

“D”

Initial Study/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:** Davis Estates; Use Permit Major Modification (#P14-00411-MOD)
2. **Property Owner/Project Sponsor Name and Address:** Frostfire Vineyards II, LLC (Mike Davis), 4060 Silverado Trail, Calistoga, CA 94515
3. **Representative:** Tom Adams, Dickenson, Peatman & Fogarty, 1455 First Street, Suite 301, Napa, CA 94559
4. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Sean Trippi, Principal Planner, (707) 253-4417, [sean.trippi@countyofnapa.org](mailto:sean.trippi@countyofnapa.org)
5. **Project Location and APN:** The 114.32 acre project site is located on the east side Silverado Trail, immediately south of its intersection with Larkmead Lane APN: 021-010-003. 4060 Silverado Trail, Calistoga, CA
6. **General Plan Description:** Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space (AWOS)
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Watershed (AW)
8. **Background/Project History:** A Use Permit for the Saviez winery was approved in 2002 and subsequently deemed "used" in 2004. Additional details are provided below.

**June 5, 1998 – A Home Occupation permit was issued by the Zoning Administrator (#97493-HO)** to Paul Saviez to use a 158 sq. ft. room in the main residence to conduct wines sales and record keeping. Approximately 300 gallons of wine was produced annually and crushed, aged, bottled and stored off-site. No visitors or on-site storage of wine were allowed in conjunction with this permit.

**August 7, 2002 – Use Permit (#01099-UP) was approved by the Planning Commission** to convert an existing  $\pm$  3,780 sq. ft. historic barn and add a second floor to create a  $\pm$  6,306 sq. ft. two-story winery production and administration building with an outdoor tank and crush pad area for a new winery with a production capacity of 20,000 gallons annually. No new structures were proposed with this application. The approved hours of operation were from 7:00 AM to 5:00 PM, seven days a week, with two full-time and one part-time employee, and three on-site parking spaces. The approval also included tours and tastings by appointment for up to 10 visitors on the busiest day with an average of 40 visitors per week and two annual marketing events with catered food for up to 40 guests at each event.

**August 27, 2003 – A one-year time extension was approved by the Zoning Administrator.** There were no changes to the project or original conditions of approval.

**January 30, 2004 – The CDPD Director determined the use permit "Used"** based on the installation of the winery's waste water system. No other improvements were constructed.

**January 7, 2009 – Use Permit Modification (P07-00436-MOD) was approved by the Planning Commission** to convert  $\pm$  836 sq. ft. of the existing main residence to winery office and tasting room and convert  $\pm$  2,700 sq. ft. of the previously approved but unbuilt winery office, laboratory and tasting room within the barn to winery storage. No other changes were approved. This approval rescinded the previously approved Home Occupation permit. This Modification subsequently expired as no building permits were issued to convert the residence to winery accessory uses.

**July 3, 2013 – Use Permit Modification (P12-00373-MOD) and Viewshed (P13-00195-VIEW)** were approved by the Planning Commission to increase annual production from 20,000 to 30,000 gallons; convert the existing 3,780 sq. ft. historic barn to hospitality uses, including a commercial kitchen; construct two new winery buildings with approximately 17,495 sq. ft. of floor area; create approximately 2,800 sq. ft. of outdoor work area including a 1,600 sq. ft. covered crush pad; construct approximately 15,445 sq. ft. of cave area; increase previously approved on-site parking from 3 to 14 spaces; revise the existing Marketing Plan to allow two (2) events per month for a maximum of 50 guests at each event, two (2) events per year for a maximum of 100 guests at each event, and participation in the wine auction; increase tours and tastings which may include food pairing(s) by appointment only for a maximum of 20 visitors per weekday, 34 visitors on weekends and holidays with a maximum of 168 visitors per week or 182 visitors per week when there's a holiday; extend hours of operation from 10 AM to 6:30 PM (tasting) and 8 AM to 5 PM (production), 7 days a week; allow on-premise consumption within the winery building and surrounding paved/courtyard area pursuant to Business/Professions Code Sections 23358, 23390 and 23396.5; increase full-time employees

from 2 to 5 with no part-time employees; install a new on-site winery process and domestic wastewater treatment system; and, new landscaping, driveway improvements and signage.

**December 23, 2013 – Use Permit Modification (P13-00388-MOD) was approved by the Interim Director** to limit wine production to no more than 20,000 gallons annually; convert the existing 2,715 sq. ft. historic barn to winery production and hospitality uses; construct a 855 sq. ft. addition at the rear of the historic barn; provide one on-site parking space; allow tours and tastings which may include food pairing(s) by appointment only for a maximum of 10 visitors per day with a maximum of 40 visitors per week; allow two (2) marketing activities per year for a maximum of 40 guests per event; operate between from 10 AM to 6:30 PM (tasting) and 8 AM to 5 PM (production), 7 days a week; allow on-premise consumption pursuant Business/Professions Code Sections 23358, 23390 and 23396.5; and, install a new on-site winery process and domestic wastewater treatment system. The purpose of this modification was to allow use of the existing historic barn for wine production and hospitality with visitation pursuant to the original use permit (#01099-UP) until construction of the winery complex approved by use permit P12-00373 was completed.

**March 11, 2014 – Code Enforcement Case (CE14-00038) was opened** to investigate the possible construction of a guest cottage. It was determined that construction had commenced prior to the submittal and issuance of a building permit. All worked stopped, once the issue was brought to the attention of the owner's representative. The location of the guest cottage also required a Viewshed application. Both the Viewshed application and (P14-00315-VIEW) and the building permit (B14-01539) were submitted on October 2, 2014. A grading permit (ENG16-00048) was submitted on August 23, 2016, to allow construction of a driveway to the guest cottage. Subsequent to the submittal of the aforementioned permits and prior to issuance, a demolition permit (B16-01750) was issued on November 28, 2016. Demolition of the structure was completed on April 7, 2017.

**October 2, 2014 – A building permit application (B14-01540) was submitted** to address the removal of a small structure without a demolition permit. The location of the structure conflicted with construction of the winery site improvements. The permit was placed on hold after it was determined that the structure, identified as an "1880 Worker's Cottage", was part of the Francois Saviez Farmstead which is listed on the State Register of Historic Resources. The structure was subsequently reconstructed (B15-01532) in a different location. The reconstruction was undertaken in compliance with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*. Reconstruction was completed April 26, 2016.

**March 23, 2015 – Use Permit Modification (P14-00287-MOD) was approved by the Director** to relocate the commercial kitchen from the historic barn to the upper floor of the winery building; reconfigure and reduce the floor area of the caves from approximately 15,445 sq. ft. to 13,350 sq. ft.; increase the outdoor production work area from 2,800 sq. ft. to 3,375 sq. ft. including an 1,850 covered area; increase the floor area of the two winery buildings from 17,495 sq. ft. to 18,170 sq. ft.; recognize an approximately 616 sq. ft. hayloft in the historic barn to be used for storage; and, incorporate the floor area of the detached service buildings into the winery building. No changes to production, tours and tastings visitation, marketing activities, employees, parking, hours of operation, water use or wastewater treatment were proposed or approved as part of this modification.

9. **Project Description:** Approval of Use Permit Major Modification to an existing winery to modify previous project approvals to allow the following:
- (a) increase annual wine production from 30,000 to 100,000 gallons;
  - (b) expansion of the cave area by 10,820 sq. ft. increasing the total cave area from 13,350 sq. ft. to 24,170 sq. ft.;
  - (c) installation of two (2) outdoor fermentation tanks on a previously approved outdoor work area;
  - (d) increase previously approved on-site parking from 14 parking spaces to 31 striped spaces and 45 overflow spaces;
  - (e) increase employees from 5 full-time to 25 full-time;
  - (f) installation of a left turn lane on Silverado Trail to the central (visitor) driveway, and widening of existing driveways, as necessary;
  - (g) expansion, upgrading and/or replacement of existing on-site domestic and process wastewater treatment systems;
  - (h) increase daily tours and tastings by appointment only from 20 visitors on weekdays and 34 visitors on weekends and holidays to a maximum of 200 visitors per day, 800 maximum per week from June 1 to October 31, a maximum of 100 visitors per day, 350 maximum per week from November 1 to November 30 and February 1 to May 31, and a maximum of 75 visitors per day, 250 maximum per week from December 1 to January 31 (tours and tastings will continue to include food pairing); and,
  - (i) increase marketing events from two (2) per month with up to 50 guests at each event and two (2) per year with up to 100 guests at each event (1,400 guests per year) to 24 events per year with up to 100 guests at each event and 15 events per year with up to 200 guests at each event (5,400 guests per year).

The existing winery buildings have dark brown board and batten wood siding with corrugated metal roofs and stone accents. The main winery building is benched into the site and behind an earth berm reducing the scale of the structure and diminishing views of the cave portal walls. No new buildings or expansion of existing buildings is proposed. All new floor area will be within the cave tunnels.

10. **Environmental setting and surrounding land uses:**

The 114.32 acre project site is located on the east side of Silverado Trail, immediately south of its intersection with Larkmead Lane. The project site is concurrently developed with three winery buildings, including the renovated historic barn, a main and secondary residence, the old cottage previously used for farm management purposes now used as a garden shed, a recently constructed agricultural barn, a windmill, water storage tanks, and approximately 10.7 acres of vineyards. Access to the property is provided by three existing driveways from Silverado Trail. The centermost driveway serving the winery will be widened as needed to provide an 18-foot wide two-way driveway with a one-foot shoulder on each side. The southerly driveway provides access to the primary residence. The northerly driveway provides access to an existing secondary residence and the recently constructed barn used to support the on-site agricultural activities. The northerly and southerly driveways also provide access to the properties vineyards.

North/northeast of the project site are four properties ranging in size from 8.8 acres to 70 acres with 3 homes and vineyards. South/southwest of the project site six properties ranging in size from 4.0 to 9.5 acres with three homes, vines, and the Wermuth winery. East/southeast are two properties of 29 and 88 acres, each developed with a home with vines on the larger property. West of the project site are two properties of 39 and 43 acres, both planted in vines with a home on the smaller property.

Producing wineries within the vicinity of the project site include Dutch Henry and Hourglass wineries to the north, Wermuth winery to the south, and Frank Family Vineyards and Larkmead Vineyards to the west.

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

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

**Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies**

None

**Other Agencies Contacted**

Federal Trade and Taxation Bureau  
Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control

12. **Tribal Cultural Resources. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?** On February 27, 2018, 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. A response was received from the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation that indicated that the project site was not located within their aboriginal territories and declined comment on the project. A response was also received from the Middletown Rancheria requesting additional information which was provided to the tribal representative. No further consultation was requested and the consultation period closed on May 16, 2018.

**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.



Sean Trippi, Principal Planner  
Napa County Planning, Building, and Environmental Services

9/10/2018

Date

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. <b>AESTHETICS.</b> 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 a mix of vineyard, winery, and residential uses. The project would not result in a substantial damage to scenic resources, including trees and rock outcroppings, or substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The project site is currently developed with a winery, residences, vineyards, an agricultural building and other accessory structures. External changes to the winery are limited to new parking areas, two outdoor fermentation tanks located within an existing paved work area, driveway improvements as applicable, and a left-turn lane within the Silverado Trail right-of-way. The proposed increased floor area will occur within the cave tunnels. Silverado Trail is identified as a Viewshed Road. However, the County's Viewshed Protection Program is not applicable to the proposed project as no construction or improvements are proposed on slopes in excess of 15 percent. Because there is minimal visual impact from the road, there is a less than significant impact to a scenic vista.

d. Although the site is currently developed with an existing residence, second unit, agricultural and other outbuildings, the proposed improvements may result in the installation of additional lighting that may have the potential to impact nighttime views. Although the project is in an area that has a certain amount of existing nighttime lighting, the installation of new sources of nighttime lights may affect nighttime views. 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 will 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
<b>II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.<sup>1</sup> Would the project:</b>				
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. The California Department of Conservation District maps the area between Silverado Trail and the winery building and between the northerly and southerly driveways as "Prime Farmland." The remainder of the property, including the winery and other built up areas, are mapped as "Other Land." Modification of the winery's use permit entitlements would not have the effect of reducing existing on-site vineyard acreage or otherwise result in the conversion of farmland. Consistent with the General Plan definition of "agriculture" (Policy AG/LU-2), continuation of the processing of agricultural products and expansion of the related accessory uses are agricultural uses of land. Thus, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact with respect to conversion of farmland.
- b. The County's zoning of the property is AW (Agricultural Watershed) Districts, and the General Plan land use designation of the property is Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space. The proposed winery is consistent with the property's zoning, as Napa County Code Section 18.20.030 lists wineries and related, accessory uses as conditionally permitted in the AW Districts. General Plan Policies AG/LU-20 and AG/LU-21 also identify processing of agricultural products (grape crushing/winemaking) as a use that is consistent with the Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space land use designation. There is not a Williamson Act contract that is applicable to this property.
- c/d. The project site is zoned AW (Agricultural Watershed), which allows wineries upon grant of a use permit. The proposed parking spaces and existing winery are located in an area of the site that is also developed with vineyards and other structures. No vines will be proposed to be removed to accommodate the additional parking spaces. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Sensitive Biotic Oak woodlands, Riparian Woodland forest, and Coniferous forest) the project site does not contain lands classified as containing sensitive biotic communities, except for an area at the northeast corner of the property, well outside the proposed development area. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.
- e. As discussed in item "a.", above, the winery and winery accessory uses are defined as agricultural by the Napa County General Plan and are allowed under the parcels' AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning. Neither this project, nor any foreseeable consequence thereof, would result in changes to the existing environment which would result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

<sup>1</sup> "Forest land" is defined by the State as "land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits." (Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) The Napa County General Plan anticipates and does not preclude conversion of some "forest land" to agricultural use, and the program-level EIR for the 2008 General Plan Update analyzed the impacts of up to 12,500 acres of vineyard development between 2005 and 2030, with the assumption that some of this development would occur on "forest land." In that analysis specifically, and in the County's view generally, the conversion of forest land to agricultural use would constitute a potentially significant impact only if there were resulting significant impacts to sensitive species, biodiversity, wildlife movement, sensitive biotic communities listed by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, water quality, or other environmental resources addressed in this checklist.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. <b>AIR QUALITY.</b> 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 there is approximately 10,876 sq. ft. of existing floor area devoted to hospitality and administrative uses (including a 4,000 sq. ft. tasting room), approximately 25,020 sq. ft. of floor area devoted to production within existing buildings and cave tunnels, and a 10,820 sq. ft. cave expansion for additional production, 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, including the proposed cave expansion, which is approximately 46,176 sq. ft. of existing and proposed enclosed floor area (hospitality, administrative, winery buildings 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 the proposed parking areas and cave tunnels. 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 adhere 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](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 closest residence is approximately 1,100 feet to the northwest of the existing winery building. 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. <b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers - plants 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) no known candidate, sensitive, or special status species have been identified as occurring within the project boundaries. The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any special status species, or species of particular concern, as there are none identified in the project area. The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) recorded an occurrence of a Townsend's big-eared bat approximately 1.3 miles north/northwest of Highway 128 at Larkmead Lane in the attic of a barn that was demolished in 1945. Most of the site within the proposed development area is disturbed and developed with a winery, vineyards, a residence, second unit, three barns, outbuildings, and associated improvements. Proposed physical improvements (new paved parking area, unmarked overflow parking, cave expansion, and left-turn lane installation) would occur within the previously disturbed areas. No trees, vegetation or structures are proposed to be removed to accommodate the proposed site improvements. Furthermore, there were no species or site conditions which would be considered essential for the support of a species with limited distribution or considered to be a sensitive natural plant community. The site has not been identified in any local/regional or State plans as being a sensitive community. The potential for this project to have an impact on special status species is 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), no blue line streams traverse the site and vernal pools and wetlands are not present. All proposed improvements would occur within a previously disturbed area that is not a wildlife corridor. Therefore, project activities would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with their corridors or nursery sites. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e/f. This project would not interfere with any ordinances protecting biological resources. There are no tree preservation ordinances in effect in the County. 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:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. <b>CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> 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. An historic analysis was prepared by Dan Peterson, dated July 1, 2002, as part of the previously approved use permit to convert the historic barn to winery uses which concluded that the proposed improvements are in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Buildings. A letter from John Taft of Baken, Gillam and Kroger Architects, dated May 23, 2013, was submitted to provide an update to the Peterson report. The letter from Mr. Taft indicates that although the use of the building is now for hospitality uses, the conversion/rehabilitation of the structure is still consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Buildings. As mentioned in the Background/Project History section, above, the "1880 Worker's Cottage", which is listed on the State Register of Historic Resources was relocated and reconstructed in compliance with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*. The current proposal does not include any alterations of the historic barn, now used for hospitality purposes, or the former worker's cottage.
- b. As part of the previous use permit modification, a Cultural Resources Study was prepared by Tom Origer and Associates, dated June 3, 2013, to determine the presence or absence of archaeological or paleontological resources, and potential impacts, if any, as a result of the proposed project. According to the study, a sparse surface scattering of obsidian flakes and biface fragments on locally darkened soil were

found within a small portion of the site that had been exposed by past ground disturbing activities on the site. However, no archaeological deposits were discovered during construction of the project. If resources are 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.*

- c. No paleontological resources or unique geological features have been identified on the property or were encountered on the property when the existing buildings were constructed or when the vines were planted. However, if resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the standard condition of approval stated above.
- 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.	<b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> Would the project:				
	a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Discussion:

- a.
- 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 facility 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 facility will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible.
  - 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 reduce any impacts to a less than significant level.
  - iv.) The Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) did not indicate the presence of landslides on the property.
- b. Based upon the Soil Survey of Napa County, prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the site is composed of three soil types. Soils in the proposed development area and running along the sites frontage on Silverado Trail are classified as Bale clay loam which are characterized by slow runoff with a slight hazard of erosion. Bale soils are nearly level and are generally found on flood plains and low terraces. Soils in the northern half of the property are classified as Hambright rock-Outcrop and Boomer gravelly loam soils are found on the southern half of the property. Soils in the Hambright series are characterized by very high runoff with a high hazard of erosion. Soils in the Boomer series are also characterized by high runoff but with a moderated hazard of erosion. Both soil types are found on land with 30-75% slopes. Cole and Bale soils are found on steep upland areas. Project approval will require incorporation of best management practices and will be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable, to ensure that development does not impact adjoining properties, drainages, and roadways.
- c/d. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Surficial Deposits layer) the majority of the site is underlain by Pre-Quaternary deposits and bedrock. The proposed development area is underlain Holocene fan deposits. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Liquefaction layer) the project site has very low to medium susceptibility for liquefaction. The proposal includes expansion of the existing caves and site improvements associated with providing additional parking spaces will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- e. The Napa County Division of Environmental Health has reviewed this application and recommends approval based on the submitted wastewater feasibility study prepared by Summit , dated May 2, 2017. Soils on the property have been determined to be adequate to support the proposed septic improvements including the winery's process waste as well as the proposed number of visitors to the winery.

**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 (CO<sub>2</sub>e)]. 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 (CO<sub>2</sub>) 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](http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/glossary/letter_c.html)). Equivalent Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>e) is the most commonly reported type of GHG emission and a way to get one number that approximates total emissions from all the different gasses that contribute to GHG (BAAMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2017). In this case, carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) is used as the reference atom/compound to obtain atmospheric carbon CO<sub>2</sub> effects of GHG. Carbon stocks are converted to carbon dioxide equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e) 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 existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed. As previously stated, this project includes the construction

of a new paved parking area, cave expansion, installation of a left-turn lane, and upgrades or alterations of existing wastewater treatment systems.

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 increased 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 there is approximately 10,876 sq. ft. of existing floor area devoted to hospitality and administrative uses, approximately 25,020 sq. ft. of floor area devoted to production within existing buildings and cave tunnels, and a 10,820 sq. ft. cave expansion for additional production when compared to the BAAQMD's GHG screening criteria of 121,000 sq. ft. for general industrial, and compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 9,000 sq. ft. for high quality restaurant, the project was determined not to exceed the 1,100 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr GHG threshold of significance. Given the size of the entire project, which is approximately 46,176 sq. ft. of existing and proposed enclosed floor area (hospitality, administrative, winery buildings and cave) including the existing 4,000 sq. ft. tasting room, the screening criterion outlined above would not be exceeded.

Furthermore, the applicant proposes to incorporate the following additional GHG reduction methods: bicycle incentives; alternative fuel fleet vehicles; use of recycled water; water efficient landscaping; and, three electric vehicle charging stations. The existing winery has already implemented the following GHG reduction practices: photovoltaic panels that produce up 134,095 kwh (the winery's estimated energy demand is 140,000 kwh); well pump run by a windmill; cool roofing on the existing winery buildings; water efficient landscaping; use of 70-80% cover crops; chipping and reusing pruned plant materials, and certified "Napa Green" vineyards.

The proposed project has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds and determined that the project would not exceed the 1,100 MT/yr of CO<sub>2</sub>e. 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.

Greenhouse Gas Emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the Cal Green Building Code, vehicle fuel efficiency standards, and the project-specific on-site programs identified 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.	<b>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 an existing 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 buildings.
- 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. No impact would occur as the project site is not located within an airport land use plan.
- f. No impact would occur as the project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.
- g. The project's access driveways meet Napa County Road and Street Standards. Therefore, the winery would not obstruct emergency vehicle access. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division and found acceptable, as conditioned.
- h. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. The project currently complies and would continue to comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. 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
IX. <b>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b> Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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 partially within the Calistoga subarea of the Napa Valley floor and partially within the Eastern Mountains subarea of Napa County. The Napa County Comprehensive Groundwater Monitoring Program 2016 Annual Report and CASGEM Update prepared by LSCE in March 2016 concluded that the Calistoga subarea of Napa County has stable groundwater conditions. 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. Approximately 10.2 acres of the 114.3 acre property is located within the Valley Floor, which has an established acceptable water use criteria of 1.0 acre foot per acre per year based upon current County Water Availability Analysis (WAA) policies. Based upon those criteria, the Allowable Water Allotment for the area of the project site located within the Valley Floor is 10.2 acre-feet per year, determined by multiplying the 10.2 acre Valley Floor area by a one acre foot per acre per year fair share water use factor. This allotment was not incorporated into the WAA. The remainder of the property is within the hillside area, including the water supply well for the winery, or an area otherwise categorized as “all other areas” by the County WAA Guidance Document. Property located within “all other areas” requires a Tier 2 analysis which is intended to estimate annual groundwater recharge during average and dry years. A Tier 2 analysis was completed by Summit Engineering, dated May 2, 2017. According to the analysis, the estimated annual amount of infiltration for the property is 280.4 acre-feet per year for a normal year and 162.6 acre-feet per year for a dry year. These numbers do not account for the amount of water vegetation on the site will uptake due to evapotranspiration. The report assumed that the vegetation would conservatively uptake 90% of the infiltrated rainwater during a drought year resulting in recharging 16.26 acre-feet per year to the aquifer.

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 Feasibility Study prepared by Summit Engineering, dated May 2, 2017, the project site has adequate capacity to serve the project. The study concluded that the facility’s existing sanitary sewage (SS) management system will require expansion or an upgrade, and a new or upgraded system for process wastewater (PW) management system will be required. The Environmental Health Division reviewed this report and concurred with its findings.

The project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements nor substantially deplete local groundwater supplies. The facility’s domestic water system is classified as transient, non-community and is owned and operated by the winery. Water sources for the project site consist of seven groundwater wells. Only one well, Well #2, is used as the groundwater source for the public water system providing water for the existing winery, main residence, and secondary dwelling. One well is not operational, one well operates a windmill, and the other wells provide water for vineyard and landscape irrigation. According to the WAA prepared by Summit Engineering, Well #2 was constructed in 2007, has a depth of 440-feet with a 56-foot seal, and a yield of 12.7 gallons per minute for an 8-hour test.

As noted above, the applicant submitted a Tier 2 Water Availability Analysis (WAA) completed by Summit Engineering showing the projected overall water demand for the project site of 10.39 AF/YR representing a 2.17 AF/YR increase of the existing water demand of 8.22 AF/YR. 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	5.36	5.36
Winery/Residential		
Wine Production	0.55	1.84
Domestic (winery & residential)	1.05	1.93
Landscape Irrigation	1.26	1.26
<b>Net Use (Acre-ft per Year)</b>	<b>8.22</b>	<b>10.39</b>

The estimated groundwater demand of 10.39 AF/YR represents a net increase of 2.17 AF/YR over the existing condition and is below the water allotment for the parcel. In addition, the winery utilizes treated process wastewater for vineyard irrigation to offset groundwater demand from the existing irrigation wells which is projected to account for as much as 1.84 AF/YR of the 5.36 AF/YR of vineyard irrigation. 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.

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 an increase on the demand of ground water supplies. A well interference analysis was conducted as part of the Tier 2 analysis to review the project's potential impacts on neighboring wells within 500 feet from the property wells. The groundwater drawdown from all on-site wells within 500-feet of the property lines was determined using the Theis equation as indicated in the WAA guidelines. The assumed closest distance that any neighboring well could be located is the edge of the parcel. The analysis concluded that, based on using very conservative estimates for aquifer thickness, specific storage, and hydraulic conductivity, only one of the wells should produce a drawdown greater than 10 feet on any wells that are adjacent to the property. The WAA guidelines establish a 10-foot drawdown as the criteria to determine significant adverse effects. The well in question, Well #7, is approximately 380 feet from the north property line and has a flow rate of approximately 90 gallons per minute (gpm). Based on County records, the nearest well on the adjoining property to the north is over 600-feet from the project site's north property line. The WAA indicates that if a significant impact is encountered at an offsite well due to interference from Well #7, the pumping rate could be reduced to approximately 70 gpm to reduce the anticipated drawdown to 10-feet. Because of the distance between the two wells (approximately 980-feet), no significant drawdown impact is anticipated for wells on adjacent parcels. However, a condition of approval will require reducing the pump rate of Well #7 if there is a substantiated case of well interference. 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.

- 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 cultivated agricultural vineyard and winery site. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. The preliminary grading and drainage plan has been reviewed by the Engineering Division. 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 is located outside the boundaries of the 100 and 500 year flood hazard zones. Accordingly, no impact 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. <b>LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-c. The project would not would result in the division of an established community. The project complies with the Napa County Code and all other applicable regulations. The subject parcel is located in the AW zoning district, which allow wineries and uses accessory to wineries subject to use permit approval. The proposed project is compliant with the physical limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance. The County has adopted the Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO) to protect agriculture and open space and to regulate winery development and expansion in a manner that avoids potential negative environmental effects.

Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-1 of the 2008 General Plan states that the County shall, “preserve existing agricultural land uses and plan for agriculture and related activities as the primary land uses in Napa County.” The property’s General Plan land use designation is AR which allows “agriculture, processing of agricultural products, and single-family dwellings.” More specifically, General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-2 recognizes wineries and other agricultural processing facilities, and any use clearly accessory to those facilities, as agriculture. The project would allow for the continuation of agriculture as a dominant land use within the county and is 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. <b>MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> 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. <b>NOISE.</b> Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. The project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during construction of a left-turn lane on State Route 29 at the project's primary access driveway, construction of the new parking areas near the existing winery building, and expansion of the existing cave. 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 1,100 feet to the southwest of the existing winery structures and proposed parking area, there is a low potential for impacts related to construction noise to result in a significant impact. Further, construction activities would occur during the period of 7am-7pm 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.*

c/d. The proposed project involves changes to the approved marketing program with the largest events hosting up to 200 guests as opposed to 100 guests currently allowed. Marketing activities will continue to occur both inside and outside winery buildings. 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 also include rural residences; of these land uses, the residential uses are 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 1,100 feet to the southwest of the existing winery. Under the proposed project, the largest event that would occur on the parcel would have an attendance of no more than 200 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). 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, excluding quiet 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. The proposed project would not result in long-term significant permeant nose impacts.

4.10 **AMPLIFIED MUSIC**

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

e/f. The winery and proposed modifications would not expose people to excessive noise levels associated with air traffic. No private landing facility is proposed with the requested modification, and the winery is neither within the boundaries of an airport land use compatibility planning area nor within two miles of any public or private airport or airstrip.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII.	<b>POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b> 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. Proposed staffing for the project includes increasing the number of full-time employees from five (5) to 25 as part of this project. 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 20 additional full-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.

The proposed use permit modification would facilitate ongoing operation of an existing winery. Other than on-site wastewater treatment improvements to serve exclusively the winery's operations, no new infrastructure is proposed that might induce growth by extending service outside of the boundaries of any of the winery owner's properties.

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. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> 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. The property is located within the service areas of both the Napa County Sheriff's Department as well as the Napa County Fire Department. The proposed winery improvements, if approved, would be inspected by County building inspectors and fire officials in order to ensure that construction occurs in accordance with current Building and Fire Codes applicable at the time of submittal of any requisite building permit application. If approved, the requested use permit modification would facilitate the continued operation and expansion of an existing winery on-site of existing vineyards. The proposed project scope does not include construction of any new residential units nor accompanying introduction of new residents that would utilize existing parks or potentially increase student enrollment in schools located in the area of the winery. School impact fees, which assist local school districts with capacity building measures, would be levied pursuant to building permit submittal. No new parks or other public recreational amenities or institutions are proposed to be built with the proposed use permit. Impacts to public services would be less than significant. Also see discussion under Section XV, below.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XV. RECREATION.</b> 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/b. The proposed project is a request for modification to the existing Use Permit allowing operation of the winery. If approved as proposed, the modification would allow operational changes that include expansion of the currently permitted hospitality program, additional marketing activities, an increase in the number of employees and gallons of wine produced, and various other site and utility changes. While the existing main residence and second dwelling on the winery property would be retained, the proposed project includes no new residential units nor accompanying introduction of new residents that would utilize existing parks in the area, potentially accelerating those recreational facilities' deterioration. The proposal would increase the number of employees at the winery and visitors to the property, some of whom might visit recreational facilities in the area during breaks, before or after work, or on the way to or from other wineries. However, given that the purpose of employees' and guests' trips are to and from the winery as the primary destination, such visits to area recreational facilities are anticipated

to be infrequent and would not drastically accelerate the deterioration of the park amenities. No new parks or other public recreational amenities are proposed to be built with the proposed winery.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

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

**Discussion:**

a. The 114.32 acre project site is located on the east side Silverado Trail, immediately south and opposite of its intersection with Larkmead Lane. The applicant has submitted a traffic study *Updated Traffic Analysis for the Proposed Davis Estates Winery Use Permit Modification*, prepared by Omni-Means, dated February 2, 2018, which analyzes existing, proposed, near term and cumulative traffic conditions and provides the basis for this analysis. The proposal would increase annual wine production from 30,000 gallons to 100,000 gallons; increase employment from 5 full-time employees to 25 full-time employees; increase daily tours and tastings by appointment only from 20 visitors weekday and 34 visitors on weekends and holidays to a maximum of 200 visitors per day, 800 maximum per week from June 1 to October 31, a maximum of 100 visitors per day, 350 maximum per week from November 1 to November 30 and February 1 to May 31, and a maximum of 75 visitors per day, 250 maximum per week from December 1 to January 31; and, increase marketing events from two (2) per month with up to 50 guests at each event and two (2) per year with up to 100 guests at each event to 24 events per year with up to 100 guests at each event and 15 events per year with up to 200 guests at each event. Marketing activities would occur outside the weekday (4:00 to 6:00 P.M.) and Saturday peak (1:00 to 3:00 P.M.) traffic periods.

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)

The project site has approximately 1,100 feet of frontage along Silverado Trail extending south from the Larkmead Lane intersection. Silverado Trail is classified as a rural two-lane undivided arterial roadway. Near the project site Silverado Trail is improved with two 12-foot wide travel lanes, 3-4 foot paved shoulders plus drainage swales or slopes in some areas. Access to the site is from three existing driveways on Silverado Trail. The center driveway provides access to the winery for visitors. Driveways north and south of the winery driveway provide access to the site for employees and deliveries (north driveway) and for the main residence and second unit (south driveway.) The existing driveways would be widened, as necessary, to meet the County Road and Street Standards. Larkmead Lane and the three driveways have a single lane at their intersection with Silverado Trail that is controlled by a stop sign.

According to the traffic analysis (page 3), existing daily traffic volumes along Silverado Trail at the winery location are approximately 4,550 average daily trips (ADT). Although Saturday volumes on Silverado Trail are generally somewhat lower than weekday volumes, the traffic analysis conservatively assumed that the 4,550 daily traffic volume reflects both weekday and Saturday conditions. The daily volume on Silverado Trail is indicative of a LOS B. Peak hour volumes during the weekday peak period (496 trips) and weekend peak period (369 trips) are also indicative of LOS B conditions. The Larkmead Lane eastbound approach and all three on-site driveways approaches to Silverado Trail operate at LOS B or better as well.

New trips would consist of the proposed increased number of visitors and employees, and wine production-related truck traffic including grape deliveries. The winery is expected to generate 109 new daily trips on a typical weekday and 151 trips on a typical Saturday. Trips during the PM peak hour would be 41 on a weekday and 38 on a Saturday. The project would generate approximately 182 new daily trips and 45 peak hour trips during the six-week harvest season. Silverado Trail would continue to operate at LOS B when project trips, both daily and peak hour, are added to existing traffic volumes.

Near-term project trips, which include current trips associated with the project site plus approved/pending projects, but excluding the project proposal, are expected to generate about 650 average daily trips for a total of approximately 5,200 daily trips on Silverado Trail when added to the existing daily volume of 4,550 trips. Approximately 558 trips would occur during the weekday PM peak hour and 448 trips during the weekend mid-day peak hour. Daily volumes on Silverado Trail would continue to operate at LOS B. Peak hour volumes would be LOS C during weekdays and LOS B during weekends. LOS would remain unchanged for daily trips on Silverado Trail as well as weekday and weekend peak hour trips when project trips are added to near term conditions.

The traffic volumes on Silverado Trail do not currently result in a requirement for a left turn lane from Silverado Trail into the project site. The proposed project would increase traffic volumes on Silverado Trail and dictate that employees access the winery via the center or main driveway resulting in a requirement to provide a left turn at the main driveway which is included as part of the project proposal. By redistributing employee trips to the main driveway, the north driveway would only be used by delivery trucks and would not result in a left turn lane. Vehicle trips at the south driveway would still only be used by the residents of the property and also do not result in the need for a left turn lane.

Cumulative volume projections on Silverado Trail were derived from the Napa Valley Transportation Authority forecasts in the General Plan EIR. Traffic volumes on Silverado Trail are expected to increase from approximately 4,550 to 6,920 daily trips without the project and 7,000 daily trips with the project in the year 2030. Weekday PM peak hour trips are expected to be about 1,342 trips. Weekend peak hour volumes are expected to be about 80% of weekday peak hour volumes. The cumulative increases on Silverado Trail would result in projected operating conditions of LOS C, which is an acceptable level of service under cumulative conditions using forecasted traffic volumes.

- c. No air traffic is proposed and there are no new structures proposed for this project that would interfere with or require alteration of air traffic patterns. No impact would occur.
- d/e. Access to the proposed winery is from an existing driveway near the center of the site which will be improved as needed to meet County Road and Street Standards. As noted above, a left turn lane is proposed at this driveway. The traffic study indicated existing vehicle speeds on Silverado Trail were measured at about 55-59 miles per hour (mph) with a posted vehicle speed of 55 mph. Stopping sight distances, based on Cal Trans design standards for the measured vehicle speeds, would be 500-564 feet measured along the two travel lanes on Silverado Trail. Based on field measurements by the traffic consultant, sight distances from the driveway locations are in excess of this distance in both directions of Silverado Trail. The study did note that keeping vegetation trimmed along the east side of Silverado Trail to the

extent possible will help maintain adequate sight distance at the southerly driveway. The study also recommended that signs should identify the use of each driveway, ie. visitors, deliveries, and private residence as well as directing employees who may arrive or depart during the AM and PM peak periods to only use the middle driveway. The traffic consultant also recommends that traffic counts be taken at all three driveways approximately one-year after this proposal is implemented to determine if there are any volume issues regarding vehicles trips to and from the site. These suggestions are included as project specific conditions of approval.

- f. The project proposes to add 17 striped parking spaces to the previously approved 14 parking space for a total of 31 spaces. An additional 45 overflow spaces will also be provided. The spaces will be distributed throughout the site so there will not be a single, large parking lot maintaining the agricultural character of the site. No parking is permitted or proposed within the right-of-way of Silverado Trail.
- f. As proposed, the project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation. The project proposes the installation of bicycling parking facilities. No impact would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII.	<b>TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> 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. On February 27, 2018, 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. A response was received from the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation that indicated that the project site was not located within their aboriginal territories and declined comment on the project. A response was also received from the Middletown Rancheria requesting additional information which was provided to the tribal representative. No further consultation was requested and the consultation period closed on May 16, 2018.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII.	<b>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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. The project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and would not result in a significant impact on the environment relative to wastewater discharge. Wastewater disposal would continue to be accommodated on-site and in compliance with State and County regulations. According to the Wastewater Feasibility Study prepared by Summit Engineering, dated May 2, 2017, the existing sanitary and process waste disposal systems will need to be upgraded to accommodate the proposed project. The soil type and topography would support expansion of the sanitary waste disposal system. Existing process wastewater is treated by a package system that will be upgraded or replaced to accommodate increased wine production. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings.

The facility's domestic water system is classified as transient, non-community and is owned and operated by the winery. Water sources for the project site consist of seven groundwater wells. Only one well, Well #2, is used as the groundwater source for the public water system providing water for the existing winery, main residence, and secondary dwelling. One well is not operational, one well operates a windmill, and the other wells provide water for vineyard and landscape irrigation. According to the Water Availability Analysis (WAA) prepared by Summit Engineering, Well #2 was constructed in 2007, has a depth of 440-feet with a 56-foot seal, and a yield of 12.7 gallons per minute for an 8-hour test. As noted above, the applicant submitted a Tier 1 WAA completed by Summit Engineering showing the projected overall water demand for the project site of 10.39 AF/YR representing a 2.17 AF/YR increase of the existing water demand of 8.22 AF/YR. The parcel water demand can be met with the existing project wells. The concluded that sufficient water would be available to serve the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. The preliminary grading and drainage plan has been reviewed by the Engineering Division. As conditioned, impacts would be less than significant.

d. Approximately 10.2 acres of the 114.3 acre property is located within the Valley Floor, which has an established acceptable water use criteria of 1.0 acre foot per acre per year based upon current County Water Availability Analysis (WAA) policies. Based upon those criteria, the Allowable Water Allotment for the area of the project site located within the Valley Floor is 10.2 acre-feet per year, determined by multiplying the 10.2 acre Valley Floor area by a one acre foot per acre per year fair share water use factor. This allotment was not incorporated into the WAA. The remainder of the property is within the hillside area, including the water supply well for the winery, or an area otherwise categorized as "all other areas" by the County WAA Guidance Document. Property located within "all other areas" requires a Tier 1 analysis which is intended to estimate annual groundwater recharge during average and dry years. As noted above, the applicant submitted a Tier 1 WAA completed by Summit Engineering showing the projected overall water demand for the project site of 10.39 AF/YR representing a 2.17 AF/YR increase of the existing water demand of 8.22 AF/YR. The parcel water demand can be met with the existing project wells. Impacts would be less than significant as there is sufficient water supply available to serve the proposed project.

e. Wastewater would be treated on-site and would not require a wastewater treatment provider. Impacts would be less than significant.

f. The project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the projects demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the project.

- g. The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, 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
<b>XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>				
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** above, all potential biological related impacts would be less than significant. As identified in **Section V** above, no known 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.
- 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 pollutants, 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.

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." The cumulative increases on Silverado Trail would result in projected operating conditions of LOS C, which is an acceptable level of service under cumulative conditions using forecasted traffic volumes.

- c. All environmental effects from this project have been mitigated to a level of less than significant. There are no environmental effects caused by this project that would result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, whether directly or indirectly. No hazardous conditions resulting from this project have been identified. The project would not have any environmental effects that would result in significant impacts.

**Mitigation Measures:** None Required.