

“D”

Initial Study/Negative Declaration

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

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated January 2019)

1. **Project Title:** Fontanella Family Winery – P18-00431-UP
2. **Property Owner:** The Jeffrey and Karen Fontanella Trust
3. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Fontanella Wines, LLC; 1717 Partrick Road, Napa, CA 94558
4. **Representative's name and address:** Beth Painter, Balanced Planning, (707) 337-3385 or beth@bpnapa.com
5. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and Email:** Emily Hedge, (707) 259-8226, Emily.Hedge@CountyofNapa.org
6. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):** 1721 Partrick Road, Napa; APN 050-010-018
7. **General Plan Designation:** Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space (AWOS)
8. **Zoning District:** Agricultural Watershed (AW)
9. **Background/Project History:**

On July 5 2006, the Planning Commission approved Use Permit P06-0113-UP for a new 30,000 gallon winery with an approximately 5,000 square foot winery building and an approximately 2,600 square foot outdoor work area. The approval permitted three full-time and two part-time employees, tours and tastings by appointment only for four visitors per day with an average of 10 visitors a week, and an annual marketing plan of nine events. Use Permit modification P07-00280 was approved to reduce the winery building size to approximately 3,500 square feet, the outdoor work area to 2,100 square feet, and convert an existing, approximately 1,500 square foot barn to a winery office. The property has two approved erosion control plans and is planted in approximately 5.4 acres of vineyards. In December 2018, the property entered into an Agricultural Preserve Contract with the County. The current application for a major modification was submitted December 6, 2018.
10. **Description of Project:**

The application proposes the following operational changes and physical improvements to the existing winery. Increase existing visitation from four visitors per day to 14 visitors per day. The marketing program would add small, eight-person events, occurring with a frequency of approximately one per week with a total of 50 per year; have six events with a maximum of 30 visitors (reduced from 9 events); one event with a maximum of 75 visitors; and one event with a maximum of 150 visitors. These two larger events would replace the one existing Wine Auction event for 100 visitors. Increase the number of employees from three full-time and two part-time employees to six full-time. Approval of on-premises consumption in the winery tasting room and the outdoor patio. Physical improvements include demolition of the existing 1,500-square foot winery office building and construction a replacement, approximately 2,900-square foot office building. The new building would be located in approximately the same location on the existing outdoor work area, southwest of the building it is replacing. The existing driveway will be widened to meet County Road and Street Standards, which will remove the need for winery visitors to utilize the loop road through the property. The driveway will remain for use of the residence. Four new parking spaces will be added for a total of nine spaces. The existing outdoor work area will have wine tanks permanently installed.
11. **Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses.**

The 26.4-acre property is located approximately three miles west of the City of Napa in the western foothills of the valley. Existing on-site development includes the winery, winery office building, outdoor work area, and associated winery parking, as well as a residence and an irrigation reservoir. The property is planted in approximately 5.4 acres of vineyards.

A blue line stream, containing oak-bay woodland, begins approximately 200 feet south of the winery building and drains easterly to the adjacent parcel to the east. There is a drainage that flows in and out of the irrigation reservoir, converging with the stream south of the winery. Elevations at the site range from approximately 600 to 700 feet above sea level, with the winery development area situated at approximately

675 feet above sea level. Portions of the property were burned in the 2017 Napa Fires. The vineyards served as a fire break stopping the fire from reaching the winery and residence.

Surrounding development includes residences and vineyards, with some oak-bay woodlands to the north, south, and west, and undeveloped grasslands to the east. The closest off-site residence is at approximately 300 feet to the northeast of the existing winery site, with the existing on-site residence located on a small knoll between the winery and the off-site residence. Renteria winery is located on the adjacent property to the west.

12. **Other agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).
The project would also require various approvals by the County, including but not limited to building permits and grading permits.
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.?

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.

In accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1, on August 14, 2019, 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. The Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation responded and declined comment as the project site is not located within their aboriginal territories. No other responses were received within 30-days of the tribes' receipt of the invitations.

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 (SUBSEQUENT) 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.

Emily Hedge

Signature

October 29, 2019

Date

Name: Emily Hedge, Planner III
Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department

I.	AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	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. The replacement office building is in approximately the same location as the building it would replace and the improvements to the existing driveway and parking spaces are minimal. All proposed structures and improvements are within the existing developed area. Although the project is not visible from a scenic highway, it is located on Partrick Road, a designated Viewshed road. The existing winery and proposed improvements are not located on slopes greater than 15%; therefore the project is not subject to review under Napa County Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 18.106 (Viewshed Protection Ordinance). The project would not have a significant impact on a scenic vista or scenic resources.
- c. As all proposed structures and improvements are within the existing developed area of the property, the project would not degrade the existing visual character and would not have a significant impact.
- d. The replacement office building is a similar design and would be located in approximately the same location as the building it would replace. Pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approval for wineries, outdoor lighting would be required to be shielded and directed downwards, with only low level lighting allowed in parking areas. As subject to the standard conditions of approval, below, the project would not have a significant impact resulting from new sources of outside lighting.

6.3 LIGHTING – PLAN SUBMITTAL

- a. Two (2) copies of a detailed lighting plan showing the location and specifications for all lighting fixtures to be installed on the property shall be submitted for Planning Division review and approval. All lighting shall comply with the CBC.
- b. All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward, shall be located as low to the ground as possible, shall be the minimum necessary for security, safety, or operations; on timers; and shall incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. All lighting shall be shielded or placed such that it does not shine directly on adjacent properties or impact vehicles on adjacent streets. No flood-lighting or sodium lighting of the building is permitted, including architectural highlighting and spotting. Low-level lighting shall be utilized in parking areas as opposed to elevated high-intensity light standards.

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.

II.	AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. ¹ Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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./e. The existing winery site is designated as "other land" as shown on the Napa County Important Farmland Map 2002 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. This portion of the property does not qualify as "prime" or "unique" farmland. The proposed development and improvements are located on the portion of the property that is already developed with the winery. There are no other changes included in this proposal that would result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. No impacts would occur.
- b. The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. The property zoning designation of Agricultural Watershed (AW) permits wineries upon grant of a use permit. 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. In December 2018, the property entered into a Napa County Agricultural Preserve contract. The contract type "H", permits agricultural processing facilities, which includes wineries and permitted uses accessory thereto. The project would not conflict with existing zoning or the agricultural contract. No impacts would occur.
- c/d. The project site is zoned AW, which allow wineries upon grant of a use permit. The proposed development and improvements are located on the portion of the property that is already developed with the winery and no tree removal is required. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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.

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:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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:

On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) Board of Directors unanimously adopted thresholds of significance to assist in the review of projects under the California Environmental Quality Act. These Thresholds are designed to establish the level at which BAAQMD believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA and were posted on BAAQMD's website and included in BAAQMD's updated CEQA Guidelines (updated May 2012). The Thresholds are advisory and may be followed by local agencies at their own discretion.

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

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

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

a-b. The mountains bordering Napa Valley block much of the prevailing northwesterly winds throughout the year. Sunshine is plentiful in Napa County, and summertime can be very warm in the valley, particularly in the northern end. Winters are usually mild, with cool temperatures overnight and mild-to-moderate temperatures during the day. Wintertime temperatures tend to be slightly cooler in the northern end of the valley. Winds are generally calm throughout the county. Annual precipitation averages range from about 24 inches in low elevations to more than 40 inches in the mountains.

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

The impacts associated with implementation of the project were evaluated consistent with guidance provided by BAAQMD. Ambient air

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

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

As mentioned above, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Operational-Related Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursors Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. Given the size of the entire project, which is approximately 6,500 square feet of enclosed floor area (winery building and winery office) with 450 square feet of space dedicated to tasting/hospitality uses compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47,000 square feet (high quality restaurant) and 541,000 square feet (general light industry) for NOX (oxides of nitrogen), the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. (Please note: a high quality restaurant is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, but grossly overstates emissions associated with other portions of a winery, such as office, barrel storage and production, which generate fewer vehicle trips. Therefore, a general light industry comparison has also been used for other such uses.) The project falls well below the screening criteria as noted above, and consequently will not significantly affect air quality individually or contribute considerably to any cumulative air quality impacts.

- c-d. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from earthmoving and construction activities required for project construction related to the replacement office building and access driveway 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.

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 replacement office building would not significantly increase odors associated with the winery. The closest off-site residence is approximately 300 feet to the northeast of the proposed replacement office building. Construction-phase pollutants would be reduced to a less than significant level by the above noted standard condition of approval. The project would not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

IV.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a.-d The 26.4-acre property is located approximately three miles west of the City of Napa in the western foothills of the valley. Existing on-site development includes the winery, winery office building, outdoor work area, and associated winery parking, as well as a residence and an irrigation reservoir. The property is planted in approximately 5.4 acres of vineyards. A blue line stream, containing oak-bay woodland, begins approximately 200 feet south of the winery building and drains easterly to the adjacent parcel to the east. There is a drainage that flows in and out of the irrigation reservoir, converging with the stream southwest of the winery.

In December 2011, a biological resources reconnaissance survey and special-status plant study report was prepared by LSA Associates for a proposed Erosion Control Plan (P11-00486). The vineyard proposal avoided the drainages and swales that flow in and out of the reservoir and the vineyards met the required creek setback (Napa County Code Chapter 18.108.025). The Oak-bay woodland would not be impacted

by the project, and the removal of a small area of native grassland in one of the vineyard blocks, which represented a minor portion of the extent of grassland habitat in the area, would not have a significant impact. The report concluded that due to negative findings of the focused plant surveys, no special-status plant species were expected to be present on site, but required pre-construction surveys if vegetation removal would occur during the nesting season.

As noted above, the proposed development and improvements are located on the portion of the property that is already developed with the winery buildings, outdoor work area, and associated infrastructure. The replacement office building will be located on the existing paved area approximately 50 feet southwest of the office building being removed. All proposed improvements would occur outside of the previously determined stream setback, which ranges from of 55 feet to 105 feet. No tree removal is proposed as part of the project. No impacts would occur.

- e. Napa County General Plan Conservation Element Policy CON-24 requires that oak woodland be maintained and/or improved to the extent feasible to provide for oak woodland and wildlife habitat, slope stabilization and soil protection, and species diversity. Additionally, the County Water Quality and Tree Protection Ordinance (Ordinance #1438) includes requirements for vegetation retention and vegetation removal mitigation for properties zoned Agricultural Watershed (AW). The proposed development and improvements are located on the portion of the property that is already developed with the winery and no tree removal is required. Because the proposed project would not remove trees within oak woodland habitats or biological communities, no impacts would occur.
- f. The project site is not covered by any adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

V.	CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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. In 2011, a cultural and paleontological resource study was prepared for the proposed vineyard project on site. The study concluded that no paleontological resources were identified within or adjacent to the project area. The Great Valley Sequence deposits underlying the project site are sensitive for significant paleontological resources, however it was not anticipated that the vineyard project development would approach the depth of which the Great Valley Sequence occurs under the project area. Further study was not recommended. The proposed improvements of this project would occur on the already developed area of the site. 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 would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval. The project would not result in significant impacts.

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. 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.

VI.	ENERGY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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.

VII.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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. The project would not result in significant impact involving the following:
- 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. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the improvements are proposed for an area which has a very low susceptibility for liquefaction. Compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.
 - iv.) Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Landslides – line; Landslides – polygon; Landslide Geology), there is no existing documentation of landslides.
- b. The proposed developments and improvements would occur on existing developed area. The project would require incorporation of best management practices and would be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c./d. The following soil type is present at the subject site: Fagan clay loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes and Felton gravelly loam, 30 to 50 percent slopes. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the area has a very low susceptibility for liquefaction. Improvements are proposed on the existing developed area. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. The winery facility and existing residence are serviced by a combined sanitary sewer and process wastewater pretreatment and subsurface drip type dispersal system. According to the Wastewater Feasibility Study prepared by Applied Civil Engineering, November 18, 2018, the wastewater flows associated with the proposed Use Permit Modification can be accommodated within the capacity of the existing sanitary and process wastewater treatment and dispersal system. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f. If resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard Condition of Approval 7.2 identified in **Section V** above.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

VIII.	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 the project include: emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area, construction, and construction equipment and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as Equipment Emissions). These emissions also include underground carbon stocks (or Soil carbon) associated with any existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed. As previously stated, this project includes the construction of a replacement winery office building and improvements to existing internal access road.

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

As discussed in the Air Quality section of this Initial Study, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors & GHG Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, including GHG emissions, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. With the existing winery building and replacement winery office totaling approximately 6,500 square feet of floor area, with 450 square feet of space dedicated to tasting/hospitality uses, compared to the BAAQMD's GHG screening criteria of 121,000 square feet for general industrial, and compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 9,000 square feet for high quality restaurant, the project was determined not to exceed the 1,100 MT of CO₂e/yr GHG threshold of significance.

Furthermore, the applicant intends to implement the following GHG reduction methods at the winery: solar hot water heating, energy conserving lighting, water efficient fixtures, water efficient landscaping, composting 75% food and garden material. The winery already has shade trees in close proximity to the south side of the buildings and works to educate staff and visitors on sustainable practices. The vineyards are Napa Green certified and best management practices include 70-80% cover crop, and retention of biomass removed via pruning and thinning by chipping the material and reusing it rather than burning on-site. The winery's efforts to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) include: during the reservation process guests and larger groups are encouraged to carpool and information on group transportation options are provided, staff is encouraged to bring lunch, space is provided to eat onsite, and occasionally the winery provides meals for employees. It is also noted that approximately 10,000 to 12,000 gallons of the total production is able to be produced from the vineyards on site and on the adjacent property, limiting trips associated with grape on-haul. Additionally, the owners live on site reducing the trips of two employees.

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.

IX.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-b. 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. 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. Therefore, it would not be reasonably foreseeable for the proposed project to create upset or accident conditions that involve the release of hazardous materials into the environments. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the existing winery building. According to Google Earth, the nearest school to the project site is Browns Valley Elementary School, located approximately 2.5 miles east in the City of Napa. No impacts would occur.
- d. Based on a search of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control database, the project site does not contain any known EPA National Priority List sites, State response sites, voluntary cleanup sites, or any school cleanup sites. No impact would occur.
- e. No impact would occur as the project site is not located within an airport land use plan.
- f. The proposed improvements to the on-site driveway will meet the Napa County Road and Street Standards and the existing gate will be widened to meet Standards. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division and found acceptable, as conditioned. The proposed project would not obstruct emergency vehicle access and impacts would be less than significant.
- g. Partrick Road provides adequate access to the existing winery. The proposed onsite driveway improvements and widening of the existing gate would ensure Department of Forestry and Engineering Division road requirements and improve access in and out of the property. The replacement winery office building would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. During the 2017 Napa fires the vineyards served as a natural fire break and on-site damage was limited. The proposed increase in employees and the level of visitation and marketing would potentially increase the number of people onsite at one time, however, project requirements for access and building safety would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

X.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

On January 14, 2014, Governor Jerry Brown declared a drought emergency in the state of California. That declaration was followed up on April 1, 2015, when the Governor directed the State Water Resources Control Board to implement mandatory water reductions in cities and town across California to reduce water usage by 25 percent. These water restrictions do not apply to agricultural users. However, on April 7, 2017, Governor Jerry Brown signed an executive order lifting California's drought emergency in all but four counties (Fresno, Kings, Tulare and Tuolumne). The County of Napa had not adopted or implemented any additional mandatory water use restrictions. The County requires all 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-Tuluca (MST) area, however, have shown increasing depths to groundwater, but recent stabilization in many locations. Groundwater availability, recharge, storage and yield are not consistent across the County. More is known about the resource where historical data have been collected. Less is known in areas with limited data or unknown geology. In order to fill existing data gaps and to provide a better understand of groundwater resources in the County, the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan recommended 18 Areas of Interest (AOIs) for additional groundwater level and water quality monitoring. Through the well owner and public outreach efforts of the Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee (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, providing a definition, and explaining the shared responsibility for Groundwater Sustainability and the important role of monitoring as a means to achieving groundwater sustainability.

In 2009, Napa County began a comprehensive study of its groundwater resources to meet identified action items in the County's 2008 General Plan update. The study, by Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE), emphasized developing a sound understanding of groundwater conditions and implementing an expanded groundwater monitoring and data management program as a foundation for integrated water resources

planning and dissemination of water resources information. The 2011 baseline study by LSCE, which included over 600 wells and data going back over 50 years, concluded that “the groundwater levels in Napa County are stable, except for portions of the MST district”. Most wells elsewhere within the Napa Valley floor with a sufficient record indicate that groundwater levels are more affected by climatic conditions, are within historical levels, and seem to recover from dry periods during subsequent wet or normal periods. The LSCE Study also concluded that, on a regional scale, there appear to be no current groundwater quality issues except north of Calistoga (mostly naturally occurring boron and trace metals) and in the Carneros region (mostly salinity). The subject property is located within the Western Mountains subarea of Napa County according to the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2013.

Minimum thresholds for water use have been established by the Department of Public Works using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS). These reports are the result of water resources investigations performed by the USGS in cooperation with the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. Any project which reduces water usage or any water usage which is at or below the established threshold is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels.

The project is categorized as “all other areas” based upon current County Water Availability Analysis policies and therefore water use criteria is parcel specific based upon a Tier 2 analysis. The Water Availability Analysis completed by O’Conner Environmental Inc. was originally submitted November 28, 2018, with a revised document submitted March 20, 2019, and an Addendum submitted on July 8, 2019.

- a. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. According to the Wastewater Feasibility Study prepared by Applied Civil Engineering, November 18, 2018, the wastewater flows associated with the proposed Use Permit Modification can be accommodated within the capacity of the existing sanitary and process wastewater treatment and dispersal system. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings. The permittee shall comply with all construction and post-construction storm water pollution prevention protocols as required by the County Engineering Services Division, and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board. All proposed improvements would occur outside of the previously determined stream setback, which ranges from of 55 feet to 105 feet. The project would not degrade surface or groundwater quality. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. A Water Availability Analysis was completed by O’Conner Environmental Inc. and submitted November 28, 2018, with a revised document submitted March 20, 2019, and an Addendum submitted on July 8, 2019.

Current water use on the project parcel is for the 30,000 gallon per year Fontanella Winery, irrigation of about 5.4 acres of on-site vineyard, and one single family residence. The project parcel has two wells, one serving the winery and one serving as irrigation for the vineyards. There is a perennial spring on the parcel, providing domestic water to the residence and the residence on the adjacent parcel to the east, and irrigation to off-site vineyards owned by the winery.

The reports calculated estimates based on Napa County’s Water Availability Analysis Guidance Document, dated May 2015 (Napa County, 2015). Additional estimates were generated with a combination of the metered water use data and County Guidance Document for uses not specifically metered.

Using the County Guidance Document, the estimated existing water demand totals approximately 4.89 ac-ft/yr, comprised of 0.89 ac-ft/yr of winery use, 2.7 ac-ft/yr of irrigation use, and 1.3 ac-ft/yr of residential use. The metered data estimates a total of 2.46 ac-ft/yr, comprised of 0.66 ac-ft/yr of winery use, 1.1 ac-ft/yr of irrigation use, and 0.70 ac-ft/yr of residential use. This estimate is about half the estimate derived based on the County Guidance Document. To be conservative the report retained the estimate based on County standard use rates, however it should be noted that this estimate likely overstates the actual water use on the parcel by about a factor of 2.

The proposed modification to the winery makes no changes to winery production use, irrigation use. Winery employees will increase from three full-time and 2 part-time employees to 6 full-time employees and winery visitation will increase from a maximum of 890 visitors per year to a maximum of 5,901 visitors per year. Using the County Guidance Document, the proposed increase in employees and visitation results in an increase in winery water use from 0.89 ac-ft/yr to 1.15 ac-ft/yr. The proposed total property water use of 5.15 ac-ft/yr represents an increase of 0.26 ac-ft/yr.

Water Use	Existing AF/YR	Proposed Use AF/YR	Increase AF/YR
Irrigation	1.10	1.10	0
Residential	0.70	0.70	0
Winery Production	0.57	0.57	0
Winery Employee	0.05	0.07	0.02
Winery Visitation & Marketing	0.04	0.28	0.24
Total Use	2.46	2.72	0.26

The Soil Water Balance (SWB), developed by the U.S. Geological Survey (Westenbroek et al., 2010), was used to produce a spatially distributed estimate of annual recharge on the project parcel. Daily precipitation data was compiled for the Sonoma Weather Station which is located approximately 4.9 miles west-southwest of the project parcel. This station was selected because it represents the best available climate station in proximity to the project site with a long and continuous period of record. The PRISM dataset for precipitation was scaled by a factor of 1.07 to account for the difference in precipitation between the station location and the project area. Water Year 2010 was selected to represent Average Water Year conditions for the analysis because it represents a recent year with near long-term average precipitation conditions (28.21 inches at the scaled Sonoma Weather Station, equivalent to 94% of the long-term average). The model was also evaluated for water year 2014 to represent a Dry Water Year drought conditions. Water year 2014 precipitation was 16.56 inches at the scaled Sonoma Weather Station or approximately 50% of long-term average conditions.

The simulated Average Water Year recharge results indicate a potential recharge of 7.7 ac-ft/yr. The proposed groundwater use of 5.1 ac-ft/yr would allow for a 2.6 ac-ft/yr recharge surplus. The simulated Dry Water Year recharge results indicate a potential recharge of 3.1 ac-ft/yr. The proposed groundwater use of 5.1 ac-ft/yr would exceed the estimated recharge and potentially impact groundwater supply. In order to address this concern, the July 8, 2019, Addendum calculated the estimated proposed groundwater use utilizing the metered rates as available for existing uses. As noted above, utilizing the metered data, reduces the total proposed groundwater use to 2.7 ac-ft/yr. This quantity of groundwater use is less than the simulated Dry Water Year and would allow for a 0.4 ac-ft/yr recharge.

Proposed Demand		Average Water Year Recharge		Dry Water Year Recharge	
Data Source		Recharge	Surplus	Recharge	Surplus
County Data Estimate	5.1	7.7	2.6	3.1	-2.0
Winery Metered Data + County Data Estimate	2.7	7.7	5	3.1	0.4

Additionally, the report notes that groundwater sustainability is generally measured by average water year or long-term average conditions since recharge deficits during periods of drought are expected to balance with recharge surpluses during wetter periods. It is relatively common for water use to exceed recharge during periods of drought and this is not an indication of insufficient water supply. Given the magnitude of the surpluses during average water years, the modest increase in groundwater use proposed by the project is unlikely to result in significant reductions in groundwater levels or depletion of groundwater resources over time.

The closest neighboring well to the winery well is located about 195-ft to the north on the adjacent parcel (APN #050-010-013). This parcel is owned by the project applicants therefore the Tier II Well Interference Analysis is not required per County guidance. No water transfers occur or are planned to occur between these two adjoining parcels and no other active wells are located within 500-ft of the project winery well. No springs are located within 1,500 of the well, therefore the Tier II screening criteria have been met and no further analysis is required.

The Water Availability Analysis demonstrates that the proposed project will not exceed potential recharge. Project specific conditions of approval will be included to require a Groundwater Demand Management Program to meter all wells servicing the property to ensure that the total water usage on the parcel does not exceed the proposed estimate, based on the combination of metered data and County Guidance Document. The project will not substantially increase impervious area that would cause an interference with groundwater recharge. The proposed project will not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. Impacts will be less than significant.

- c. All proposed improvements would occur outside of the previously determined stream setback, which ranges from of 55 feet to 105 feet. The replacement winery office building and the proposed parking spaces would be located on the existing developed winery area and the improvements to the on-site driveway will not substantially increase impervious areas. The proposed project will not alter the existing drainage pattern, create substantial erosion, increase the surface water runoff, or impede or redirect flood flows. The permittee shall comply with all construction and post-construction storm water pollution prevention protocols as required by the County Engineering Services Division and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- d. The property is not within a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones and does not increase the risk of releasing pollutants due to project inundation.
- e. The property is not subject to a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. As discussed above, total water usage will be limited the proposed estimate, based on the combination of metered data and County Guidance Document.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XI.	LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would modify the existing winery and on-site improvements. The proposed improvements would not divide an established community. No impact would occur.
- b. The subject parcel is located in the AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district, which allows wineries and uses accessory to wineries subject to use permit approval. The proposed project is compliant with the physical limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance, including the Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO). The County has adopted the WDO to protect agriculture and open space and to regulate winery development and expansion in a manner that avoids potential negative environmental effects.

Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-1 of the 2008 General Plan states that the County shall, “preserve existing agricultural land uses and plan for agriculture and related activities as the primary land uses in Napa County.” The property’s General Plan land use designation is AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space) which allows “agriculture, processing of agricultural products, and singlefamily 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 proposed use of the property for the “fermenting and processing of grape juice into wine” (NCC §18.08.640) supports the economic viability of agriculture within the county consistent with General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-4 (“The County will reserve agricultural lands for agricultural use including lands used for grazing and watershed/ open space...”) and General Plan Economic Development Policy E-1 (The County’s economic development will focus on ensuring the continued viability of agriculture...). The General Plan includes two policies requiring wineries to be designed generally of a high architectural quality for the site and its surroundings. The existing winery building is a light brown paneled siding with a stone material around the base of the building. The proposed replacement winery office building will be designed to coordinate with the existing winery building and meet the County’s required earth tone color palette. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XII.	MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 Fontanella Family Winery Use Permit P18-00431

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.

XIII.	NOISE. Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 ambient and groundborne noise levels during construction of the proposed replacement office building and driveway improvements. 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. The closest off-site residence is approximately 300 feet to the northeast of the proposed replacement office building.

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.

The proposed increase in employees and the level of visitation and marketing would potentially increase the number of people onsite at one time, which could result in elevated ambient noise levels. Wine tasting occurs in the tasting room on the western side of the existing building and the adjacent outdoor patio. The patio is proposed for on-premise consumption and may also be used for events. Six trees and landscaping surround this outdoor area which faces west toward vineyards and a winery on the adjacent parcel. The closest off-site residence at approximately 300 feet to the northeast of the existing winery site, with the existing on-site residence located on a small knoll between the winery and the off-site residence. The County has not received any noise complaints in the past.

Under the proposed project, the largest outdoor event that would occur on the parcel would have an attendance of no more than 125 people, and all events would end by 10:00 p.m., with clean-up conducted afterwards. Winery operations and visitation would occur between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. (excluding harvest). The potential for the creation of significant noise from visitation is significantly reduced, since the tasting room and outdoor patio are located on the western side of the winery, facing away from the closest residence.

Additional regulations contained within County Code Chapter 8.16 establish exterior noise criteria for various land uses in the County. As described in the Project Setting, above, land uses that surround the proposed parcel are predominantly agricultural (vineyards) but include some residential. Of these land uses, the residential land use is considered the most sensitive to noise. Based on the standards in County Code section 8.16.070, noise levels, measured at the exterior of a residential structure or residential use on a portion of a larger property,

may not exceed 50 decibels for more than half of any hour in the window of daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) within which the applicant proposes to conduct events. Noise impacts of the proposed project would be considered bothersome and potentially significant if sound generated by it had the effect of exceeding the standards in County Code more than 50 percent of the time (i.e., more than 50 decibels for more than 30 minutes in an hour for a residential use). Continuing enforcement of Napa County's Noise Ordinance by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff, including the prohibition against amplified music, should further ensure that marketing events and other winery activities do not create a significant noise impact. Events and non-amplified music, including clean-up are required to finish by 10:00 p.m. Amplified music or sound systems would not be permitted for outdoor events as identified in standard Condition of Approval 4.10 below. Temporary events would be subject to County Code Chapter 5.36 which regulates proposed temporary events.

4.10 AMPLIFIED MUSIC

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

Due to the distance between potential increased noise source and the closest off-site residence, there is a low potential for noise levels to exceed the Napa County Noise Ordinance and create a significant impact.

- c. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 project proposes to increase employees from three full-time and two part-time to a maximum of six full time. 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 three (3) full-time employees and three (3) additional part-time employees which are part of this project could lead to minor population growth in Napa County. Relative to the County's projected low to moderate growth rate and overall adequate programmed housing supply that population growth does not rise to a level of environmental significance. In addition, the project would be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs.

Cumulative impacts related to population and housing balance were identified in the 2008 General Plan EIR. As set forth in Government Code §65580, the County of Napa must facilitate the improvement and development of housing to make adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community. Similarly, CEQA recognizes the importance of balancing the prevention of environment damage with the provision of a "decent home and satisfying living environment for every Californian." (See Public Resources Code §21000(g).) The 2008 General Plan sets forth the County's long-range plan for meeting regional housing needs, during the present and future housing cycles, while balancing environmental, economic, and fiscal factors and community goals. The policies and programs identified in the General Plan Housing Element function, in combination with the County's housing impact mitigation fee, to ensure adequate cumulative volume and diversity of housing. Cumulative impacts on the local and regional population and housing balance would be less than significant.

- b. 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.

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XVII.	TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-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:

A Traffic Impact Study was prepared by W-Trans, July 29, 2019, as a focused traffic analysis addressing potential traffic impacts and circulation needs for the proposed Use Permit modification. The study reviewed Level of Service (LOS), sight distance, County left-turn lane warrant, and parking. An Addendum to the Traffic Impact Study was prepared on October 4, 2019, to modify the analysis of the project with a smaller number of proposed parking spaces (nine reduced from 17).

The winery would continue to be accessed via the existing driveway off of Partrick Road. The existing gate will be widened to meet Napa County Road and Street Standard requirements. Partrick Road is classified as a general minor road in the Napa County Road Classification section of the General Plan. It generally runs east-west in the study area, has a width of 22 feet, and is located in winding, rolling terrain. The study segment of Partrick Road has a posted speed limit of 30 miles per hour (mph) near the City limits and a prima facie speed limit of 55 mph near the project driveway, which is located outside the City limits in the County of Napa. Due to the winding roadway configuration, most drivers travel at lower speeds. The study area consists of the intersection of Partrick Road/Browns Valley Road and the segment of Partrick Road that runs from the project driveway to the City of Napa limits. It is noted that there are two intersections of the two roadways. Vehicle counts were obtained on Partrick Road near both the project driveway and the Napa City limits for a period of four days from Thursday, October 26 to Sunday, October 29, 2017.

a/b. Intersection Operation The Levels of Service for the easterly intersection of Partrick Road/Browns Valley Road were analyzed using the "Two-Way Stop-Controlled" intersection capacity method from the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). This methodology determines a level of service for each minor turning movement by estimating the level of average delay in seconds per vehicle. Under existing conditions, the intersection of Partrick Road/Browns Valley Road is operating acceptably at LOS A overall and LOS B on the stop-controlled Browns Valley Road approach during the weekend peak hour.

Trip Generation The Napa County Winery Traffic Information/Trip Generation Form was used to determine the potential trip generation for the existing operation (as permitted) and proposed conditions. The form estimates the number of daily and peak hour trips for weekdays and Saturdays based on the number of full- and part-time employees, average daily visitors, and production. It is noted that because small VIP events (maximum eight people) could occur at least once per week, the guests attending these events were added to the number of proposed daily visitors under both daily weekday and Saturday conditions, resulting in a conservative analysis.

Based on the current Use Permit parameters the site is currently generating six trips during the weekday p.m. peak hour and nine trips during the weekend midday peak hour. The proposed changes to the Use Permit would be expected to result in a total of 14 trips during the weekday p.m. peak hour and 19 trips during the weekend midday peak hour, for an increase of eight and ten trips during the two peaks, respectively.

The modified Use Permit would be expected to result in an average of 19 additional daily trips during a Crush Saturday, including 11 trips during the peak hour. These trips represent the increase in traffic associated with the proposed use permit compared to currently permitted conditions. This nominal increase in trips would therefore reasonably be expected to have a minimal impact on traffic operation.

In order to analyze the potential highest volume, long-term conditions, the study analyzed the Future plus Project plus 150-Person Event Conditions Future volumes for the horizon year 2040. The conditions were calculated based on output from the Napa Solano Travel Demand Model, maintained by the Solano Transportation Authority (STA). It is noted that the County model does not include volume projections for the eastbound Partrick Road and westbound Browns Valley Road approaches to the easterly intersection, so available model volumes for the nearby intersection of Browns Valley Road/McCormick Lane were used. In or to account for the different intersection as well as base year data of 2015, a growth factor was applied and adjusted. To arrive at an analysis representative of "worst-case" conditions, the growth factor projected by the model was doubled and the resulting growth factor of three was applied to the existing volumes for Partrick Road. The Future plus Project plus 150-person Event volumes during a typical weekday p.m. peak period and crush Saturday peak period were analyzed and under these highest volume conditions, the study intersection is expected to continue operating acceptable at LOS A overall and LOS C on the stop-controlled Browns Valley Road approach during the weekend peak hour. Under these same conditions, the eastbound study segment of Partrick Road would operate acceptably at LOS B and the westbound segment would operate acceptably at LOS C during both peaks. Because acceptable operation is projected under the highest potential volumes included in the analysis, it is reasonable to conclude that operation will be acceptable under all other scenarios with lower background and/or project-generated volumes. Additional analysis was therefore not performed of each of these other scenarios.

The County of Napa General Plan Circulation Element (updated February 2019) Policy CIR-38 states that the County shall seek to maintain an arterial Level of Service D or better on all county roadways. The study shows that under the potential highest volume scenario the intersections are estimated to maintain an acceptable LOS. The study demonstrates that the proposed project will not cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load or conflict with General Plan policies.

The project will not have any impacts to the existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities in the project area. The project will not change the existing driveway or impact Partrick Road in a way that would conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

- 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.

The project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b). The applicant provided information demonstrating the winery's efforts to reduce vehicle miles traveled. Activities include: during the reservation process guests and larger groups are encouraged to carpool and information on group transportation options are provided, staff is encouraged to bring lunch, space is provided to eat onsite, and occasionally the winery provides meals for employees. It is also noted that approximately 10,000 to 12,000 gallons of the total production is able to be produced from the vineyards on site and on the adjacent property, limiting trips associated with grape on-haul. Additionally, the owners live on site reducing the trips of two employees. Impacts would be less than significant.

- d-e. Based on the County's Road and Street Standards Left turn lane warrant graph, the project, based on Future plus 30-person event volumes, would not meet the warrant; therefore, a left-turn lane is not warranted. Sight distances along Partrick Road at the project driveway were evaluated based on sight distance criteria contained in the Highway Design Manual published by Caltrans. As Partrick Road does not have a posted speed limit in the general vicinity of the project driveway the prevailing prima facie speed limit of 55 mph would apply. The study notes that considering the winding roadway configuration, most drivers travel at lower speeds. The study found that sight distance on Partrick Road from the project driveway is adequate to the west, but inadequate to the east to meet the applied criteria for both entering and exiting movements based on the prima facie speed limit. To avoid the potential conflict which would occur if a vehicle turned left out of the driveway in front of an oncoming westbound vehicle, access out of the site should be restricted to right turns only. The study recommends that the applicant install a right-turn only sign for vehicles exiting the project driveway and a "combination curve/side road" (W1-10) sign along the north side of Partrick Road in advance of the project driveway. County Public Works Traffic Engineering has reviewed the study and concurs with the findings and recommendations, which have been incorporated as conditions of approval. The proposed improvements to the on-site driveway will meet the Napa County Road and Street Standards and the existing gate will be widened to meet the Standards. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division and found acceptable, as conditioned. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially increase hazards or result in inadequate emergency vehicle access. Impacts would be less than significant.

- f. As updated in the October 4, 2019, Traffic Impact Study Addendum, the project was analyzed to determine whether the proposed parking supply of nine parking spaces would be sufficient for the anticipated daily demand during harvest conditions as well as during events. It is understood that the crush pad area and unpaved drive aisle shoulders could be used for temporary overflow parking for events. Based on the study parameters that there should be one space per on-site employee and parking stalls for approximately 25 percent of the expected daily tasting room visitors, the proposed parking is sufficient to meet the anticipated parking demand and avoids providing excess parking. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k); or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a./b. On August 14, 2019, 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. The Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation responded and declined comment as the project site is not located within their aboriginal territories. No other responses were received within 30-days of the tribes' receipt of the invitations. No impacts would occur.

As discussed in Section V above, the proposed improvements of this project would occur on the already developed area of the site, therefore discovery of tribal cultural resources is not expected. 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 would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the County of Napa standard Condition of Approval 7.2 *ARCHEOLOGICAL FINDING*. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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. The project would not 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. As discussed in Section VII. above, the winery facility and existing residence are serviced by a combined sanitary sewer and process wastewater pretreatment and subsurface drip type dispersal system. According to the Wastewater Feasibility Study prepared by Applied Civil Engineering, November 18, 2018, the wastewater flows associated with the proposed project can be accommodated within the capacity of the existing sanitary and process wastewater treatment and dispersal system. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. As discussed in Section X. the project is categorized as "all other areas" based upon current County Water Availability Analysis policies and therefore water use criteria is parcel specific based upon a Tier 2 analysis. The Water Availability Analysis (WAA) completed by O'Conner Environmental Inc. was originally submitted November 28, 2018, with a revised document submitted March 20, 2019, and an Addendum submitted on July 8, 2019.

The proposed modification to the winery makes no changes to winery production use, irrigation use, and residential use. Winery employees will increase from three full-time and 2 part-time employees to 6 full-time employees and winery visitation will increase from a maximum of 890 visitors per year to a maximum of 5,901 visitors per year. Using the County Guidance Document, the proposed increase in employees and visitation results in an increase in winery water use from 0.89 ac-ft/yr to 1.15 ac-ft/yr. The proposed total property water use of 5.15 ac-ft/yr represents an increase of 0.26 ac-ft/yr. See further discussion in Section X.

In summary, the existing yield would be sufficient to serve all uses on the property. Any project which reduces water usage or any water usage which is at or below the established threshold is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels. Impacts would be less than significant as there is sufficient water supply available to serve the proposed project.

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

XX.	WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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?
- 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?

Discussion:

The project site is located within the State Responsibility Area (SRA) for fire protection. The property has a fire hazard severity zone designation of Moderate and a Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) rating of Moderate. Portions of the property were burned in the 2017 Napa Fires. The vineyards served as a fire break stopping the fire from reaching the winery and residence.

- a. The project site is not covered by an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. Partrick Road provides adequate access to the existing winery. The proposed onsite driveway improvements and gate widening would ensure Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and the County Engineering Division road requirements are met and would improve access in and out of the property. No impact would occur.
- b.-d. The replacement winery office building and other physical improvements would take place on the existing developed area of the site. All construction will comply with California Building Code requirements for fire safety. An existing power line runs along the east property line from the northeast corner for approximately two thirds of the property line, where it veers west to provide service to the back spring. No new power lines are proposed as part of this project. The project will not result in substantial changes to the site that would exacerbate wildfire risks or increase post-fire slope instability or drainage issues. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XXI.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	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 development and improvements are located on the portion of the property that is already developed with the winery buildings, outdoor work area, and associated infrastructure. As identified in Section IV above, due to the location of and limited scope of physical improvements, potential impacts to biological resources and wildlife species would be less than significant. As identified in Section V above, a cultural and paleontological resource study was prepared for the proposed on-site vineyard project in 2011. The study concluded that no paleontological resources were identified within or adjacent to the project area. 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 would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval. The project would not result in significant impacts to rare or endangered plant or animal species or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology, and traffic are discussed in the respective sections above and were determined to have a less than significant impact. Potential impacts to air pollution and GHG emissions are being addressed through Greenhouse Gas Voluntary Best Management Practices and VMT reduction strategies as discussed in Section VIII. Green House Gas and Section XVII. Transportation. Noted efforts include: solar hot water heating, energy conserving lighting, water efficient fixtures, water efficient landscaping, composting 75% food and garden material. The winery already has shade trees in close proximity to the south side of the buildings and works to educate staff and visitors on sustainable practices. The vineyards are Napa Green certified and best management practices include use 70-80% cover crop, and retention of biomass removed via pruning and thinning by chipping the material and reusing it rather than burning on-site. The winery's efforts to reduce vehicle miles traveled include: during the reservation process guests and larger groups are encouraged to carpool and information on group transportation options are provided, staff is encouraged to bring lunch, space is provided to eat onsite, and occasionally the winery provides meals for employees. It is also noted that approximately 10,000 to 12,000 gallons of the total production is able to be produced from the vineyards on site and on the adjacent property, limiting trips associated with grape on-haul. Additionally, the owners live on site reducing the trips of two employees. Section X. Hydrology includes detail on the Water Availability Analysis which demonstrates that estimated water use is less than the potential groundwater recharge capacity of the property. The Traffic Impact Study detailed in Section XVII. Transportation concluded that the roadways would operate at acceptable under the highest potential volumes. The proposed project would not lead to a deterioration of the level of service on Partrick Road or surrounding road network. Potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant.
- c. Due to the limited scope of this project, the proposed changes to the existing winery present limited potential impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in environmental effects that cause substantial adverse effects on human being either directly or indirectly.

Mitigation Measures: None required.