

“D”

Initial Study/Negative Declaration

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

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated January 2019)

1. **Project Title:** Vineyard 29 Winery Major Modification #P20-00062-MOD & Exception to the Napa County Road and Street Standards
2. **Property Owner:** Vineyard 29, LLC, Charles McMinn, PO Box 93, St. Helena, CA 94574
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Sean Trippi, Supervising Planner; phone: (707) 299-1353 or email: sean.trippi@countyofnapa.org.
4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):**
The project is located on a 28.14-acre site within the Agricultural Watershed (AW) zoning district. The site is accessed via an existing private driveway off State Highway 29, approximately 2,230 feet north of the St. Helena city limits. Project address: 2929 N. St. Helena Highway, St. Helena, CA 94574. APN's: 022-200-027 (winery) & 022-200-026 (six parking spaces, associated access and emergency vehicle turnaround)
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Charles McMinn, PO Box 93, St. Helena, CA 94574
6. **General Plan description:** Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space (AWOS)
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Watershed (AW)
8. **Background/Project History:**

February 2001 - The Planning Commission approved the original Vineyard 29 Winery Use Permit #00146-UP. This approval entitled a new, 48,500 gallon per year winery with a 20,543 sf winery building and 16,110 sf of cave area with three portals for a winery totaling 36,653 sf; 3 full-time and 2 part-time employees; five on-site parking spaces; 30 visitors on the busiest day, 10 on average per week, by appointment only; a marketing plan with six events per year with a maximum of 15 people, 12 events per year with a maximum of 110 people, and one event per year with maximum of 50 people, marketing activities are to occur between the hours of 12:00 to 4:00 PM and 6:00 to 11:30 PM; and, custom production for a maximum of five entities up to a maximum of 50% of the annual production (24,250 gal/yr).

May 2001 - The Zoning Administrator approved Use Permit Modification #00397-MOD for the winery to reduce the size of the building and cave to 17,804 sf and 14,038 sf, respectively, and correct the marketing plan to allow six events per year with a maximum of 15 people, two events per year with a maximum of 110 people, four events per year with maximum of 50 people, four events per year with maximum of 25 people, and one event per year with a maximum of 50 people.

January 2004 - The Director approved Use Permit Modification #04067 for the winery to rearrange interior spaces within the winery building with no change to the exterior building elevations.

April 2011 – The Director approved Use Permit Modification No. P11-00122-MOD for the winery to recognize the existing 3,390 sf private residential cave for use by the winery with no public access.

May 2017 – The Director approved Use Permit Modification No. P16-00317-MOD for the winery to delete a previous condition of approval to construct a left-turn lane on highway 29.

Existing Entitlement:

July 2019 – The Director issued a status determination (P19-00123) documenting/confirming the winery's entitlements. In summary the winery's existing entitlements include the following:

- 1) an annual production capacity of 48,500 gallons including custom production (crushing, fermentation, barrel ageing and bottling) with marketing and tasting by alternating proprietors only for a maximum of five entities up to a maximum of 50% (24,250 gallons/year of the

48,500 gallon/year) of the production capacity of the winery);

- 2) A 17,804-sf winery building;
- 3) A cave with 14,038 sf of floor area to be used for barrel storage, and approximately 3,390 sf of additional private residential cave area to be used for storage of tax paid wine, equipment and supplies, and for storage of the winery owner's personal wine collection, with no public access;
- 4) Three full-time and two part-time employees;
- 5) Hours of operation, Monday through Friday, 7:00 AM to 5:00 PM;
- 6) Five (5) off-street parking spaces;
- 7) Retail sales by appointment only limited to wines fermented or refermented and bottled at the winery;
- 8) 30 visitors on the busiest day, 10 on average per week by appointment; and,
- 9) Marketing activities by all permitted entities to occur during the hours of 12:00 to 4:00 PM and 6:00 to 11:30 PM with six events per year with a maximum of 15 people, two events per year with a maximum of 110 people, four events per year with maximum of 50 people, four events per year with maximum of 25 people, and one event per year with a maximum of 50 people.

9. **Description of Project:** Approval of a major modification of the previous project approvals for an existing 48,500 gallons per year winery to allow the following:

A. COMPONENTS NECESSARY TO REMEDY EXISTING VIOLATIONS:

- 1) Recognition of by-appointment visitation for tours and tastings for a maximum of 40 visitors per day, maximum of 280 per week;
- 2) Recognition of existing visitation hours of operation; 10:00 AM to 5:00 PM seven days a week and existing production hours of 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM, seven days a week;
- 3) Recognition of 13 full-time, two part-time and three employees during harvest;
- 4) Recognition of existing marketing activities of (i) 10 events per year with 15 people per event, (ii) 10 events per year with 25 people per event, (iii) five events per year with 50 people per event, (iv) two events per year with 110 people per event, and (v) one event per year with 165 people;
- 5) Recognition of an existing employee/overflow parking area with five (5) parking spaces; and,
- 6) Recognition of on-premises consumption of wines produced on site in the tasting areas (indoor and outdoor) in accordance with Business and Professions Code Sections 23358, 23390 and 23396.5;

B. EXPANSION BEYOND EXISTING ENTITLEMENTS:

- 1) Increase annual wine production from 48,500 gallons to 75,000 gallons;
- 2) Increase by-appointment visitation for daily tours and tastings to 60 persons per day, 370 person per week maximum (existing conditions to be recognized via the County's Code Compliance program)
- 3) Increase the number of employees to 15 full-time, six part-time and five employees during harvest (existing conditions to be recognized via the County's Code Compliance program); and,
- 4) Modification of an existing Marketing Program to increase events identified in A.4(iii), (iv) and (v), above, as follows: 10 events per year with 50 people per event, five events per year with 110 people per event, and two events per year with 165 people per event (existing conditions to be recognized via the County's Code Compliance program) with no change to the events identified in A.4(i) and (ii), above;
- 5) Addition of 26 parking spaces for a total of 36 spaces on-site;
- 6) A new process wastewater treatment system including two 10,000-gallon storage tanks;
- 7) A new driveway connection from State Highway 29, opposite the driveway to the Revana winery, and removal of the existing driveway;
- 8) A two-way left turn lane on State Highway 29; and,
- 9) A new replacement well with a 50-foot seal and a 5,000-gallon water storage tank.

The request also includes an exception to the Napa County Road & Street Standards from the commercial driveway width standard (20.0-foot-wide driveway plus two (2) foot total shoulders) for approximately 500-feet where the roadway width is 15.8 to 17.8-feet and is located within a stream setback and abuts a steep slope and alternate emergency vehicle turnaround.

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

The project site is comprised of two properties totaling approximately 28.14-acres, located at 2929 St. Helena Highway N., north of the city of St. Helena. The property is located on the east side of the Mayacamas Mountains. The existing winery, parking areas, associated improvements and vineyards are located within the front half or lower elevations of the site. Vineyards adjoin the highway frontage and extend west of the highway several hundred feet. An unnamed drainage channel with intermittent flows travels through the approximate center of the project site, daylighting just below the winery buildings via an outfall structure and extending as an open channel all the way to N. St. Helena Highway where it exits the project site via a culvert under the highway. This channel is not mapped as a blue line stream.

Along this channel's upper reaches it is incised and supports oak canopy; it becomes less incised and without a tree canopy at the project site's lowest elevations as it nears N. St. Helena Highway. The site slopes up into the hills west of the winery building. The upper elevations of the site include a dense growth of mixed oak-bay woodland with a sparse occurrence of Douglas fir. This woodland burned in the Glass Fire of 2020, as did woodland and conifer forest on the surrounding properties upslope of the project site.

Properties in the vicinity of the project site range in size from about a ¼-acre to 84 acres. Surrounding uses include single-family homes, vineyards, and a number of producing wineries (Grace Family, Revana, Ballentine, St. Cement Vineyards, William Cole, Markham, and Morlet Family Estate). Undeveloped areas are generally heavily wooded. Elevations range from approximately 280-ft. to 860-ft. above mean sea level.

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

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies
CalTrans

Other Agencies Contacted
California Department of Fish and Wildlife

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

On May 16, 2023, 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. Staff received a response from the Yocha Dehe Tribe on June 14, 2023; the Tribe did not request to consult or provide comments.

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been

avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Sean Trippi

October 12, 2023

Signature

Date

Name: Sean Trippi, Supervising Planner
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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-c. Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms, geological features, water, trees and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of a beautiful or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken-in. As generally described in the **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses** section, above, this area is defined by a mix of vineyard, winery, and residential uses. The project would not result in a substantial damage to scenic resources, including trees and rock outcroppings, or substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The project site is currently developed with a winery, caves, vineyards, water storage tanks and a pump house. External changes to the site are limited to new wastewater treatment tanks, an additional water storage tank, new parking spaces on existing paved areas, and a realigned driveway. The existing driveway will be removed and planted in vines. The proposed improvements would not be in an area which would damage any known scenic vista, or damage scenic resources, trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings.
- d. The project primarily proposes operational changes including increasing the number of by appointment tours and tastings, marketing events, and full-time/part-time employment. The expansion of marketing events could result in an increase in the amount of time existing and new sources of light are functioning during evening and nighttime hours, however, this increase would be temporary in nature and would only occur during marketing events. Marketing activities are allowed to occur during the hours of 12:00 to 4:00 PM and 6:00 to 11:30 PM. There are no proposed changes to these hours. The winery currently holds a total of 28 events per year. The project proposes to add an additional nine events per year. As noted above, new parking spaces will be provided on-site. Pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approval for wineries, any new outdoor would be required 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 lighting. Impacts are expected to be less than significant.

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 floodlighting 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 are 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/b/e. The project site includes approximately 5.4 acres of vineyards. The area comprising the existing winery development is designated as "Other Land", while the vineyards along Highway 29 are designated as "Prime Farmland/Farmland of Statewide Importance" by the Napa County Important Farmland Map of 2018 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) of the California Resources Agency. The vineyard southeast of the winery is designated "Farmland of Statewide Importance." Most of the proposed physical improvements are located within previously developed areas. The realigned driveway will require some vineyard but will be offset by vineyard plantings when the existing driveway is removed.

General Plan Agriculture 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. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. There are no other changes included in this proposal that would result in the conversion of Farmland. As a result, the proposed project would not result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use. No impacts would occur.

c/d. According to the Napa County GIS Sensitivity Maps (based on the following layer – Vegetation) the project site contains Oak Woodlands and Coniferous Forest. The proposed improvements are not proposed within these wooded areas. These improvements are not within areas that would cause a conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production, nor would it result in the loss or, or conversion of, forest land to a non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits. No impacts would occur.

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.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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 PM_{2.5}, are the major regional air pollutants of concern in the San Francisco Bay Area. Ozone is primarily a problem in the summer, and fine particle pollution in the winter. In Napa County, ozone rarely exceeds health standards, but PM_{2.5} occasionally does reach unhealthy concentrations. There are multiple reasons for PM_{2.5} exceedances in Napa County. First, much of the county is wind-sheltered, which tends to trap PM_{2.5} within the Napa Valley. Second, much of the area is well north of the moderating temperatures of San Pablo Bay and, as a result, Napa County experiences some of the coldest nights in the Bay Area. This leads to

greater fireplace use and, in turn, higher PM_{2.5} levels. Finally, in the winter easterly winds often move fine-particle-laden air from the Central Valley to the Carquinez Strait and then into western Solano and southern Napa County (BAAQMD, In Your Community: Napa County, April 2016)

The impacts associated with implementation of the project were evaluated consistent with guidance provided by BAAQMD. Ambient air quality standards have been established by state and federal environmental agencies for specific air pollutants most pervasive in urban environments. These pollutants are referred to as criteria air pollutants because the standards established for them were developed to meet specific health and welfare criteria set forth in the enabling legislation. The criteria air pollutants emitted by development, traffic and other activities anticipated under the proposed development include ozone, ozone precursors oxides of nitrogen and reactive organic gases (NO_x and ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), and suspended particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}). Other criteria pollutants, such as lead and sulfur dioxide (SO₂), would not be substantially emitted by the proposed development or traffic, and air quality standards for them are being met throughout the Bay Area.

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

As mentioned above, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Operational-Related Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursors Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. The size of the entire project is approximately 38,376 square feet, including the winery buildings (17,804 square feet) and caves (17,428 square feet). The winery buildings and caves include approximately 9,509 square feet dedicated to accessory and hospitality uses and approximately 28,867 square feet dedicated to production 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 NO_x (oxides of nitrogen), the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. Please note: a high-quality restaurant is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, but grossly overstates emissions associated with other portions of a winery, such as office, barrel storage and production, which generate fewer vehicle trips. Therefore, a general light industry comparison has also been used for other such uses. The project falls 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. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from construction activities required for project construction. Earthmoving and construction emissions would have a temporary effect; consisting mainly of dust during construction activities, exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles, and relatively minor emissions from paints and other coatings. If grading were to result in off or on-haul of soils, these potential construction impacts would be temporary in nature and subject to standard conditions of approval from the Engineering Division as part of the grading permit or building permit review process.

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.

- d. 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 physical improvements and operational changes would not significantly increase odors associated with the winery. 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 are 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Discussion:

a/b. According to the Napa County GIS Sensitivity Maps (Owl Habitat layer) Northern spotted owl (NSO) may be located within the hillsides west of the project site. An assessment for NSO's was conducted by Monk & Associates, dated March 31, 2021. The Project Area is currently developed with the existing winery, caves, paved parking areas, and vineyards. An unnamed drainage channel with intermittent flows, possibly from an offsite spring, travels through the approximate center of the project site, daylighting just below the winery buildings via an outfall structure and extending as an open channel all the way to the highway where it exits the project site via a culvert under the highway. Along this channel's upper reaches it is incised and supports oak canopy; it becomes less incised and without a tree canopy at the project site's lowest elevations as it nears the Highway. The project site's upper elevations, west of the Project Area, include a dense growth of mixed oak-bay woodland with a sparse occurrence of Douglas fir. The project proposal consists of primarily changes to the winery's operations (increases to wine production, visitors, and employees). Physical improvements include new wastewater treatment facilities, a water storage tank, new parking areas, and realigning the driveway through the existing vineyard. The physical improvements are proposed on already disturbed and/or developed areas of the site. No development is proposed within the undeveloped upper elevations of the site.

According to the assessment, the NSO nests, roosts, and feeds in a variety of habitat types and forest stand conditions. Tree species used for these activities include western hemlock, Douglas-fir, redwood, ponderosa pine, and western red cedar; while habitat types used include mixed evergreen forests, mixed coniferous forests, Douglas-fir/ hardwood mixed forests, evergreen hardwood forests, pine-oak mixed forests, and riparian corridors. Steep, rocky canyons are occasionally used for nesting, roosting, and feeding in different parts of the NSO range. There is no western hemlock, redwood or ponderosa pine, or western red cedar trees onsite. Douglas fir is present but in low numbers and none of it is mature, old growth. There are no steep, rocky canyons on the project site. Finally, the narrow riparian corridor that exists on the site is along an actively used driveway and this narrow riparian corridor lacks the mature/old-growth forest characteristics described below as necessary habitat.

Most observations of habitat use by NSOs are in areas having some elements of old-growth or mature forest; no such elements occur on the project site. NSOs generally use forests with the utmost complexity and structure. The upper elevations of the project site where woodland occurs is dominated almost exclusively by oak and bay trees with a smaller percentage of the cover provided by young, open stands of Douglas fir and with little to no structural complexity. Roost sites selected by NSOs generally consist of dense vegetation characterized by high canopy closure, large-DBH (diameter at breast height) trees, and multiple canopy layers. None of these conditions exist on the project site. Further, the project site does not provide suitable NSO habitat due to a number of homes immediately adjacent to the project site which indicates moderate to high amounts of human activity in the area, a potential disruption to NSO, and the proximity of the St. Helena Highway which is actively travelled at all times of the day and night and generates a high volume of noise that reverberates all the way up to the upper project site elevations.

NSO foraging habitat use is highly variable, as predicted by the varied distribution of the NSO's preferred prey. Despite this variability, foraging habitat remains characterized by high canopy closure and complex structure, which are absent from the project site. The assessment concluded that there would be no change in NSO habitat due to the project and therefore no mitigation measures are required.

The assessment also addressed all special status wildlife species listed in the CDFW's Natural Diversity Database as being known to occur within three miles of the project site. The report addressed the probability of these species occurring onsite or being impacted by the proposed driveway project. According to the report, no impacts to special status species are expected from the proposed project.

No other sensitive species have been identified. Based on the limited location of site improvements and minor modifications to winery operations it is unlikely that the proposed project would have a substantial adverse effect on any candidate, sensitive or special status species, or that it would have a substantial adverse effect on sensitive natural communities. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c. According to the Napa County GIS Sensitivity Maps (based on the following layers – Wetlands and vernal pools and National Wetlands Inventory) there are no wetlands on the site. The project will not 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.
- d. All proposed improvements would occur on, or adjacent to, previously disturbed areas of the property. Therefore, project activities would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with their corridors or nursery sites. No impacts would occur.
- e. The project does not require tree removal and would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources,

such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. No impacts would occur.

- f. The site is not subject to 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 are 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. A Cultural Resource Inventory, dated January 30, 2023, was prepared by Archeological Resource Service (ARS) to determine the presence or absence of potentially significant cultural resources within the development area. The evaluation included a check of the information on file with ARS's office and the Regional Office of the California Historical Resources Information System, to determine the presence or absence of previously recorded historic or prehistoric cultural resources; a check of appropriate historic references to determine the potential for historic era archaeological deposits; and, a surface reconnaissance of all accessible parts of the project area to locate any visible signs of potentially significant historic or prehistoric cultural deposits. The overall literature search determined that the current project area has not been the subject of a previous cultural resource study and there are no previously recorded archaeological sites located within the project area. ARS contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to determine the presence or absence of listed Sacred Lands within the project area and all appropriate Native American organizations or individuals designated by the Native American Heritage Commission as interested parties for the project area.

As noted above, a surface examination was conducted to locate any visible signs of potentially significant historic or prehistoric cultural deposits. The field site evaluation reviewed the realigned driveway from the highway, and the two proposed parking areas. The investigation resulted in a negative finding, indicating that no artifacts or potentially significant cultural features were observed.

No significant or potentially significant prehistoric artifacts, archaeological deposits, or features have been identified within the project area. The soil observed did not indicate any subsurface deposits or evidence of prehistoric human occupation. Since no significant cultural resources were identified on the property, no further recommendations are warranted for cultural materials at this time. Further, ARS does not recommend any archaeological subsurface testing or monitoring during the proposed development.

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. Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

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 previously encountered on the property; no information has been encountered that would indicate that this project would encounter human remains. If human remains are encountered during project development, construction of the project is required to cease, and the requirements of Condition of Approval 7.2, listed above, would apply. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None are 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 are 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 wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a.
- i.) There are no known faults that run beneath the project site 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 of a known fault. Impacts would be less than significant.
 - 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 standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level in relation to seismic ground shaking.
 - iii.) According to Napa County GIS Sensitivity Maps (based on the following layer – Liquefaction) the property is designated in an area with a Very Low susceptibility for liquefaction. No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. There were no known issues with the construction of the existing building and caves. Compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.
 - iv.) The Napa County GIS Sensitivity Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) did not indicate the presence of landslides within the development area. The physical improvements are proposed in already developed areas. Impacts are expected to be less than significant.
- b. The proposed improvements would occur within the previously disturbed and/or developed portions of the site. 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. According to the Napa County GIS Sensitivity Maps (based on the following layers - Geology, Surficial deposits, and Soil Type), the vineyard area and winery development area are composed of Perkins gravelly loam (1 to 10% slopes) and Aiken Clay loam, (2 to 15% slopes), respectively. The upper portions of the site are composed of Forward silt loam (12 to 57% slopes). The majority of the site is underlain by bedrock with a slim portion of the site near the highway underlain by Late Pleistocene to Holocene fan deposits. The property includes areas generally subject to very low to low tendencies to liquefy. All proposed construction will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction. The project is not proposed on an unstable geologic unit or soil that would become unstable or would create direct or indirect risks to life or property. Compliance with the latest editions of the California Building Code for seismic stability would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible, resulting in less than significant impacts.
- e. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The Napa County Division of Environmental Health has reviewed this application and recommends approval based on the submitted wastewater feasibility report prepared by RSA+, dated September 30, 2022. Soils on the property have been determined to be adequate to support the on-site treatment and dispersal of wastewater generated by the project including the winery's process waste resulting from the increased wine production capacity as well as sanitary wastewater based on the proposed number of employees and visitors.
- f. No paleontological resources or unique geological features have been identified on the property in the project area or were encountered on the property when the existing building and cave were constructed, and the vines were planted. The project as proposed would require minimal earth disturbing activities and construction is unlikely to uncover paleontological or unique geological features. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are 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: On April 20, 2022, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) adopted new recommended thresholds for determining the significance of individual projects’ greenhouse gas impacts under CEQA. Under the new thresholds, proposed land use projects may be analyzed for consistency with a qualified greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction strategy in the event one has been adopted. To date, Napa County has not adopted a qualified GHG reduction strategy pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15183.5. Absent an adopted strategy, BAAQMD recommends that a land use project must include specified minimum design elements to ensure that the project is contributing its “fair share” toward achieving the state’s key climate goal of carbon neutrality by 2045. Napa County has not adopted a qualified GHG reduction strategy or an air quality plan, therefore projects will be evaluated per the BAAQMD recommended minimum design elements.

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. 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.

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

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from construction represent a very small portion of a project’s lifetime GHG emissions. The BAAQMD recommended thresholds do not include a construction-related climate impact threshold at this time. 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). If the proposed project adheres to relevant best management practices identified by the BAAQMD and the County’s standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts are considered less than significant. See Section III. Air Quality for additional information.

The BAAQMD proposed thresholds for land use projects are designed to address “Operational” GHG emissions which represent the vast majority of project GHG emissions. Operational emissions associated with a winery generally 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).

As noted above, Napa County has not adopted a qualified GHG reduction strategy or an air quality plan, therefore projects will be evaluated per the BAAQMD recommended minimum design elements.

Specifically for transportation, the project must:

- Achieve compliance with electric vehicle requirements in the most recently adopted version of CALGreen Tier 2, and
- Achieve a reduction in project-generated vehicle miles traveled (VMT) below the regional average consistent with the current version of the California Climate Change Scoping Plan (currently 15 percent) or meet a locally adopted Senate Bill 743 VMT target reflecting the following recommendations:
 - Residential projects: 15 percent below the existing VMT per capita;
 - Office projects: 15 percent below the existing VMT per employee; or
 - Retail projects: no net increase in existing VMT.

The project will be required to comply with the recently adopted version of CALGreen Tier 2. Project approval will include a condition of approval to ensure this is reviewed and implemented at the time of construction through adherence to the California Building Code. As discussed above and in section XVII. Transportation, the County maintains TIS Guidelines that include VMT analysis requirements for projects based on trip generation. The project TIS, prepared by W-Trans, dated April 7, 2021, includes a recommendation to implement a Traffic Demand Management (TDM) Plan for reducing vehicle miles traveled. See section XVII. Transportation for additional detail. Additionally, the applicant already implements the following greenhouse gas reduction methods at the winery: generation of on-site renewable energy, one electrical vehicle in the wineries fleet, VMT reduction plan, energy conserving lighting, four electrical vehicle charging stations, and shade trees planted within 40 feet of the south side of the building. The winery also intends to provide bicycle incentives, bicycle route improvements, use of recycled water, and limiting the amount of grading and tree removal. The applicant also intends to or is has already implemented the following: becoming a certified as a Napa Green Winery and Napa Green Land, an employee edible garden, educating staff and visitors about sustainable practices, using 70-80% cover crop, retaining biomass, and involvement with the Countywide vine trail. A condition of approval will be included to require implementation of the checked Voluntary Best Management Practices Measures submitted with the project application. 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 are 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?
- g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires?

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts utilized in typical winery operations. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. Hazardous materials such as diesel and maintenance fluids would potentially be used onsite during construction. Should they be stored onsite, these materials would be stored in secure locations to reduce the potential for upset or accident conditions. The proposed project consists of an existing winery that would not be expected to use any substantial quantities of hazardous materials. The operational changes are not anticipated to significantly increase the quantities. 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 environment. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the existing winery buildings. The nearest school is within the City of St. Helena, a little under a mile and a half south of the winery. No impacts would occur.
- d. Based on a search of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control database, the project site does not contain any known EPA National Priority List sites, State response sites, voluntary cleanup sites, or any school cleanup sites. No impact would occur as the project site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.
- e. No impact would occur as the project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.
- f. The Napa County Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) outlines procedures, including establishing leadership roles and responsibilities of various agency staff, that guide local preparedness, response, recovery, and resource management efforts associated with occurrence of a natural disaster, significant emergency, or other threat to public safety. The project would not result in closure or permanent obstruction of adjacent public rights-of-way. No component of the implementation of the EOP would otherwise be impaired by the proposed modifications to the use permit. The driveway relocation will meet County standards. The proposed winery would not obstruct an emergency response or evacuation plan. Impacts would be less than significant.
- g. According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps (based on the following GIS layer – Fire Hazard Severity Zones) the winery buildings and associated improvements are within an area designated as a moderate fire risk. The hillsides west of the winery are within an area designated as a high fire risk. The proposed project would increase production, visitation for by appointment tours and tastings, marketing events, and employees which will increase the total number of employees, visitors, and guests who work at and visit the project site on a daily and annual basis. The proposed physical improvements are within the existing developed area of the site and would not result in a physical modification to the site that would alter factors that would likely exacerbate wildfire risks. Although the project results in a larger amount of people on site, the proposed physical improvements and operational changes do not increase the potential for significant loss, injury or death due to wild-land fires. See section XX. Wildfire for additional detail. Impacts of the project would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: On April 21, 2021, Governor Gavin Newsom declared a drought emergency in the state of California and as of July 8, 2021, 50 counties are under the drought state of emergency, including Napa County. The Governor directed the Department of Water Resources to increase resilience of water supplies during drought conditions. On June 8, 2021, the Napa County Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution declaring a Proclamation of Local Emergency due to drought conditions which are occurring in Napa County. On October 19, 2021, the Governor issued a proclamation extending the drought emergency statewide. The County requires all discretionary permit applications (such as use permits and ECPAs) 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 March 2022, Governor Newsom enacted Executive Order N-7-22, which requires prior to approval of a new groundwater well (or approval of an alteration to an existing well) in a basin subject to the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act and that is classified as medium- or high-priority, obtaining written verification from the GSA (Groundwater Sustainability Agency) managing the basin that groundwater extraction would not be inconsistent with any sustainable groundwater management program established in any applicable GSP (Groundwater Sustainability Plan) and would not decrease the likelihood of achieving sustainability goals for the basin covered by a GSP, or that it is determined first that extraction of groundwater from the new/proposed well is (1) not likely to interfere with the production and functioning of existing nearby wells, and (2) not likely to cause subsidence that would adversely impact or damage nearby infrastructure.

On March 28, 2022, August 9, 2022, and November 8, 2022, the Napa County Board of Supervisors adopted resolutions proclaiming a continued state of Local Emergency due to the 2021-2022 drought. On June 7, 2022, the Napa County Board of Supervisors provided direction regarding interim procedures to implement Executive Order N-7-22 for issuance of new, altered or replacement well permits and discretionary projects that would increase groundwater use during the declared drought emergency. The direction limits a parcel's groundwater allocation to 0.3 acre-feet per acre per year, or no net increase in groundwater use if that threshold is exceeded already for parcels located in the GSA Subbasin. For parcels not located in the GSA Subbasin (i.e., generally located in the hillsides), a parcel-specific Water Availability Analysis would suffice to assess potential impacts on groundwater supplies.

- a. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. According to the *Winery Wastewater Feasibility Report* prepared by RSA+, dated September 30, 2022, the project site and existing systems have adequate disposal capacity to serve the project. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality. Any earth disturbing activities will be subject to the County's Stormwater Ordinance which complies with State requirements, would include measures to prevent erosion, sediment, and waste materials from entering waterways both during and after any construction activities. By following the above mentioned measures the project would not have the potential to significantly impact water quality and discharge standards. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

- b. According to the *Water System Feasibility Study For A Regulated System* and *Water Availability Analysis (WAA)* prepared by RSA+, dated January 29, 2021, and November 21, 2022, respectively, the existing domestic water system is currently classified as a Transient-Noncommunity system. The system is owned and operated by Vineyard 29 LLC. The existing well on the property has a 21.5-foot seal. A new well with a minimum 50-foot seal will be drilled in the vicinity of the existing well to provide the winery with a code compliant well for the winery's public water system. A new well is required because the existing well does not have the depth of seal required for a public water system. The existing well will be used for irrigation purposes. Water for the public water system will be stored in a ±10,800-gallon tank. The parcel is located within the GSA Subbasin and the 0.3 acre-feet per acre per year calculation was used to determine the water allocation. For the 24.64-acre parcel the water allocation is 7.39 acre-feet per year. Based on the WAA prepared for the project, proposed water use would be 0.22 acre-feet per year less than current water use due to the use of recycled or treated process wastewater for vineyard irrigation.

Usage Type	Existing Usage (acre-ft.)	Proposed Usage (acre-ft.)
Vineyard		
Irrigation	2.23	2.23
Irrigation with Treated PWW	0	-0.93
Landscaping	0.24	0.24
Winery		
Process Water	1.04	1.61
Domestic Water	0.35	0.49
Total Use (Acre-feet per Year)	3.86	3.64
GSA Groundwater Recharge Rate (AF/AC/YR)		0.30
Estimated Groundwater Recharge (AF/YR)		7.39

The estimate of vineyard irrigation included water use for approximately 3.62 acres of vineyards on-site and 0.95 acres on the adjoining property to the south under the same ownership. Even without the use of treated process wastewater for vineyard irrigation, the proposed water use would still be less than the estimated groundwater recharge allocation.

Tier II and Tier III analyses are required if the proposed project represents a net increase in water use from existing conditions and if the well is within 1,500-feet of a significant stream. The total water use on the parcel is estimated to be reduced from the existing conditions, therefore a Tier II and Tier III analysis are not required for this project.

Staff has considered impacts to public trust resources in the event the project wells may be connected to a navigable waterway. The ground water/surface water criteria are presumptively met if the distance standards and well construction assumptions are met per Tables 3, 4, and 5 of the County's WAA Guidance document when a well is within 1,500-feet of a significant stream. Staff determined that because the project engineer has demonstrated that the project well is not within 1,500-feet of a significant steam, there is not a hydraulic connection to a navigable waterway and therefore no impacts to public trust resources. Additionally, applicants have reasonably demonstrated no net increase of water use over existing demand by installing a water treatment system to allow use of the recycled water, resulting in less groundwater use. County has satisfied its duty to consider impacts to trust resources and no further analysis is required.

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

4.9 GROUND WATER MANAGEMENT - WELLS

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

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

technology and best water management conservation practices.

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

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

- c. The project would not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off the project site. Improvement plans prepared prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit would ensure that the proposed project does not increase runoff flow rate or volume as a result of project implementation. General Plan Policy CON-50 requires discretionary projects, including this project, to meet performance standards designed to ensure peak runoff in 2-, 10-, 50-, and 100-year events following development is not greater than predevelopment conditions. The proposed project would implement standard stormwater quality treatment controls to treat runoff prior to discharge from the project site. The incorporation of these features into the project would ensure that the proposed project would not create substantial sources of polluted runoff. In addition, the proposed project does not have any unusual characteristics that create sources of pollution that would degrade water quality. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d. The site lies outside the boundaries of the 100- and 500-year flood hazard boundaries. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. No impacts would occur.
- e. In January 2022 the Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) submitted a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) to the Department of Water Resources (DWR). As discussed above, although the operational changes would increase water use, the applicant would use treated wastewater for vineyard irrigation resulting in an overall reduction in water use below the existing conditions. The project would not result in an impact to water use and would therefore comply with the GSP. Water quality would be maintained through standard stormwater quality treatment control measures and compliance with Engineering Division Conditions of Approval. No impacts would occur.

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

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would not change the existing agricultural land uses of the property, which are consistent with the single-family houses and vineyards developed on properties proximate to the site. The proposed project would not introduce a non-agricultural use, nor any new, non-winery related development to the property. The proposed project would integrate with the property's surroundings and would not physically divide an established community. The project would have no impact.
- 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 County has adopted the Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO) to protect agriculture and open space and to regulate winery development and expansion in a manner that avoids potential negative environmental effects. Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-1 of the 2008 General Plan states that the County shall, "preserve existing agricultural land uses and plan for agriculture and related activities as the primary land uses in Napa County." The property's General Plan land use designation is Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space (AWOS), which allows "agriculture, processing of agricultural products, and

single-family dwellings.” More specifically, General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-2 recognizes wineries and other agricultural processing facilities, and any use clearly accessory to those facilities, as agriculture. The project would allow for the continuation of agriculture as a dominant land use within the county and is fully 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...). There are no applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the property. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are 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 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 are 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: The parcel is bordered on the east State Highway 29 which contributes to a high ambient noise level. The closest offsite residence is located on the parcel that borders the project site to the north. The residence is located approximately 230 feet from the existing winery building. The residence sits approximately 20-25 feet higher than the winery. Additionally, there are a number of trees on both properties between the existing residence and existing winery. No tree removal is included in this project.

a/b. The project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during construction of the relocated driveway and other site improvements. Impacts due to a temporary increase in ambient noise generated from construction activities, or from groundborne vibration, would remain below a level of significance through compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). The County Noise Ordinance limits construction activities to daylight hours (7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.) using properly muffled vehicles. In addition to the County Noise Ordinance, the project applicant will be required to comply with project Conditions of Approval (outlined below) related to construction noise, which will limit activities further by requiring construction vehicles to be muffled and backup alarms adjusted to the lowest allowable levels. Due to the distance, natural terrain of the area, and ambient noise levels from the highway there is a low potential for impacts related to construction noise to result in substantial temporary or long-term construction noise impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.

7.3. CONSTRUCTION NOISE

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

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 in the area are rural residential properties, wineries, and vineyards; of these land uses, residential land uses are considered the most sensitive to noise. Based on the standards in County Code section 8.16.070, noise levels, measured at the exterior of a residential structure or residential use on a portion of a larger property, may not exceed 50 decibels for more than half of any hour in the window of daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.), the timeframe within which the winery currently has have visitation and marketing events. Noise impacts of the proposed project would be considered bothersome and potentially significant if sound generated by it had the effect of exceeding the standards in County Code more than 50 percent of the time (i.e., more than 50 decibels for more than 30 minutes in an hour for a residential use).

Noise from winery operations is generally limited and intermittent, meaning the sound level can vary during the day and over the course of the year, depending on the activities at the winery. The primary noise-generating activities are equipment associated with wineries including refrigeration equipment, bottling equipment, barrel washing, de-stemmers and press activities occurring during the harvest crush season, delivery trucks, and other vehicles. The Napa County General Plan EIR indicates the average, or equivalent, sound level (Leq) for winery activities is 51dBA in the morning and 41dBA in the afternoon. Audibility of a new noise source and/or increase in noise levels within recognized acceptable limits are not usually considered to be significant noise impacts, but these concerns should be addressed and considered in the planning and environmental review processes. Typical winery production operations currently occur between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. (excluding harvest), visitation (tours and tastings) occur between 10:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., with marketing events generally occurring between noon to 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. to 11:30 p.m.

The proposed increases to production, visitation and marketing events were not accompanied by a request to change or extend the hours of operations of the winery, nor are new areas for outdoor activities proposed. Thus, while there might be a minor increase in noise generated by vehicles used for shipment of the increased volume of fruit and wine and by visitors and vehicles used by visitors, noise generated by the winery operations would continue to fall within the current hours of operation, excluding harvest, and in existing outdoor areas.

c. The project site is not located within the boundaries of an airport land use compatibility plan nor the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None are 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. 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 environmental 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 State of California’s Department of Finance projects the total population of Napa County to increase 4% between the year 2020 and 2060 (State of California Department of Finance Projections, July 19, 2021, <https://dof.ca.gov/forecasting/demographics/projections/>). Unincorporated Napa County, and the five incorporated jurisdictions, all have existing state compliant Fifth Cycle (2014-2022) Housing Elements and are working on developing compliant Sixth Cycle (2023-2031) Housing Elements, as required by state law. Complaint Housing Elements indicates that the jurisdictions have enough dwelling units programed over the cycle to meet or exceed state growth projections.

The requested use permit major modification would facilitate the continued operation of an existing winery on the project site, with expanded production and hospitality service. The addition of eight (8) new employees (net increase above existing conditions) is not anticipated to generate a substantial need for additional housing.

The proposed project does not require installation of any new infrastructure, including that which might induce growth by extending services outside of the boundaries of the subject site or increasing the capacity of any existing roadway. Napa County collects fees from developers of nonresidential projects to help fund local affordable housing (see Napa County Code Section 18.107.060 – Nonresidential developments – Housing fee requirement). New visitors to the winery could increase demand for group transportation services to the winery, though the potential for employment changes of other businesses supporting the winery’s requested operations is uncertain, unquantifiable, and speculative.

The policies and programs identified in the General Plan Housing Element function, in combination with the County’s housing impact mitigation fee, ensure adequate cumulative volume and diversity of housing. With small staffing increases proposed and no off-site expansion of utilities or facilities to serve other developments, the project would have a less than significant impact on population growth.

b. There is no existing residential development on the property. No residential buildings on or off the property would be demolished as a result of the project. Thus, no residents would be displaced, and there would be no impact.

Mitigation Measures: None are 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 measures, such as winery access that meets Napa County Road and Street Standards (RSS) and defensible space will be required as part of the development. The Fire Department and Engineering Services Division have reviewed the application and recommend approval, as conditioned. There would be no foreseeable impact to fire or police emergency response times with compliance with these conditions of approval. The proposed project scope does not include construction of any new residential units nor accompanying introduction of new residents that would utilize existing parks or potentially increase student enrollment in schools located in the cities north and south of the winery. No new parks or other public recreational amenities or facilities (such as police or fire stations) are proposed to be built with or as a result of the requested use permit major modification. School impact fees, which assist local school districts with capacity building measures, would be levied for any required building permits for the project, however as demonstrated in **Section XIV(a), Population and Housing**, the project is expected to create a minimal increase in the county's population and its need for housing such that local schools would not be strained by the proposed project and the increase in visitation, marketing events, and employment. The proposed project would have minimal impact on public parks as no residences are proposed, and as previously noted the increase in regional population from the proposed project is expected to be minimal. Impacts to public services would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are 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 requested use permit major modification does not include any residential component and is not likely to lead to the accompanying introduction of new residents to the site or area. The use permit major modification would increase the number of winery employees and the number of daily tours and tastings visitors to the property, some of whom might visit regional recreational facilities on the way to or from other wineries. However, given that the purpose of employees' and guests' trips are to and from the winery as the primary destination, such visits to area recreational facilities are anticipated to be infrequent and would not drastically accelerate the deterioration of the park amenities. This impact would be less than significant.
- b. No new public recreational amenities are proposed to be built with, or as a result of, the requested use permit major modification. The proposed project would have no impact.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

XVII.	TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) 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"/>
	b) 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"/>
	c) 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"/>
	d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) 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./c./d. The parcel is accessed via a private driveway off State Highway 29. The project proposes to relocate the driveway to the south to align with the driveway for the Revana winery on the opposite side of the State Highway 29. The applicant proposes to install a two-way left turn lane on State Highway 29 which would require an encroachment permit from CalTrans.

The winery is seeking an exception to the County's Road and Street Standards (RSS) to allow for a reduction in commercial driveway width (20.0 foot wide driveway plus two (2) foot total shoulders) for approximately 500-feet where the roadway width is 15.8 to 17.8-feet and is located within the setback of an extrapolated stream and abuts a steep slope. The request would minimize earthwork on slopes to preserve the existing environmental features and protect water quality. The driveway in the area of the exception has a width of 16-feet and intervisibility between the connections to the compliant two-lane driveway at both ends. Further, the applicant proposes to install "yield to emergency vehicles" signs at both ends of the 16-foot-wide driveway section. The request also includes an exception to the maximum longitudinal slope and maximum cross-slope perpendicular to the longitudinal slope near the terminus of the driveway, just north of the winery building, to create a compliant turnaround area. The exception is requested to minimize earthwork on steep slopes and to preserve a large native oak tree. A turnaround area is provided approximately 35-40 feet south of the driveway terminus, in front of the crush pad/receiving area. All portions of the driveway not discussed in this Road Exception Evaluation will meet commercial standards as defined in the RSS. The request has been reviewed by the Engineering Division and Fire Marshal's Office and staff determined that the request achieves the same overall practical effect of the RSS by providing defensible space and consideration toward life, safety and public welfare as conditioned in the Road Exception Evaluation memo, dated July 11, 2022.

While the study area lacks pedestrian facilities and transit service, there is not expected to be a demand, and therefore, the lack of facilities is considered acceptable. Planned future bicycle facilities on SR 29, including Class II bike lanes along this roadway and a segment of the proposed Vine Trail that would be located across from the project site, would provide adequate bicycle access. To accommodate cyclists utilizing the paths, the project would provide bicycle parking spaces in accordance with requirements of the California Building Code. As proposed the project would not conflict with any plans, ordinances or policies addressing the circulation system. All designs will comply with County RSS and Public Works standards for safe access into and throughout the site. The project

would not substantially increase hazards due to design features or result in inadequate emergency access. Impacts would be less than significant.

- b. As part of the statewide implementation of Senate Bill (SB) 743, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) settled upon automobile vehicle miles of travel (VMT) as the preferred metric for assessing passenger vehicle-related impacts under CEQA and issued revised *CEQA Guidelines* in December 2018, along with a *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA* to assist practitioners in implementing the *CEQA Guidelines* revisions.

The County's General Plan Circulation Element contains a policy statement (Policy CIR-7) indicating that the County expects development projects to achieve a 15% reduction in project-generated VMT to avoid triggering a significant environmental impact. Specifically, the policy directs project applicants to identify feasible measures that would reduce their project's VMT and to estimate the amount of VMT reduction that could be expected from each measure. The policy states that "projects for which the specified VMT reduction measures would not reduce unmitigated VMT by 15 or more percent shall be considered to have a significant environmental impact." That policy is followed by an action item (CIR-7.1) directing the County to update its CEQA procedures to develop screening criteria for projects that "would not be considered to have a significant impact to VMT" and that could therefore be exempted from VMT reduction requirements.

The new *CEQA Guidelines* and the OPR Technical Advisory note that CEQA provides a categorical exemption (Section 15303) for additions to existing structures of up to 10,000 square feet, so long as the project is in an area that is not environmentally sensitive and where public infrastructure is available. OPR determined that "typical project types for which trip generation increases relatively linearly with building footprint (i.e., general office building, single tenant office building, office park, and business park) generate or attract 110-124 trips per 10,000 square feet". They concluded that, absent substantial evidence otherwise, the addition of 110 or fewer daily trips could be presumed to have a less than significant VMT impact.

The County maintains a set of Transportation Impact Study Guidelines (TIS Guidelines) that define situations and project characteristics that trigger the need to prepare a TIS. The purpose of a TIS is to identify whether the project is likely to cause adverse physical or operational changes on a County roadway, bridge, bikeway or other transportation facility, to determine whether the project should be required to implement or contribute to improvement measures to address those changes, and to ensure that the project is developed consistent with the County's transportation plans and policies. Per the County's current TIS Guidelines, a project is required to prepare a TIS if it generates 110 or more net new daily vehicle trips. Based on the County's winery trip generation assumptions, the proposed project would be expected to generate 60 new daily trips on a Friday and 66 on Saturdays, including 20 new trips during the Friday p.m. peak hour and 26 during the Saturday p.m. peak hour, compared to permitted conditions. During harvest the proposed project would be expected to generate 71 new daily trips on a Friday and 69 on Saturdays, including 23 new trips during the Friday p.m. peak hour and 28 during the Saturday p.m. peak hour, compared to permitted conditions. When compared to existing conditions, the project would be expected to generate 22 new daily trips on a Friday, 29 during harvest, and 46 on Saturdays, 39 during harvest, including seven (7) new trips during the Friday p.m. peak hour, nine (9) during harvest, and 27 during the Saturday p.m. peak hour, 17 during harvest. The trip generation does not exceed 110 net new daily trips; therefore, the project is not required to prepare a traffic impact study (TIS). However, the project included a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) prepared by W-Trans, dated April 7, 2021, that was prepared prior to the County's updated TIS Guidelines which went into effect in January 2022.

The TIS Guidelines also include VMT analysis requirements for projects based on trip generation, which includes a screening approach that provides a structure to determine what level of VMT analysis may be required for a given project. This project would fall into the category of a "project modifying an existing facility that would generate additional trips". The TIS Guidelines state that if the net cumulative result of all project modifications after January 1, 2022, would generate less than 110 net new daily passenger vehicle and truck trips the project is presumed to have a less than significant impact for VMT. As noted above, based on the trip generation sheet, the maximum employee and visitor/guest data for the harvest/crush season, the proposed project would not exceed the 110 trip threshold and is therefore presumed to have a less than significant impact. Although not required, the TIS includes the applicant's proposal for a Traffic Demand Management (TDM) Plan with the intent of reducing vehicle miles traveled. The winery's TDM program could provide information, encouragement, and access to non-motorized travel options for both employees and guests, to reduce the number of vehicle trips and overall VMT. Report recommendations include: Carpool incentives, financial incentives for carpooling or biking to work, guaranteed ride home program, bicycle parking, and designation of a Transportation Coordinator. The project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b). Impacts would be less than significant.

- e. Developers of new or expanded land uses are required to provide adequate parking or demonstrate that adequate parking exists to meet their anticipated parking demand. Excess parking that could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or commercial activity exceeding the site's capacity is discouraged. The winery currently has 10 parking spaces and proposes to add 26 additional spaces for a total of 36 parking spaces. The TIS determined that the proposed parking supply is adequate for the anticipated demand based on increase to the number of employees and visitors. The proposed project would not be in conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-14.

Mitigation Measures: None are 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. On May 16, 2023, 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. Staff received a response from the Yocha Dehe Tribe on June 14, 2023; the Tribe did not request to consult or provide comments.

Mitigation Measures: None are 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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?

Discussion:

- a. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. A Wastewater Feasibility Study, dated September 30, 2022, was prepared by RSA+, detailing the existing system and proposed changes to accommodate the changes in production, employees, and hospitality. The proposed wastewater improvements presented in this feasibility study will enhance the method of wastewater treatment that is currently used by the facility. According to the study, the existing standard system will be used to dispose of only the domestic wastewater generated from the winery. No additional domestic wastewater treatment or dispersal system is needed. Treatment of production wastewater will be treated using a worm-based wastewater treatment to the required standards and will be beneficially reused via surface drip for vineyard irrigation. The winery process wastewater system will be fully automated and will be designed so minimal input from winery staff is required. Per Napa County guidelines, a Registered Civil Engineer, Registered Environmental Health Specialist, or Licensed Contractor will provide semi-annual monitoring and evaluation of the system. The contract with the responsible party will be provided prior to the final inspection for the system installed. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings, conditioning that the selected design and plans shall be designed by a licensed Civil Engineer or Registered Environmental Health Specialist and approved by the Division of Environmental Health. Impacts would be less than significant.

According to the *Water System Feasibility Study For A Regulated System*, dated January 29, 2021, the winery has an existing Domestic Water Supply Permit via the Calcode system with state ID# 28- 00038. With the increase in employees and visitors, the winery will need to establish that the Transient-Noncommunity Water System is served by a code compliant well. The existing well on the property has a 21.5-foot seal. A new well with a minimum 50-foot seal will be drilled in the vicinity of the existing well to provide the winery with a code compliant well for the winery's public water system. A new well is required because the existing well does not have the depth of seal required for a public water system. The existing well will be used for irrigation purposes.

Stormwater drainage would be managed through the Napa Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Guidance. All on site civil improvements shall be constructed according to plans prepared by a registered civil engineer, which will be reviewed and approved by the Engineering Division. The project does not require the construction of new or expanded electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities. Impacts are expected to be less than significant.

- b. As discussed in Section X. a Water Availability Analysis was prepared by RSA+, dated November 21, 2022, there is no net increase in water consumption associated with the proposed project. The increased demand for the winery's process and domestic water will be offset by water savings associated with the use of treated process wastewater for irrigation. Overall, the Proposed water use of 3.64 af/yr is slightly less than the Permitted use and the Existing levels of 3.86 af/yr. The proposed water use would not impact groundwater availability.
- c. As discussed above and in Section X, Hydrology, the existing on-site domestic waste system can accommodate the proposed increases to employees and visitors. Winery process waste will be treated by a new onsite system, which has been sized to accommodate the proposed production capacity of 75,000 gallons. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings, conditioning that the selected design and plans shall be designed by a licensed Civil Engineer or Registered Environmental Health Specialist and approved by the Division of Environmental Health. The project is not served by a wastewater treatment provider; therefore, no impact would occur.
- d/e. According to the Napa County Baseline Data Report, all of the solid waste landfills where Napa County's waste is disposed have more than sufficient capacity related to the current waste generation. 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 are 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Due to slope, prevailing winds and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. There are no proposed project features that would substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The winery is seeking an exception to the Napa County Rad and Street Standards (RSS) to allow for a reduction in commercial roadway width for approximately 500-feet where the roadway width is 15.8 to 17.8-feet and is located within the setback of an extrapolated stream and abuts a steep slope. This stretch of the driveway is completely visible from end to end to oncoming drivers. Drivers can see the other end of the segment with the reduced width and can therefore easily stop to let an oncoming vehicle pass before entering that segment of the driveway. All portions of the driveway not discussed in the Road Exception Evaluation will meet commercial standards as defined in the RSS. The request has been reviewed by the Engineering Division and Fire Marshal's Office and staff determined that the improvement achieves the same overall practical effect of the RSS taking into consideration adequate turnaround areas, life, safety, and public welfare as conditioned in the Road Exception Evaluation memo, dated July 11, 2022. Access onto and throughout the parcel includes design components to accommodate fire and emergency apparatus. The Fire Marshal's office has reviewed the plans, which demonstrate that the project would have adequate emergency access to the existing development. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps (based on the following GIS layer – Fire Hazard Severity Zones) the winery buildings and associated improvements are within an area designated as a moderate fire risk. The hillsides west of the winery are within an area designated as a high fire risk. The proposed physical improvements are within the existing developed area of the site and vineyards along State Highway 29. Although the project results in a larger amount of people on site, the physical improvements and operational changes would not result in a physical modification to the slope of the site, change prevailing winds, or alter other factors that would likely exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.
- c. As noted above, a 500-foot portion of the existing driveway would not meet current standards. The Fire Marshal's office has reviewed the plans, which demonstrate that the project would have adequate emergency access to the existing development. The relocation of the driveway off State Route 29 will meet current standards. In addition, a two-way left-turn lane will be installed on the highway improving access to the property for emergency vehicles. The project does not require installation or maintenance of infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. Impacts will be less than significant.
- d. The physical improvements are in an area of the site which is already graded and paved or plated in vines. The proposed project would not physically alter the site in a way, which would expose people or structures to risks such as downstream or downslope flooding or landslides resulting from runoff, post-fire instability or drainage changes. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are 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. As discussed in Section IV. Biological Resources, there are limited potential wildlife species and habitats in the area that could be impacted by the proposed project. The project site's upper elevations, west of the Project Area, include a dense growth of mixed oak-bay woodland with a sparse occurrence of Douglas fir. An unnamed drainage channel with intermittent flows travels through the approximate center of the project site, daylighting just below the winery buildings via an outfall structure and extending as an open channel all the way to the highway where it exits the project site via a culvert under the highway. The Project Area is currently developed with the existing winery, caves, paved parking areas, and vineyards. The project proposal consists of primarily changes to the winery's operations (increases to wine production, visitors, and employees). Physical improvements include new wastewater treatment facilities, a water storage tank, new parking areas, and realigning the driveway through the existing vineyard. The physical improvements are proposed on already disturbed and/or developed areas of the site. No development is proposed within the undeveloped upper elevations of the site or within the drainage channel. No tree removal is required as part of the project. Based on site conditions the proposed project does not 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.

As identified in Section V. Cultural Resources, Archeological Resource Service (ARS) prepared a Cultural Resource Inventory, dated January 30, 2023, to determine the presence or absence of potentially significant cultural resources within the development area. According to the report, no significant or potentially significant prehistoric artifacts, archaeological deposits, or features were identified within the project area. The soil observed did not indicate any subsurface deposits or evidence of prehistoric human occupation. Since no significant cultural resources were identified on the property, no further recommendations are warranted for cultural materials. The proposed improvements would be in previously disturbed areas of the site, accidental upset of unidentified resources is unlikely. The project would not result in significant impacts or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Impacts would be less than significant.

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. As discussed in Section VIII. Green House Gas and Section XVII. Transportation, potential impacts to air pollution and GHG emissions are being addressed through meeting BAAQMD recommended design elements, with the addition of Greenhouse Gas Voluntary Best Management Practices, and VMT reduction strategies. The applicant already implements the following greenhouse gas reduction methods at the winery: generation of on-site renewable energy, one electrical vehicle in the wineries fleet, VMT reduction plan, energy conserving lighting, and shade trees planted within 40 feet of the south side of the building. The winery also intends to provide bicycle incentives, bicycle route improvements, use of recycled water, and limiting the amount of grading and tree removal. A condition of approval will be included to require implementation of the checked Voluntary Best Management Practices Measures submitted with the project application. Section X. Hydrology includes detail on the Water Availability Analysis which demonstrates that the proposed project would slightly decrease water use from 3.86 af/yr to 3.64 af/yr as a result of using 0.93 af/yr treated process wastewater for irrigation. Consequently, the project would not interfere with groundwater recharge or lowering of the local groundwater level. The Traffic

Impact Study (TIS) Report detailed in Section XVII, Transportation, concluded that the proposed project would not have significant impacts on the County roadway system. Although the project falls below the County threshold requiring a VMT analysis, the applicant has proposed to implement a Travel Demand Management as recommended by and outline in the TIS to reduce VMTs associated with the project. Any future modification to the winery would look at the net cumulative result of all project modifications after January 1, 2022, including this project, determining if a VMT analysis is required at that time. Potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

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

Mitigation Measures: None are required.
