

“C”

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative
Declaration

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

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated January 2019)

1. **Project Title:** Scarlett Winery, Use Permit #P16-00428-UP
2. **Property Owner:** Sherrett Reicher, Alsace Company LTD; 3200 Danville Blvd, Suite 100, Alamo, CA 94574; (925) 314-0193
3. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Sherrett Reicher, Alsace Company LTD; 3200 Danville Blvd, Suite 100, Alamo, CA 94574; (925) 314-0193
4. **Representative:** Donna Oldford, Plans4Wine, 2620 Pinot Way, St. Helena, CA 94574, (707) 963-5832
5. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and Email:** Charlene Gallina, Supervising Planner, (707) 299-1355, charlene.gallina@countyofnapa.org
6. **Project Location and APN:** The project is located on an approximately 47.88 acre site at 1052 Ponti Road, which intersects with Skellenger Lane just west of Silverado Trail, St. Helena, CA; APN: 030-280-010.
7. **General Plan Description:** AR (Agriculture Resource) & Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space (AWOS)
8. **Zoning:** Agricultural Preserve (AP) – 47.17 Acres & Agricultural Watershed (AW) District – 0.71 Acres
9. **Project Description:** Approval of a Use Permit for a new 30,000 gallon per year winery to allow the following:
 - a) Construction of a winery building consisting of two detached structures (a two story 4,514 sf hospitality/administration building and a one story 18,022 sf production building) separated between the east outdoor terrace area and a landscaped area;
 - b) Construction of a 4,725 sf covered outdoor crush pad;
 - c) Tours and tastings by appointment only with a maximum of 15 visitors per day and a weekly maximum of 80 visitors;
 - d) A marketing program of two (2) food and wine pairing lunch event per month with a maximum of 10 persons; one (1) wine club release event per year with a maximum of 100 guests; one (1) large event per year with a maximum of 125 guests; and one (1) wine club release event per year for groups of up to 200 guests with up to 10 event staff. Events to be held between 10 am and 6 pm or 6 pm to 10 pm. Larger events (100, 125, and 200 guests) to be held on weekends only. Portable toilets to be utilized during any event hosting greater than 75 guests. Shuttle service used for events over 100 guests;
 - e) Six (6) full-time, two (2) part-time employees and two (2) employees during harvest;
 - f) A commercial kitchen for some food preparation and use as a caterers' staging area for some of the marketing events;
 - g) On-premise consumption of wines produced on-site within the east and west outdoor terraced areas, outdoor picnic area and hospitality building designated tasting areas in accordance with Business and Professions Code Sections 23358, 23390 and 23396.5 (AB2004-Evans Bill);
 - h) Winery hours of operation daily 6 am – 6 pm (Non-harvest production hours) and daily visitation hours of operation daily 10 am –6pm;
 - i) Construction of seven (7) visitor and five (5) employee parking spaces both with a handicapped space and one area for a high occupancy vehicle for a total of 13 spaces;
 - j) Installation of a wastewater system;
 - k) Installation of a regulated transient non-community water system;
 - l) Installation of two (2) 20,000-gallon domestic water storage tank and one (1) 100,000-gallon fire water storage tank;
 - m) Installation of an entry gate and winery sign; and
 - n) All project spoils to be disposed on-site.
10. **Environmental setting and surrounding land uses:**

The 47.88-acre project site is located at 1052 Ponti Road, which intersects with Skellenger Lane just west of Silverado Trail. The project site is currently developed with an existing primary residence, guest cottage, miscellaneous structures associated with vineyard operations, and an irrigation pond. The site currently contains 38 acres of vineyards. The amount of existing vineyards proposed to be removed for development is two acres. The applicant proposes to replant 0.4 acres of vineyards. The water source for the existing and proposed uses is from two (2) existing onsite wells. There is an existing well onsite serving the existing residence and guest cottage (Well #1) and one

well used for vineyard irrigation (Well #2). The property is relatively flat ($\pm 0-5\%$ slope) with elevations on the property ranging from approximately 60 feet above mean sea level (msl) to approximately 85 feet above msl. The closest water source is Conn Creek, which is approximately 1,935 feet or 0.367 miles west of the westernmost portion of the study area. The proposed winery development area is not located within the designated floodplain area.

The surrounding area consists of existing vineyards and rural residential uses to the north, south, and west. Across Silverado Trail to the east the topography gradually slopes upwards from 175 feet to 1,000+ feet above msl. Pina Cellars Winery is located directly across the proposed project site off of Silverado Trail. The closest residence is approximately 560 feet to the north of the proposed winery building along Ponti Road.

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. The project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County, including but not limited to building permits, grading permits, waste disposal permits, and an encroachment permit. 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

13. **Tribal Cultural Resources. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resource, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?**

On October 19, 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 located within their aboriginal territories and requested additional information was provided to the tribal representative on November 21, 2018. No further correspondence has been received. Therefore, the consultation period was closed. A response was also received from the Middletown Rancheria requesting that they be contacted should any new information or evidence of human habitation be found as the project progresses.

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 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

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

September 10, 2019
Date

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<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/b. 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, the project site is defined by a mix of vineyard, miscellaneous structures, 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 residence, vineyards, and accessory structures. 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%. Because there is minimal visual impact from the road, there is a less than significant impact to a scenic vista.
- c. The proposed new winery consists of two structures set back 300 feet from Ponti Road. These structures will be screened with vineyards and decorative landscaping. As proposed, the hospitality building will be placed in front of the production building with all winery functions occurring behind the building which will also be screened with decorative landscaping and vineyards to provide screening of the back of house operations from Silverado Trail which is over 740 feet to the east. The façade of the winery will be plaster with steel sash doors and metal windows, a redwood screen wall, and a corrugate metal roof and will comply with County's required earth tone color palette. The maximum height of the slope-roof hospitality building is 15 feet and 25 feet for the slope-roof production building. As such, the project would not degrade the existing character of the site and its surrounding and impacts would be less than significant.
- d. Although the site is currently developed with an existing residence and outbuildings, the proposed new winery building may result in the installation of additional lighting that may have the potential to impact nighttime views. The closest residence is approximately 560 feet to the north of the proposed winery building. 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 will be required to be shielded and directed downward, with only low-level lighting allowed in parking areas. As designed, and 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.*

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

- a. All lighting shall be permanently maintained in accordance with the lighting and building plans approved by the County. Lighting utilized during harvest activities is exempt from this requirement.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.¹ Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The California Department of Conservation District map designates the property as “Prime Farmland.” The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use policies AG/LU-2 and AG/LU-13 recognize wineries, and any use consistent with the Winery Definition Ordinance and clearly accessory to a winery, as agriculture. Thus, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact with respect to conversion of farmland. Approximately 2.0 acres of vines will be removed to facilitate construction of the proposed winery. However, 0.4 acres will be replanted. There are no other changes included in this proposal that would result in the conversion of Farmland.
- b. The County’s zoning of the property is AP (Agricultural Preserve) and AW (Agricultural Watershed) and the General Plan land use designation of the property is Agriculture Reserve and Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space. The proposed winery is consistent with the property’s zoning, as Napa County Code Sections 18.16.030 and 18.20.030 lists wineries and related, accessory uses as conditionally permitted in the AP and 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 Resource and Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space land use designations. There is not a Williamson Act contract that is applicable to this property.
- c/d. The project site is zoned AP (Agricultural Preserve) and AW (Agricultural Watershed), which allows wineries upon grant of a use permit. According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps (based on the following layers – Sensitive Biotic Oak Woodlands, Riparian Woodland Forest and Coniferous Forest) the project site does not contain lands classified as forest or timberland. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

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

- 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 AP (Agricultural Preserve) and 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.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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 PM_{2.5}, 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 PM_{2.5} occasionally does reach unhealthy concentrations. There are multiple reasons for PM_{2.5} exceedances in Napa County. First, much

of the county is wind-sheltered, which tends to trap PM_{2.5} 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 PM_{2.5} 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 (NO_x and ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), and suspended particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}). 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 4,514 sq. ft. of proposed floor area dedicated to hospitality and administrative uses, approximately 18,022 sq. ft. of floor area dedicated to production, and an approximately 5,406 sq.ft. outdoor crush pad area, when compared to the BAAQMD's screening criteria of 541,000 sq. ft. for general industrial, and compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47,000 sq. ft. for high quality restaurants, 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 proposed project compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47,000 sq. ft. (high quality restaurant) and 541,000 sq. ft. (general light industry) for NO_x (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 winery buildings, parking areas, cave tunnels and associated site improvements. Earthmoving and construction emissions would have a temporary effect; consisting mainly of dust generated during grading and other construction activities, exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles, and relatively minor emissions from paints and other architectural coatings. The Air District recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction impacts. If the proposed project adheres to these relevant best management practices identified by the Air District and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts are considered less than significant:

7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

c. AIR QUALITY

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

- 1. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. The BAAQMD's phone number shall also be visible.*
- 2. Water all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) two times per day.*
- 3. Cover all haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site.*

4. Remove all visible mud or dirt traced onto adjacent public roads by using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
5. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
6. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
7. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting off equipment when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five (5) minutes (as required by State Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
8. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator. Any portable engines greater than 50 horsepower or associated equipment operated within the BAAQMD's jurisdiction shall have either a California Air Resources Board (ARB) registration Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) or a BAAQMD permit. For general information regarding the certified visible emissions evaluator or the registration program, visit the ARB FAQ http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/perp/perpfact_04-16-15.pdf or the PERP website <http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/portable.htm>.

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

7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

b. DUST CONTROL

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

- e. While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. The closest residence is approximately 560 feet to the north of the proposed winery buildings. Construction-phase pollutants would be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. The project would not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 state or federally protected wetlands (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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 GIS Sensitivity Maps (Natural Diversity Data Base and US Fish and Wildlife Critical Habitat) 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 within the project area. Most of the site within the proposed development area is disturbed and developed with vineyards, a residence, guest cottage, accessory structures and associated improvements. No trees, vegetation, other than vineyards, or structures are proposed to be removed. Only two (2) acres of existing vineyards are proposed to be removed to accommodate the proposed site improvements in which the applicant proposes to replant 0.4 acres of vineyards. 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 GIS Sensitivity Maps (Wetland & vernal pools layer), no vernal pools and wetlands are present on the project site. 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. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to 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) 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/b. A Historical Resources Study was prepared by Tom Origer and Associates dated May 4, 2017. The study was conducted to determine the presence or absence of historical or archaeological resources, and potential impacts, if any, as a result of the proposed project. According to the study, no historical resources were observed on the site and the property contains no archaeological remains. The report concluded that no further study or specific recommendations are required. However, if any previously undiscovered resources are found during grading of 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 following standard condition of approval that will be imposed on the project:

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 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.	ENERGY. Would the project:				
	a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would comply with Title 24 energy use requirements and would not result in significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency 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
VII.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
	a) Directly or indirectly cause 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 direct or indirect risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a.
- i.) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.
 - ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project would be required to comply with the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
 - iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.
 - iv.) The Napa County GIS Sensitivity Maps (Landslides line and polygon) did not indicate the presence of landslides within the area proposed for development.
- b. The proposed improvements would occur on slopes of less than 1 percent. The spoils resulting from grading activities will be retained on-site and used for construction of the engineered pad and fill slope proposed for construction of the winery and driveway. The project would require incorporation of best management practices and would be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance, which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c/d. Based upon the Soil Survey of Napa County, prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the site is composed of Bale clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes. Boomer-Forward-Felta complex, 30 to 50 percent slopes. Clear-Lake clay, drained, 0 to 2 percent slopes, MLRA 14. Cole site loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes. Perkins gravelly loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes. Pleasanton loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes. According to the Napa County GIS Sensitivity Maps (Surficial Deposits layer), the area consists of alluvial fan deposits that date from the latest Pleistocene through the Holocene (30,000 years ago to present) epochs, undivided alluvium that dates to the Holocene (11,700 years ago to present) epoch, stream terrace deposits that date to the Holocene epoch, and artificial fill. Based on the Napa County GIS Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the property includes areas generally subject to a low to medium tendencies to liquefy. All proposed construction will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction. Compliance with the latest editions of the California Building Code for seismic stability would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible, resulting in less than significant impacts.
- e. There is a septic system installed on site that serves residential development which will remain separate for the wastewater treatment system for the proposed winery. Bartelt Engineering prepared wastewater system calculations and plans, dated January, 2018 (revised), to

evaluate the feasibility of treating wastewater flows generated by the winery. The report proposes two wastewater system options, a pressure distribution wastewater dispersal system to dispose of sanitary wastewater and process wastewater (preferred option), or by using a pressure distribution system to dispose of sanitary wastewater only and converting the existing irrigation/frost protection pond into a wastewater evaporation pond to treat process wastewater. The study concludes that the proposed winery wastewater disposal needs can be accommodated onsite. The Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the application materials and determined that either of the proposed systems would be adequate to serve the winery. Full design calculations and construction plans will be prepared in accordance with Napa County standards at the time of building permit application submittal. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

- f. 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 7.2 identified in **Section V** above.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

In July 2015, the County re-commenced preparation of the CAP to: i) account for present day conditions and modeling assumptions (such as but not limited to methods, emission factors, and data sources), ii) address the concerns with the previous CAP effort as outlined above, iii) meet applicable State requirements, and iv) result in a functional and legally defensible CAP. On April 13, 2016 the County, as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP, released Final Technical Memorandum #1: 2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016. This initial phase included: i) updating the unincorporated County's community-wide GHG emissions inventory to 2014, and ii) preparing new GHG emissions forecasts for the 2020, 2030, and 2050 horizons. Additional information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or <http://www.countyofnapa.org/CAP/>.

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

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

the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency in December 2009, and served as the basis for development of a refined inventory and emission reduction plan for unincorporated Napa County.

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

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

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

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

One time "Construction Emissions" associated with a winery development project include: i) the carbon stocks that are lost (or released) when existing vegetation is removed and soil is ripped in preparation for a new winery structure and associated infrastructure; and ii) emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area and construct a winery, including construction equipment and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as Equipment Emissions). These emissions also include underground carbon stocks (or Soil carbon) associated with the removal of any existing vegetation. As previously stated, this project includes the construction of two winery buildings, an access driveway and parking, and other winery related utilities and infrastructure.

In addition to the one time Construction Emissions, "Operational Emissions" of the winery are also considered and include: i) any reduction in the amount of carbon sequestered by existing vegetation that is removed as part of the project compared to a "no project" scenario (hereinafter referred to as Operational Sequestration Emissions); and ii) ongoing emissions from the energy used to maintain and operate the winery, including vehicle trips associated with employee and visitor trips (hereinafter referred to as Operational Emissions). See Section XVI, Transportation/Traffic, for anticipated number of operational trips. Operational Emissions from the proposed winery would be the primary source of emissions over the long-term when compared to one-time construction emissions.

As discussed in the Air Quality section of this Initial Study, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors & GHG Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, including GHG emissions, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. Of the two proposed winery structures, one winery building floor area, approximately 4,514 sq.ft. in size is dedicated to hospitality and administrative uses and the second building, approximately 18,022 sq.ft., is dedicated to production activities. In addition, a covered outdoor crush pad area, approximately 5,406 sq.ft. in size, will also be installed. 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 CO₂e/yr GHG threshold of significance. Given the size of the entire project, which is approximately 22,536 sq.ft. of proposed enclosed floor area (hospitality, administrative, and production) and the 5,406 sq.ft. covered outdoor crush pad area, the screening criterion outlined above would not be exceeded.

Furthermore, the applicant intends to implement the following GHG reduction methods at the winery: generation of on-site renewable energy (accommodate photovoltaic (PV) panels); solar hot water heating; energy conserving lighting; bicycle incentives; energy star roof/living roof/cool roof; installation of water efficient fixtures; water efficient landscape; recycle 75 percent of all waste; compost 75 percent of food and garden material; implement a sustainable purchasing and shipping program; a electrical vehicle charging station, site design that is oriented and designed to optimize conditions for natural heating, cooling, and day lighting of interior spaces, and to maximize winter sun exposure; limit the amount of grading and tree removal; use of recycled materials; education to staff and visitors on sustainable

practices; use of 70 to 80 percent cover crop; and retain biomass removed via pruning and thinning by chipping the material and reusing it rather than burning on-site.

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts utilized in typical winery operations. A business plan would be filed with the Environmental Health Division should hazardous materials reach reportable levels. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. Hazardous materials such as diesel, maintenance fluids, and paints would be used onsite during construction. Should they be stored onsite, these materials would be stored in secure locations to reduce the potential for upset or accident conditions. The proposed project consists of a new 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 proposed winery building.
- 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 or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.
- f. The project's access driveway meets 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.
- g. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. The project would 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
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<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 or through the addition of impervious surfaces which would:				
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) 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"/>
iii) 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"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 discretionary 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-Tulucay (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).

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

A Tier I Water Availability Analysis (WAA), dated January 2018 (revised), was prepared by Bartelt Engineering, Inc., to determine the estimated water use of the existing development, the proposed project and water availability. The water source for the existing property is provided from two (2) existing onsite wells. There is an existing well onsite serving the existing residence and guest cottage (Well #1) and one well used for vineyard irrigation (Well #2). One of these wells is proposed to be used for the proposed winery. Generally, since the groundwater extraction for the winery and residence would be from a well located on the Valley Floor area, the Valley Floor screening criteria of one acre-foot of water per acre of land was used for the 47.17-acre property generating a water use availability of 47.17 acre-feet per year (AF/YR). It should be noted that the remaining 0.71 acres of the parcel lies in an area physically separated from the rest of the parcel by Silverado Trail and is effectively disconnected from the proposed parcel. Therefore, the parcels allowable water allotment analysis means the calculation is a conservative assessment - 47.17 AF/YR versus 47.88 AF/YR. According to the Napa County Watershed Information & Conservation Council, the subject parcel is primarily located in the St. Helena Groundwater Subarea of Napa County. The Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Program tested wells in this area in 2014 and 2015. The observed groundwater depth in these wells ranged from 44 feet to 240 feet below ground surface. Ground elevations range from 90 feet to 150 feet, mean sea level. The groundwater availability in this subarea is reported to be stable and as the well for this project is on the valley floor, a recharge analysis was not conducted. Based on the WAA prepared for the project, proposed water use would be 29.40 AF/YR, which will be less than current water use due to the removal of approximately 2.00 acres of vines (Bartelt Engineering January 2018).

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 Report prepared by Bartelt Engineering, dated February 2017 (revised), the project site and proposed system would have adequate disposal capacity to serve the project. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings.

There is an existing well onsite serving the existing residence and guest cottage (Well #1) and one well used for vineyard irrigation (Well #2). Well #2 is capable of producing a flow rate in excess of 400 gallons per minute (gpm). As proposed, Well #1 will be transitioned to satisfy only the residential landscaping demand while Well #2 will be transitioned to satisfy all of the parcel's remaining water demands, including residential, winery tasting room and production domestic water demands, fire protection demands, vineyard irrigation and frost protection demands and winery landscape demands.

As noted above, the applicant submitted a Water Availability Analysis (WAA) completed by Bartelt Engineering showing the projected overall water demand for the project site of 29.40 AF/YR representing a 0.15 AF/YR decrease of the existing water demand of 29.55 AF/YR. The parcel water demand can be met with the existing project well. 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	Estimated Usage [Acre-AF/YR]
Existing Water Demand:	
Primary Residence	0.75
Secondary Residence (Guest House)	0.30
Vineyard Irrigation (on 38.0 +/- acres)	19.00
Vineyard Frost Protection (on 38.0 +/- acres)	9.50
Total Existing Water Demand =	29.55 AF/YR
Proposed Water Demand:	
Primary Residence	0.75
Secondary Residence (Guest House)	0.30
Winery (30,000 gallons annually):	
Process Water	0.65
Domestic & Landscaping	0.15
Employees	0.17
Visitation	0.04
Marketing Events	0.04
Vineyard Irrigation (on 36.4 +/- acres of vineyards)	18.20
Vineyard Frost Protection (on 36.4 +/- acres of vineyards)	9.10
Total Proposed Water Demand =	29.40 AF/YR or (0.15 Decrease)

The estimated groundwater demand of 29.40 AF/YR represents a decrease of 0.15 AF/YR over the existing condition. The winery, as part of its entitlement would include the County's standard Condition of Approval 4.9, below, requiring well monitoring, as well as, the potential to modify/alter permitted uses on site should groundwater resources become insufficient to supply the use. The proposed project would result in a slight decrease on the demand of ground water supplies and therefore would not interfere with groundwater recharge or lowering of the local groundwater level.

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.

4.9 GROUND WATER MANAGEMENT - WELLS

This condition is implemented jointly by the Public Works and PBES Departments:

The permittee shall be required (at the permittee's expense) to record well monitoring data (specifically, static water level no less than quarterly, and the volume of water no less than monthly). Such data will be provided to the County, if the PBES Director determines that substantial evidence¹ indicates that water usage at the winery is affecting, or would potentially affect, groundwater supplies or nearby wells. If data indicates the need for additional monitoring, and if the applicant is unable to secure monitoring access to neighboring wells, onsite monitoring wells may need to be established to gauge potential impacts on the groundwater resource utilized for the project. Water usage shall be minimized by use of best available control technology and best water management conservation practices.

In order to support the County's groundwater monitoring program, well monitoring data as discussed above will be provided to the County if the Director of Public Works determines that such data could be useful in supporting the County's groundwater monitoring program. The project well will be made available for inclusion in the groundwater monitoring network if the Director of Public Works determines that the well could be useful in supporting the program.

In the event that changed circumstances or significant new information provide substantial evidence¹ that the groundwater system referenced in the Use Permit would significantly affect the groundwater basin, the PBES Director shall be authorized to recommend additional reasonable conditions on the permittee, or revocation of this permit, as necessary to meet the requirements of the County Code and to protect public health, safety, and welfare.

¹ Substantial evidence is defined by case law as evidence that is of ponderable legal significance, reasonable in nature, credible and of solid value. The following constitute substantial evidence: facts, reasonable assumptions predicated on facts; and expert opinions supported by facts. Argument, speculation, unsubstantiated opinion or narrative, or clearly inaccurate or erroneous information do not constitute substantial evidence.

- c. The project would not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off the project site. Improvement plans prepared prior to the issuance of a building permit would ensure that the proposed project does not increase runoff flow rate or volume as a result of project implementation. General Plan Policy CON-50 c) requires discretionary projects, including this project, to meet performance standards designed to ensure peak runoff in 2-, 10-, 50-, and 100-year events following development is not greater than predevelopment conditions. The preliminary grading and drainage plan have been reviewed by the Engineering Division. The proposed project would implement standard stormwater quality treatment controls to treat runoff prior to discharge from the project site. The incorporation of these features into the project would ensure that the proposed project would not create substantial sources of polluted runoff. In addition, the proposed project does not have any unusual characteristics that create sources of pollution that would degrade water quality. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d. The proposed winery development area is not located within the designated floodplain area. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. No impacts would occur.
- e. The proposed project would not conflict with a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

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

The 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. The proposed new winery consists of two structures that will be screened with vineyards and decorative landscaping. As proposed, the hospitality building will be placed in front of the production building with all winery functions occurring behind the building which will also be screened with decorative landscaping and vineyards to provide screening of the back of house operations from Silverado Trail. The façade of the winery is plaster with steel sash doors and metal windows, a redwood screen wall, and a corrugate metal roof and will comply with County’s required earth tone color palette. The maximum height of the slope-roof hospitality building is 15 feet and 25 feet for the slope-roof production building. As such, the architectural design of the project would not degrade the existing character of the site and its surrounding and impacts would be less than significant. 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
XII.	MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project 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) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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"/>

Discussion:

a/b. The project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during construction of the winery and its infrastructure. 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 winery development area is approximately 560 feet to the north of the proposed winery structures, 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.

8.3. **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. 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). Noise from winery operations is generally limited and intermittent, meaning the sound level can vary during the day and over the course of the year, depending on the activities at the winery. The primary noise-generating activities are equipment associated with wineries including refrigeration equipment, bottling equipment, barrel washing, de-stemmers and press activities occurring during the harvest crush season, delivery trucks, and other vehicles. The Napa County General Plan EIR indicates the average, or equivalent, sound level (L_{eq}) for winery activities is 51dBA in the morning and 41dBA in the afternoon. Audibility of a new noise source and/or increase in noise levels within recognized acceptable limits are not usually considered to be significant noise impacts, but these concerns should be addressed and considered in the planning and environmental review processes. Winery operations would occur between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. (excluding harvest). The nearest off-site residence to the proposed winery is approximately 560 feet to the north of the proposed winery. As proposed, winery operations will be located on the east side of the production building facing Silverado Trail and would be screened with landscaping from neighboring properties. Any outdoor equipment would be subject to the following standard conditions requiring that any exterior winery equipment be enclosed or muffled and maintained so as not to create a noise disturbance.

6.6 OUTDOOR STORAGE/SCREENING/UTILITIES

c. Exterior winery equipment shall be located, enclosed or muffled so as not to exceed noise thresholds in the County Code.

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

b. All landscaping and outdoor screening, storage, and utility structures shall be permanently maintained in accordance with the landscaping and building plans approved by the County. No stored items shall exceed the height of the screening. Exterior winery equipment shall be maintained so as to not create a noise disturbance or exceed noise thresholds in the County Code.

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 evening events would commence at 6:00 p.m. and conclude by 10:00 p.m., with clean-up conducted afterwards. The location of events are likely to occur within the hospitality building either in the tasting room, open tasting area or the east terrace area of which the hospitality building has been screened with decorative landscaping to buffer noise from surrounding residences. 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 permanent noise 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 proposed winery 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
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned 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 people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a. The Association of Bay Area Governments' *Projections 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 proposed staffing for the project includes six full-time and four part-time employees 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 would facilitate construction and operation of a new 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. No existing housing or people would be displaced as a result of the project. Therefore, the project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere and no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. Public services are currently provided to the project area and the additional demand placed on existing services as a result of the proposed project would be minimal. The property is located within the service areas of both the Napa County Sheriff's Department, as well as, the Napa County Fire Department. 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. The proposed project does not include construction of any new residential units or 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 is proposed to be built with the proposed use permit. County revenue resulting from any building permit fees, property tax increases, and taxes from the sale of wine will help meet the costs of providing public services to the property. The proposed project will have a less than significant impact on public services. Also see discussion under Section XVI, below.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b. The proposed project is a request to establish and operate a new winery, including wine production, a hospitality program, marketing activities, new employees, and various other site and utility changes. The proposed project includes no new residential units or accompanying introduction of new residents that would utilize existing parks in the area, potentially accelerating those recreational facilities' deterioration. The proposal would include new 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 is 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
XVII. TRANSPORTATION. 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-38, 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 a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-14, 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"/>

Discussion:

The proposed winery would have its sole access to the County road network via a driveway on the east side of Ponti Road about 1,230 feet north of Skellenger Lane and just west of Silverado Trail. Ponti Road is a level and straight two-lane local roadway extending north of Skellenger Lane. It is

15 feet wide at the project entrance, lacks centerline striping or paved shoulders, but has wide dirt and grass shoulders with trees planted. There is no posted speed limit. There is a stop sign control on its approach to Skellenger Lane. Skellenger Lane is a two-lane rural collector roadway extending westerly from Silverado Trail. Its eastbound approach to Silverado Trail is stop sign controlled. There is centerline striping, but no posted speed limit. There are narrow paved shoulders, but no left turn lane is provided on the eastbound approach to the Ponti Road intersection. There is a deep drainage ditch along the north side of the road most of the distance between Silverado Trail and Ponti Road. Silverado Trail has two well-paved 12-foot travel lanes and paved shoulders that are signed and striped as Class II bicycle lanes. The roadway is not controlled on its approaches to Skellenger lane, although a left turn lane is provide on the northbound Silverado Trail intersection approach. The posted speed limit is 55 miles per hour.

- a. Level of service standards for roads in the unincorporated areas have been established by the County in its General Plan (2008). Level of service (LOS) is a measure of how well an intersection or roadway is able to carry traffic. LOS is usually designated with a letter grade A-F, where 'A' is best and 'F' is worst." General Plan policy CIR-38 establishes the County's desired LOS on all County roadways as LOS D, which represents the level where traffic nears an unstable flow. Intersections still function, but short queues develop and cars may have to wait through one cycle during short peaks. In situations where the County determines that achieving LOS D would cause an unacceptable conflict with other goals and objectives, minimizing collisions and the adequacy of local access will be the County's priorities. LOS E is considered acceptable for Silverado Trail between State Route 128 and Yountville Cross Road per CIR-38.

The applicant submitted a traffic impact study; prepared by Crane Transportation Group (Crane), dated February 15, 2018, with the winery use permit application submittal. Crane collected vehicle counts for the traffic analysis in May 2016 and seasonally adjusted to reflect September 2016 harvest conditions. Historical 2015 and 2016 Friday and Saturday peak period traffic count data from Caltrans PeMS system were utilized to determine that September Friday PM peak hour volumes are about 4 percent higher than May Friday PM peak hour volumes, while September Saturday PM peak hour volumes are about 6 percent higher than May Saturday PM peak hour volumes. In addition to the criterion of analysis utilized in the traffic study, staff referenced the peak hour roadway capacities listed in Table 5 of the Napa County General Plan Update Technical Memorandum, in order to determine applicable level of service of the studied segments.

The traffic study analyzed the potential impacts of the project during the PM peak hour on two intersections in the vicinity: Silverado Trail/Skellenger Lane and Skellenger Lane/Ponti Road. All two approaches are stop sign controlled. According to the County of Napa's Winery Traffic Information/Trip Generation Sheet, the proposed project's daily traffic volumes and peak hour trips have been calculated to be 38 vehicle trips with 14 trips occurring during the PM peak period on a typical weekday, 36 vehicle trips with 16 trips occurring during the PM peak period on a typical Saturday, and 43 vehicle trips with 18 trips occurring during the PM peak period on a Saturday during crush. Approximately 16 off-hauling grape trucks during the harvest season will be eliminated as a result of project. It should be noted that 10% of the grapes will be required to be grown off site. Grapes will be transported to the site in about 1 truck per day over 22 days.

The Traffic Study found with seasonal adjustments that the proposed project would result in an increase of two inbound trips and one outbound trip during Friday PM peak hour (3:45 to 5:15) and one inbound trip and two outbound trips on Saturday PM peak hour (4:30 to 5:30). All two study intersections operate at unacceptable levels of service (LOS E or F) for both the Friday and Saturday PM peak hour under existing conditions, year 2020 conditions, and cumulative conditions (year 2030) both with and without the project.

Year 2016 Harvest + Project Off-Site Circulation Impacts - The project would not result in any significant off-site circulation impacts or signal warrant impacts to either Ponti Road or Silverado Trail intersections with Skellenger Lane Road intersection. The project would not degrade operation from acceptable to unacceptable at the Skellenger Lane/Ponti Road intersection or increase peak hour volumes on the Skellenger Lane stop sign controlled approach to Silverado Trail by 10 percent or greater at this location which would already be experiencing unacceptable "without project" operation. Therefore, as indicated, the impacts would be less than significant.

Year 2020 Harvest + Project Off-Site Circulation Impacts - The project would not result in any significant off-site circulation impacts or signal warrant impacts to either the Ponti Road or Silverado Trail with Skellenger Lane intersection. The project would not degrade operation from acceptable to unacceptable at the Skellenger Lane/Ponti Road intersection or increase peak hour volumes on the Skellenger Lane stop sign controlled approach to Silverado Trail by 10 percent or greater at this location which would already be experiencing unacceptable "without project" operation. Therefore, as indicated, the impacts would be less than significant.

Year 2030 (Cumulative) Harvest + Project Off-Site Circulation Impacts - The project would not result in a significant off-site circulation impacts to either the Ponti Road or Silverado Trail intersections with Skellenger Lane. The project would not degrade operation from acceptable to unacceptable at the Skellenger Lane/Ponti Road intersection or increase peak hour volumes on the Skellenger Lane stop sign controlled approach to Silverado Trail by five (5) percent or greater at this location which would already be experiencing unacceptable "without project" operation. Therefore, as indicated, the impacts would be less than significant.

Staff also evaluated potential peak hour traffic using the more conservative County Trip Generation Sheet with trip distribution as noted above. As expected the project-related trips added to the roadway network increased but are still less than one percent, during the

weekday and Saturday evening peak under existing, year 2020, and cumulative (year 2030) conditions. No mitigation necessary for level of service impacts is therefore required for the proposed project.

- b. There is currently no bus service on Silverado Trail and Skellenger Lane; the proposed project would therefore not impair use of public transit facilities in its vicinity. The Napa Countywide Bicycle Plan, adopted by the Board of Supervisors in June 2012, identifies Silverado Trail as an existing Class II bicycle facility (on-street bike lane); currently the road includes eight-foot wide, striped and paved lanes on both sides of the roadway. Skellenger Lane has no bike lane striped but is considered a primary route. The proposed project would therefore maintain existing bicycle facilities in its vicinity.
- c. The transition to VMT is not required of lead agencies until July 1, 2020. However, in anticipation of the transition, the Circulation Element includes new policies that reflect this new regulatory framework for transportation impact assessment, along with a draft threshold of significance that is based on reduction of VMT compared to the unmitigated project rather than the regional average VMT (Policies CIR-7 through CIR-9). Staff believes this alternative approach to determining the significance of a project's transportation impacts would be better suited to Napa County's rural context, while still supporting the efforts of the County to achieve the greenhouse gas emissions goals of its pending Climate Action Plan. The reduction in VMT and, correspondingly, GHG emissions from the transportation sector, is also necessary for Napa County, the region, and the state to achieve long-term, statewide mandates targeted toward reducing GHG emissions. Such mandates include, but are not limited to Executive Orders S-3-05 and B-16-12, which respectively, set a general statewide GHG emissions reduction target of 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050, and an 80 percent GHG emissions reduction below 1990 levels (also by 2050) specifically for the transportation sector.
- d/e. After implementation of the proposed project, the site would be accessed via a new driveway off Ponti Road (using the existing driveway access point). Based on the existing volumes on Ponti Road and expected daily volumes at the project driveways, a left turn lane is not required at the proposed project driveway per the County's standard left turn lane warrant. Sight distance along Ponti Road at the proposed project driveway was evaluated based on sight distance criteria contained in the Caltrans Highway Design Manual (March 2004). While there is no posted speed limit on Ponti Road at the project entrance, vehicles were observed traveling between 25 and 35 miles per hour during two field surveys by Crane Transportation Group. Based upon Caltrans Highway Design Manual, a 35 mile per hour criteria, the 900+ foot sight lines to the north and south along Ponti Road from the driveway would be acceptable. However, if landscaping on either side of the project driveway is not maintained, sight lines for exiting drivers could be reduced to less than acceptable distance. Therefore, such landscaping will need to be trimmed on a regular basis in order to maintain the acceptable sight lines as provided below in mitigation measure TRANS 1, thereby reduce project impacts to less than significance. Proposed site access was reviewed and approved by the Napa County Fire Department, Engineering Services Division, and Public Works Department, as mitigated.
- f. Developers of new land uses are required to provide adequate parking or demonstrate that adequate parking exists to meet their anticipated parking demand. Excess parking that could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or commercial activity exceeding the site's capacity is discouraged. On-site parking for 13 vehicles is proposed based on the winery's business plan, visitation, and employment levels. Parking for the larger marketing events will be off-site with shuttle service to the winery. No parking is permitted or proposed within the right-of-way of Ponti Road.

Mitigation Measures:

MM Trans – 1: The permittee shall maintain landscaping on a regular basis along the project's Ponti Road frontage to the north and south of the project driveway in order to maintain acceptable sight lines to accommodate 35 mile per hour traffic speeds on Ponti Road. No items that are wider than 18 inches can be taller than 30 inches other than street trees and traffic devices. Street trees should be deciduous and have branches lower than 4 feet in height removed once the tree is established.

Monitoring: Prior to the issuance of a building permit, an annual landscape maintenance program in conjunction with the project's landscape plan shall be submitted to the Planning Division and the Public Works Department for review and approval.

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

Discussion:

a/b. On October 19, 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 located within their aboriginal territories and requested additional information was provided to the tribal representative on November 21, 2018. No further correspondence has been received. Therefore, the consultation period was closed. A response was also received from the Middletown Rancheria requesting that they be contacted should any new information or evidence of human habitation be found as the project progresses.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of a new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-c. The project would require the construction of a new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects. There is

an existing well onsite serving the existing residence and guest cottage (Well #1) and one well used for vineyard irrigation (Well #2). Well #2 is capable of producing a flow rate in excess of 400 gallons per minute (gpm). Well #1 will be transitioned to satisfy only the residential landscaping demand while Well #2 will be transitioned to satisfy all of the parcel's remaining water demands, including residential, winery tasting room and production domestic water demands, fire protection demands, vineyard irrigation and frost protection demands and winery landscape demands. As noted above, the applicant submitted a Water Availability Analysis (WAA) completed by Bartelt Engineering showing the projected overall water demand for the project site of 29.40 AF/YR representing a 0.15 AF/YR decrease of the existing water demand of 29.55 AF/YR. The parcel water demand can be met with the existing project well. The parcel water demand can be met with the two existing project wells. Similarly, all of the wastewater generated by the winery (process wastewater and sanitary wastewater) would be treated on-site using treatment systems. With water and wastewater treatment facilities provided on-site, the proposed project requires no determination of service or will-serve letters from water or wastewater treatment service providers. The winery is proposed to include self-treating and self-retaining areas, as well as, bioretention areas that in combination would serve as both stormwater quality and runoff management measures. Work areas of the proposed winery would be covered with a roof and plumbed to discharge runoff into the on-site wastewater treatment system, also with the intent to preserve stormwater quality. Grading for construction of three bioretention basins, storm drain pipelines and wastewater treatment system improvements would occur concurrently with site grading associated with the winery construction, which would be subject to the dust suppression measures listed in Section III, Air Quality, of this initial study.

d/e. The project would be served by Keller Canyon Landfill, which has a capacity which exceeds current demand. As of January 2004, the Keller Canyon Landfill had 64.8 million cubic yards of remaining capacity and has enough permitted capacity to receive solid waste through 2030. 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
XX. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-d. The proposed project is located within a non-wildland/non-urban fire hazard severity zone and in the Napa County Local Responsibility Area (LRA district). There are no project features that would substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project site is generally flat with slopes ranging from 0-1% and is located on the valley floor with access from Ponti Road left onto Skellinger Lane to Silverado Trail on the east and/or right onto Skellinger Lane to Conn Creek Road/SR 128 to the west. There are currently overhead power lines along the west side of Ponti Road and Silverado Trail frontage. The existing overhead lines will not be affected by the project. The project would 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
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a. The proposed project consists of construction of a two new winery buildings with utility and surface improvements such as wastewater treatment equipment and vehicle access roads, and operation of a winery with visitation and marketing programs. An existing residence on-site would be retained for use as a residence and guest cottage, by the property owner. The proposed project site has been previously developed and disturbed as a result of construction of the residence and guest cottage, agricultural structures, and vineyards.

Proposed site improvements would include a covered trash enclosure and stormwater bioretention areas that would serve to treat runoff from proposed new impervious surfaces, including the parking lot and buildings. Additionally, as noted above, the property has been in agricultural use. The property is predominantly flat and lacking any unique geological features such as rock outcroppings, mounds or other landforms. There are no known archaeological or paleontological resources on the property, and the property has a lengthy history of ground disturbance. However, if any resources not previously uncovered during this prior disturbance are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the proposed project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist must be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard County conditions of development.

b. As described in the sections above, noise and air quality impacts associated with installation of proposed winery building and site improvements would be temporary in nature, and so would be less than significant. Operational noise and air quality impacts are also anticipated to be less than significant due to the small size of the structures and distance to the closest sensitive receptors (off-site single-family residences). Groundwater extraction associated with the proposed project would decrease compared to existing conditions due to removal of vines to accommodate the new winery building.

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

c. There are no schools or hospitals housing sensitive receptors within a quarter-mile of the winery site. Noise from construction that would occur with construction and installation of the proposed site improvements would be temporary, lasting approximately nine to 10 months, would be limited to day time hours, and would be subject to best management practices intended to limit fugitive dust and protect

stormwater quality. Ongoing operations of the winery are also anticipated to have less than significant noise impacts on nearby residences due to distance between those residences and the proposed tasting room patio and partially enclosed work area.

Mitigation Measures: None Required.