential hazardous spills and none were identified. Impacts from the project to water quality would be less than significant.
- g/h. The project site lies outside the boundaries of the 100-year flood hazard zone and the 500-year flood hazard boundaries. No impacts would occur.
- i/j. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. 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
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-c. The project would not occur within an established community, nor would it result in the division of an established community.

The project complies with the Napa County Code and all other applicable regulations with the exception of a request to the Napa County Road and Street Standards (NCRSS). The project's new driveway would improve an existing gravel driveway to conform to the commercial roadway requirements outlined in NCRSS with exception of a reduce width for 305 feet of the proposed new access driveway from Cold Springs Road to the proposed winery. All other portions of the driveway will be improved to conform to the commercial roadway requirements. Mitigation measures BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO 3, and BIO-4, discussed under the "Biological Resources" section above, are intended to address any potential biological impacts from the proposed driveway improvements.

The subject parcel is located in the AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district, which allows wineries and uses accessory to wineries subject to use permit approval. The proposed project is compliant with the physical limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance. The

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

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

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

The General Plan includes two policies requiring wineries to be designed generally of a high architectural quality for the site and its surroundings. There are no applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the property. No impacts would occur.

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

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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during construction of the winery and proposed new driveway connecting to Cold Springs Road. Construction activities would be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. As such, the project would not result in potentially significant temporary construction noise impacts or operational impacts. Because the nearest residence to the project site is approximately 861.6 feet to the east of the proposed hospitality building (west portal built into the hillside with access to the cave) and 805 feet east of the south portal Production/Mechanical/Equipment Structure, there is a low potential for impacts related to construction noise to result in a significant impact. The nearest residence to proposed driveway improvements would be approximately 218 feet to the north and may result in a short-term impact to this neighbor during construction activities. However, construction activities would occur during the period of 7:00 a.m. – 7:00 p.m. on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity. All construction activities would be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). The proposed project would not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts. Conditions of approval identified below would require construction activities to be limited to daylight hours, vehicles to be muffled, and backup alarms adjusted to the lowest allowable levels. Impacts would be less than significant.

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 am to 5 pm.

Furthermore, in response to the current processing an Erosion Control Plan (P14-00410) and preparing a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the LeColline, LLC property located on APNs 024-300-070, 024-300-071, 024-300-072 and 024-340-001 in which the project involves approximately 25 net acres of vineyard within 33.8 acres on the approximately 92-acre property, any noise impacts associated with adding this project proposal should be minimal with respect to the Aloft Winery proposal. If approved, the noise generated by the clearing and removal of timber and other trees would occur in a short duration of time while construction of the winery is being completed. Once the vineyard development is completed and vineyards are being harvested, noise generated should be minimal and for a short period of time. It should be noted that mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Draft EIR for the Le Colline, LLC project addressing any potential impacts unforeseen and not addressed in this Initial Study.

c/d. The proposed project involves a marketing program including 30 events on an annual basis with the largest events permitting up to 125 guests, as well as, the use of an outdoor patio for tastings and marketing events that has the potential to generate higher noise levels, compared to existing conditions, as a result of the proposed occurrence of marketing events outdoors.

Additional regulations contained within County Code Chapter 8.16 establish exterior noise criteria for various land uses in the County. As described in the Project Setting, above, land uses that surround the proposed parcel are predominantly agricultural (vineyards) but include low density residential; of these land uses, the residential land use is considered the most sensitive to noise. Based on the standards in County Code section 8.16.070, noise levels, measured at the exterior of a residential structure or residential use on a portion of a larger property, may not exceed 50 decibels for more than half of any hour in the window of daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) within which the applicant proposes to conduct events. Noise impacts of the proposed project would be considered bothersome and potentially significant if sound generated by it had the effect of exceeding the standards in County Code more than 50 percent of the time (i.e., more than 50 decibels for more than 30 minutes in an hour for a residential use).

The nearest off-site residence to the proposed winery is approximately 861.6 feet to the east of the proposed hospitality building (west portal built into the hillside with access to the cave). Under the proposed project, the largest outdoor event that would occur on the parcel would have an attendance of no more than 125 people, and all events would end by 10:00 p.m., with clean up conducted afterwards. Winery operations would occur between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. (excluding harvest) and visitation hours would occur 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. The potential for the creation of significant noise from visitation is significantly reduced, since the tasting areas are predominantly within the hospitality building itself with the exception of a 3,000 square foot outdoor patio which is located on the west side of the hospitality building. This building will be built into the hillside of the west portal of the wine cave in which sits at an elevation of approximately 1,570 feet. At that point, the topography of the area raises to an elevation of 1,670 feet thereby providing a noise buffer to residential properties to the east of the subject property. Continuing enforcement of Napa County's Noise Ordinance by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff, including the prohibition against amplified music, should further ensure that marketing events and other winery activities do not create a significant noise impact. Events and non-amplified music, including clean up are required to finish by 10:00 p.m. Amplified music or sound systems would not be permitted for outdoor events as identified in standard Condition of Approval 4.10 below. Temporary events would be subject to County Code Chapter 5.36, which regulates proposed temporary events.

4.10 AMPLIFIED MUSIC

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

The proposed project would not result in long-term significant permanent noise impacts.

- e/f. Parrett Field, a private landing strip which is located as part of the Pacific Union College within the unincorporated community of Angwin is located approximately 1.25 miles to the northwest of the project site. Based upon review of the Napa County Compatibility Plan, the project site will not be impacted from the operation of this airstrip, thereby exposing people working at the proposed winery to excessive noise levels.

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"/>
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. Staffing for the proposed winery consists of up to a maximum of 10 full-time employees (six (6) full-time employees, two (2) part-time employees, and two (2) seasonal (harvest) employees). The Association of Bay Area Governments' *Projections 2003* figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase some 23% by the year 2030 (*Napa County Baseline Data Report*, November 30, 2005). Additionally, the County's *Baseline Data Report* indicates that total housing units currently programmed in county and municipal housing elements exceed ABAG growth projections by approximately 15%. The six (6) full-time employees and four (4) part-time employees, which are part of this project could lead to minor population growth in Napa County. Relative to the County's projected low to moderate growth rate and overall adequate programmed housing supply that population growth does not rise to a level of environmental significance. In addition, the project would be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs.

Cumulative impacts related to population and housing balance were identified in the 2008 General Plan EIR. As set forth in Government Code §65580, the County of Napa must facilitate the improvement and development of housing to make adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community. Similarly, CEQA recognizes the importance of balancing the prevention of environment damage with the provision of a "decent home and satisfying living environment for every Californian." (See Public Resources Code §21000(g).) The 2008 General Plan sets forth the County's long-range plan for meeting regional housing needs, during the present

and future housing cycles, while balancing environmental, economic, and fiscal factors and community goals. The policies and programs identified in the General Plan Housing Element function, in combination with the County's housing impact mitigation fee, to ensure adequate cumulative volume and diversity of housing. Cumulative impacts on the local and regional population and housing balance would be less than significant.

b/c. This application would not displace a substantial volume of existing housing or a substantial number of people and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. An existing wood frame cottage will be demolished for installation of the project driveway. As identified in the Historical Analysis prepared for the project by historic architect Juliana Inman, dated September 7, 2017, the cottage was determined to be in poor to very poor condition and, therefore, deemed not a significant cultural resource. Due to the structural integrity to the cottage, it was recommended that the cottage could probably not be successfully moved from its current location for reuse. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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

Discussion:

a. Public services are currently provided to the project area and the additional demand placed on existing services as a result of the proposed project would be minimal. Fire protection measures would be required as part of the development pursuant to Napa County Fire Marshall conditions and there would be no foreseeable impact to emergency response times with compliance with these conditions of approval. The Fire Department and Engineering Services Division have reviewed the application and recommend approval, as conditioned. School impact fees, which assist local school districts with capacity building measures, would be levied pursuant to building permit submittal. The proposed project would have minimal impact on public parks as no residences are proposed. Impacts to public services would be less than significant.

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

Discussion:

- a. The project would not significantly increase use of existing parks or recreational facilities based on its limited scope. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. No recreational facilities are proposed as part of the project. No impact would occur.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-23, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. A Traffic Impact Report, dated February 1, 2018 was prepared by Crane Transportation Group in accordance with the criteria established by the Napa County, and is consistent with the standard traffic engineering techniques. Operating conditions at the Cold Springs Road intersections with Howell Mountain Road and Las Posadas Road were evaluated for all analysis scenarios based upon recently updated significance criteria utilized in all recent County traffic studies. In addition, the project driveway intersection with the end of Cold Springs Road was evaluated for sight line adequacy.

The project study area consists of the intersections of Cold Springs Road and Howell Mountain Road and Cold Springs Road/Los Posadas Road/Discoveryland Preschool Driveway. Howell Mountain Road is a two-lane arterial roadway running in a general north-south direction through the community of Angwin. It continues downhill to the south, changes names to Deer Park Road, and then intersects both Silverado Trail and State Route 29. It also continues downhill to the north of Angwin into the Pope Valley. In the vicinity of Cold Springs Road it has a posted speed limit of 35 miles per hour, paved shoulders and a sidewalk along the east side of the street. It is uncontrolled at the Cold Springs Road Tee intersection and a left turn lane is provided on the southbound intersection approach.

Cold Springs Road is a two-lane rural road extending east of Howell Mountain Road for about 1,250 feet before intersecting Las Posadas Road, and then turns south and extends about 3,700 feet before ending at a cul-de-sac. Las Posadas Road is a rural two-lane roadway without centerline striping and limited shoulder areas.

At the Cold Springs Road/Las Posadas Road intersection the west and south legs are Cold Springs Road, the east leg is Las Posadas Road and the north leg is the driveway serving the Discoveryland Preschool parking lot. The north, west and southbound approaches are stop sign controlled, while the eastbound Cold Springs Road approach is not. An exclusive right turn lane is provided on the eastbound Cold Springs Road approach allowing uncontrolled flow to southbound Cold Springs Road. Cold Springs Road between Howell Mountain Road and the Las Posadas Road intersection has a posted speed limit of 25 miles per hour, no centerline striping, limited or no shoulder areas, and an asphalt path (or sidewalk) along the north side of the road. The Pacific Union College Elementary School and the Discoveryland Preschool line the north side of the street, while residences line the south side of the street. Cold Springs Road between the Las Posadas Road intersection and the end of the road, about 3,700 feet to the south, has a posted speed limit of 35 miles per hour, no centerline striping and only limited gravel shoulder areas. There are no curbs, gutters, sidewalks or pathways. It is lined by residences on both sides of the road. There are minor vertical and horizontal curves. The road is wide enough for comfortable two-way traffic flow for about the first 2,500 feet south of Las Posadas Road. At that point the road crests a minor hill and traverses a gentle horizontal curve while narrowing to 14 to 15 feet between a large tree (on the west side) and a stone wall (on the east side of the street). Two-way traffic flow is required to proceed at slow speed. South of this point the road, goes downhill and then is level and straight (with good sight lines) the remaining 800 feet to the cul-de-sac at the end of the road. However, while sight lines are good this last 800 feet, the roadway is still 14 to 15 feet wide and two-way traffic flow occasionally needs to take advantage of widened pavement at driveway connections.

Three driveways connect to the south end of the cul-de-sac at the end of Cold Springs Road. The westerly driveway serves the project site and its existing two residences and vineyards. There is no stop sign control on the project driveway approach to the cul-de-sac nor on the other two driveway approaches. The closest driveway to the project access in the cul-de-sac is about 30 feet to the east.

Peak travel hours for Cold Springs Road and Howell Mountain Road have been identified as 3:15-4:15 PM Monday-Friday and 12:30-1:30 PM Saturday. Peak travel hours for Silverado Trail and SR 29 are 3:00 -5:30 PM.

There is one school and one preschool located along the north side of Cold Springs Road between Howell Mountain Road and Las Posadas Road: the PUC Elementary School near Howell Mountain Road and the Discoveryland Preschool and Childcare Center at the Cold Springs Road/Las Posadas road intersection.

- PUC Elementary School – 135 Nielson Court (grades K-8) - Monday to Thursday 8:00 AM to 3:15 PM; Friday 8:00 AM to Noon
Some children walk and bike to/from school. All others are driven. There is no busing.
- Discoveryland Preschool and Childcare Center – 85 Cold Springs Road (ages 2-5) - Monday to Friday Arrival Time: 7:30-9:00 AM; Departure Time: throughout the afternoon until 5:30 PM
All children are driven.

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

LOS A- Free-flowing travel with an excellent level of comfort and convenience and freedom to maneuver.

LOS B- Stable operating conditions, but the presence of other road users causes a noticeable, though slight, reduction in comfort, convenience, and maneuvering freedom.

LOS C- Stable operating conditions, but the operation of individual users is substantially affected by the interaction with others in the traffic stream.

LOS D- High-density, but stable flow. Users experience severe restrictions in speed and freedom to maneuver, with poor levels of comfort and convenience.

LOS E- Operating conditions at or near capacity. Speeds are reduced to a low but relatively uniform value. Freedom to maneuver is difficult with users experiencing frustration and poor comfort and convenience. Unstable operation is frequent, and minor disturbances in traffic flow can cause breakdown conditions.

LOS F- Forced or breakdown conditions. This condition exists wherever the volume of traffic exceeds the capacity of the roadway. Long queues can form behind these bottleneck points with queued traffic traveling in a stop-and-go fashion. (2000 Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board)

Proposed visitation levels and number of employees requested are 20 visitors per day and six full-time and four part-time employees. The applicant has further committed in scheduling marketing events to prevent any guest traffic on the local circulation system between 3:00 - 5:30 PM. Furthermore, approximately 24% of the grapes for wine production, which currently represent approximately 14 out haul grape trucks per year will now remain on-site requiring 76% of the grapes required for requested production levels to be grown off-site. The Applicant and Traffic Impact Report has identified that 76% of the grapes will be transported to the site in two trucks per day over a two month period (beginning September 1st to the end of October) and that there will be some days during this period when there will be only

one or no grape delivery trucks. All project spoils and rocks generated or removed to be disposed on-site through stockpiling and/or integrated into project design features.

As calculated by the Applicant's Planning and Traffic Consultant, the proposed project is expected to generate an average of 38 new weekday daily trips and 30 new weekend daily trips. Proposed conditions for a typical Saturday crush are calculated at 38 new total daily trips. The largest marketing event would have up to 125 attendees per event and would occur two times per year are projected to generate a total of 119 trips. (Refer to Use Permit Application Form - Winery Traffic Information/Trip Generation Sheet). The residence located on APN 024-340-011 and also owned by the applicant would generate approximately 10 vehicle trips per day. An existing wood frame cottage will be demolished for installation the project driveway and therefore, will not generate any trips associated with this project.

Friday PM peak hour and Saturday afternoon peak hour harvest trip generation projections were developed with the assistance of the project applicant and their representative for all components of new employee, grape delivery and visitor activities associated with the proposed Aloft Winery. Results are presented on an hourly basis in Tables 3 and 4 for harvest Friday and Saturday conditions, respectively, while a summary of peak hour trips in Table 5 (Aloft Winery Traffic Impact Report). The project applicant has agreed not to schedule any winery-related activity that would result in traffic along Cold Springs Road during times of children walking and biking to/from the PUC Elementary School, during weekdays when the PUC Elementary School is in operation (7:30-8:15 AM Monday to Friday, 3:00-3:45 PM Monday to Thursday and 11:45 AM-12:30 PM on a Friday). Furthermore, the applicant has agreed to provide shuttle bus service from a preauthorized location for guest pick up and drop off for the 125-person marketing event to consolidate trips and prevent any marketing event guest traffic on the local circulation system between 3:00 and 5:30 PM. Given these implementation measures, the harvest Friday PM peak traffic hour there would be a projected 1 inbound and 3 outbound project vehicles, while during the harvest Saturday afternoon peak traffic hour there would be a projected 1 inbound and 1 outbound project vehicles. As shown, a few visitors and possibly one delivery vehicle would be expected on the local roadway network during the harvest Friday PM peak hour, while during the harvest Saturday afternoon peak traffic hour new traffic would only be due to visitors. During harvest conditions employees are working extended hours and are not on the local roadway system during the ambient peak traffic hours. Given the low peak hour traffic volumes on the local roadway system (Existing or 2030), even if all project employees would be traveling during the peak traffic hours, operation would still be acceptable and far below capacity with no significant impacts due to project traffic. The proposed Traffic Impact Analysis and required mitigation measures have been reviewed and approved by the Public Works Department and deemed acceptable.

Cumulative operating conditions were determined by the calculating the project's percentage contribution to the total growth in traffic from existing conditions and compared with growth projected and modeled in the horizon year (2030) of the General Plan. Horizon year conditions were evaluated both with project and without project generated traffic to determine the project's contribution to cumulative conditions. General Plan horizon year cumulative growth analysis accounts for traffic increases resulting from forecasted development in both unincorporated Napa County as well as the cities of Napa County and neighboring counties. Level of Service on Cold Springs Road, Howell Mountain Road and Las Posadas Road would remain at a LOS A or B with proposed project implementation.

It should be noted that the County is currently processing an Erosion Control Plan (P14-00410) and preparing a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the LeColline, LLC property located on APNs 024-300-070, 024-300-071, 024-300-072 and 024-340-001. The project involves development of approximately 25 net acres of vineyard within 33.8 gross acres on the approximately 92-acre property. If approved, the traffic generated by the clearing and removal of timber and other trees should occur in short duration of time that may occur while construction of the winery is being completed. Once the vineyard development is completed and vineyards are being harvested, traffic generated should be minimal and for a short period of time thereby roadway segments analyzed in the Aloft Winery traffic analysis would remain at a LOS A or B. It should be noted that mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Draft EIR for the Le Colline, LLC project addressing any potential impacts unforeseen and not addressed in this Initial Study.

- c. No air traffic is proposed and there are no structures proposed for this project that would interfere with or require alteration of air traffic patterns. No impact would occur.
- d/e. The Traffic Impact Study further concluded that there would be no need for a left turn lane in the Cold Springs Road cul-de-sac due to low volumes and due to all project entry movements being right turns. Currently, sight lines at the Cold Springs Road/project access driveway intersection on the south side of the cul-de-sac are acceptable to the north to see approaching southbound traffic on Cold Springs Road (at more than 600 feet). For traffic outbound from the project driveway, there is about a 50-foot sight line to the right (east) to see traffic exiting the adjacent driveway. The posted speed limit along Cold Springs Road is 35 miles per hour, although at the end of the road speeds would be less, particularly for most vehicles exiting driveways. The Traffic Impact Study identified that not all vehicles exiting from the project driveway would be likely to stop without stop sign control. No stop sign control signs are posted at the other two driveways. Given this potential impact, a mitigation measure is being warranted requiring the applicant to install a stop sign on the project driveway approach to the Cold Springs Road cul-de-sac. Furthermore, the Traffic Impact Study had concluded that the proposed project would add minor amounts of traffic throughout the day to the section of Cold Springs Road about 1,000 feet north of the Winery entrance where sight lines are reduced due to roadway curvature in conjunction with trees and landscaping adjacent to the edges of the roadway. While project

employees would immediately become familiar with the driving conditions through this stretch of roadway, first time project visitors would not be familiar with the sight limitations and the possibility of an opposing vehicle traveling 35 miles per hour on a 14- to 15-foot-wide road. Therefore, mitigation will be required in the form of posting Cold Springs Road with horizontal alignment warning signs on both approaches to the segment of roadway about 1,000 feet north of the road's cul-de-sac where sight lines are reduced due to roadway curvature, grade change and trees/landscaping in close proximity to the edges of the road. The purpose of the horizontal alignment warning sign would be to inform first time drivers of Cold Springs Road (i.e. winery visitors) that added attention should be paid at this particular location. The proposed site access analysis and required mitigation measures have been reviewed and approved by the Napa County Fire Department, Engineering Services Division, and Public Works Department and deemed acceptable.

The project also includes an Exception to the Napa County Roads & Street Standards (NCRSS) to allow for a reduced commercial driveway width for 305 feet of the driveway located at approximately STA 8+75 to STA 11+80. All other portions of the driveway will be improved to conform to the commercial roadway requirements as outlined in the NCRSS. An existing wood frame cottage will be demolished for installation this driveway.

The proposed road exception is based upon constraints from existing topographical features, trees, steep slopes, and setback from the natural water course, as well as, minimizing impacts to the Napa False Indigo which are a rare plant species throughout their range with the majority endemic to California. The plants were found along the existing entrance road specifically on a north-facing slope where the access is required to be widened to meet Napa County Roads & Street Standards. As discussed in **Section IV Biological Resources** above, all potential biological related impacts would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. The proposed road exception have been reviewed by the Division of Engineering Services and the Fire Marshal who support grant of the exception as currently designed. To grant a Road Exception the Planning Commission must find that the alternative design meets the same overall practical effect as a project that complies with the standard. As proposed, the Division of Engineering Services and the Fire Marshal recommend that the design meets the same overall practical effect.

- f. The project is proposing 12 parking spaces. Staff believes this number of parking spaces is commensurate with the proposed number of employees and visitation. The proposed parking will meet the anticipated parking demand and will avoid providing excess parking, and will therefore have no impact. The applicant has agreed to provide shuttle bus service from a preauthorized location for the 125-person marketing event to prevent any marketing event guest traffic on the local circulation system between 3:00 and 5:30 PM. Providing such service would alleviate any parking issues on-site.
- g. There is no aspect of this proposed project that would conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. The applicant has indicated that the project will include transportation demand management incentives to reduce trips to the winery as part of their voluntary best management practices.

Mitigation Measures:

MM TRANS-1: Any winery-related activity that would result in traffic along Cold Springs Road during times of children walking and biking to/from the PUC Elementary School, during weekdays when the PUC Elementary School is in operation (7:30-8:15 AM Monday-Friday, 3:00-3:45 PM Monday-Thursday and 11:45 AM-12:30 PM Friday) shall not be scheduled.

Monitoring: A Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan which prohibits any winery activity during times of children walking and biking to/from the PUC Elementary School, during weekdays when the PUC Elementary School is in operation (7:30-8:15 AM Monday-Friday, 3:00-3:45 PM Monday-Thursday and 11:45 AM-12:30 PM Friday) shall be prepared and submitted to the Planning Division prior to the issuance of a Final Certificate of Occupancy. After issuance of a Final Certificate of Occupancy, an Ongoing Monitoring and Reporting Statement shall be submitted to the Planning Division on January 15 of each year. Planning Division staff will review the statement to ensure compliance with the TDM Plan. Enforcement steps will be taken, if needed, to attain compliance status.

MM TRANS-2: All larger marketing events (75 persons or larger) held between 10:00 AM and 6:00 PM, or from 6:00 PM to 10:00 PM shall schedule guest arrival and departure times to avoid traffic on Silverado Trail and SR 29 between 3:00 and 5:30 PM. Shuttle bus service for the 125-person marketing events shall be utilized.

Monitoring: A TDM Plan which requires guest arrival and departure times at the winery to avoid traffic on Silverado Trail and SR 29 between 3:00 PM or after 5:30 PM and the use of a shuttle bus service, including identification of a designated locations for guest pick up and drop off, for the 125-person marketing events shall be prepared and submitted to the Planning Division prior to the issuance of a Final Certificate of Occupancy. After issuance of a Final Certificate of Occupancy, an Ongoing Monitoring and Reporting Statement shall be submitted to the Planning Division on January 15 of each year. Planning Division staff will review the statement to ensure compliance with the TDM Plan. Enforcement steps will be taken, if needed, to attain compliance status.

MM TRANS-3: Provide a stop sign on the project driveway approach to the Cold Springs Road cul-de-sac.

Monitoring: Improvement Plans for the installation of a stop sign and an application for an encroachment permit shall be submitted for the Engineering Services Division and the Public Works Department review and approval prior to the issuance of a building or grading permit for the project.

MM TRANS-4 Post Cold Springs Road with horizontal alignment warning signs on both approaches to the segment of roadway about 1,000 feet north of the road's cul-de-sac where sight lines are reduced due to roadway curvature, grade change and trees/landscaping in close proximity to the edges of the road. The California MUTCD 2014 Edition, Revision 2, Section 2C.06 indicates that a W1-2 sign in advance of a curve may be used on a roadway with less than 1,000 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) volumes based on engineering judgment. The purpose of the horizontal alignment warning sign would be to inform first time drivers of Cold Springs Road (i.e. winery visitors) that added attention should be paid at this particular location.

Monitoring: Improvement Plans for the installation of a horizontal alignment warning sign and an application for an encroachment permit shall be submitted for the Engineering Services Division and the Public Works Department review and approval prior to the issuance of a building or grading permit for the project.

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

Discussion:

a-b. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology surveys, sites, sensitive areas, and flags) no historic sites or tribal resources have been identified on the property. Invitation for tribal consultation was completed in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1. On November 21, 2017, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to 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. One response was received on December 13, 2017 from the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation requesting a copy of the cultural resource study and historical resources study which was sent on February 26, 2018 with a request for additional information or further discussion by close of business March 28, 2018. Staff did not receive a response within that time and forward a letter on April 4, 2018 identifying consultation proceedings with the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation had concluded. On April 12, 2018, the County received a letter dated April 5, 2018 from the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation indicating that they were not aware for any known cultural resources near the project site and a cultural monitor was not needed. However, it was recommended that a cultural sensitivity training for any pre-project personnel be provided by the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation prior to start of project construction. A project specific condition will be incorporated into the project to address this issue. As discussed in **Section V** of this initial study, no significant cultural resources were found on the site, and 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 the 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 facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-b. An existing wastewater dispersal system is located on parcel APN 024-034-011 and currently serves the existing residence located on that parcel. The existing residence dispersion system will remain separate from the proposed winery wastewater system(s) and not proposed to be modified as part of this permit.

For the proposed winery, separate wastewater conveyance, treatment and dispersal systems are proposed. Process wastewater would be pretreated then surface and/or pretreated applied as vineyard/landscape irrigation. Sanitary wastewater would also be pretreated then dispersed via a subsurface drip field. It should be further noted that the treated winery process wastewater (300,000 gallons/year or 0.92 AF) proposes to be beneficially reused as a source for vineyard irrigation. Reusing treated process wastewater for vineyard irrigation would reduce the proposed water demand to 7.43 AF and be below the existing water demand of 7.75 AF. (Source: Onsite Wastewater Dispersal Feasibility Study prepared by Bartelt Engineering, dated May 2017.)

As proposed, wastewater disposal will be accommodated on-site in compliance with State and County regulations. The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and will not result in a significant impact. The project will not require construction of any new water treatment facilities that will result in a significant impact to the environment. Water will be provided through the existing irrigation well also located on the winery parcel (APN 024-034-011). Potential impacts would be less than significant.

c. The project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, which would cause a significant impact to the environment. The preliminary grading and drainage plan and storm water control plan has been reviewed by the Engineering Division. As conditioned, impacts would be less than significant.

d. As discussed in **Section IX** above, the project is not expected to violate any water quality standards nor substantially deplete local groundwater supplies. According to the Water Availability Analysis (WAA) prepared by Bartelt Engineering in May 2017, the project is categorized as "all other areas" based upon current County Water Availability Analysis policies and, therefore, water use criteria is parcel specific based upon a Tier 2 analysis. There is an active well on the winery parcel (APN 024-340-010) located northwest of the proposed winery facility which currently supplies irrigation water, and one on the APN 024-340-010 which supplies the residential parcel. The well will not be utilized for the proposed winery project. The project well was constructed in 2005 to a depth of 670 feet with a 62-foot cement

annual seal with an estimated yield of 150 gallons per minute after eight hours of continuous pumping. The existing water demand for the property is estimated at 7.75 AF (Vineyard). The proposed water demand for the project is estimated at 8.35 AF (winery processed water - 1.08 AF, domestic and landscaping - 0.25 AF, and vineyard irrigation - 7.02 AF), which represents an increase of 0.60 AF/YR over the existing condition. The facility's proposed domestic water system will be classified as transient, non-community and will be managed by employees of the winery.

In May 2017, a Tier 2 analysis was completed by Bartelt Engineering, which included a parcel specific recharge evaluation. According to the recharge evaluation, the property yields 15.3 AF during an average rainfall years and 9.0 AF during dry rainfall years. The parcel water demand can be met with the existing on site well. In summary, the existing yield would be sufficient to serve all uses on the property. According to the Water Availability Analysis (WAA) prepared by Bartelt Engineering in May 2017, there is sufficient ground water for both irrigation and domestic water purposes to be provided by the existing project well. Impacts would be less than significant as there is sufficient water supply available to serve the proposed project.

- e. Wastewater will be treated on-site and will not require a wastewater treatment provider. As such, impacts would be less than significant.
- f. According to the Napa County Baseline Data Report, all of the solid waste landfills where Napa County's waste is disposed have more than sufficient capacity related to the current waste generation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- g. The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. 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
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. As discussed in **Section IV Biological Resources** and **Section XVI Transportation/Traffic** above, all potential biological and transportation/traffic related impacts would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. As identified in **Section V Cultural Resources** above, no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified within the project site. In the event archaeological artifacts are found, a standard condition of approval would be incorporated into the project. Impacts would be less than significant with the incorporation of the biological resources mitigation measures and standard condition of approval related to cultural resources.
- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology, and traffic impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The project would also increase the demands for public services to a limited extent, increase traffic and air pollutions, all of which contribute to cumulative effects when future development in Napa Valley is considered. Cumulative impacts of these issues are discussed in previous sections of this Initial Study, wherein the impact from an increase in air pollution is being addressed as discussed in the project's Greenhouse Gas Voluntary Best Management Practices including but not limited to: installation of rooftop solar panels; planting of additional new trees and vegetation; exceed Title 24

energy efficient standard building to Calgreen Tier 2; implementation of a Transportation Demand Management Plan; installation of solar hot water heating system; installation of energy conserving lighting; installation of a cool/green roof; installation of water efficient fixtures; application of low impact development; installation of water efficient landscape in compliance with the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (WELO); implementation of a program that recycles 75% of all waste and composts 75% food and garden material; implementation of a sustainable purchasing and shipping program; incorporate the planting of shade trees into project landscaping; and install electric vehicle charging stations. Through design of the project, the applicant has limited the amount of grading and tree removal to the maximum extent feasible, as well as, oriented and designed the site to optimize conditions for natural heating, cooling and day lighting of interior space to maximize winery winter sun exposure, including proposing the construction of a cave. As part of this project, the applicant intends to become certified as a Napa Green Winery and Napa Green Land, as well as, implement the use of recycled materials, provide education to staff and visitors on sustainable practices, use 70-80% cover crop, and retain biomass removed via pruning and thinning by chipping the material and reusing versus burning on-site.

Potential impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The project trip generation was calculated from winery operations, where the calculated trips reflect total visitation, on-site employees and wine production trips generated by the winery. Under the Napa County General Plan, traffic volumes are projected to increase and will be caused by a combination of locally generated traffic as well as general regional growth. The General Plan EIR indicates that much of the forecasted increase in traffic on the arterial roadway network will result from traffic generated outside of the county, however the project would contribute a small amount toward the general overall increase.

General Plan Policy CIR-16 states that "The County will seek to maintain an arterial Level of Service D or better on all County roadways, except where the level of Service already exceeds this standard and where increased intersection capacity is not feasible without substantial additional right of way." Cumulative operating conditions were determined by the calculating the project's percentage contribution to the total growth in traffic from existing conditions and compared with growth projected and modeled in the horizon year (2030) of the General Plan. Horizon year conditions were evaluated both with project and without project generated traffic to determine the project's contribution to cumulative conditions. General Plan horizon year cumulative growth analysis accounts for traffic increases resulting from forecasted development in both unincorporated Napa County as well as the cities of Napa County and neighboring counties. Level of Service on Cold Springs Road/ Howell Mountain Road would remain at a LOS B and Cold Springs Road/Las Posadas Road/Discoveryland Preschool Driveway would remain at a LOS A with proposed project implementation and would be considered less than significant under the County's guidelines. As discussed above under Section XVI Transportation, implementation of mitigation measures Trans-1, Trans-2, Trans-3, and Trans-4 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level requiring the project's additional traffic at the peak hours to avoid adding a deterioration of the level of service to Silverado Trail and SR 29, to prohibit any winery activity during the times of children walking and biking or from the PUC Elementary School, and to ensure adequate site distance and the safety of vehicles traveling on Cold Springs road near the project site, thereby reducing potential cumulative impacts to a level less than significant.

Furthermore, in response to the current processing an Erosion Control Plan (P14-00410) and preparing a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the LeColline, LLC property located on APNs 024-300-070, 024-300-071, 024-300-072 and 024-340-001 in which the project involves development of approximately 25 net acres of vineyard within 33.8 gross acres on the approximately 92-acre property, cumulative impacts associated with adding this project proposal should be minimal with respect to the Aloft Winery proposal. If approved, the traffic generated by the clearing and removal timber and other trees should occur in a short duration of time that may occur while construction of the winery is being completed. Once the vineyard development is completed and vineyards are being harvested, any impacts associated with the operation of Aloft Winery plus vineyard operations nearby should be minimal, thereby reducing potential cumulative impacts to a level less than significant. It should be noted that mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Draft EIR for the Le Colline, LLC project addressing any cumulative potential impacts unforeseen and not addressed in this Initial Study.

- c. All impacts identified in this MND are either less than significant after mitigation or less than significant and do not require mitigation. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in environmental effects that cause substantial adverse effects on human being either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None Required.