

“D”

Initial Study/  
Mitigated Negative Declaration

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

Initial Study Checklist  
(form updated January 2019)

1. **Project Title:** Venge Vineyards, Use Permit Major Modification #P19-00141-MOD
2. **Property Owner:** Kirk Venge, 4708 Silverado Trail, Calistoga, CA 94515; (707) 942-9100
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Jason R. Hade, Principal Planner, (707) 259-8757, jason.hade@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):** The project is located on an approximately 12 acre site within the AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning district at 4708 Silverado Trail, Calistoga; APN: 020-350-043.
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Kirk Venge, 4708 Silverado Trail, Calistoga, CA 94515; (707) 942-9100
6. **General Plan description:** Agricultural Resource (AR) designation
7. **Zoning:** AP (Agricultural Preserve)
8. **Background/Project History:**
  - Venge Vineyards was approved by the Planning Commission on December 2, 2009 (Use Permit P08-00647-UP) with a maximum annual production capacity of 20,000 gallons, conversion of an existing 2,800 square foot residence to an administrative office/hospitality building, construction of a 3,600 square foot barn-style production and fermentation building, construction of up to 9,000 square feet of barrel storage either within a cave or, in lieu of the cave, by expanding the production building to accommodate the needed barrel storage for a winery totaling a maximum of 15,400 square feet, construction of a 3,324 square foot uncovered outdoor work area, six parking spaces, 12,000 gallon water tank, and improvement of portions of the existing private road to the winery. An exception to the Napa County Road and Street Standards (RSS) was granted to permit a 780 linear foot portion of the access road to include 10-foot wide surfaced roadway plus two-feet of drivable shoulders. The Use Permit authorized two full-time and two-part time employees, tours and tastings by appointment only with 20 visitors per day and a maximum of 140 visitors per week, and a marketing program with three events per year with 10 persons per event, five events per year with 30 persons per event, and participation in the Napa Valley Wine Auction event as a temporary event.
  - On April 26, 2013, the PBES Director approved Use Permit Modification P13-00047-MOD to permit the construction of a 3,348 square foot structure for barrel and winery equipment storage.

The 12.37 acre parcel is relatively flat with the exception of the northwest corner of the site and is currently developed with three winery buildings, a waste disposal system, six parking spaces, a well, and approximately 11.5 acres of vineyards.
9. **Description of Project:** Approval of a Use Permit Major Modification to an existing 20,000 gallon per year winery to allow the following:
  - A. **COMPONENTS NECESSARY TO REMEDY EXISTING VIOLATIONS:**
    - 1) Recognition of existing production of 70,000 gallons per year. Currently authorized to produce a maximum of 20,000 gallons of wine per year; and
    - 2) Recognition of five full-time employees. Currently authorized for two full-time and two part-time employees.

**B. EXPANSION BEYOND EXISTING ENTITLEMENTS:**

- 1) Decrease daily tours and tastings from 20 persons per day (appointment required), 140 person per week maximum to 19 persons per day (appointment required), 133 visitors maximum per week;
- 2) Modification of an existing Marketing Program to increase events from 8 events per year (180 guests) to 36 events per year (600 guests) as follows:
  - a. Twenty-four (24) annual events for up to 10 guests; and
  - b. Twelve (10) annual events for up to 30 guests;
- 3) Addition of 10 new parking spaces and provision of a minimum of two bicycle parking spaces;
- 4) Improvement of the existing driveway to county standards;
- 5) Installation of a left turn lane at Silverado Trail and the project driveway; and
- 6) Upgrade the existing wastewater treatment system.

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

Access to the property is from Silverado Trail via a paved driveway. On-site soil type is Pleasanton loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes. The site lies outside of the boundaries of the 100 and 500-year flood hazard boundaries. The majority of the project site is outside of a designated Fire Hazard Severity area with the exception of the northwest corner, which is designated moderate, and the northeast corner, which is designated high.

Land uses in the area are dominated by large lot residential properties, wineries, including Fisher Winery and Phifer Pavitt Family Vineyards, and vineyards. The nearest residence to the project site is approximately 350 feet to the northwest of the existing hospitality building.

**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, and an encroachment permit, in addition to meeting Cal Fire 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**

None

**Other Agencies Contacted**

Federal Trade and Taxation Bureau  
Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control

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

On October 12, 2020, County staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. The Middletown Rancheria requested consultation and met with the County at the project site on November 18, 2020 to discuss their concerns. A mitigation measure was developed in consultation with the tribe and is included in the Tribal Cultural Resources section below. No other responses were received within 30-days of the tribe's receipt of the invitations.

**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.

*Jason R. Hade*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

November 15, 2021

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Name: Jason R. Hade, Principal 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The project site is not located within a scenic vista, nor are there any proposed new structures. As such, no impacts would occur.
- b. Silverado Trail is identified as a Viewshed Road. However, the County's Viewshed Protection Program is not applicable to the proposed project as no construction is proposed on slopes in excess of 15 percent. No trees would be removed as part of project construction. No rock outcroppings or historic buildings are located at the subject site. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. The proposed project consists of the improvement of an existing driveway to County standards as well as the upgrading of a wastewater treatment system. Visual impacts would be minimal as the physical changes are limited in scope and would occur within previously disturbed areas. Remaining proposed changes are operational in nature (production capacity, number of employees, and marketing and visitation program). As such, the project would not degrade the existing character of the site and its surroundings and impacts would be less than significant.
- d. No additional lighting is proposed as part of the project. As such, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. <sup>1</sup> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

Discussion:

a/b/e. The project site is designated as "prime farmland" and "other land" as shown on the Napa County Important Farmland Map 2002 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. All changes as a result of the project would occur within the portion of the site mapped as "other land" with the exception of minor driveway improvements within the "prime farmland" area. No vines are proposed for removal. The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. There is no existing agricultural contract on the property. There are no other changes included in this proposal that would result in the conversion of Farmland. General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use policies AG/LU-2 and AG/LU-13 recognize wineries, and any use consistent with the Winery Definition Ordinance and clearly accessory to a winery, as agriculture. Impacts would be less than significant.

c/d. The project site is zoned AP, which allow wineries upon grant of a use permit. According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps (based on the following layers – Sensitive Biotic Oak Woodlands, Riparian Woodland Forest and Coniferous Forest) the project site contains a small area of sensitive oak woodland within the northwest corner of the subject site. However, no disturbance is proposed within this area of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) Board of Directors unanimously adopted thresholds of significance to assist in the review of projects under the California Environmental Quality Act. These Thresholds are designed to establish the level at which BAAQMD believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA and were posted on BAAQMD's website

and included in BAAQMD's updated CEQA Guidelines (updated May 2012). The Thresholds are advisory and may be followed by local agencies at their own discretion.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As mentioned above, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Operational-Related Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursors Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. Given that no changes to the existing buildings are proposed compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47ksf (high quality restaurant) and 541ksf (general light industry) for NOx (oxides of

nitrogen), the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. (Please note: a high quality restaurant is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, but grossly overstates emissions associated with other portions of a winery, such as office, barrel storage and production, which generate fewer vehicle trips. Therefore, a general light industry comparison has also been used for other such uses.)

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

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

#### 7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

##### c. AIR QUALITY

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

1. *Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. The BAAQMD's phone number shall also be visible.*
2. *Water all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) two times per day.*
3. *Cover all haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site.*
4. *Remove all visible mud or dirt traced onto adjacent public roads by using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.*
5. *All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.*
6. *All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.*
7. *Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting off equipment when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five (5) minutes (as required by State Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.*
8. *All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator. Any portable engines greater than 50 horsepower or associated equipment operated within the BAAQMD's jurisdiction shall have either a California Air Resources Board (ARB) registration Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) or a BAAQMD permit. For general information regarding the certified visible emissions evaluator or the registration program, visit the ARB FAQ [http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/perp/perpfact\\_04-16-15.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/perp/perpfact_04-16-15.pdf) or the PERP website <http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/portable.htm>.*

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

#### 7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

##### b. DUST CONTROL

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

While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. The nearest residence to the project site is approximately 350 feet to the northwest of the existing hospitality building. Construction-phase pollutants would be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. The project would not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts would be less than significant.



Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a/b. The project is dominated by agricultural uses such as vineyards and a winery. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource maps, the project site contains no sensitive biological resources with the exception of potential Northern Spotted Owl habitat and a small area of sensitive oak woodland within the northwest corner of the subject site. However, no trees or vegetation is proposed for removal. Proposed project construction would occur within previously disturbed areas. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c/d. According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps, the project area does not contain any wetlands, vernal pools, aquatic or riparian habitat. The project includes the operational expansion of an existing winery and associated driveway improvements. Accordingly, the project, would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. As illustrated on the submitted plans, no trees are proposed for removal. No impacts would occur.
- f. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans because there are no plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

V.	CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-b. According to Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Archaeological Resources Layer, historical site, points & lines), no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified within the project site. If resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval:

7.2 ARCHEOLOGICAL FINDING

*In the event that archeological artifacts or human remains are discovered during construction, work shall cease in a 50-foot radius surrounding the area of discovery. The permittee shall contact the PBES Department for further guidance, which will likely include the requirement for the permittee to hire a qualified professional to analyze the artifacts encountered and to determine if additional measures are required.*

*If human remains are encountered during project development, all work in the vicinity must be halted, and the Napa County Coroner informed, so that the Coroner can determine if an investigation of the cause of death is required, and if the remains are of Native American origin. If the remains are of Native American origin, the permittee shall comply with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.*

c. No human remains have been encountered on the property and no information has been encountered that would indicate that this project would encounter human remains. However, if resources are found during project grading, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard condition of approval noted above. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

VI.	ENERGY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would comply with Title 24 energy use requirements and would not result in significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency because there are no plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

VII.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a.
  - i.) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.

- ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project would be required to comply with the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
  - iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. The project site is identified as having a very low or low liquefaction potential according to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (liquefaction layers). Compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.
  - iv.) According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) there are no known landslide areas on the subject site.
- b. The proposed improvements would occur on slopes of five percent to 15 percent. The project would require incorporation of best management practices and would be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c/d. The on-site soil type is Pleasanton loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the improvements are proposed for an area which has a very low or low susceptibility for liquefaction. Compliance with the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code, would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level of less than significant.
- e. According to the Onsite Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study for the Venge Winery Use Permit Modification Application 4708 Silverado Trail, Calistoga, California APN 020-350-043 prepared by Applied Civil Engineering, Incorporated on June 2, 2020, the project site and proposed system upgrade, consisting of the addition of 800 linear feet of new leach line, would create adequate disposal capacity to serve the project. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f. According to Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Archaeological Resources Layer, historical site, points & lines), no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified within the project site. If resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard condition of approval 7.2 identified in **Section V** above.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

**Discussion:**

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

the County's policy goal related to reducing GHG emissions.

In July 2015, the County re-commenced preparation of the CAP to: i) account for present day conditions and modeling assumptions (such as but not limited to methods, emission factors, and data sources), ii) address the concerns with the previous CAP effort as outlined above, iii) meet applicable State requirements, and iv) result in a functional and legally defensible CAP. On April 13, 2016 the County, as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP, released Final Technical Memorandum #1: 2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016. This initial phase included: i) updating the unincorporated County's community-wide GHG emissions inventory to 2014, and ii) preparing new GHG emissions forecasts for the 2020, 2030, and 2050 horizons. Additional information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or <https://www.countyofnapa.org/592/Climate-Action-Plan>

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

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

In 2011, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) released California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Project Screening Criteria and Significance of Thresholds [1,100 metric tons per year (MT) of carbon dioxide and carbon dioxide equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e)]. This threshold of significance is appropriate for evaluating projects in Napa County.

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

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

GHGs are the atmospheric gases whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for the greenhouse effect, including carbon dioxide, methane, ozone, and the fluorocarbons, that contribute to climate change (a widely accepted theory/science explain human effects on the atmosphere). Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) gas, the principal greenhouse gas (GHG) being emitted by human activities, and whose concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity, also serves as the reference gas to compare other greenhouse gases. Agricultural sources of carbon emissions include forest clearing, land-use changes, biomass burning, and farm equipment and management activity emissions ([http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/glossary/letter\\_c.html](http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/glossary/letter_c.html)). Equivalent Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>e) is the most commonly reported type of GHG emission and a way to get one number that approximates total emissions from all the different gasses that contribute to GHG (BAAMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2017). In this case, carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) is used as the reference atom/compound to obtain atmospheric carbon CO<sub>2</sub> effects of GHG. Carbon stocks are converted to carbon dioxide equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e) by multiplying the carbon total by 44/12 (or 3.67), which is the ratio of the atomic mass of a carbon dioxide molecule to the atomic mass of a carbon atom (<http://www.nciasi2.org/COLE/index.html>).

One time "Construction Emissions" associated with a winery development project include: i) the carbon stocks that are lost (or released) when existing vegetation is removed and soil is ripped in preparation for the driveway improvements; and ii) emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area, including construction equipment and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as Equipment Emissions). These emissions also include underground carbon stocks (or Soil carbon) associated with any existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed. As previously stated, the proposed project consists of the improvement of an existing driveway to County standards as well as the upgrading of a wastewater treatment system. The physical changes are limited in scope and would occur within previously disturbed areas. Remaining proposed changes are operational in nature (production capacity, number of employees, and marketing and visitation program).

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

As discussed in the Air Quality section of this Initial Study, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors & GHG Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, including GHG emissions, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. Because no additional floor area is proposed when compared to the BAAQMD’s GHG screening criteria of 121,000 sf for general industrial, and compared to the BAAQMD’s screening criterion of 9,000 sf. for a high quality restaurant, the project was determined not to exceed the 1,100 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr GHG threshold of significance.

Furthermore, the winery has already implemented the following GHG reduction methods: installation of solar panels which generate on-site renewable energy; installation of energy conserving lighting; installation of water efficient fixtures; use of water efficient landscaping; recycling of 75 percent of all waste; implementation of a sustainable purchasing and shipping program; site design oriented to optimize conditions for natural heating, cooling, and day lighting of interior spaces, and to maximize winter sun exposure; and minimizing the amount of grading and tree removal.

The proposed project has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds and determined that the project would not exceed the 1,100 MT/yr of CO<sub>2</sub>e. GHG Emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the Cal Green Building Code, tightened vehicle fuel efficiency standards, and more project-specific on-site programs including those winery features noted above would combine to further reduce emissions below BAAQMD thresholds.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

- f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- 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. A business plan would be filed with the Environmental Health Division should hazardous materials reach reportable levels. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. Hazardous materials such as diesel, maintenance fluids, and paints would be used onsite during construction. Should they be stored onsite, these materials would be stored in secure locations to reduce the potential for upset or accident conditions. The proposed project consists of the continued operations of an existing winery that would not be expected to use any substantial quantities of hazardous materials. Therefore, it would not be reasonably foreseeable for the proposed project to create upset or accident conditions that involve the release of hazardous materials into the environments. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the project site. According to Google Earth, the nearest school to the project site is Calistoga Junior-Senior High School, located approximately 1.5 miles to the west. 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.
- f. The proposed access driveway improvements meets Napa County Road and Street Standards. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division and found acceptable, as conditioned. Therefore, the proposed project would not obstruct emergency vehicle access and impacts would be less than significant.
- g. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. The proposed driveway improvements would provide adequate access to Silverado Trail. The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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, the Governor of the State of California proclaimed a State of Emergency for the Counties of Sonoma and Mendocino due to extremely low reservoir levels and drought conditions. On May 11, 2021, the Governor expanded the drought emergency to an additional 39 counties, including the County of Napa. This potentially historic drought in Napa County may result in broad impacts and considerations that extend beyond drinking water and conservation efforts. The local agricultural system, general county operational practices, tourism, fire services and prevention, maintenance of environmental health, protection of vulnerable ecosystems, and consideration of the public's health are all important aspects. 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.

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

In 2009, Napa County began a comprehensive study of its groundwater resources to meet identified action items in the County's 2008 General Plan update. The study, by Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE), emphasized developing a sound understanding of groundwater conditions and implementing an expanded groundwater monitoring and data management program as a foundation for integrated water resources planning and dissemination of water resources information. The 2011 baseline study by LSCE, which included over 600 wells and data going back over 50 years, concluded that "the groundwater levels in Napa County are stable, except for portions of the MST district". Most wells elsewhere within the Napa Valley floor with a sufficient record indicate that groundwater levels are more affected by climatic conditions, are within historical levels, and seem to recover from dry periods during subsequent wet or normal periods. The LSCE Study also concluded that, on a regional scale, there appear to be no current groundwater quality issues except north of Calistoga (mostly naturally occurring boron and trace metals) and in the Carneros region (mostly salinity).

The subject property is located within the Napa Valley Floor Calistoga subarea of Napa County according to the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2013. A neighboring property owner at 4704 Silverado Trail reviewed a draft of the Water Availability Analysis for the proposed project and commented, "Our well was drilled in the 1980's, predating Venge's nearby well #2. We'd been using ours for many years when



Venge's predecessor drilled well #2 approximately 75 feet away, depleting our well's production. Currently, each of those two wells probably produce a similar low volume, as seems to be the case with wells on neighboring properties. (David Clark, 2020). No further evidence was presented regarding this comment and the County has no record of any other problems or complaints of diminished groundwater supplies at the project site or in the general vicinity.

Minimum thresholds for water use have been established by the Department of Public Works using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS). These reports are the result of water resources investigations performed by the USGS in cooperation with the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. Any project which reduces water usage or any water usage which is at or below the established threshold is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels. The project is categorized as "all other areas" based upon current County Water Availability Analysis policies and therefore water use criteria is parcel specific based upon a Tier 2 analysis. A Tier 2 analysis was completed by O'Connor Environmental, Inc. on September 18, 2020 which included a parcel specific recharge evaluation. According to the recharge evaluation, groundwater recharge for the project parcel is estimated to be 8.6 AF/YR (O'Connor Environmental, Inc., 2020).

- a/b. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements nor substantially deplete local groundwater supplies. According to the Onsite Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study for the Venge Winery Use Permit Modification Application 4708 Silverado Trail, Calistoga, California APN 020-350-043 prepared by Applied Civil Engineering, Incorporated on June 2, 2020, the project site and proposed system would have adequate disposal capacity to serve the project. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings.

Currently, there are five wells located on the project parcel. Well #1 would continue to serve as the project well for winery related water demands while wells #2 – 5 would continue to serve water demands for irrigation purposes including the on-site vineyard. Well completion details regarding the wells located on the project parcel as well as nearby parcels are included within Table 1 of the Water Availability Analysis completed for the proposed project.

According to the Water Availability Analysis for Venge Vineyards 4708 Silverado Trail, Calistoga, CA 94515 APN: 020-350-043 prepared by O'Connor Environmental, Inc. on September 18, 2020, the anticipated total overall water demand for the project site would be 7.76 AF/YR representing a 0.04 AF/YR increase of the existing water demand of 7.72 AF/YR, and within the estimated groundwater recharge of 8.6 AF/YR provided by O'Connor Environmental, Inc.. The amount of water required for wine production needs would remain the same as the project seeks recognition for the annual production of 70,000 gallons of wine as an existing condition. Therefore, the impacts from the project would be less than significant and no further analysis is needed. Below is a table that details each source of existing and proposed groundwater use:

Usage Type	Existing Usage	Proposed Usage
Vineyard Irrigation	5.75	5.75
Winery		
Wine Production	1.86	1.86
Domestic (Employees & Visitors)	0.11	0.15
<b>Net Use (Acre-ft per Year)</b>	<b>7.72</b>	<b>7.76</b>

The estimated groundwater demand of 7.76 AF/YR, represents an increase of 0.04 AF/YR over the existing condition and is below the water allotment and estimated recharge for the parcel. The winery, as part of its entitlement would include the County's standard condition of approval requiring well monitoring as well as the potential to modify/alter permitted uses on site should groundwater resources become insufficient to supply the use.

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

- By 2017, local groundwater management agencies must be identified;
- By 2020, overdrafted groundwater basins must have sustainability plans;

By 2022, other high and medium priority basins not currently in overdraft must have sustainability plans; and  
 By 2040, all high and medium priority groundwater basins must achieve sustainability.

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

The proposed project would result in a modest increase on the demand of ground water supplies, but would remain below the parcel's water allotment and estimated recharge, and therefore would not interfere with groundwater recharge or lowering of the local groundwater level. According to the WAA, the closest neighboring offsite well to the project well is located at least 650 feet southeast of the project well. Given the significant distances separating the project wells from neighboring wells, well interference associated with water use for the proposed project is highly unlikely (O'Connor Environmental, Inc., 2020). According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Water Deficient Areas/Storage Areas*), the project site is not located within a water deficient area and the County is not aware of, nor has it received any substantiated reports of groundwater deficiencies in the area.

Under contract with Napa County, Lohdorff and Scalmanini, Consulting Engineers (LSCE) conducted a peer review of the Venge Vineyards Draft Water Availability Analysis (WAA), dated June 8, 2020 and found that the WAA adequately addresses Tier 1 criteria and the proposed project will have a water use less than estimated normal year recharge occurring on both the subject parcel and the surrounding watershed. They further concluded that the WAA presents information on Tier 2 requirements for well interference and notes that no non-project wells exist within 500 feet of the project well, which is the distance criteria established in the County's WAA Guidelines for triggering a Tier 2 analysis. Based on this information and the absence of substantial evidence of a potentially significant impact from the proposed use of the Project Well, the WAA adequately addresses the Tier 2 criteria. Minor technical changes and clarifications were completed as a result of the peer review and are included in the final WAA dated September 18, 2020. In particular, with respect to project water use during dry years, the final WAA reiterated that the water use data for all project wells and irrigation water use was discussed in the context of a dry water year in the Existing Use subsection of the Water Demand portion of the report on pages 8 and 9. It was determined that farming practices at Venge Vineyards result in a water use of approximately 0.09 acre-ft/acre, substantially less than the 0.5 acre-ft/acre previously estimated, and therefore the 0.5 acre-ft/acre use rate is now considered to be a conservative "worst-case" demand representing a dry year in which the vineyard requires regular irrigation. It was assumed that winery water use would not change during dry year or drought conditions.

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI.	LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				

- a) Physically divide an established community?
- 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?

Discussion:

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

The project complies with the Napa County Code and all other applicable regulations. The subject parcel is located in the AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning district, which allows wineries and uses accessory to wineries subject to use permit approval. The proposed project is compliant with the physical limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance, including the Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO). The County has adopted the WDO to protect agriculture and open space and to regulate winery development and expansion in a manner that avoids potential negative environmental effects.

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

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

The General Plan includes two policies requiring wineries to be designed generally of a high architectural quality for the site and its surroundings. Visual changes would be minimal as the physical changes are limited in scope (driveway widening) and would occur within previously disturbed areas. Remaining proposed changes are operational in nature (production capacity, number of employees, and marketing and visitation program). As such, the project would fit within the context of its surroundings. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XII.	MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. Historically, the two most valuable mineral commodities in Napa County in economic terms have been mercury and mineral water. More recently, building stone and aggregate have become economically valuable. Mines and Mineral Deposits mapping included in the Napa

County Baseline Data Report (*Mines and Mineral Deposits*, BDR Figure 2-2) indicates that there are no known mineral resources nor any locally important mineral resource recovery sites located on the project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XIII.	NOISE. Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. The project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during construction of the proposed driveway improvements. Construction activities would be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. As such, the project would not result in potentially significant temporary construction noise impacts or operational impacts. Because the nearest residence to the project site is approximately 350 feet to the northwest of the existing hospitality building, there is a low potential for impacts related to construction noise to be significant. Further, construction activities would occur during the period of 7am-7pm on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity. All construction activities would be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). The proposed project would not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts. Conditions of approval identified below would require construction activities to be limited to daylight hours, vehicles to be muffled, and backup alarms adjusted to the lowest allowable levels. Impacts would be less than significant.

8.3. CONSTRUCTION NOISE

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

The proposed project involves a marketing program including 36 events on an annual basis with the largest event permitting up to 30 guests. If held outdoors, the marketing events have the potential to generate higher noise levels, compared to existing conditions. All wine processing has and would continue to occur inside or under the existing covered crush pad area and daily tours and tastings are proposed to decrease slightly from the existing condition.

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 dominated by large lot residential properties, wineries and vineyards; of these land uses, the residential land use is considered the most sensitive to noise. Based on the standards in County Code section 8.16.070, noise levels, measured at the exterior of a residential structure or residential use on a portion of a larger property, may not

exceed 50 decibels for more than half of any hour in the window of daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) within which the applicant proposes to conduct events. Noise impacts of the proposed project would be considered bothersome and potentially significant if sound generated by it had the effect of exceeding the standards in County Code more than 50 percent of the time (i.e., more than 50 decibels for more than 30 minutes in an hour for a residential use).

Under the proposed project, the largest outdoor event that would occur on the parcel would have an attendance of no more than 30 people, and all events would end by 10:00 p.m., with clean-up conducted afterwards. If held outdoors, the marketing events have the potential to generate higher noise levels, compared to existing conditions because of the increase in the number of events and number of associated guests attending the events. Winery operations would occur between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. (excluding harvest). The Napa County Noise Ordinance, which was adopted in 1984, sets the maximum permissible received sound level for a residence in a rural area as 45 dBA between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. and 50 dBA between the hours of 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. While the 45 dBA limitation is strict (45 dBA is roughly equivalent to the sound generated by a quiet conversation), the area surrounding the subject property is developed with residential uses and vineyards with the nearest off-site residence to the existing winery located approximately 350 feet to the northwest of the existing hospitality building and parking area. With the location of the closest receptor residence ±350 feet away, potential noise impacts from periodic bottling activities would have a less than significant impact on local residences. Recent noise studies of bottling activities measured 50 feet from the activity itself found the noise levels to be 67 dBA. (Scarlett Winery Use Permit #P16-00428-UP Noise and Vibration Assessment, Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc, March 18, 2021). The noise studies further state that such point source sound levels are reduced with distance in accordance with the "inverse square law", which yields a six (6) dB sound reduction for each doubling of the distance from the source. Based upon the measurements and calculation stated in that study, the receptor residence located ±350 feet away, the noise level for the bottling activity at the adjacent residence would be approximately 16.9 decibels lower than the measured 67 dBA noise level 50 feet from the bottling line, or 50 dBA which would fall within the daytime noise standards discussed above. Additionally, the proposed 36 marketing events with the largest events permitting up to 30 people would generate vocal noise (amplified music would be prohibited). But, by using the noise measurements taken at a small to moderate sized winery event with non-amplified music in the previously mentioned report, 67 dBA at 50 feet, it can be calculated that at a 350 foot distance, the noise level for an event would be 16.9 dB lower, or 50 dBA. Therefore, the daytime noise standards discussed above would not be exceeded. Continuing enforcement of Napa County's Noise Ordinance by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff, including the prohibition against amplified music, should further ensure that marketing events and other winery activities do not create a significant noise impact. Events and non-amplified music, excluding quiet clean-up, are required to finish by 10:00 p.m. Amplified music or sound systems would not be permitted for outdoor events as identified in standard Condition of Approval 4.10 below. Temporary events would be subject to County Code Chapter 5.36 which regulates proposed temporary events.

4.10 **AMPLIFIED MUSIC**

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures None required.

XIV.	POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

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

- b. No existing housing or people would be displaced as a result of the project. Therefore, the project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere and no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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



Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XVII.	TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system and/or conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-38, which seeks to maintain an adequate Level of Service (LOS) at signalized and unsignalized intersections, or reduce the effectiveness of existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-14, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

a/b. Three intersections along Silverado Trail at Pickett Road, Venge Vineyards Winery, and Dunaweal Lane were evaluated for existing and future operating conditions with and without the proposed project. In addition, the arterial segments of Silverado Trail as well as Dunaweal Lane and Pickett Road were evaluated for peak hour weekday and weekend operating conditions. Silverado Trail extends in a north-south direction between the incorporated cities of Calistoga and St. Helena in the project study area. In the Calistoga area, Silverado Trail is classified as a two lane arterial based on the updated Napa County General Plan Circulation Element. The roadway provides access north through Calistoga connecting with Lake County Highway (SR 29) to Middleton and Lower Lake. South of Calistoga, Silverado Trail provides access to St. Helena, Rutherford, Oakville, Yountville, and Napa. In the immediate project site area, Silverado Trail has one travel lane in each direction. Wide (7-9 feet) paved shoulders exist on the east and west sides of the arterial and are designated as Class II bike lanes that extend north to SR 29 and south to Napa. The speed limit on Silverado Trail is 55 mph in the project area. Dunaweal Lane extends in an east-west direction between SR 29 and Silverado Trail for approximately 0.8 miles. A two-lane rural collector street, Dunaweal Lane provides access to residential and agricultural development south of the project site. The roadway has little or no shoulders but does "flare" at its intersection with Silverado Trail to provide separate right and left turn movements. There are no bike lanes on Dunaweal Lane. The posted speed limit on Dunaweal Lane is 50 mph. Pickett Road extends in an easterly direction from Silverado Trail north of the proposed project site for approximately 1 mile. A two-lane local roadway, Pickett Lane provides access to agricultural and residential areas in the northern Napa Valley. The roadway has a prima facie speed limit of 25 mph with no bicycle facilities. The Pickett Road/Silverado Trail intersection is stop-sign controlled for the westbound turning movements from Pickett Road located approximately one-quarter mile north of the project site. Pickett Road is a narrow roadway with unimproved shoulders and does not have striped separate westbound right or left-turn lanes at Silverado Trail. The north-south Silverado Trail approaches are single-lane with shared turning movements onto Pickett Road. It is noted that Silverado Trail is striped for a short 280-foot passing lane (northbound direction) immediately north of Pickett Road. In addition, there is a private residential driveway directly opposite Pickett Road of the west side of Silverado Trail. The Venge Vineyards Driveway/Silverado Trail is stop-sign controlled for the westbound turning movements from the Venge Vineyards Driveway. The Venge Vineyards Driveway is a shared driveway that extends east from Silverado Trail and provides vehicle turnouts consistent with County Road and Street Standards for non-standard travel widths (less than 18-feet) for the first 800-foot segment. In this segment, the driveway provides access to neighboring residents/vineyards. Continuing east, the driveway then widens to minimum County standards as it extends another 500-feet to the Venge Vineyards Winery facilities and parking areas. Like the Pickett Road/Silverado Trail intersection, there are no separate vehicle turn lanes from Silverado Trail into the Venge Vineyards driveway. Outbound vehicles from the Venge Vineyards driveway also have shared left/right-turn lane. The Dunaweal Lane/Silverado Trail intersection is stop-sign controlled for eastbound turning movements from Dunaweal Lane and is located approximately one-quarter mile south of the Venge Vineyards project driveway. The north-south Silverado Trail approaches are single-lane with shared turning movements onto Dunaweal Lane. However, the southbound Silverado Trail approach lane widens at Dunaweal Lane to provide a de-facto right-turn lane when bicyclists are not in the existing Class II bike lane (identified by broken dashed lines). Vehicle access to project site is gained by an existing, primary driveway that extends directly northeast from Silverado Trail to the winery facilities and hospitality buildings.

GHD prepared a *Focused Traffic and VMT Analysis for the Proposed Venge Vineyards Use Modification Project* in April 2021. According to the study, the proposed project is expected to generate 42 total daily trips during the weekdays and 41 total daily trips on the weekend. During the weekday (Friday), the project would be generating 15 PM peak hour (4:00 PM to 5:00 PM) trips with the weekend (Saturday) midday peak hour (1:00 PM to 2:00 PM) generating 20 peak hour trips. Accounting for permitted winery uses, the net increase in daily and peak hour trips would be even less. Specifically, there would be an actual net increase of 15 daily trips during both the weekday and weekend periods. During the weekday (Friday) PM peak hour, the project would generate 5 net new trips. There would be a net increase of 8 project trips during the weekend (Saturday) midday peak hour. The largest requested marketing event would have up to 30 attendees per event and up to ten times a year. These events would be scheduled to not start or end during the weekday PM hour (4:00 PM to 5:00 PM) or weekend midday peak hour (1:00 PM to 2:00 PM) on weekend days.



Cumulative operating conditions were determined by the calculating the project's percentage contribution to the total growth in traffic from existing conditions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The study intersection of Dunaweal Lane/Silverado Trail is currently operating at LOS E during the Saturday midday peak hour for outbound left and right-turn movements from the minor street onto Silverado Trail. The Pickett Road and Venge Vineyards intersections at Silverado Trail are operating at LOS D or better. Arterial operation on Silverado Trail, Dunaweal Lane, and Pickett Road is acceptable (LOS C or better). Based on increases in traffic volumes from near-term traffic growth, the Dunaweal Lane/Silverado Trail intersection would continue to operate at LOS E during the Saturday midday peak hour. The remaining Pickett Road and Venge Vineyards driveway intersections at Silverado Trail would operate at acceptable levels (LOS D or better). Under existing plus project conditions, the Dunaweal Lane/Silverado Trail intersection would continue to operate at LOS E the weekend midday peak hour with proposed project traffic. The remaining study intersections of Pickett Road and the Venge Vineyards Driveway at Silverado Trail would continue to operate acceptable levels (LOS D or better) during the same peak time periods. Based on Napa County Updated Transportation Impact Study Guidelines; the intersection of Dunaweal Lane/Silverado Trail has been evaluated for proposed project impacts since the LOS operates at an unacceptable level (LOS E) without proposed project traffic during the weekend midday peak hour. County criteria indicate that a significant impact could be found if the proposed project contributes 10 percent or more to the side-street approach volumes at the intersection. The guidelines go on to state, "the peak hour signal warrant criteria should also be evaluated and presented for informational purposes." During the weekend (Saturday) midday peak hour, the proposed project would add five total trips to the Dunaweal Lane/Silverado Trail intersection. Out of the five total trip contribution, one project trip would be added to the Dunaweal Lane side-street approach. Under the County significance criteria, these impacts are less than significant. The Dunaweal Lane/Silverado Trail intersection would continue to meet the peak hour signal warrant with or without proposed project. Peak hour roadway operation has been evaluated consistent with Napa County criteria for arterial level-of-service. With the proposed project adding only five weekday PM peak hour trips and eight weekend midday peak hour trips to the adjacent street network, arterial operations would remain unchanged from existing conditions. Dunaweal Lane would continue to operate at LOS A at 229 westbound directional peak hour vehicles. Silverado Trail would have a peak hour directional flow (one-way northbound) of approximately 494 vehicles during the weekday PM peak hour. Based on an undivided two-lane highway over 40 mph this would yield LOS B. It is noted that field observations on Silverado Trail indicate that during the weekday PM peak hour traffic flows are primarily northbound into the Valley towards Calistoga in the project study area. Pickett Road would continue to operate at LOS A with 35 vehicles (westbound direction).

With year 2030 cumulative (no project) traffic volumes, the Dunaweal Lane/Silverado Trail intersection would operate at LOS F during the weekend midday peak hour. The remaining two study intersections would operate at acceptable LOS levels. Directional roadway segment operations along Silverado Trail, Dunaweal Lane, and Pickett Road would operate at acceptable levels (LOS D or better) with year 2030 cumulative (no project) volumes. The Dunaweal Lane/Silverado Trail intersection would continue to meet the peak hour signal warrant under year 2030 cumulative (no project) conditions. Similar to year 2030 cumulative (no project) conditions, the Dunaweal Lane/Silverado Trail intersection would continue to operate at LOS F during the weekend midday peak hour with proposed project traffic. The remaining two study intersections along Silverado Trail at Pickett Road and Venge Vineyards would operate at acceptable LOS levels. Directional roadway segment operations along Silverado Trail, Dunaweal Lane, and Pickett Road would operate at acceptable levels (LOS D or better) with year 2030 cumulative plus. The Dunaweal Lane/Silverado Trail intersection would continue to meet the peak hour signal warrant under year 2030 cumulative (no project) conditions. Based on updated County significance criteria for unsignalized intersections; the off-site intersection of Dunaweal Lane/Silverado Trail has been evaluated for proposed project impacts since its LOS operates at an unacceptable level (LOS F) without proposed project trips during the weekend midday peak hour. County

criteria indicate that a significant impact could be found if the proposed project contributes 5 percent or more of the total traffic growth the intersection. The guidelines go on to state, "the peak hour signal warrant criteria should also be evaluated and presented for informational purposes." During the weekend midday peak hour, the proposed project would add five trips to the Dunaweal Lane/Silverado Trail. Based on the net growth in cumulative traffic volumes at the intersection of 258 vehicles during the weekend midday peak hour the proposed project contribution would be less than 5 percent and less-than-significant. Public Works Department staff reviewed the study and concluded that the study adequately demonstrates that the proposed use in the proposed location would not result in any significant impacts, either project-specific or cumulative, on traffic circulation in the vicinity. Therefore, the project would result in a nominal increase in trips on the study area transportation network. Additionally, a project specific condition would ensure that daily tastings would not occur during events of greater than 10 guests.

As proposed, the project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation. According to the traffic impact study, "pedestrian and bicycle circulation occur primarily in the areas adjacent to the winery production building (WPB) and hospitality building (HB) in the northeast portion of the project site. The one-way internal loop road around the WPB is wide enough (14-20') to allow pedestrian and bicycle traffic to access the Winery facilities. In addition, pedestrians can walk along the both sides on the WPB (adjacent to parking spaces) removed from any circulating vehicles. Pedestrians would access the HB on the north side of the project site where a pedestrian walkway links the building with the parking areas. Bicyclists would access the project site via the primary driveway (planned for widening) from Silverado Trail then extend north to the WPB and/or HB via the one-way loop road. The Napa Countywide Bicycle Plan has been completed and adopted by the Napa Valley Transportation Authority (NVT) and the County. In the project site vicinity, Silverado Trail is designated at a Class II bike route (on-street bike lanes). A review of the Napa Countywide Pedestrian Plan indicates that no specific pedestrian improvements are identified for Silverado Trail in the area" (GHD, 2021). A minimum of two on-site bicycle parking spaces would be provided as part of the project.

- c. The Circulation Element includes new policies that reflect the new VMT reduction regulatory framework for transportation impact assessment, along with a draft threshold of significance that is based on reduction of VMT compared to the unmitigated project rather than the regional average VMT (Policies CIR-7 through CIR-9). Staff believes this alternative approach to determining the significance of a project's transportation impacts would be better suited to Napa County's rural context, while still supporting the efforts of the County to achieve the greenhouse gas emissions goals of its pending Climate Action Plan. The reduction in VMT and, correspondingly, GHG emissions from the transportation sector, is also necessary for Napa County, the region, and the state to achieve long-term, statewide mandates targeted toward reducing GHG emissions. Such mandates include, but are not limited to Executive Orders S-3-05 and B-16-12, which respectively, set a general statewide GHG emissions reduction target of 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050, and an 80 percent GHG emissions reduction below 1990 levels (also by 2050) specifically for the transportation sector.

The project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b). The proposed project is estimated to generate 15 net new daily trips on, which is well below the 110 trip threshold in the Office of Planning and Research guidelines. The traffic study provided strategies such as carpool incentives, active transportation incentives, on-site lunches, and a guaranteed ride home to be considered for implementation via a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan. A condition of approval would require implementation of a TDM with strategies such as these for the life of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

- d-f. After implementation of the proposed project, the site would continue to be accessed via an existing driveway connecting to Silverado Trail. According to the traffic study, proposed project access and vehicle circulation would be adequate. As part of the project description, the 1,340-foot Venge Vineyards Driveway extending northeast from Silverado Trail would be improved to the minimum County standards of 20-foot (with 1-foot shoulders). Sight distance adequacy at the project driveway was evaluated and found to be acceptable to accommodate all turns into and out of the site (GHD, 2021). Proposed site access, including the left-turn lane, was reviewed and approved by the Napa County Fire Department, Engineering Services Division, and Public Works Department, as conditioned.

Vehicle parking for daily operations is provided by a combination of visitor and employee parking spaces accessible via the primary Venge Vineyards driveway from Silverado Trail. As noted, visitors access parking areas along the east side of the WPB, immediately adjacent the HB, and adjacent to the winery storage building. As shown on the project site plan, there would be 17 striped parking spaces made up of 14 standard spaces and three ADA spaces. There would be one ADA parking space located in each of the three parking areas. A parking area is also proposed between the winery storage building and HB. This parking area is intended to accommodate 10 additional parking spaces. Typically, there are more employees on-site during the weekdays with fewer visitors and vice-versa on the weekends. Shared parking serves to provide adequate parking supply while reducing the project's on-site parking footprint.

Based on the existing volumes on Silverado Trail and expected daily volumes at the project driveway under the expansion beyond existing entitlements scenario described above, a left turn lane is required at the proposed project driveway per the County's standard left turn lane warrant. Therefore, a left turn lane would be installed at the intersection of the property driveway and Silverado Trail as a

recommended condition of approval from the Public Works Department.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

<b>XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. On October 12, 2020, County staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. The Middletown Rancheria requested consultation and met with the County at the project site on November 18, 2020 to discuss their concerns. A mitigation measure was developed in consultation with the tribe and is included in the Tribal Cultural Resources section below. No other responses were received within 30-days of the tribe's receipt of the invitations. Implementation of mitigation measure MM TRI-1 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure:

- MM TRI-1: Prior to commencement of construction of project improvements at the project site, the permittee shall coordinate with an archaeological monitor and a representative of Middletown Rancheria. Pre-construction coordination shall, at a minimum, include the following:
- a. Submittal of copies of grading plans to the archaeological monitor and tribal representatives, concurrently with submittal of the grading permit application to the Napa County Planning, Building & Environmental Services (PBES) Department;
  - b. Execution of a Standard Monitoring Agreement with Middletown Rancheria;
  - c. Training of construction field crews, by an archaeological monitor and tribal representative, of the potential for presence of Native American resources on the property, the potential types of resources that could be found on-site, and the procedures to follow in the event of discovery of such resources;
  - d. The permittee must meet and confer with the Middletown Rancheria at least 45 days prior to commencing ground disturbance activities on the site to address notification, protection, treatment, care and handling of tribal cultural resources potentially discovered or disturbed during ground disturbance activities of the project. All potential cultural resources unearthed by the permittee by project activities shall be evaluated by the representative of Middletown Rancheria. The Tribe must have an opportunity to inspect and determine the nature of the resource and the best course of action for avoidance, protection, and/or treatment of tribal cultural resources to the extent permitted by law. If the resource is determined to be a tribal cultural resource of value to the Tribe, the Tribe will coordinate with the permittee to establish appropriate treatment and disposition of the resources with appropriate dignity which may include reburial or preservation of resources. The permittee must facilitate and ensure that the determination of treatment and disposition

- by the Tribe is followed to the extent permitted by law. No laboratory studies, scientific analysis, curation or video recording are permitted for tribal cultural resources without the prior written consent of the Tribe; and
- e. Presence of an archaeological monitor and tribal representative on-site during initial rough grading of improvements (driveway widening) on the Venge Vineyards parcel.

**Monitoring:** Concurrently with submittal of the grading application for Venge Vineyards parcel improvements to Engineering and Building staff of PBES, the permittee shall submit confirmation of submittal of the grading plans to the archaeological monitor and tribal representative previously identified. If the permittee neglects to submit such confirmation to PBES, then Planning staff of PBES will convey a copy of the plans to the archaeological monitor and tribal representatives upon receipt of the grading permit application.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. The project would not require the construction of a new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

As discussed in **Section X** above, minimum thresholds for water use have been established by the Department of Public Works using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS). These reports are the result of water resources investigations performed by the USGS in cooperation with the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. Any project which reduces water usage or any water usage which is at or below the established threshold is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels. The project is categorized as "all other areas" based upon current County Water Availability Analysis policies and therefore water use criteria is parcel specific based upon a Tier 2 analysis. A Tier 2 analysis was completed by O'Connor Environmental, Inc. on September 18, 2020 which included a parcel specific recharge evaluation. According to the recharge evaluation, groundwater recharge for the project parcel is estimated to be 8.6 AF/YR (O'Connor Environmental, Inc., 2020).

Currently, there are five wells located on the project parcel. Well #1 would continue to serve as the project well for winery related water demands while wells #2 – 5 would continue to serve water demands for irrigation purposes including the on-site vineyard. Well completion details regarding the wells located on the project parcel as well as nearby parcels are included within Table 1 of the Water Availability Analysis completed for the proposed project.

According to the Water Availability Analysis for Venge Vineyards 4708 Silverado Trail, Calistoga, CA 94515 APN: 020-350-043 prepared by O'Connor Environmental, Inc. on September 18, 2020, the anticipated total overall water demand for the project site would be 7.76 AF/YR representing a 0.04AF/YR increase of the existing water demand of 7.72 AF/YR.

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

- c. Wastewater would be treated on-site and would not require a wastewater treatment provider. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d/e. 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 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/b. The proposed project is located primarily within the local responsibility area and is classified as outside of a designated Fire Hazard Severity area with the exception of the northwest corner, which is designated moderate, and the northeast corner, which is designated high. The project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan because the proposed driveway improvements would provide adequate access to Silverado Trail. The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. The project application was reviewed and recommended for approval by the Napa County Fire Department, as conditioned. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c/d. Implementation of the project would include the improvement of the existing access driveway to County standards. Sight distance adequacy at the project driveway was evaluated and found to be acceptable to accommodate all turns into and out of the site (GHD, 2021). Proposed site access was reviewed and approved by the Napa County Fire Department, Engineering Services Division, and Public Works Department, as conditioned. There are no steep slopes at the project site.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XXI.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
------	------------------------------------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a. As discussed in **Section IV** above, the project is dominated by agricultural uses such as vineyards and a winery. According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps, the project site contains no sensitive biological resources with the exception of potential Northern Spotted Owl habitat and a small area of sensitive oak woodland within the northwest corner of the subject site. However, no trees or vegetation is proposed for removal. Proposed project construction would occur within previously disturbed areas. As identified in **Section V** above, no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified within the project site. In summary, all potential effects on biological and cultural resources would be less than significant.
- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology, and traffic impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The project would also increase the demands for public services to a limited extent, increase traffic and air pollutions, all of which contribute to cumulative effects when future development in Napa Valley is considered. Cumulative impacts of these issues are discussed in previous sections of this Initial Study, wherein the impact from an increase in air pollution is being addressed through Greenhouse Gas Voluntary Best Management Practices which the winery has already implemented including: the winery has already implemented the following GHG reduction methods: installation of solar panels which generate on-site renewable energy; installation of energy conserving lighting; installation of water efficient fixtures; use of water efficient landscaping; recycling of 75 percent of all waste; implementation of a sustainable purchasing and shipping program; site design oriented to optimize conditions for natural heating, cooling, and day lighting of interior spaces, and to maximize winter sun exposure; and minimizing the amount of grading and tree removal.

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

General Plan Policy CIR-16 states that "The County will seek to maintain an arterial Level of Service D or better on all County roadways, except where the level of Service already exceeds this standard and where increased intersection capacity is not feasible without substantial additional right of way." According to the traffic study, under cumulative (Year 2030) plus project conditions, the Pickett Road and Venge Vineyards Driveway at Silverado Trail would continue to operate at acceptable conditions (LOS D or better). The Dunawael Lane/Silverado Trail intersection would continue to operate at LOS F with or without project volumes. County significance criteria for intersection operations indicate that the proposed project would need to add five percent or more in net cumulative volume growth to cause a significant impact for intersections already operating at LOS E-F. Proposed project volume contribution would be less than

significant. Arterial LOS operation along Pickett Road, Silverado Trail, and Dunaweal Lane would remain at acceptable levels (LOS D or better) under existing, near-term, and cumulative plus project conditions. Potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

---

**Venge Vineyards Use Permit Major Modification No. P19-00141-MOD  
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Potential Environmental Impact	Adopted Mitigation Measure	Monitoring and Reporting Actions and Schedule	Implementation	Monitoring	Reporting & Date of Compliance/Completion
<p><b>Impact TRI-1: Tribal Cultural Resources.</b> The proposed project has the potential to impact 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.</p>	<p><b>MM TRI-1:</b> Prior to commencement of construction of project improvements at the project site, the permittee shall coordinate with an archaeological monitor and a representative of Middletown Rancheria. Pre-construction coordination shall, at a minimum, include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Submittal of copies of grading plans to the archaeological monitor and tribal representatives, concurrently with submittal of the grading permit application to the Napa County Planning, Building &amp; Environmental Services (PBES) Department;</li> <li>b. Execution of a Standard Monitoring Agreement with Middletown Rancheria;</li> <li>c. Training of construction field crews, by an archaeological monitor and tribal representative, of the potential for presence of Native American resources on the property, the potential types of resources that could be found on-site, and the procedures to follow in the event of discovery of such resources;</li> <li>d. The permittee must meet and confer with the Middletown Rancheria at least 45 days prior to commencing ground disturbance activities on the site to address notification, protection, treatment, care and handling of tribal cultural resources potentially discovered or disturbed during ground disturbance activities of the project. All potential cultural resources unearthed by the permittee by project activities shall be evaluated by the representative of Middletown Rancheria. The Tribe must have an opportunity to inspect and determine the nature of the resource and the best course of action for avoidance, protection, and/or treatment of tribal cultural resources to the extent permitted by law. If the resource is determined to be a tribal cultural resource of value to the Tribe, the Tribe will coordinate with the permittee to establish appropriate treatment and disposition of the resources with appropriate dignity which may include reburial or preservation of resources. The permittee must facilitate and ensure that the determination of treatment and disposition by the Tribe is followed to the extent permitted by law. No laboratory studies, scientific analysis, curation or video recording are permitted for tribal cultural resources without the prior written consent of the Tribe; and</li> <li>e. Presence of an archaeological monitor and tribal representative on-site during initial rough grading of improvements (driveway widening) on the</li> </ol>	<p>Concurrently with submittal of the grading application for Venge Vineyards parcel improvements to Engineering and Building staff of PBES, the permittee shall submit confirmation of submittal of the grading plans to the archaeological monitor and tribal representative previously identified. If the permittee neglects to submit such confirmation to PBES, then Planning staff of PBES will convey a copy of the plans to the archaeological monitor and tribal representatives upon receipt of the grading permit application.</p>	<p>P</p>	<p>PD</p>	<p>PC _/_/_  CPI  _/_/_</p>

Notes: P = Permittee, PD = Planning Division, BD = Building Division, AC = Agricultural Commissioner, DFW = Dept of Fish & Wildlife, CT = CALTRANS, EH = Environmental Health, PW = Public Works Dept, PE/G =Project Engineer/Geologist  
PC = Prior to Project Commencement CPI = Construction Period Inspections FI = Final Inspection OG = Ongoing



Potential Environmental Impact	Adopted Mitigation Measure	Monitoring and Reporting Actions and Schedule	Implementation	Monitoring	Reporting & Date of Compliance/Completion
	Venge Vineyards parcel.				

Notes: P = Permittee, PD = Planning Division, BD = Building Division, AC = Agricultural Commissioner, DFW = Dept of Fish & Wildlife, CT = CALTRANS, EH = Environmental Health, PW = Public Works Dept, PE/G =Project Engineer/Geologist  
 PC = Prior to Project Commencement CPI = Construction Period Inspections FI = Final Inspection OG = Ongoing