

“C”

## Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

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

**Initial Study Checklist**  
**(form updated January 2019)**

This document presents minor corrections made to the proposed Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) by the Lead Agency (Napa County). New text is indicated in underline and text to be deleted is reflected by ~~strike through~~. Text changes are presented in the section and page order in which they appear in the proposed Initial Study Checklist. These corrections do not constitute substantial revisions pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15073.5 (Recirculation of a Negative Declaration Prior to Adoption) because they do not involve new significant impacts or new mitigation measures.

1. **Project Title:** Bremer Family Winery Use Permit Major Modification #P22-00086-MOD & Exception to the Napa County Road and Street Standards
2. **Property Owner:** John Bremer ETAL TR, c/o Bremer Family Winery, 1660 Chicago Avenue, Ste M11, Riverside, CA 92507
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Sean Trippi, Supervising Planner; phone: (707) 299-1353 or email: sean.trippi@countyofnapa.org.
4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):**  
The project is located on two adjoining properties totaling approximately 46.09 acres within the Agricultural Watershed (AW) zoning district. The Project Site is accessed via an existing driveway on the east side of Deer Park Road, slightly offset from the intersection of Deer Park Road and Sanitarium Road. Project address: 975 Deer Park Road, St. Helena, CA 94574. APN's: 021-400-002 (winery property), 021-420-027 (vineyard property - recycled water storage tanks, utility lines, and treated wastewater dispersal area).
5. **Applicant / Project sponsor's name and address:** Pioneer Law Group, LLP, Andrea Matarazzo, Partner, 1122 S Street, Sacramento, CA 95811
6. **General Plan description:** Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space (AWOS)
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Watershed (AW)
8. **Background/Project History:**  
The site was originally developed in the late 1800's and early 1900's with a winery, a farmhouse and associated accessory structures including but not limited to, a barn and other agricultural buildings/sheds site and access improvements, and landscaping.

August 15, 1979, Use Permit #U-697879 (known then as the Clark Winery and/or Deer Park Winery) to reactivate a 6,780 square foot winery on the subject site was approved by the Planning Commission. The approval included a minimum of five parking spaces and no public tours or tastings. The use permit application indicated ultimate wine production of 14,400 gallons per year, one visitor per day, six per week, two full-time and one part-time employees, nine existing parking spaces, and hours of operation from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm, Monday through Friday. The plans showed an existing dwelling/farmhouse, a guest house, a garage/shed (tractor shed), winery and barn (Ag storage barn).

August 21, 1979, the Board of Supervisors approved rezoning (#R-57879) the property from RD:B-5 (Residential Double with a Special Building Site Combining) and RD:A:B-5 (Residential Double with an Agricultural / Special Building Site Combining) to AW (Agricultural Watershed).

August 13, 1985, the Board of Supervisors denied an appeal and upheld the Planning Commission's decision to deny a Bed & Breakfast application (BB-478485) to bring a one-bedroom detached bed and breakfast under use permit.

October 2002, the Bremer's purchased the property known then as Deer Park Winery (APNs 021-400-002 and 021-420-027).

August 2005, a Notice of Violation was issued for construction and/or reconstruction of a deck on the dwelling/farmhouse, remodeling of a barn, and construction of stone wall without building permits (Code Enforcement Case #CE-2686). Building Permit #B05-01249 (issued September 2005) and Building Permit #B06-01434 (issued August 2006) rectified these matters.

December 13, 2007, Minor Modification application #P07-00654-MM to modify Use Permit #U-697879 to allow a 11,685 square foot cave for barrel storage was approved by the Director. The approval letter referenced an annual production capacity of 15,000 gallons, as well as a 6,780 square foot winery with no public tours and tastings. Building Permit #B08-01030 was issued for the wine storage cave utilities. This building permit also included a freestanding bathroom.

February 26, 2008, application #P08-00088-VMM for a Very Minor Modification to Use Permit #U-697879 was approved by the Director to repair and expand 572 square feet of porch and deck

June 4, 2009, Very Minor Modification #P09-00178-VMM to increase the wine cave from 11,685 square feet to 16,136 square feet was approved by the Director. Building permit #B09-01138 was issued for the west entrance cave portal and associated retaining walls based on #P09-00178-VMM approval.

In September and October 2016, Notices of Violation were issued under Code Enforcement Case #CE16-00251 for the following: construction and use matters: site grading; installation of a sink in the outdoor kitchen; alteration of the dwelling/Farmhouse including use as winery office; wine cave occupancy and use; increased parking; winery visitation and marketing events including food service; rental of winery for events, and use of other site improvements (primarily the bocce court and outdoor kitchen area) for events and tastings.

January 19, 2017, a Use Permit Major Modification application was submitted (#P17-00023), however this application was closed due to a civil complaint being filed by the County in August of 2017 against the Bremer's as result of the aforementioned violations.

August 2017, a Civil Complaint was filed by the County, and in February of 2019 a Settlement Agreement was entered into between the Bremer's and the County to rectify, in part, the aforementioned violations. The Settlement Agreement also set forth the following winery operational characteristics: visitation of 3,600 visitors per year with no more than 70 visitors per day; winery visitation between the hours of 8:00 am to 5:00 pm, Monday through Sunday; no marketing events; no food was to be served at the winery; and the winery cannot be rented for private events. In addition, the winery could not use the main floor of the Farmhouse or the surrounding deck for winery purposes; the winery cave cannot be used in a manner that is inconsistent with a Type II designation; and the bocce ball court, pizza oven, and tractor shed areas cannot be used for winery purposes. However, the Settlement Agreement did allow for subsequent future modifications to the winery use permit(s).

March 2019 through July 2019, building permits were issued by the PBES Department to satisfy some of the Settlement Agreement terms and aforementioned violations. These permits included #B19-00307 for retaining walls, #B19-00339 for work done on the second floor of the winery building, #B19-00460 to install handrails at various locations, and #B19-00513 for the sink in the outdoor kitchen. It should be noted issuance of these building permits did not include areas within required stream setbacks (unless occurring within an existing structure) or authorize any uses, either residential or winery, that had not been previously entitled. Any modification(s) to existing use limitations as identified in the Settlement Agreement, or additional setback encroachments, requires a separate use permit application for an Exception to the Conservation Regulations (see below for a summary of the applications required by the Settlement Agreement.)

October 16, 2019, the Planning Commission approved an Exception to the Conservation Regulations in the form of a Use Permit (P19-00153-UP) legalizing six (6) existing improvements within the County stream setbacks: (a) an approximate 2,200 square foot agricultural storage building and associated water tank; (b) an approximate 800 square foot concrete pad and associated walls attached to the winery; (c) an approximate 150 square foot ground floor/story addition and second floor/story deck to the farmhouse/office building; (d) an approximate 100 square foot freestanding restroom; (e) approximately 1,210 lineal feet of rock walls; and, (f) two pedestrian bridges over a blue-line stream. No operational changes were approved with this permit.

The Planning Commission's October 16, 2019, decision was appealed to the Board of Supervisors. On March 17, 2020, the Board heard the appeal and adopted a motion of intent to deny the appeal and uphold the Planning Commission's approval of Use Permit #P19-00153, but only as to the approximately 1,210 lineal feet of low decorative rock walls and the two pedestrian bridges. On May 5, 2020, the Board of Supervisors took final action and adopted Resolution No. 2020-65 (Findings of Fact and Decision on Appeal), approving the decorative rock walls and two pedestrian bridges and remade to the Planning Commission to further consider items (a) through (d) identified above.

July 15, 2020 the Planning Commission considered a request for an Exception to the Conservation Regulations in the form of a use permit (P20-00143-UP) to allow the following four structures or improvements to remain within stream setbacks: (a) an approximate 2,200 square foot agricultural storage building and associated water tank that replaced an approximate 320 square foot barn; (b) an

approximate 800 square foot pad located off the east side of the winery building; (c) an approximate 150 square foot ground floor/story addition and second floor/story deck to the main dwelling (a.k.a. farmhouse/office building)(the "farmhouse addition") constructed and completed under Building Permit #B08-00074; and, (d) an approximate 100 square foot freestanding restroom constructed and completed under Building Permit #B08-01030. The Planning Commission granted the request for the approximate 800 square foot concrete pad and associated walls attached to the winery and the approximate 150 square foot ground floor/story addition and second floor/story deck to the farmhouse/office building. However, the Commission denied the request for the approximate 2,200 square foot agricultural storage building and associated water tank and the approximate 100 square foot freestanding restroom.

The Planning Commission's July 15, 2020, decision to deny the 2,200 square foot agricultural storage building and associated water tank and the approximate 100 square foot freestanding restroom was appealed by the applicant to the Board of Supervisors. On December 8, 2020, the Board heard the appeal and adopted a motion of intent to uphold the grounds of the Appeal in its entirety, reverse the Planning Commission's denial of the barn and the restroom, and approve the Exception to the Conservation Regulations in the form of a Use Permit. On February 2, 2021, the Board of Supervisors took final action and adopted Resolution No. 2021-09 (Findings of Fact and Decision on Appeal), approving the barn and restroom.

October 2021, a Winery Administrative Permit #P21-00038-WADM was approved by the Director to allow the following: (a) the placement and use of a wine press, eleven wine tanks, and associated tank tie downs and catwalk (with no increase in production); (b) reconfiguration of open storage on the second level of the winery building to offices, tasting/visitation areas, employee lounge and restrooms; (c) a change in the occupancy of the existing wine cave to allow visitation (with no increase in visitation or marketing); (d) the use of two outdoor visitation and tasting areas (encompassing approximately 1,132 square feet) located off the south side of the winery building (with no increase in visitation or marketing); and, (e) a change in the number of parking spaces and the alignment of internal roads and driveways as shown in the subject/application site plans, with no increase in impervious area.

An Erosion Control Plans (P11-00317) was approved April 10, 2011, and subsequently modified by Erosion Control Plan P16-00271, approved October 10, 2021, approving approximately 32.7 acres of vineyard development spread across six properties owned by the Bremer's including the winery (021-400-002) and vineyard properties (021-420-027). Approximately 9.97 of the approved 32.7 acres of vines have been planted on the Bremer's holdings. An additional 3.26 acres were planted prior to the requirement for approval of an Erosion Control Plan for vineyard development. Three water storage tanks for vineyard irrigation, each with a 10,000-gallon capacity, were entitled as part of the Bremer Winery Vineyard Conversion Erosion Control Plan (P11-00317-ECPA) on the vineyard property for irrigation but have not been installed. The proposed project would "replace" these three approved but not yet installed tanks with four smaller tanks in the same location.

- 
9. **Description of Project:** Approval of a major modification of the previous project approvals for an existing 15,000 gallons per year winery to allow the following:
- a. Increase wine production from 15,000 gallons per year to 50,000 gallons per year.
  - b. Increase the annual number of visitors from 3,600 people to 12,500 people, with no change to the daily maximum of 70 visitors.
  - c. Establish marketing events as follows: two (2) annual events with 100 guests, three (3) annual events with 50 guests, and two (2) annual events with 25 guests.  
Daily visitors on event days would be as below:
    - i. On 100 guest event days, 25 daily visitors.
    - ii. On 50 guest event days, 20 daily visitors.
    - iii. On 25 guest event days, 45 daily visitors.
    - iv. During production in the barrel room, there will be no visitation or events in the barrel room.
  - d. Increase staff from four (4) full-time and two (2) part-time, to eight (8) full-time and two (2) part-time employees.
  - e. Allow on-site consumption pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 23358, 23390 and 23396.5 (AB 2004), the two tasting rooms and in previously approved outdoor tasting areas.
  - f. A new one-way loop driveway connection to Deer Park Road consistent with Napa County Road and Street Standards.
  - g. Nine (9) new parking stalls for a total of 20 spaces.
  - h. Replacement of the existing conventional commingled wastewater system with separate process and domestic wastewater treatment systems to utilize state-of-the-art environmental processes.
  - i. Install four water storage tanks for vineyard irrigation, each with a capacity of 5,000 gallons in place of the three previously approved but not yet installed 10,000-gallon tanks approved under Erosion Control Plan P11-00317-ECPA.

The proposal also includes a request for an Exception to the Napa County Road and Street Standards to allow for an exception from requiring the installation of a left turn lane on Deer Park Road. There are no other proposed modifications.

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

The project site is comprised of two adjoining properties totaling approximately 46.09-acres, located at 975 Deer Park Road, slightly offset from the intersection of Deer Park Road and Sanitarium Road: the 26.65-acre winery property (APN 021-400-002) and the 20.44-acre vineyard property (APN 021-420-027). In addition to the existing winery and wine caves, the winery property includes a main residence (the Farmhouse), a second dwelling unit, residential carport, an agricultural barn, water storage tanks, a standalone restroom building, parking areas and access drives, vineyards, and associated infrastructure. An unnamed blue line stream runs along the east side of the developed area, fed by several ephemeral drainage channels northeast of the developed area. The vineyard property, which lies north of the winery property, includes vineyards, an existing Howell Mountain Water System storage tank, an existing intermittent spring collection box established in approximately 1891, and associated transmission lines. In addition to existing vineyards, both properties include approved but not yet developed vineyards totaling approximately 6.4 acres (approximately 7.6 acres have been approved on the project site). As discussed above, approximately 32.7 acres have been approved under Erosion Control Plan P19-00271 with planted vineyards totaling approximately 9.9 acres across the Bremer's holdings.

Although no structures on the project were lost in the 2020 Glass Fire, approximately 29 acres of Oak Woodland ( $\pm$ 19.2 acres) and Chaparral ( $\pm$ 9.8 acres) were lost in the fire. The Oak Woodland generally runs along the east side of the unnamed blue line stream.

Land uses within the immediate vicinity (i.e. within approximately 0.5 to 1.0 mile) of the subject property predominately consist of semirural residential, scattered agricultural uses (vineyards and wineries), and undeveloped woodlands and shrub-lands. There are a number of approved and/or producing wineries (Broman Cellars, Ink Grade Winery, Vineyard 22, Viader Vineyards, Woodbridge Winery, Vida Valiente, and Merus Wines) within about a mile of the project site. The St. Helena Hospital is located approximately a half a mile to the southwest of the property and Bell Canyon Reservoir is located approximately a half a mile to the northwest of the property.

Deer Park Road runs along the west side of the two properties and continues north to its apex then runs south before turning towards the east. The northern most portion of the vineyard property adjoins the Deer Park Road right-of-way.

North – As noted above, the northern most portion of the vineyard property adjoins the Deer Park Road right-of-way. Across Deer Park Road are properties ranging from 1.0 to 22.6 acres and are developed with single-family homes, vineyards and an approved winery (Vineyard 22).

South – Adjoining the project site to the south of the winery property is a 11.47-acre property developed with a single-family home, the Broman Cellars winery, and vineyards.

East – To the east of the project site are four properties ranging in size from 3.95 to 43.77 acres. The two northerly most properties are developed with single-family homes, one property is undeveloped, and the fourth and largest property is developed with a single-family home and an accessory dwelling unit (i.e. ADU or second unit). The largest property is owned by the project applicant.

West – Deer Park Road borders the west side of the winery property and a portion of the vineyard property. Immediately west of the road adjoining the winery property are three properties ranging in size from 0.66 to 2.46 with three single-family homes and an ADU on the largest property. Across Deer Park Road from the vineyard property are two properties consisting of 1.1 and 2.14 acres. The smaller property is developed with a single-family home; the other property is undeveloped. A 2.52-acre property developed with a single-family home is bordered on its south and east property lines by the vineyard property and by Deer Park Road along its west property line. North of this property and west of the vineyard property is a 19.7-acre property with a single-family home. The northern boundary of this property adjoins Deer Park Road, south of the road's apex.

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

The project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County, including but not limited to building permits, grading permits, waste disposal permits, in addition to meeting CalFire standards. Permits may also be required by the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, & Firearms.

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

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

**Other Agencies Contacted**

None

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 January 16, 2025, 2023, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. Staff received a response from the Yocha Dehe Tribe on February 14, 2025; the Tribe did not request to consult or provide comments. Staff also received a request from the Middletown Rancheria Tribal Historic Preservation Department requesting additional information which was provided on May 12, 2025. No additional correspondence or requests have been received from Middletown Rancheria Tribal Historic Preservation Department.

**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.

Other sources of information used in the preparation of this Initial Study include site-specific studies conducted by the applicant and filed by the applicant in conjunction with Application No. P22-00086-MOD as listed below, and the environmental background information contained in the permanent file on this project. These documents and information sources are incorporated herein by reference and available for review at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services located at 1195 Third Street, Suite 210, Napa, CA 94559:

- Water Availability Analysis for the Bremer Family Winery, dated: 7/12/2024
- Winery Wastewater Feasibility Report for the Bremer Family Winery, dated: 7/12/2024
- Updated Traffic Study Report for the Bremer Family Winery, dated ~~7/12/2024~~ 8/12/2025
- Request for an Exception to the Napa County Road and Street Standards dated November 26, 2025
- Napa County Geographic Information System (GIS) sensitivity maps/layers.
- Project description and plans for Permit No. P22-00086.

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

*Sean Trippi*

April 2, 2026

Signature

Date

Name: Sean Trippi, Supervising Planner  
Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department

I. <b>AESTHETICS.</b> Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-c. Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms, geological features, water, trees and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of a beautiful or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken in. As generally described in the **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses** section, above, this area is defined by a mix of vineyard, winery, and residential uses. The project would not result in a substantial damage to scenic resources, including trees and rock outcroppings, or substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The project site is currently developed with the winery, wine caves, agricultural structures, residential structures, vineyards, parking, access drives, and associated infrastructure. External changes to the site are limited to replacement of the underground wastewater treatment tanks, additional parking spaces, a new driveway connection to Deer Park Road, and water storage tanks for recycled winery process wastewater to be used for vineyard irrigation and associated water line on the vineyard property. As noted above, the water storage tanks were previously analyzed and approved as part of an erosion control plan. All new physical improvements are generally proposed on previously disturbed areas of the site. The proposed improvements would not be in an area which would damage any known scenic vista, or damage scenic resources, trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings.

d. The project primarily proposes operational changes including increasing the number of by-appointment tours and tastings, establishing marketing events, and increasing full-time/part-time employment. The proposed marketing events would result in an increase in the amount of time existing and new sources of light are functioning during evening and nighttime hours, however, this increase would be temporary in nature and would only occur during marketing events. Marketing activities are proposed to take place during the hours of 10:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approval for wineries, any new outdoor lighting would be required to be shielded and directed downwards, with only low-level lighting allowed in parking areas. As subject to the standard conditions of approval below, the project would not have a significant impact resulting from new sources of lighting. Impacts are expected to be less than significant.

6.3 **LIGHTING – PLAN SUBMITTAL**

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

II.	AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. <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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b/e. The majority of the site, including the area comprising the existing winery development, is designated as “Other Land”, while the vineyards are designated as “Prime Farmland/Farmland of Statewide Importance” by the Napa County Important Farmland Map of 2020 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) of the California Resources Agency. Most of the proposed physical improvements are located within previously developed areas. Part of the proposed wastewater treatment improvements will require the removal of approximately 470 sq. ft. of vineyard. General Plan Agriculture Preservation and Land Use policies AG/LU-2 and AG/LU-13 recognize wineries, and any use consistent with the Winery Definition Ordinance and clearly accessory to a winery, as agriculture. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. There are no other changes included in this proposal that would result in the conversion of Farmland. As a result, the proposed project would not result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use. No impacts would occur.

c/d. According to the Napa County GIS Sensitivity Maps (based on the following layer – Vegetation) the project site contains mixed Oak Woodlands and shrub-lands. As mentioned above, the proposed improvements are not proposed within these areas except for the recycled water storage tanks and water line. These improvements are not within areas that would cause a conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land or timberland nor would it result in the loss or, or conversion of, forest land to a non-forest use in a

<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.

manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion:

On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (now known as the Bay Area Air District (BAAD)) 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 BAAD believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA and were posted on BAAD's website and included in BAAD'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 BAAD to any specific course of regulatory action.

BAAD published a new version of the Guidelines dated May 2017, which includes revisions made to address the Supreme Court's opinion (Cal. Bldg. Indus. Ass'n vs. Bay Area Air Quality Mgmt. Dist., 62 Ca 4th 369). 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.

The request consists of various operational changes to the existing winery, including an increase of annual wine production, changes to winery staffing, an increase in its permitted number of visitors, establishing a marketing program, a new driveway, additional parking spaces, replacing the existing wastewater treatment system, and new storage tanks and associated waterlines for irrigation.

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

in low elevations to more than 40 inches in the mountains.

Ozone and fine particle pollution, or PM<sub>2.5</sub>, are the major regional air pollutants of concern in the San Francisco Bay Area. Ozone is primarily a problem in the summer, and fine particle pollution in the winter. In Napa County, ozone rarely exceeds health standards, but PM<sub>2.5</sub> occasionally does reach unhealthy concentrations. There are multiple reasons for PM<sub>2.5</sub> exceedances in Napa County. First, much of the county is wind-sheltered, which tends to trap PM<sub>2.5</sub> within the Napa Valley. Second, much of the area is well north of the moderating temperatures of San Pablo Bay and, as a result, Napa County experiences some of the coldest nights in the Bay Area. This leads to greater fireplace use and, in turn, higher PM<sub>2.5</sub> 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 BAAD. Ambient air quality standards have been established by state and federal environmental agencies for specific air pollutants most pervasive in urban environments. These pollutants are referred to as criteria air pollutants because the standards established for them were developed to meet specific health and welfare criteria set forth in the enabling legislation. The criteria air pollutants emitted by development, traffic and other activities anticipated under the proposed development include ozone, ozone precursors oxides of nitrogen and reactive organic gases (NO<sub>x</sub> and ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), and suspended particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>). Other criteria pollutants, such as lead and sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), would not be substantially emitted by the proposed development or traffic, and air quality standards for them are being met throughout the Bay Area.

The BAAD 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. BAAD 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 BAAD 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 BAAD 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 BAAD through May 2017. The existing size of the entire project is approximately 26,212 square feet, including the winery buildings and cave. The winery buildings include approximately 3,693 square feet dedicated to accessory, office and hospitality uses and approximately 22,519 square feet dedicated to production uses. Compared to the BAAD's screening criterion of 47,000 square feet (high quality restaurant) and 541,000 square feet (general light industry) for NO<sub>x</sub> (oxides of nitrogen), the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. Please note: a high-quality restaurant is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, but grossly overstates emissions associated with other portions of a winery, such as office, barrel storage and production, which generate fewer vehicle trips. Therefore, a general light industry comparison has also been used for other such uses. The project falls below the screening criteria as noted above and consequently will not significantly affect air quality individually or contribute considerably to any cumulative air quality impacts.

- c. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from construction activities required for project construction. Earthmoving and construction emissions would have a temporary effect; consisting mainly of dust during grading and other construction activities, exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles, and relatively minor emissions from paints and other coatings, if applicable. If grading were to result in off or on-haul of soils, these potential construction impacts would be temporary in nature and subject to standard conditions of approval from the Engineering Division as part of the grading permit or building permit review process. The small area of disturbance, short duration of work and compliance with standard conditions would not cause a substantial increase in particulate matter and therefore, would result in a less than significant construction impact related to particulate matter

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.

With the small area of work, temporary duration of construction, and the project proponent's adherence to these relevant best management practices identified by the BAAD and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related air quality impacts of the project are considered to be less than significant.

- d. While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. The physical improvements and operational changes would not significantly increase odors associated with the winery. Construction-phase pollutants would be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. The project would not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

a/b. The winery property is currently developed with the existing winery, cave, paved parking areas and access drives, vineyards, a main residence and accessory dwelling unit, an agricultural barn, a water storage tank and other miscellaneous site improvements. An unnamed blue line stream runs along the east side of the developed area, fed by several ephemeral drainage channels northeast of the developed area. No improvements are proposed within these areas. Additional improvements proposed on the winery property include replacing the wastewater treatment system in place, providing nine parking spaces on an existing paved area, and a new driveway connection to Deer Park Road through a portion of the existing vineyard which will require removal of approximately 2,750 sq. ft. of vines. All proposed improvements are in previously developed and/or disturbed areas. As noted above, three 10,000-gallon capacity water storage tanks for vineyard irrigation, were entitled as part of the Bremer Winery Vineyard Conversion Erosion Control Plan (#P11-00317-ECPA) on the vineyard property. A waterline would run along the westerly property line of the site approximately 10-feet from an existing waterline from the Howell Mountain Water System tank on the vineyard property that provides water to the winery property. The three previously approved but not yet installed tanks would be “replaced” by four 5,000-gallon capacity water storage tanks for irrigation as shown on the plans and mentioned in the Wastewater Feasibility Study. The tanks would be in the same location as the previously approved 10,000-gallon tanks. The vineyard irrigation tanks would be fed from two existing wells on the well property (APN 021-400-005) as previously analyzed in the ECP. As part of the proposed project, the tanks would also be filled with treated winery process wastewater to be used for vineyard irrigation. No changes or improvements are proposed on the well property that were not previously approved in the ECP.

In review of Napa County Geographic Information System (GIS) California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) layers, the subject property is within an area of the County that is known to have the potential for Northern Spotted Owl (NSO) habitat and the potential Calistoga Ceanothus (Ceanothus divergens), Holly-Leaf Ceanothus (Ceanothus purpureus) and the Northern Spotted Owl (NSO).

Prior surveys conducted by Kjeldsen Biological Consulting and Theodore Wooster on the project site and surrounding properties for vineyard development under ownership by the Bremer’s in 2011, including the winery and vineyard properties, identified several small populations of Holly-Leaf Ceanothus on the vineyard property, some near the previously approved water storage tanks. Calistoga Ceanothus was not found on the vineyard or winery properties. Because of the prior known occurrence of Holly-Leaf Ceanothus near the area proposed for the previously approved water storage tanks, Mitigation Measure BIO-1, which requires preconstruction surveys, is recommended to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Physical improvements are proposed in disturbed or developed areas and no special-status animal species or habitat was observed on the subject site during the surveys conducted by Kjeldsen Biological Consulting or Theodore Wooster for Erosion Control Plan #P11-00317. A Northern Spotted Owl (NSO) Assessment, dated December 8, 2022, was completed by Kjeldsen Biological Consulting associated with an application under the Viewshed Protection Program to rebuild a residence that was destroyed by the 2020 fires on a property owned by the Bremer’s southeast of the winery property (APN 025-370-058). The report confirmed that there are no Northern Spotted Owls in the area. According to the report, the nearest recorded occurrence of the Northern Spotted Owl (NSO) is 1.34 miles east of the home site within an adjacent watershed. The home site is approximately 0.33 miles from the winery building. Kjeldsen’s investigation concluded that construction of the home would not disturb any breeding activities or potentially injure or otherwise harm NSO through habitat modification, direct injury, noise disturbance, or any other means. Further, the general attributes of NSO habitat include dense, multi-layered canopy of several tree species of varying size and ages with open spaces among the lower branches to

allow flight under the canopy which are lacking on the project site. NSO habitat also tends to include abundant logs, snags/cavity trees with broken tops or platform-like substrates. The proposed locations for physical development are within the existing winery development area and existing vineyards except for the water storage tanks which will be installed in the same area as was previously evaluated. No trees or large bushes would be removed to install the water storage tanks. As noted above, the 2020 Glass fire impacted the vegetation on the project site which has not fully grown back. No direct or indirect impacts to NSO habitat would occur. Per County GIS there are no formal NSO sightings on or near the winery and vineyard properties.

- c. According to the Napa County GIS Sensitivity Maps (based on the following layers – Wetlands and vernal pools and National Wetlands Inventory) there are no wetlands on the site. The project will not have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.
- d. All proposed improvements would occur on, or adjacent to, previously disturbed areas of the property. Therefore, project activities would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or within their corridors or nursery sites. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. The project does not require tree removal and would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f. The site is not subject to any adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation Measure BIO-1:

- a. Prior to commencement of any earthmoving activities, a floristic survey of the water storage tank area shall be conducted by a qualified biologist or botanist, for any special-status plant species. Any special-status plants or populations found shall be mapped. To the fullest extent practicable, removal of special-status plants shall be avoided through adjustments to the location of the water storage tanks to avoid and provide special-status plants/populations and provide them with a minimum 10-foot buffer. In accordance with NCC Section 18.108.100, Vegetation preservation and replacement) any special-status plants/populations that cannot be avoided shall be replaced on-site at a ratio of 2:1 at locations within similar habitat. For such removal, a replacement plan shall be prepared by a qualified botanist, ecologist or the like for review and approval by the Director prior to installation of the water storage tanks. The replacement plan shall include i) a site plan showing the locations where replacement plants will be planted, ii) a plant pallet composed of the special-status plant species being removed including sizes and/or application rates: seed mixes shall not contain species known to be noxious weeds and any non-native grasses should be sterile varieties, iii) planting notes and details including any recommended plant protection measures, iv) invasive species removal and management specifications, v) an implementation schedule, vi) performance standards with a minimum success rate of 80%, and vii) a monitoring schedule for a period of at least five years to ensure success criteria are met.
- b. In accordance with Napa County Code Section 18.108.100 (Erosion hazard areas – Vegetation preservation and replacement) any special-status plants/populations inadvertently removed as part of development authorized under #P21-00206-ECPA shall be replaced on-site at a ratio of 2:1 at locations with similar habitat. For such removal a replacement plan shall be prepared by a qualified botanist or ecologist for review and approval by the Director prior to vineyard planting. At a minimum, the replacement plan shall include i) a site plan showing the locations where replacement plants will be planted, ii) a plant pallet composed the special-status plans specie(s) being removed including sizes and/or application rates, iii) planting notes and details including any recommended plant protection measures, iv) invasive species removal and management specifications, v) an implementation and monitoring schedule, and vi) performance standards with a minimum success rate of 80% to ensure the success of re-vegetation efforts. Any replaced special-status plants shall be monitored for a period of at least three years to success criteria are met.
- c. Prior to any earthmoving activities, temporary fencing shall be installed a minimum of 10 feet from the outer boundary of Holly-leaf Ceanothus plants/populations proposed for retention. The precise locations of the protection fencing shall be inspected and approved by the Planning Division prior to the commencement of any earthmoving activities. No disturbance, including grading, placement of fill material, storage of equipment, etc. shall occur within the designated areas for the duration of erosion control plan installation, vineyard installation and/or installation of the water tanks. All fencing shall be maintained for the duration of vineyard and/or water tank construction.

Responsible Agencies: California Department of Fish and Wildlife & PBES

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

Discussion:

a/b. An Archaeological Survey Report, dated November 3, 2006, was prepared by Tom Origer & Associates (TOA) as part of the previously approved Erosion Control Plan (P11-00317-ECPA) for vineyard development that included both the winery and vineyard properties. The report was prepared to determine the presence or absence of potentially significant cultural resources within the development area. The evaluation included a check of the information on file with the Regional Office of the California Historical Resources Information System, to determine the presence or absence of previously recorded historic or prehistoric cultural resources; a check of appropriate historic references to determine the potential for historic era archaeological deposits; and, a surface reconnaissance of all accessible parts of the project areas to locate any visible signs of potentially significant historic or prehistoric cultural deposits. The overall literature search determined that the current project area has not been the subject of a previous cultural resource study and there are no previously recorded archaeological sites located within the project area. TOA contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to determine the presence or absence of listed Sacred Lands within the project area and all appropriate Native American organizations or individuals designated by the Native American Heritage Commission as interested parties for the project area.

As noted above, a surface examination was conducted to locate any visible signs of potentially significant historic or prehistoric cultural deposits. The investigation resulted in a negative finding, indicating that no artifacts or potentially significant cultural features were observed.

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

However, if resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval. Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

**7.2 ARCHEOLOGICAL FINDING**

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

VII.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a.
- i.) There are no known faults that run beneath the project site on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing of a known fault. Impacts would be less than significant.
  - ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project would be required to comply with the latest standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level in relation to seismic ground shaking.
  - iii.) According to Napa County GIS Sensitivity Maps (based on the following layer – Liquefaction) the property is designated in an area with a Very Low to Low susceptibility for liquefaction. No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. There were no known issues with the construction of the existing buildings and cave. Compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.
  - iv.) The Napa County GIS Sensitivity Maps (Landslides line) indicate the presence of a small landslide deposit, identified as questionable, east of the creek on the winery property. No improvements are proposed east of the creek. The physical improvements are proposed in already developed areas or have been previously assessed. Impacts are expected to be less than significant.
- b. The proposed improvements would occur within the previously disturbed and/or developed portions of the site. The water storage tanks were previously evaluated under an approved erosion control plan. The project would require incorporation of best management practices and would be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c/d. According to the Napa County GIS Sensitivity Maps (based on the following layers - Geology, Surficial deposits, and Soil Type), improvements south of the winery buildings on the winery property are composed of Cortina very stony loam (0 to 5% slopes) which are underlain by undifferentiated Late Pleistocene alluvium. The remainder of the winery property and the north property are composed of Rock outcrop-Kidd complex (50 to 75% slopes) underlain by undifferentiated Pre-Quaternary deposits and bedrock. The project site includes areas generally subject to very low to low tendencies to liquefy. Any proposed construction would be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction. The project is not proposed on an unstable geologic unit or soil that would become unstable or would create direct or indirect risks to life or property. Compliance with the latest editions of the California Building Code for seismic stability would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible, resulting in less than significant impacts.
- e. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The Napa County Division of Environmental Health has reviewed this application and recommends approval based on the submitted wastewater feasibility report prepared by RSA+, dated July 12, 2024. Soils on the property have been determined to be adequate to support the on-site treatment and dispersal of wastewater generated by the project including the winery's process waste resulting from the increased wine production capacity as well as sanitary wastewater based on the proposed number of employees and visitors.
- f. No paleontological resources or unique geological features have been identified on the property in the project area or were encountered on the property when the existing building and cave were constructed, and the vines were planted. The project as proposed would require minimal earth disturbing activities and construction is unlikely to uncover paleontological or unique geological features. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion:

On April 20, 2022, the BAAD adopted updated thresholds of significance for climate impacts (CEQA Thresholds for Evaluating the Significance of Climate Impacts, BAAD April 2022).<sup>2</sup> The updated thresholds to evaluate GHG and climate impacts from land use projects are qualitative and geared toward building and transportation projects. Per the BAAD, all other projects should be analyzed against either an adopted local Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy (i.e., Climate Action Plan (CAP)) or other threshold determined on a case-by-case basis by the Lead Agency. If a project is consistent with the State’s long-term climate goals of being carbon neutral by 2045, then a project would have a less-than-significant impact as endorsed by the California Supreme Court in *Center for Biological Diversity v. Department of Fish & Wildlife* (2015) 62 Cal. 4th 204). There is no proposed construction-related climate impact threshold at this time. Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from construction represent a very small portion of a project’s lifetime GHG emissions. The proposed thresholds for land use projects are designed to address operational GHG emissions which represent the vast majority of project GHG emissions.

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 BOS 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 addition, the BOS recommended utilizing the emissions checklist and associated carbon stock and sequestration factors in the Draft CAP to assess and disclose potential GHG emissions associated with project development and operation pursuant to CEQA.

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. On July 24, 2018, the County prepared a Notice of Preparation of a Draft Focused EIR for the Climate Action Plan. The review period was from July 24, 2018, through August 22, 2018. The Draft Focused EIR for the CAP was published May 9, 2019. Additional information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or online at <https://www.countyofnapa.org/589/Planning-Building-Environmental-Services>. The County’s draft CAP was placed on hold, when the Climate Action Committee (CAC) began meeting on regional GHG reduction strategies in 2019. The County is currently preparing an updated CAP to provide a clear framework to determine what land use actions will be necessary to meet the State’s adopted GHG reduction goals, including a quantitative and measurable strategy for achieving net zero emissions by 2045.

For the purposes of this assessment the carbon stock and sequestration factors identified within the 2012 Draft CAP are utilized to calculate and disclose potential GHG emissions associated with agricultural “construction” and development and with “ongoing” agricultural maintenance and operation, as further described below. The 2012 Draft CAP carbon stock and sequestration factors are utilized in this assessment because they provide the most generous estimate of potential emissions. As such, the County considers that the anticipated potential emissions resulting from the proposed project that are disclosed in this Initial Study reasonably reflect proposed conditions and therefore are considered appropriate and

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/california-environmental-quality-act-ceqa/updated-ceqa-guidelines>

adequate for project impact assessment.

Regarding operational emissions, as part of the statewide implementation of Senate Bill (SB) 743, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) settled upon automobile vehicle miles of travel (VMT) as the preferred metric for assessing passenger vehicle-related impacts under CEQA and issued revised CEQA Guidelines in December 2018, along with a Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA to assist practitioners in implementing the CEQA Guidelines revisions. The CEQA Guidelines and the OPR Technical Advisory concluded that, absent substantial evidence otherwise, the addition of 110 or fewer daily trips could be presumed to have a less than significant VMT impact.

The County maintains a set of Transportation Impact Study Guidelines (TIS Guidelines) that define situations and project characteristics that trigger the need to prepare a TIS. The purpose of a TIS is to identify whether the project is likely to cause adverse physical or operational changes on a County roadway, bridge, bikeway or other transportation facility, to determine whether the project should be required to implement or contribute to improvement measures to address those changes, and to ensure that the project is developed consistent with the County's transportation plans and policies. Per the County's current TIS Guidelines, a project is required to prepare a TIS if it generates 110 or more net new daily vehicle trips.

The TIS Guidelines also include VMT analysis requirements for projects based on trip generation, which includes a screening approach that provides a structure to determine what level of VMT analysis may be required for a given project. For a new project that would generate less than 110 net new daily vehicle and truck trips, not only is the project not required to prepare a TIS, it is also presumed to have a less-than-significant impact for VMT. However, applicants are encouraged to describe the measures they are taking and/or plan to take that would reduce the project's trip generation and/or VMT. Projects that generate more than 110 net new passenger vehicle trips must conduct a VMT analysis and identify feasible strategies to reduce the project's vehicular travel; if the feasible strategies would not reduce the project's VMT by at least 15%, the conclusion would be that the project would cause a significant environmental impact.

- 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.

The County requires project applicants to consider methods to reduce GHG emissions consistent with Napa County General Plan Policy CON-65(e). Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, this assessment focuses on impacts that are "peculiar to the project," rather than the cumulative impacts previously assessed, because this Initial Study assesses a project that is consistent with an adopted General Plan for which an EIR was prepared.

GHGs are atmospheric gases whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for the greenhouse effect, including carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane, ozone, and the fluorocarbons, which contribute to climate change. CO<sub>2</sub> is the principal GHG emitted by human activities, and its concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity. It also serves as the reference gas to which to compare other GHGs. For the purposes of this analysis potential GHG emissions associated with winery 'construction' and 'development' and with 'ongoing' winery operations have been discussed.

GHG emissions from construction represent a very small portion of a project's lifetime GHG emissions. The BAAD recommended thresholds do not include a construction-related climate impact threshold at this time. One time "Construction Emissions" associated with the project include: emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area, construction, and construction equipment, and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as Equipment Emissions). The physical improvements associated with this project includes improvements to the driveway and parking areas, consistent with Napa County Road and Street Standards, and wastewater treatment system. As discussed in Section III. Air Quality, construction emissions would have a temporary effect and BAAD recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction impacts. If the proposed project adheres to relevant best management practices identified by the BAAQMD and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts are considered less than significant. See Section III. Air Quality for additional information.

The BAAD proposed thresholds for land use projects are designed to address "Operational" GHG emissions which represent the vast majority of project GHG emissions. Operational emissions associated with a winery generally include: i) any reduction in the amount of carbon sequestered by existing vegetation that is removed as part of the project compared to a "no project" scenario (hereinafter referred to as Operational Sequestration Emissions); and ii) ongoing emissions from the energy used to maintain and operate the winery, including vehicle trips associated with employee and visitor trips (hereinafter referred to as Operational Emissions).

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

Specifically for buildings, the project must not:

- Include natural gas appliances or natural gas plumbing (in both residential and nonresidential development); and
- Result in any wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary electrical usage as determined by the analysis required under CEQA section 21100(b)(3) and CEQA Guidelines section 15126.2(b).

The project does not propose improvements that would install natural gas appliances or natural gas plumbing. Additionally, at the time of any construction the project will be required to comply with the California Building Code, which is currently being updated to include regulations to assist in the reduction of air quality impacts associated with construction, such as prohibiting natural gas appliance and natural gas plumbing. Any new construction will be required to install energy efficient fixtures complying with CA Building Code Title 24 standards. See section VI. Energy for additional information on energy usage.

Specifically for transportation, the project must:

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

As discussed above and in section XVII. Transportation, the County maintains TIS Guidelines that include VMT analysis requirements for projects based on trip generation. The project trip generation numbers did not require completion of a VMT analysis because it would only generate X new trips; however, a project TIS, was prepared by GHD, dated ~~July 12, 2024~~ August 12, 2025, and included a recommendation to implement a Traffic Demand Management (TDM) Plan for reducing vehicle miles traveled. See section XVII. Transportation for additional detail.

On the GHG Voluntary Best Management Practices (BMP) Checklist submitted with the use permit application, dated February 26, 2021, the applicant identified three GHG reduction BMPs that the operators are currently implementing at the winery. These include the use of energy-conserving lighting (BMP-9); use of water efficient fixtures (BMP-14); and site design that is oriented and designed to optimize conditions for natural heating, cooling, and day-lighting of interior spaces, and to maximize winter sun exposure, which includes the existing cave. As a component of the vineyard operation, the applicant indicated that the operators implement BMPs that include use of 70-80 percent cover crop (BMP-31) and chipping and reuse of pruned biomass, rather than burning the material on-site (BMP-32). The applicant did not indicate on the checklist their intent to introduce new GHG reduction programs into the winery's current operations. A condition of approval will be included to require continuation of the existing BMP operations identified. The increase in emissions expected as a result of the project would be relatively modest, and the project is in compliance with the County's efforts to reduce emissions as described above. For these reasons, project impacts related to GHG emissions are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

IX.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

X.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces which would:				
	i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The County requires all discretionary permit applications (such as use permits and erosion control plans for vineyard and other agricultural development) to complete necessary water analyses in order to document that sufficient water supplies are available for the proposed project and to implement water saving measures to prepare for periods of limited water supply and to conserve limited groundwater resources.

On June 7, 2022, the Napa County Board of Supervisors provided interim procedures to implement provisions of the Napa County Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) for issuance of new, altered or replacement well permits and discretionary projects that would increase groundwater use. The direction limits a parcel's groundwater allocation to 0.3- acre feet per acre per year, or no net increase in groundwater use if that threshold is exceeded already for parcels located in the GSA Subbasin. For parcels not located in the GSA Subbasin (i.e., generally located in the hillsides), a parcel-specific Water Availability Analysis would suffice to assess potential impacts on groundwater supplies.

To assess potential impacts resulting from project well(s) interference with neighboring wells within 500 feet and/or springs within 1,500 feet, the County's WAA guidance<sup>3</sup> requires applicants to perform a Tier 2 analysis where the proposed project would result in an increase in groundwater extraction from project well(s) compared to existing levels.

<sup>3</sup> The County's Water Availability Guidelines (adopted May 2015)

To assess the potential impacts of groundwater pumping on hydrologically connected navigable waterways, the County’s WAA guidance requires applicants to perform a Tier 3 analysis for new or replacement wells, or discretionary projects that would result in an increase in groundwater demand on existing wells that are located within 1,500 feet of designated “Significant Streams.”<sup>4</sup>

Public Trust: The public trust doctrine requires the state and its legal subdivisions to “consider,” give “due regard,” and “take the public trust into account” when considering actions that may adversely affect a navigable waterway. (Environmental Law Foundation v. State Water Resources Control Bd.; San Francisco Baykeeper, Inc. v. State Lands Com.) There is no “procedural matrix” governing how an agency should consider public trust uses. (Citizens for East Shore Parks v. State Lands Com.) Rather, the level of analysis “begins and ends with whether the challenged activity harms a navigable waterway and thereby violates the public trust.” (Environmental Law Foundation, 26 Cal.App.5th at p. 403.) As demonstrated in the Environmental Law Foundation vs State Water Resources Control Board Third District Appellate Court Case, that arose in the context of a lawsuit over Siskiyou County’s obligation in administering groundwater well permits and management program with respect to Scott River, a navigable waterway (considered a public trust resource), the court affirmed that the public trust doctrine is relevant to extractions of groundwater that adversely impact a navigable waterway and that Counties are obligated to consider the doctrine, irrespective of the enactment of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA).

On January 10, 2024, Napa County released the Interim Napa County Well Permit Standards and WAA Requirements - January 2024, providing guidance to comply with the Public Trust.

- a. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. A Winery Wastewater Feasibility Report was prepared by RSA+, dated July 12, 2024, was submitted to evaluate the proposed project. The report concludes that the proposed systems will have adequate disposal capacity to serve the project. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings, conditioning that the plans are required to be designed by a licensed Civil Engineer or Registered Environmental Health Specialist and approved by the Division of Environmental Health. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality. Any earth disturbing activities will be subject to the County’s Stormwater Ordinance which complies with State requirements, would include measures to prevent erosion, sediment, and waste materials from entering waterways both during and after any construction activities. By following the above-mentioned measures, the project would not have the potential to significantly impact water quality and discharge standards. Potential impacts would be less than significant.
- b. A Water Availability Analysis (WAA) was prepared by RSA+, dated July 12, 2024. As directed by the County’s WAA Guidance Document dated May 2015 and the Interim Standards, the report includes Tier 1 calculations for existing and proposed water use.

According to the WAA, the winery and residences are served by the Howell Mountain Mutual Water Company (HMMWC) for domestic and process water. There is an existing Howell Mountain Water System water storage tank on the vineyard property that provides water to the winery property. Domestic water use would increase from 0.70 af/yr to 1.38 af/yr, an increase of 0.68 af/yr. The HMMWC issued a letter indicating that they will continue to provide water service to the property.

Usage Type	Existing Usage (acre-ft.)	Proposed Usage (acre-ft.)
Vineyard		
Irrigation	2.73	2.34*
Landscaping	2.80	2.80
<b>Total Well Use</b>	<b>5.53</b>	<b>5.14</b>
Winery		
Process Water	0.23	0.77
Domestic Water	0.11	0.25
Residential	0.36	0.36
<b>Total Domestic &amp; Process Water Use (from Howell Mountain Mutual Water Company)</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>1.38</b>
<b>Totals (AF/YR)</b>	<b>6.23</b>	<b>6.52</b>

\*0.35 af/yr of treated process wastewater will be used for irrigation. The estimate of vineyard irrigation included water use for approximately 4.07 acres of vineyards.

<sup>4</sup> Refer to Figure 1: Significant Streams for Tier 3, located at [www.countyofnapa.org/3074/Groundwater-Sustainability](http://www.countyofnapa.org/3074/Groundwater-Sustainability). The “Significant Streams” and “Significant\_Streams\_1500ft\_buffer” GIS layers are published as publicly-available open data through the County’s ArcGIS Online Account.

Tier 2: The latest Interim Napa County Well Permit Standards and WAA Requirements require an interference analysis for any proposed increase in groundwater use occurring from project wells within 500 feet of any offsite well or 1,500 feet from any off-site spring. A Tier 2 analysis is not required for discretionary projects that use an existing well provided there is no increase in groundwater use. As discussed above, the project receives water from the HMMWC, therefore a Tier 2 analysis is not required.

Tier 3: A Tier 3 analysis is the County’s adopted method for complying with its duties under the public trust doctrine. As noted above, water for the winery and residences is provided by the HMMWC, therefore further analysis is not required

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

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would not change the existing agricultural land and residential uses of the project site, which are consistent with the wineries, single-family homes and vineyards developed on properties proximate to the site. The proposed project would not introduce a non-agricultural use, nor any new, non-winery related development to the project site. The proposed project would integrate with the project site’s surroundings and would not physically divide an established community. The project would have no impact.
- b. The project site is located in the AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district, which allows wineries and uses accessory to wineries subject to use permit approval. The County has adopted the Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO) to protect agriculture and open space and to regulate winery development and expansion in a manner that avoids potential negative environmental effects. Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-1 of the 2008 General Plan states that the County shall, “preserve existing agricultural land uses and plan for agriculture and related activities as the primary land uses in Napa County.” The property’s General Plan land use designation is Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space (AWOS), which allows “agriculture, processing of agricultural products, and single-family dwellings.” More specifically, General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-2 recognizes wineries and other agricultural processing facilities, and any use clearly accessory to those facilities, as agriculture. The project would allow for the continuation of agriculture as a dominant land use within the county and is fully consistent with the Napa County General Plan. The proposed use of the property for the “fermenting and processing of grape juice into wine” (NCC §18.08.640) supports the economic viability of agriculture within the county consistent with General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-4 (“The County will reserve agricultural lands for agricultural use including lands used for grazing and watershed/ open space...”) and General

Plan Economic Development Policy E-1 (The County's economic development will focus on ensuring the continued viability of agriculture...). There are no applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the property. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion: The project site is bordered on the west by and along a portion of the northern extent by Deer Park Road which contributes to ambient noise levels. The closest offsite residence is located on the parcel that borders the project site to the north approximately 480 feet from the existing winery building. The residence sits approximately 20-25 feet higher than the winery. Additionally, there are a number of mature, large trees between the existing residence and the existing winery. No tree removal is included in this project.

a/b. The project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during construction of the driveway and other site improvements. Impacts due to a temporary increase in ambient noise generated from construction activities, or from groundborne vibration, would remain below

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

### 7.3. CONSTRUCTION NOISE

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

Additional regulations contained within County Code Chapter 8.16 establish exterior noise criteria for various land uses in the County. As described in the Project Setting, above, land uses in the area are rural residential properties, wineries, and vineyards; of these land uses, residential land uses are considered the most sensitive to noise. Based on the standards in County Code section 8.16.070, noise levels, measured at the exterior of a residential structure or residential use on a portion of a larger property, may not exceed 50 decibels for more than half of any hour in the window of daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.), the timeframe within which the winery currently has visitation and marketing events. Noise impacts of the proposed project would be considered bothersome and potentially significant if sound generated by it had the effect of exceeding the standards in County Code more than 50 percent of the time (i.e., more than 50 decibels for more than 30 minutes in an hour for a residential use).

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

The proposed increases to production, annual visitation and marketing events were not accompanied by a request to change or extend the hours of operation of the winery, nor are new areas for outdoor activities proposed. Thus, while there might be a minor increase in noise generated by vehicles used for shipment of the increased volume of fruit and wine and by visitors and vehicles used by visitors, noise generated by the winery operations would continue to fall within the current hours of operation, excluding harvest, and in existing outdoor areas. Mobile bottling would continue to occur at the paved asphalt area south of the main winery building and east of the farmhouse, approximately 509 feet from the nearest offsite residence to the northwest. Mobile bottling, which is industry standard in Napa County, occurs approximately two times per year. It is accomplished by driving a mobile bottling truck into the suitable asphalt area and connecting a hose from the barrel room to the bottling truck. Except for the truck driver, all of the bottling work is done with the winery's employees. Bottling occurs during approved production days and hours (i.e., M-F, 7:00 a.m.- 5:00 p.m.). According to the applicant, bottling has occurred in this manner for over two decades. In addition, the winery has built an approved bottling section of the cave, which is designed to accommodate a bottling line, which would be installed if/when it is warranted by production needs. While there will be an overall increase in annual visitation, with the exception of the two annual marketing events for 100 guests, the maximum number of daily visitors (e.g., 70) will remain the same.

Under the proposed project, the largest event that would occur on the parcel would have an attendance of no more than 100 people, and all evening events would conclude by 10:00 p.m., with quiet clean-up conducted afterwards. The location of events are within areas previously approved for hospitality use. Continuing enforcement of Napa County's Noise Ordinance by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff, including the prohibition against amplified music, should further ensure that marketing events and other winery activities do not create a significant noise impact. Events and non-amplified music, excluding quiet clean-up, are required to finish by 10:00 p.m. Amplified music or sound systems would not be permitted for outdoor events as identified in standard Condition of Approval 4.10 below. Temporary events would be subject to County Code Chapter 5.36, which regulates proposed temporary events. The proposed project would not result in long-term significant permanent noise impacts.

4.10 AMPLIFIED MUSIC

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion:

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

The Association of Bay Area Governments’ Plan Bay Area 2050 Growth Pattern figures indicate that the total households for Napa County are projected to increase some 10% by the year 2050, increasing from 50,000 to 56,000. Unincorporated Napa County, along with the cities of American Canyon, Napa, St. Helena, Calistoga and the town of Yountville all have existing compliant 6th Cycle Housing Elements certified by the State Department of Housing and Community Development. For the 6th Cycle, which runs from 2023 – 2031, Napa County jurisdictions have identified and have rezoned or are in the process of rezoning land to accommodate 3,844 dwelling units, more than half of the households projected by ABAG to develop in Napa County by 2050.

The requested use permit major modification would facilitate the continued operation of an existing winery on the project site, with expanded production and hospitality service. The addition of four (4) new employees is not anticipated to generate a substantial need for additional housing 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, any building permits would be subject to the County’s housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs. Cumulative impacts on the local and regional population and housing balance would be less than significant.

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

The policies and programs identified in the General Plan Housing Element function, in combination with the County’s housing impact mitigation fee, ensure adequate cumulative volume and diversity of housing. With small staffing increases proposed and no off-site

expansion of utilities or facilities to serve other developments, the project would have a less than significant impact on population growth.

- b. This application will not displace a substantial volume of existing housing or a substantial number of people and will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No residential buildings on or off the property would be demolished as a result of the project. Thus, no residents would be displaced, and there would be no impact.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion:

- a. Public services are currently provided to the project area and the additional demand placed on existing services as a result of the proposed project would be minimal. Fire protection measures, such as winery access that meet Napa County Road and Street Standards (RSS) and defensible space will be required as part of the development. The Fire Department and Engineering Services Division have reviewed the application and recommend approval, as conditioned. There would be no foreseeable impact to fire or police emergency response times with compliance with these conditions of approval. The proposed project scope does not include construction of any new residential units nor accompanying introduction of new residents that would utilize existing parks or potentially increase student enrollment in schools located in the cities north and south of the winery. No new parks or other public recreational amenities or facilities (such as police or fire stations) are proposed to be built with or as a result of the requested use permit major modification. School impact fees, which assist local school districts with capacity building measures, would be levied for any required building permits for the project, however as demonstrated in **Section XIV(a), Population and Housing**, the project is expected to create a minimal increase in the county's population and its need for housing such that local schools would not be strained by the proposed project and the increase in visitation, marketing events, and employment. The proposed project would have a minimal impact on public parks as no residences are proposed, and as previously noted the increase in regional population from the proposed project is expected to be minimal. Impacts to public services would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion:

- a. The requested use permit major modification does not include any residential component and is not likely to lead to the accompanying introduction of new residents to the site or area. The use permit major modification would increase the number of winery employees and the number of daily tours and tastings visitors to the property, some of whom might visit regional recreational facilities on the way to or from other wineries. However, given that the purpose of employees' and guests' trips are to and from the winery as the primary destination, such visits to area recreational facilities are anticipated to be infrequent and would not drastically accelerate the deterioration of the park amenities. This impact would be less than significant.
- b. No new public recreational amenities are proposed to be built with, or as a result of, the requested use permit major modification. The proposed project would have no impact.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

XVII.	TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-14, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a./c./d. The winery is accessed via an existing driveway off Deer Park Road. The project proposes to construct an additional driveway connection to Deer Park Road, south of its current driveway, creating a one-way loop providing access to visitor parking and another one-way loop around the winery building. The two one-way loops intersect near the farmhouse building. An existing graveled area preceding the new visitor parking spaces will provide a turnout area.

While the study area lacks pedestrian facilities and transit service, there is not expected to be a demand, and therefore, the lack of facilities is considered acceptable. As proposed the project would not conflict with any plans, ordinances or policies addressing the circulation system. All designs will comply with Napa County Road & Street Standards (RSS) and standards for safe access into and throughout the site. The project would not substantially increase hazards due to design features or result in inadequate emergency access. CalFire and Engineering divisions have reviewed the proposed plans for access and circulation and found them to be in compliance with the RSS. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

The County maintains a set of Transportation Impact Study Guidelines (TIS Guidelines) that define situations and project characteristics that trigger the need to prepare a TIS. The purpose of a TIS is to identify whether the project is likely to cause adverse physical or operational changes on a County roadway, bridge, bikeway or other transportation facility, to determine whether the project should be required to implement or contribute to improvement measures to address those changes, and to ensure that the project is developed consistent with the County's transportation plans and policies. Per the County's current TIS Guidelines, a project is required to prepare a TIS if it generates 110 or more net new daily vehicle trips.

The TIS Guidelines also include VMT analysis requirements for projects based on trip generation, which includes a screening approach that provides a structure to determine what level of VMT analysis may be required for a given project. This project would fall into the category of a "project modifying an existing facility that would generate additional trips". The TIS Guidelines state that if the net cumulative result of all project modifications after January 1, 2022, would generate less than 110 net new daily passenger vehicle and truck trips the project is presumed to have a less than significant impact for VMT. Projects that generate more than 110 net new passenger vehicle trips must conduct a VMT analysis and identify feasible strategies to reduce the project's vehicular travel; if the feasible strategies would not reduce the project's VMT by at least 15%, the conclusion would be that the project would cause a significant environmental impact.

Based on the County's winery trip generation assumptions, the proposed project would be expected to generate 16 new daily trips on a Friday during harvest (worst case scenario) with five (5) PM peak hour trips and four (4) net new trips on a Saturday with two (2) midday peak hour trips. Although the project did not meet the threshold requiring preparation of a traffic impact study or VMT analysis, a Traffic Study Report (TSR) was prepared by GHD, dated ~~July 12, 2024~~ August 12, 2025, to address left-turn lane warrants at the request of the Department of Public Works. According to the TSR a left-turn lane would be required on Deer Park Road at the existing driveway. However, the project includes a request for an exception to the Napa County Road and Street Standards to waive the requirement to provide a left-turn lane (LTL).

The applicant has provided information dated November 16, 2025, indicating that granting the exception is necessary to preserve unique features of the natural environment that would be permanently lost by developing a left turn lane. Construction of a LTL would result in unavoidable adverse impacts to 21 protected trees of significant importance that are part of an oak woodland and are well over 6 inches in diameter at breast height. A LTL would also require substantial grading of two (2) steep, nearly vertical cut slopes immediately adjacent to the narrow roadway shoulder, which consist of natural rock features and are forested with many protected trees. Further, if Deer Park Road is widened to the east, then the winery's 100-year stone wall and mailbox would have to be dismantled and reconstructed. The historic mailbox, just off the roadway shoulder is within the relevant construction area. The entire stone wall and part of the winery's gate, would require relocation to maintain compliance with the County's 30-foot driveway setback requirement. According to the applicant, this historic stonework cannot be reproduced and must be protected. In addition, the applicant indicates that the vast majority

(>95%) of the traffic accessing the site would be coming from the valley floor via Deer Park or Sanitarium Roads; very few trips would be coming from uphill (the Angwin area) and using the left turn lane. Construction of a LTL that almost no one will use is not advisable. For those cars that do need to make a left turn into the driveway, there is adequate sight distance to allow cars to see a turning vehicle and stop to avoid it. Additionally, the applicant has agreed to participate in the procurement and installation of two radar feedback signs which will be installed on either side of the project driveway to help mitigate driver's speed near the project. Because of the location of the driveway relative to the intersection formed by Deer Park and Sanitarium roads, the geometry of the LTL would be awkward at best, and possibly be less safe than the current configuration

Based on the information submitted by the applicant, the Director of Public Works determined that the left turn lane need not be installed for this project. The cumulative impacts as further supported by the very few trips that would benefit by the installation of the left turn lane leads to the reasonable conclusion that the lane need not be installed.

Although not required, the TSR includes suggested and/or occurring measures to reduce the demand of vehicles travelling to and from the site. The TSR includes a Traffic Demand Management (TDM) Plan memorializing these measures. The TDM Plan includes: maximum daily visitation of 70 people per day including tours and tasting and marketing events of 25-50 guests; limiting tours and tastings to 25 people during days when marketing events host up to 100 guests; shuttle service for the 100 person events and groups of 15 or more persons for tours and tastings; staggering employee work hours, and ride share programs. The project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b). Impacts would be less than significant.

- e. Developers of new or expanded land uses are required to provide adequate parking or demonstrate that adequate parking exists to meet their anticipated parking demand. Excess parking that could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or commercial activity exceeding the site's capacity is discouraged. The winery currently has 11 approved parking spaces and proposes adding nine (9) spaces for a total of 20 parking spaces. The TSR determined that the proposed parking supply is adequate for the anticipated demand based on increase to the number of employees and visitors. The proposed project would not be in conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-14.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion:

- a/b. On January 16, 2025, 2023, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. Staff received a response from the Yocha Dehe Tribe on February 14, 2025; the Tribe did not request to consult or provide comments. Staff also received a request from the Middletown Rancheria Tribal Historic Preservation Department requesting additional information which was provided on May 12, 2025. No additional correspondence or requests have been received from Middletown Rancheria Tribal Historic Preservation Department.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion:

a. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. A Wastewater Feasibility Study, dated July 12, 2024, was prepared by RSA+, detailing the existing system and proposed changes to accommodate the changes in production, employees, and hospitality. The proposed wastewater improvements presented in this feasibility study will enhance the method of wastewater treatment that is currently used by the facility. According to the study, an Engineered septic system is proposed to treat and disperse domestic wastewater from the winery and residences. An existing 1,500-gallon septic tank will be replaced in its same location with a traffic rated tank. Domestic wastewater will flow to this tank and then to a 1,500-gallon recirculation tank and from there to two treatment pods. The treated wastewater will flow to a 3,000-gallon holding tank prior to dispersal to a subsurface drip system. The subsurface drip field is sized to meet the Environmental Health Division's guidelines. Production wastewater will be treated using a BioFiltro system or equivalent prior to surface discharge for vineyard irrigation. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings, conditioning that the selected design and plans shall be designed by a licensed Civil Engineer or Registered Environmental Health Specialist and approved by the Division of Environmental Health. Impacts would be less than significant.

The project will receive water from the Howell Mountain Mutual Water Company (HMMWC) for domestic use by the winery and residences. The HMMWC issued a will-serve letter indicating that they will provide the additional 0.68 acre-feet of water use associated with the increases to production, employees and visitors.

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

b. As discussed in Section X. a Water Availability Analysis was prepared by RSA+, dated July 12, 2024, there is an overall slight increase in annual water consumption associated with the proposed project. The increased demand from 0.70 acre-feet to 1.38 acre-feet annually for winery process water and domestic water for the winery and residences will be provided by the HMMWC. The proposed project would not impact groundwater availability.

c. As discussed above and in Section X, Hydrology, the existing on-site domestic waste system can accommodate the proposed increases to employees and visitors. Winery process waste will be treated by a new onsite system, which has been sized to accommodate the proposed production capacity of 50,000 gallons. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its

findings, conditioning that the selected design and plans shall be designed by a licensed Civil Engineer or Registered Environmental Health Specialist and approved by the Division of Environmental Health. The project is not served by a wastewater treatment provider; therefore, no impact would occur.

d/e. According to the Napa County Baseline Data Report, all of the solid waste landfills where Napa County's waste is disposed have more than sufficient capacity related to the current waste generation. The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

XX.	WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Due to slope, prevailing winds and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. There are no proposed project features that would substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The proposed new (second) driveway on Deer Park Road will be designed and improved to meet commercial standards as defined in the Napa County Road & Street Standards (RSS). Access onto and throughout the parcel includes design components to accommodate fire and emergency apparatus. The Fire Marshal's office has reviewed the plans, which demonstrate that the project would have adequate emergency access to the existing development.
- b. According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps (based on the following GIS layer – Fire Hazard Severity Zones) the project site within an area designated as a high fire risk. Although the project results in a larger amount of people on site, the physical improvements and operational changes would not result in a physical modification to the slope of the site, change prevailing winds, or alter other factors that would likely exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.
- c. The Fire Marshal's office has reviewed the plans, which demonstrate that the project would have adequate emergency access to the existing development. The proposed second driveway off Deer Park Road will meet current standards. The project does not require installation or maintenance of infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. Impacts will be less than significant.
- d. The physical improvements are in an area of the site which is already graded and paved or planted in vines. The proposed project would not physically alter the site in a way which would expose people or structures to risks such as downstream or downslope flooding or landslides resulting from runoff, post-fire instability or drainage changes. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

XXI.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a. The project consists mainly of changes to the operational aspects of the winery including increased wine production, employees and visitors. The winery property is currently developed with winery building and caves, residential use, an agricultural barn, parking and access drives, other miscellaneous structures, vineyards, and associated infrastructure. An unnamed blue line stream runs along the east side of the developed area, fed by several ephemeral drainage channels northeast of the developed area on the vineyard property. Physical improvements proposed on the winery property include replacing the wastewater treatment system in place, providing additional parking spaces on an existing paved area, and a new driveway connection to Deer Park Road through a portion of the existing vineyard. As discussed in Section IV. – Biological Resources, three water storage tanks for vineyard irrigation, each with a 10,000-gallon capacity, were entitled as part of the Bremer Winery Vineyard Conversion Erosion Control Plan (#P11-00317-ECPA) on the vineyard property which would be replaced by four water storage tanks with a storage capacity of 5,000 gallons each in the same location. Mitigation measure BIO-1 has been included to reduce potential impacts to Holly-Leaf Ceanothus plants. The physical improvements are proposed on already disturbed and/or developed areas of the site. No development is proposed within the blue line stream or ephemeral drainage channels. No tree removal is required as part of the project. Based on site conditions the proposed project does not have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal.

As identified in Section V. - Cultural Resources, Tom Origer & Associates (TOA) prepared an Archaeological Survey Report, dated November 3, 2006, as part of the previously approved Erosion Control Plan (P11-00317-ECPA) for vineyard development that included both the winery and vineyard properties. The report was prepared to determine the presence or absence of potentially significant cultural resources within the development area. According to the report, no significant or potentially significant prehistoric artifacts, archaeological deposits, or features were identified within the project area. The soil observed did not indicate any subsurface deposits or evidence of prehistoric human occupation. Since no significant cultural resources were identified on the property, no further recommendations were warranted for cultural materials. The proposed improvements would be in previously disturbed areas of the site, accidental upset of unidentified resources is unlikely. The project would not result in significant impacts or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology, and traffic are discussed in the respective sections above and were determined to have a less than significant impact. As discussed in Section VIII. Green House Gas and Section XVII. Transportation, potential impacts to air pollution and GHG emissions are being addressed through meeting BAAQMD recommended design elements, with the addition of Greenhouse Gas

Voluntary Best Management Practices, and VMT reduction strategies. The applicant already implements the following greenhouse gas reduction methods at the winery the use of energy-conserving lighting, the use of water efficient fixtures, and site design that is oriented and designed to optimize conditions for natural heating, cooling, and day-lighting of interior spaces, and to maximize winter sun exposure, which includes the existing cave. As a component of the vineyard operation, the applicant indicated that the operators implement BMPs that include use of 70-80 percent cover crop (BMP-31) and chipping and reuse of pruned biomass, rather than burning the material on-site (BMP-32). Section X. Hydrology includes details of the Water Availability Analysis which indicates that water for the winery and residences on the winery property is provided by the Howell Mountain Mutual Water Company. Consequently, the project would not interfere with groundwater recharge or lowering of the local groundwater level. The Traffic Study Report (TSR) ~~Impact Study (TIS) Report~~ detailed in Section XVII, Transportation, concluded that the proposed project would not have significant impacts on the County roadway system. Although the project falls below the County threshold requiring a VMT analysis, the ~~TSR~~ ~~TIS~~ recommended the implementation of a Traffic Demand Management Plan to reduce VMTs associated with the project. Potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

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

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

---