

“C”

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

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

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated January 2019)

SCH Number 2025060897

Revised Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration: per CEQA code section 15073.5 the revised document has not been substantially revised; therefore, the document did not require recirculation. Changes are shown in strikethrough and underline.

1. **Project Title:** Gateway 24 Napa, New Winery Use Permit, P24-00134
2. **Property Owner:** Gateway 24 Napa, LLC, 220 Montgomery Street, Suite 315, San Francisco, CA 94104. Phone: (614) 502-1456 or email: srouda@phelandevco.com
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Wendy Atkins, (707) 259-8757, wendy.atkins@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):** The project is located in the Napa Valley Business Park Specific Plan (NVBPSP) area on a 4.33-acre lot located at the terminus of Gateway Road East bordered by Hwy 29 to the east and Sheehy Creek to the north, within an IP:AC (Industrial Park: Airport Compatibility) zoning district. Assessor's Parcel No. 057-200-039. Gateway Road East, Napa CA 94558
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Shea Rouda, 220 Montgomery Street, Suite 315, San Francisco, CA 94104. Phone: (614) 502-1456 or email: srouda@phelandevco.com
6. **General Plan description:** Industrial
7. **Zoning:** Industrial Park: Airport Compatibility (IP:AC)
8. **Background/Project History:** On January 18, 2012, the Napa County Conservation, Development, and Planning Commission approved Use Permit Application P08-00555 to allow the construction and operation of a three-story multi-tenant, office building totaling 67,930 sq. ft. of gross floor area, with related site improvements including an exception to the NVBPSP design standards for a 15% reduction of required parking spaces. The approval included 244 full-time employees and 203 parking spaces. Access was from an extension of the cul-de-sac of Gateway Road East, which is accessed from Devlin Road. The project would have connected to the City of American Canyon municipal water system. Sewer service was to be provided by the Napa Sanitation District. The project entitlement expired on January 18, 2014.
9. **Description of Project:**

Approval of a Use Permit for a new 250,000 gallon per year winery to allow the following:

 - a. construction of a 54,790 sq. ft one-story concrete tilt-up winery building for production, storage, and office areas;
 - b. installation of a parking area with parking for fifty-five (55) vehicles, including four (4) accessible spaces and three (3) electric vehicle charging stations;
 - c. construction of a new driveway on Gateway Road East;
 - d. hours of operation (6 a.m. to 8 p.m. Monday through Sunday);
 - e. six full-time employees during non-harvest and 15 full-time employees during harvest; and,
 - f. connection to municipal water and sewer services provided by the City of American Canyon and the Napa Sanitation District, respectively.

The request also includes a variation to the development standards of the NVBPSP and IP zoning district to increase building height from

35-feet to 45-feet.

Exterior building materials include concrete tilt-up wall panels with a multi-color paint scheme with heights of approximately 40 to 45 feet. The south facing elevation facing Gateway Road East is approximately 290 feet. The 290-foot wall section includes a formliner access panel in the center of the wall and a clear anodized storefront system at the southwest corner. The east facing elevation is approximately 255 feet and includes a formliner access panel in the center of the wall. The north facing elevation is approximately 135 feet. The west facing elevation is 254 feet and includes two grade loading doors at the northwest corner, seven dock doors, and a clear anodized storefront system at the southwest corner.

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

The site is currently vacant, has been previously graded and is located within the developed industrial park. The site has been designated for industrial development since 1955 and is within the boundaries of the NVBPSP which was adopted in 1986. The site is relatively flat with gentle slopes ranging from 0-5 percent from southeast to northwest and includes non-native grasses. There are existing wineries and office/light industrial/warehousing complexes to the west of the site across Gateway Road East and to the south of the site. North of the site, across Sheehy Creek, is a multi-building self-storage facility. The project site is in close proximity to the Napa County Airport, and is located in Zone D1, the primary traffic pattern zone. This is an area of frequent aircraft overflight at low elevations.

11. **Other agencies whose approval is required**

Discretionary approval required by Napa County consists of a use permit. The proposed project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County including, but not limited to, building permits, grading permits, and encroachment permits for any work within the County right-of-way. Permits to connect to water and sewer utilities are required from the City of American Canyon and Napa Sanitation District, respectively. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is required to meet San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board standards and is administered by the Engineering Division.

The proposed project does not involve modifications to a streambed, and this does not require a streambed alteration agreement from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. The proposed project does not involve the fill of waters of the United States and thus does not require a dredge-and-fill permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The proposed project has the potential to result in "take" of listed endangered or threatened species, or candidate species for listing, and thus may require a "take permit" from the Department of Fish and Wildlife, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or the National Marine Fisheries Service.

Please be advised that a CESA Incidental Take Permit (ITP) must be obtained if the Project has the potential to result in "take" of plants or animals listed or candidate species under CESA either during construction or over the life of the Project. The Project has the potential to impact Swainson's hawk (SWHA; Buteo swainsoni), a CESA listed as threatened species, and burrowing owl (BUOW; Athene cunicularia), a CESA candidate species. Thank you for including mitigation measures for SWHA and BUOW, including protocol surveys and obtaining an ITP if take of SWHA or BUOW cannot be avoided; CDFW recommends an additional mitigation measure for any SWHA foraging habitat impacts below. Issuance of an ITP is subject to CEQA documentation; the CEQA document must specify impacts, mitigation measures, and a mitigation monitoring and reporting program. If the Project will impact CESA listed species, early consultation is encouraged, as significant modification to the Project and mitigation measures may be required in order to obtain an ITP.

CEQA requires a Mandatory Finding of Significance if a project is likely to substantially restrict the range or reduce the population of a threatened or endangered species. (Pub. Resources Code, §§ 21001, subd. (c) & 21083; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15380, 15064, & 15065.). Impacts must be avoided or mitigated to less-than-significant levels unless the CEQA Lead Agency makes and supports Findings of Overriding Consideration (FOC). The CEQA Lead Agency's FOC does not eliminate the Project proponent's obligation to comply with CESA.

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

Federal Aviation Administration (R)
California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Region 3 (R) (T)
California Air Resources Board (R)
Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board,
San Francisco Bay Region 2 (R)
California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (T)
State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Quality (R)(T)
State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water (R)
California Department of Transportation District 4 (Caltrans) (T)
Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire) (T)
City of American Canyon (R)
Napa Sanitation District (R)

Other Agencies Contacted

Middletown Rancheria
Mishewal Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley
Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation
City of Napa

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 April 24, 2025, 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 did not receive a response for consultation or to provide comments during the 30-day period. A response was received from the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation on May 28, 2025, highly recommending including cultural monitors during development and ground disturbance. This request has been included as condition of approval 7.5.

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 the Initial Study include site-specific studies conducted by the applicant and filed by the applicant in conjunction with Applications No. P24-00134 as listed below, and the environmental background information contained in the permanent files on this project. The 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:

- Application Proposal Statement for the Gateway 24 Winery, dated April 14, 2025
- Voluntary Best Management Practices Checklist for Development Projects, dated May 16, 2025
- Site Improvement Plans, dated February 21, 2025
- Civil Plans, dated March 14, 2025
- Application Packet, dated May 24, 2024
- Winery Trip Generation Worksheet, dated August 21, 2024
- City of American Canyon operational conditions as stated in their "will serve" letter dated November 15, 2024. (**Exhibit E**)
- Napa Sanitation District "will serve" letter, dated April 4, 2025 (**Exhibit D**)
- Stormwater Control Plan, dated September 6, 2024 (**Exhibit B**)
- Sewer Feasibility Report, dated March 14, 2025 (**Exhibit C**)
- Napa County Geographic Information System (GIS sensitivity maps/layers)
- 4.3+/- Acre "Gateway Road" Site, Napa County, California: Biological Assessment, dated June 6, 2024 (**Exhibit A**)
- Pacific Gas & Electric Will Serve Document, dated January 4, 2025 (**Exhibit F**)
- Yocha Dehe Cultural Resource Letter May 23, 2025 (**Exhibit G**)
- Federal Aviation Administration Letters, dated February 10, 2025, and March 4, 2025 (**Attachment H**)

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.



Signature

June 18, 2025
Date

Name: Wendy Atkins

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

Discussion:

- a/b. The proposed project would not be located within an area which would damage any known scenic vista, or damage scenic resources, trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings. The proposed project site has been previously graded, contains no native vegetation and is currently vacant. The site is not visible from a scenic highway or any scenic routes.
- c. The proposed project is located within a fairly developed portion of the NVBPSP area that allows a mix of industrial developments. The proposed building is located adjacent to the west border of North/South CA-29 and on the east side of Gateway Road East, at the end of a cul-de-sac. The street facing building elevation includes concrete wall panels with horizontal reveals, formliner access panels, and clear anodized storefront systems. The overall design is equivalent to other similar more recent industrial projects approved and/or constructed within the NVBPSP boundaries and meets the minimum design requirements for the NVBPSP industrial park area. Therefore, the project will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and surrounding area.
- d. The new facility will result in a minor increase in the nighttime lighting. In accordance with County standards, all exterior lighting will be the minimum necessary for operational and security needs. Light fixtures will be kept as low to the ground as possible and include shields to deflect the light downward. Avoidance of highly reflective surfaces will be required, as well as standard County conditions to prevent light from being cast skyward. This is an area routinely overflown by low flying aircraft which necessitates strong controls on skyward nighttime lighting. As designed, and as subject to the standard condition of approval, below, the project will not have a significant impact resulting from new sources of outside lighting.

6.3 LIGHTING – PLAN SUBMITTAL

- a. Two (2) copies of a detailed lighting plan showing the location and specifications for all lighting fixtures to be installed on the property shall be submitted for Planning Division review and approval. All lighting shall comply with the CBC.
- b. All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward, shall be located as low to the ground as possible, shall be the minimum necessary for security, safety, or operations; on timers; and shall incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. All lighting shall be shielded or placed such that it does not shine directly on adjacent properties or impact vehicles on adjacent streets. No 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.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion:

- a/b. The project site is located within a developing industrial park. The project would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide important as shown on the Napa County Important Farmland Map 2004 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The project site is not subject to a Williamson Act Contract.
- c/d. The project site is zoned Industrial Park (IP), which allows winery, warehouse, and office uses upon grant of a use permit, and is located within the Napa Valley Business Park Specific Plan area. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Sensitive Biotic Oak woodlands, Riparian Woodland forest, and Coniferous forest) the project site does not contain woodland or forested areas. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.
- e. The project site is surrounded by developing industrial park land. Although farming activities occurred on these lands in the past, the area has been designated for industrial development for over 70 years. The project will not result in the conversion of existing farmland.

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

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion:

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

The Air District published a new version of the Guidelines dated May 2017, which includes revisions made to address the Supreme Court's 2015 opinion in Cal. Bldg. Indus. Ass'n vs. Bay Area Air Quality Mgmt. Dist., 62 Ca 4th 369.

On April 20, 2022, the Bay Area Air District adopted updated thresholds of significance for climate impacts: CEQA Thresholds for Evaluating the Significance of Climate Impacts, Bay Area Air District April 2022. The proposed thresholds to evaluate GHG and climate impacts from land use projects are qualitative, therefore there is no bright-line (quantitative) level to mitigate below. Projects that decline to integrate qualitative design elements can alternatively demonstrate consistency with a local Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Strategy that meets the criteria of the State CEQA Guidelines section 15183.5(b).

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.

In short, these thresholds of significance changes can be used by agencies as guidelines for determining climate impacts from projects subject to CEQA. However, agencies are not required to abide by these thresholds, as they are only guidelines. Refer to Section VIII, Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

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

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

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

Bay Area Air District 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. Bay Area Air District 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 Bay Area Air District 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 Bay Area Air District 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 Bay Area Air District through May 2017. Given the size of the entire project, which is approximately 54,790 sq. ft of enclosed floor area (winery building and winery office) compared to the Bay Area Air District's screening criterion of 121,000 sq. ft (General light industry) for NOX (oxides of nitrogen), the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. The project falls well below the screening criteria as noted above, and consequently will not significantly affect air quality individually or contribute considerably to any cumulative air quality impacts.

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

7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENT

c. AIR QUALITY

During all construction activities the permittee shall comply with the most current version of BAAD 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 BAAD'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 tracked 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 State Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications.
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 BAAD's jurisdiction shall have either a California Air Resources Board (ARB) registration Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) or a BAAD 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/perfaq_04-16-15.pdf or the PERP website <http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/portable.htm>.

Furthermore, while earthmoving and construction on the site will 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 IMPROVEMENT

b. DUST CONTROL

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

While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The site is part of the Gateway Business Park Subdivision approved for industrial development in 1989. Improvements adjoining the site such as curb, gutter, sidewalk, sewer and water laterals, streetlights, etc. were installed in the mid-1990s as part of the approved subdivision improvements. As part of the application, a study entitled "4.3+/- Acre "Gateway Road" Site, Napa County, California: Biological Assessment Biological Assessment" (Assessment) was prepared on June 6, 2024, by Moore Biological Consultants. The Assessment found that the site provides low quality potential foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk.

The following language is quoted from the CDFW Memorandum Staff Report regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson's Hawks (*Buteo swainsoni*) in the Central Valley of California, dated November 8, 1994, "Since small disjunct parcels of habitat seldom provide foraging habitat needed to sustain the reproductive effort of a Swainson's hawk pair, [CDFW] Staff does not recommend requiring mitigation pursuant to CEQA nor a Management Authorization by the Department for infill (within an already urbanized area) projects in areas which have less than 5 acres of foraging habitat and are surrounded by existing urban development, unless the project area is within ¼ mile of an active nest tree." Because the Project site is considered by the General Plan to be within an urbanized, is less than 5 acres and is not located within a ¼ mile of an active tree nest, mitigation measures for foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk are not required.

Large trees in and near the site and in the general project vicinity are potentially suitable for nesting Swainson's hawks, which are known to nest in the area. Although considered unlikely, Swainson's hawk may nest on the site, in large trees along Sheehy creek. **Mitigation Measure BIO-1** would reduce impacts to Swainson's hawk to less than significant.

In addition, the Assessment found that Sheehy Creek provides low quality potential habitat for western pond turtle. Although considered unlikely, western pond turtles from Sheehy Creek may travel across the site on occasion and could potentially nest in grasslands in or near the site. **Mitigation Measure BIO-2** would reduce impacts to western pond turtle to less than significant. The trees and grasslands in the site could be used by birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) or Fish and Game Code of California (FGCC). **Mitigation Measure BIO-3** would reduce impacts to birds protected by the MBTA and FGCC to less than significant. According to the Assessment, no California ground squirrel burrows were observed in the site to provide habitat for Burrowing Owl (BUOW). The suitability of the site for BOUWs is also reduced by the weediness of the grassland and routine disking.

However, in the event BUOW were to occur on the site, **Mitigation Measure BIO-4** would reduce impacts to BUOW to less than significant.

- b. The site is vacant and has been graded over the years for weed abatement and contains four live oak trees (located on the north portion of the site adjacent to Sheehy Creek), bushes, and ruderal grasses. There is existing development adjoining the property to the north (across Sheehy Creek), south, and west. Industrial development has been progressing in the general vicinity since the late 1980s.

According to the Assessment, the site is comprised of ruderal grassland; grassland habitat in the site is best described as highly disturbed. As such, there would be no loss of riparian habitat or other sensitive habitat.

- c. According to the Assessment, Sheehy Creek is a potential Water of the U.S. and Water of the State. The proposed project will fully avoid Sheehy Creek; development will be restricted to upland grasslands south of the Sheehy Creek corridor Habitat Conservation and Open Space Access easement. Beyond Sheehy Creek, there are no potentially jurisdictional Waters of the U.S. or wetlands in the site. There are also no other areas in the site meeting the criteria of Waters of the State, including wetlands. Sheehy Creek provided low quality potential habitat for western pond turtle. Although considered unlikely, western pond turtles from Sheehy Creek may travel across the site on occasion and could potentially nest in grasslands in or near the site. **Mitigation Measure BIO-3** would reduce impacts to western pond turtle to less than significant.
- d. Well-developed riparian corridors are often utilized for movement by wildlife species such as deer, coyote, red fox (*Vulpes vulpes*), and bobcat (*Felis rufus*), as well as a variety of amphibians, reptiles, and fish. Although Sheehy Creek primarily contains planted species, this creek corridor may be utilized by a handful of common species for movement. The Sheehy Creek corridor is not within the footprint of development and will not be impacted by project activities. Therefore, no impact would occur.
- e. Because no trees are proposed to be removed, the project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.
- f. The project will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation Measure BIO-1 - Swainson Hawk: If, prior to Project construction activities, nesting SWHA are detected within 0.25 miles of the Project site, impacts to SWHA foraging habitat shall be quantified by a qualified biologist based on the final Project design plans, and the Project shall obtain written acceptance of the acreage of foraging habitat impacts from CDFW. Prior to Project construction, the Project shall provide SWHA foraging habitat mitigation at a minimum 1:1 ratio, which shall include: 1) permanent preservation of the species' foraging habitat through a conservation easement and implementing and funding a long-term management plan in perpetuity, or 2) purchase of SWHA foraging habitat credits at a CDFW-approved mitigation bank, unless otherwise approved in writing by CDFW.

If Project activities are scheduled during the nesting season for Swainson's hawk (March 1 to September 15), prior to beginning work on the Project, a qualified biologist shall conduct surveys according to the Recommended Timing and Methodology for Swainson's Hawk Nesting Surveys in California's Central Valley (<https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=83990&inline>) and prepare a report documenting the survey results. The Project shall obtain CDFW's written approval of the qualified biologist and survey report prior to starting construction activities between March 1 and September 15. Survey methods shall be closely followed by starting early in the nesting season (late March to early April) to maximize the likelihood of detecting an active nest (nests, adults, and chicks are more difficult to detect later in the growing season because trees become less transparent as vegetation increases). Surveys shall be conducted: 1) within a minimum 0.5-mile radius of the Project site or a larger area if needed to identify potentially impacted active nests, unless otherwise approved by CDFW in writing, and 2) for at least the two survey periods immediately prior to initiating Project-related construction activities. Surveys shall occur annually for the duration of the Project. The qualified biologist shall have a minimum of two years of experience implementing the survey methodology resulting in detections. If active Swainson's hawk nests are detected, the Project shall immediately notify CDFW and implement a 0.5-mile construction avoidance buffer around the nest until the nest is no longer active as determined by a qualified biologist, unless otherwise approved by CDFW in writing. Any detected nesting Swainson's hawk shall be monitored by the qualified biologist to ensure it is not disturbed during construction activities, unless otherwise approved in writing by CDFW. If take of Swainson's hawk cannot be avoided, the Project shall consult with CDFW pursuant to CESA and obtain an ITP before Project activities may commence.

Method of Monitoring: The permittee shall have a Swainson's hawk nesting survey completed prior to any construction activities scheduled to occur on the site from March 1 through September 30. The survey shall also be conducted in accordance with the Recommended Timing and Methodology for Swainson's Hawk Nesting Surveys in California's Central Valley (<https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=83990&inline>). The survey results shall be provided to CDFW and the Napa County Planning, Building & Environmental Services. In the event If active Swainson's hawk nests are detected, the Project shall immediately notify CDFW and implement a 0.5-mile construction avoidance buffer around the nest until the nest is no longer active as determined by a qualified biologist, unless otherwise approved by CDFW in writing. Any detected nesting Swainson's hawk shall be monitored by the qualified biologist to ensure it

is not disturbed during construction activities, unless otherwise approved in writing by CDFW.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2 - Western Pond Turtle: No more than two weeks prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities, a Qualified Biologist shall perform surveys for western pond turtles and other aquatic species within aquatic and upland habitat at the Project, unless otherwise approved in writing by CDFW. Surveys will encompass individual turtles and nest sites. An additional survey shall occur no more than 48 hours prior to Project activities. If a pond turtle or nest site is detected at any time, CDFW shall be notified immediately. Survey results shall be submitted to CDFW prior to construction activities. All western pond turtles observed on-site shall be avoided and allowed to leave the Project activity area of their own volition or may be relocated with prior written approval from CDFW. Any turtle nest sites shall be avoided with an appropriate buffer identified by a Qualified Biologist and accepted in writing by CDFW.

Method of Monitoring: The permittee shall have a survey for western pond turtles within aquatic and upland habitat at the Project, unless otherwise approved in writing by CDFW completed no more than two weeks prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities. An additional survey shall occur no more than 48 hours prior to Project activities. The survey results shall be provided to the Napa County Planning, Building & Environmental Services.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3 - Nesting Bird Avoidance: If Project construction activities, including but not limited to vegetation clearing, occur during the nesting season for birds protected under the California Fish and Game Code and Migratory Bird Treaty Act (approximately February 15-August 31) the Project shall retain a qualified biologist to perform preconstruction surveys for nesting birds, including but not limited to nesting raptors, on the Project site and in the immediate vicinity including a minimum 500 foot radius around the Project site. The survey shall be conducted no more than seven (7) days prior to the initiation of construction activities, including but not limited to vegetation clearing. If there is a lapse of seven (7) days or more in construction activities, another nesting bird survey shall be conducted. In the event that nesting birds are found on the Project site or within 500 feet of the Project site, the Project shall: Locate and map the location of the nest site and immediately notify CDFW if nesting special-status birds or evidence of their presence is found; Establish a clearly marked no-disturbance buffer around the nest site. Buffer distances for bird nests shall be site specific and an appropriate distance, as determined by a qualified biologist, unless otherwise approved in writing by CDFW. The buffer distances shall be specified to protect the bird's normal behavior thereby preventing nesting failure or abandonment. The buffer distance recommendation shall be developed after field investigations that evaluate the bird(s) apparent distress in the presence of people or equipment at various distances. Abnormal nesting behaviors which may cause reproductive harm include, but are not limited to, defensive flights/vocalizations directed towards project personnel, standing up from a brooding position, and flying away from the nest. The qualified biologist shall have authority to order the cessation of all nearby project activities if the nesting birds exhibit abnormal behavior which may cause reproductive failure (nest abandonment and loss of eggs and/or young) until an appropriate buffer is established.

Within five working days of the nesting bird surveys prepare a survey report and submit it to CDFW; and monitor any active nest daily and ensure that the no disturbance buffer is maintained, unless otherwise approved in writing by CDFW.

Method of Monitoring: The permittee shall have a preconstruction nesting bird survey completed prior to any construction activities scheduled to occur on the site from February 15 through August 31. The survey shall be conducted no more than seven (7) days prior to the initiation of construction activities, including but not limited to vegetation clearing. If there is a lapse of seven (7) days or more in construction activities, another nesting bird survey shall be conducted. In the event that nesting birds are found on the Project site or within 500 feet of the Project site, the Project shall: Locate and map the location of the nest site and immediately notify CDFW if nesting special-status birds or evidence of their presence is found. Establish a clearly marked no-disturbance buffer around the nest site. The survey results shall be provided to CDFW and the Napa County Planning, Building & Environmental Services.

Following the "clear and grub" of the project site, and prior to the commencement of project-related trenching or grading, an Archaeologist who meets the Secretary or the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology conduct an updated survey. This shall be followed by Worker Environmental Awareness Program WEAP training for archaeological resources to be given to all construction personnel directly involved with project-related ground disturbance. The training shall include visual aids, a discussion of applicable laws and statutes relating to archaeological resources, types of resources that may found within the project site, and procedures to be followed in the event such resources are encountered.

Mitigation Measure BIO-4: A qualified biologist shall conduct a habitat assessment and surveys for wintering burrowing owls prior to construction if construction starts during the burrowing wintering season (September 1 to January 31) Surveys shall be conducted if warranted based on the habitat assessment. The habitat assessment and surveys shall follow the Department of Fish and Game Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (2012) methodology (<https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Survey-Protocols#377281284-birds>) and the qualified biologist shall prepare a report documenting the survey results. The habitat assessment and surveys shall encompass the Project site and a sufficient buffer zone to detect owls nearby that may be impacted, which is up to 500 meters (1,640 feet) around the Project site pursuant to the above methodology. Habitat assessments and surveys shall occur each year of Project construction, as conditions may change annually and suitable refugia for burrowing owl, such as small mammal burrows, can be created within a few hours or days, unless otherwise approved in writing by CDFW.

Surveys for non-breeding burrowing owls shall be spread over four visits during the nonbreeding season (i.e., wintering), September 1 to January 31. Time lapses between surveys or Project activities shall trigger subsequent surveys including, but not limited to, a final survey within 24 hours

prior to ground disturbance. The qualified biologist shall have a minimum of two years of experience implementing the above methodology resulting in burrowing owl detections. The Project shall immediately notify CDFW if burrowing owl is detected and implement a construction avoidance buffer around any detected burrowing owl pursuant to the buffer distances outlined in the Department of Fish and Game Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (2012), which may be up to 500 meters (1,640 feet). Any detected owl shall be monitored by the qualified biologist to ensure it is not disturbed during construction activities, unless otherwise approved in writing by CDFW.

If take of burrowing owl (BUOW) cannot be avoided, the Project shall consult with CDFW pursuant to CESA and obtain an ITP before Project activities commence. Take is likely to occur and the Project shall obtain an ITP if: 1) BUOW surveys of the Project site detect BUOW occupancy of burrows or burrow surrogates, or 2) there is sign of BUOW occupancy on the Project site within the past three years and habitat has not had any substantial change that would make it no longer suitable within the past three years. Occupancy means a site that is assumed occupied if at least one BUOW has been observed occupying a burrow or burrow surrogate within the last three years. Occupancy of suitable BUOW habitat may also be indicated by BUOW sign including its molted feathers, cast pellets, prey remains, eggshell fragments, or excrement at or near a burrow entrance or perch site. If BUOW, or their burrows or burrow surrogates, are detected within 500 meters (1,640 feet) of the Project site during BUOW surveys, but not on the Project site, the Project shall consult with CDFW to determine if avoidance is feasible, or an ITP is warranted and shall obtain an ITP if deemed necessary by CDFW.

Method of Monitoring: The permittee shall have a wintering burrowing owl survey completed prior to any construction activities scheduled to occur on the site from September 1 through January 31. The survey results shall be provided to the Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services. In the event any burrowing owls are found to occur on-site construction activities will be scheduled to avoid nesting and breeding periods and consultation will be sought with CDFW to develop appropriate measures to reduce potential impacts to burrowing owls which may include preservation of potential foraging habitat.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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. The project site is vacant and does not contain any structures. A Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment Gateway Road Project Napa County, California, dated February 21, 2025, was prepared by FirstCarbon Solutions (FCS). The study indicated that based on the results of the records searches, archival research, the positive results from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File search for Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs), Tribal correspondence, and the pedestrian survey, FCS considers the potential for the proposed project to have an adverse effect on historic or pre-contact cultural resources to be moderate. The results from the NAHC Sacred Lands File search were positive for the presence of TCRs in the project area. Buried site potential indicates that the entirety of the project site rests entirely upon Pliocene era deposits, which suggests a low potential for archaeological deposits. However, the project site has never been surveyed, and its proximity to Sheehy Creek increases the probability that cultural resources may be encountered during project construction. **Mitigation Measure CUL-1** would reduce impacts to historical and archaeological resources to less than significant. In the event resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval:

7.2 Archeological Finding.

“In the event that archeological artifacts or human remains are discovered during any subsequent construction in the project area, work shall cease in a 50-foot radius surrounding the area of discovery. The permittee shall contact the Planning, Building, and Environmental Services 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 the development, all work in the vicinity must be, by law, 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 nearest tribal relatives as determined by the State Native American Heritage Commission would be contacted to obtain recommendations for treating or removal of such remains, including grave goods, with appropriate dignity, as required under Public Resources Code Section 5097.98."

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

Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation Measure CUL-1 - Prior to ground disturbance activities on site, the project sponsor shall provide a cultural resources and tribal cultural resources sensitivity and awareness training program (Worker Environmental Awareness Program [WEA]) for all personnel involved in project construction, including field consultants and construction workers. The WEAP will be developed in coordination with an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Archeology and the site protection manager for the Yoche Dehe Wintun Nation tribe. The WEAP will include relevant information regarding sensitive cultural resources and tribal cultural resources, including applicable regulations protocols for avoidance, and consequences of violating State laws and regulations. The WEAP shall also describe appropriate avoidance and impact minimization measures for cultural resources and tribal cultural resources that could be located at the project site and will outline what to do and who to contact if any potential cultural resources or tribal cultural resources are encountered. Furthermore, the project sponsor shall sign the Cultural Sensitivity Training Agreement submitted by the Yoche Dehe Wintun Nation and deliver copies to the Napa County Planning, Building, & Environmental Services Department for the administrative file.

Method of Monitoring: The project sponsor/permittee shall coordinate with the Yoche Dehe Wintun Nation to ensure that the WEAP is completed prior to any construction activities, including signing the Cultural Sensitivity Training Agreement. Verification that the WEAP has been conducted shall be provided to the Napa County Planning, Building & Environmental Services Department. In the event any previously undiscovered resources are found during grading of the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with condition of approval 7.2 Archeological Finding.

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:

Consistent with Public Resources Code Section 21100(b)(3), this impact analysis evaluates the potential for the proposed project to result in a substantial increase in energy demand and wasteful use of energy during project construction, operation and maintenance. The impact analysis is informed by Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. The potential impacts are analyzed based on an evaluation of whether construction and operation energy use estimates for the proposed project would be considered excessive, wasteful, or inefficient.

- a. During construction of the proposed project, the use of construction equipment, truck trips for hauling materials, and construction workers' commutes to and from the project site would consume fuel. Project construction is anticipated to occur over eight months. Construction activities and corresponding fuel energy consumption would be temporary and localized. In addition, there are no unusual project characteristics that would cause the use of construction equipment or haul vehicles that would be less energy efficient compared with other similar construction sites within Napa County.

Once construction is complete, equipment and energy use would be slightly higher than existing levels and the proposed project would

not include any unusual maintenance activities that would cause a significant difference in energy efficiency compared to the surrounding developed land uses. Thus, the proposed project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary energy use. This impact would be less than significant.

- b. The transportation sector is a major end-user of energy in California, accounting for approximately 39 percent of total statewide energy consumption in 2014 (U.S. Energy Information Administration 2016). In addition, energy is consumed in connection with construction and maintenance of transportation infrastructure, such as streets, highways, freeways, rail lines, and airport runways. California's 30 million vehicles consume more than 16 billion gallons of gasoline and more than 3 billion gallons of diesel each year, making California the second largest consumer of gasoline in the world (CEC 2016). In Napa County, farm equipment (not including irrigation pumps) accounted for approximately 60% of agricultural emissions in Napa County in 2014, with the percentage anticipated to increase through 2050 (Napa County 2018 - <https://www.countyofnapa.org/DocumentCenter/View/9247/Revised-Draft-Climate-Action-Plan>).

With respect to transportation energy, existing energy standards are promulgated through the regulation of fuel refineries and products such as the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS), which mandates a 10% reduction in the non-biogenic carbon content of vehicle fuels by 2020. Additionally, there are other regulatory programs with emissions and fuel efficiency standards established by USEPA and the California ARB such as Pavley II/LEV III from California's Advanced Clean Cars Program and the Heavy-Duty (Tractor-Trailer) GHG Regulation. Further, construction sites will need to comply with State requirements designed to minimize idling and associated emissions, which also minimizes use of fuel. Specifically, idling of commercial vehicles and off-road equipment would be limited to five minutes in accordance with the Commercial Motor Vehicle Idling Regulation and the Off-Road Regulation 13. The proposed project would comply with these State requirements; see the Air Quality conditions of approval. Napa County has not implemented an energy action plan. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency or impede progress towards achieving goals and targets, and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

- | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a.
- i.) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed facility would result in a less than significant impact with regards to the rupturing of a known fault.
 - ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the facility will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible.
 - iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code for seismic stability would reduce any impacts to a less than significant level.
 - iv.) The Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) did not indicate the presence of landslides on the property.
- b. Based upon the Soil Survey of Napa County, prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the southern portion of the site is composed of soils in the Haire Loam (2-9 percent slopes) series which are characterized by slow or very slow runoff with little or no hazard of erosion. This nearly level soil type is found mainly on old alluvial fans and basins. Runoff is slow with a slight hazard of erosion. Project approval will require incorporation of best-management practices and will be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable, to ensure that development does not impact adjoining properties, drainages, and roadways.
- c/d. According to preliminary geologic mapping of the St. Helena Quadrangle, performed by the California Geologic Survey (CGS-2004), the property is underlain by Late Pleistocene-Holocene fan deposits. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Liquefaction layer) the project site has low susceptibility for Liquefaction. Development will be required to comply with the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible.
- e. The project will connect to municipal water service provided by the City of American Canyon and sewer service by Napa Sanitation District. "Will serve" letters have been submitted by the affected jurisdictions indicating that they have sufficient capacity to accommodate the water and wastewater demand of this project.
- f. No paleontological resources or unique geological features have been identified on the property or were encountered when streets and infrastructure were constructed. However, if resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the standard condition of approval 7.2 identified in **Section V** above.

Mitigation Measures: None 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).² 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

² <https://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/california-environmental-quality-act-ceqa/updated-ceqa-guidelines>, April 2022

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 Winery Trip Generation Worksheet, dated August 21, 2024, concluded that the Project would generate a maximum of 72 net new daily vehicle and truck trips, which would have a less-than significant impact for VMT.

- 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 the atmospheric gases whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for the greenhouse effect, including carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane, ozone, and the fluorocarbons, which contribute to climate change. CO₂ 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). These emissions also include underground carbon stocks (or Soil carbon) associated with any existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed. As previously stated, this project includes the construction of a concrete tilt-up building with approximately 54,790 sq. ft. of floor area with approximately 49,790 sq. ft. of floor area for speculative wine production and warehouse/storage space, and approximately 5,000 sq. ft. of office area.

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 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 BAAD 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 will be required, through conditions of project approval, to prohibit the use of natural gas appliances or plumbing. Additionally, at the time of 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 plumbing. The 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.

The project will be required to comply with the recently adopted version of CALGreen Tier 2. Project approval will include a condition of approval to ensure this is reviewed and implemented at the time of construction through adherence to the California Building Code.

As discussed above and in section XVII. Transportation, the County maintains TIS Guidelines that include VMT analysis requirements for projects based on trip generation. The project trip generation numbers did not require completion of a traffic study and VMT analysis. See section XVII. Transportation for additional detail.

The applicant proposes installing energy conserving lighting, providing bicycle incentives, connecting to recycled water, installing water efficient fixtures, implementing low-impact development, installing a water efficient landscape, installation of electrical vehicle charging stations, the site is accessible to public transit, limiting the amount of grading and tree removal and use recycled materials. A condition of approval will be included to require implementation of the checked Voluntary Best Management Practices Measures submitted with the project application. If the proposed project adheres to these relevant design standards identified by BAAD, the requirements of the California Building Code, and the County's conditions of project approval, impacts 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 will not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts normally used in winery operations. A Business Plan will be filed with the Environmental Health Division should the amount of hazardous materials reach reportable levels. However, in the event that the proposed use or a future use involves the use, storage or transportation of greater than 55 gallons or 500 pounds of hazardous materials, a use permit and subsequent environmental assessment would be required in accordance with the Napa County Zoning Ordinance prior to the establishment of the use. During construction of the project some hazardous materials, such as building coatings/ adhesives/ etc., will be utilized. However, given the quantities of hazardous materials and the limited duration, they will result in a less-than- significant impact.
- b. Hazardous materials such as diesel, maintenance fluids, and paints would be used onsite during construction. Should they be stored onsite, these materials would be stored in secure locations to reduce the potential for upset or accident conditions. The proposed project consists of the operations of a new winery that would not be expected to use any substantial quantities of hazardous materials. Therefore, it would not be reasonably foreseeable for the proposed project to create upset or accident conditions that involve the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site.
- 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. The project site is located within two miles of the Napa County Airport and is therefore subject to the requirements of the County's Airport Compatibility Zone districts and the requirements of the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). The project site is located with Zone D1 of the ALUCP which is an area of inner traffic pattern, low noise impact, and low risk. The proposed use of the building is normally compatible with the risk and noise impacts associated with properties within Zone D1. County development regulations have been certified as meeting ALUCP compatibility requirements, and consequently the project is not subject to separate ALUC review because the project is not considered a Major Land Use Action as defined in the ALUCP. As noted above, the request includes increasing the height from 35-feet to a maximum of 45-feet. The Federal Aviation Administration has provided a Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation, dated March 4, 2025, indicating that the requested building height does not exceed obstruction standards and would not be a hazard to air navigation providing certain conditions are met. Further, the FAA has also determined that the use of a crane during construction activities would not be a hazard to air navigation, letter dated February 10, 2025. Both letters will be included as project conditions of approval.
- f. The proposed driveway that serves the project will be improved to comply with County standards and access around the building has been designed to accommodate fire apparatus and large trucks. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Engineering Division and found acceptable as conditioned. Therefore, the design of the project will not negatively impact or hinder emergency vehicle access.
- g. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires because the project is located within an urbanized area.

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 ECPAs) to complete necessary water analyses in order to document that sufficient water supplies are available for the proposed project and to implement water saving measures to prepare for periods of limited water supply and to conserve limited groundwater resources.

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 guidance³ 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.

To assess the potential impacts of groundwater pumping on hydrologically connected navigable waterways and those non-navigable tributaries connected to navigable waters, the County's WAA guidance requires applicants to perform a Tier 3 or equivalent analysis for new or replacement

³ The County's Water Availability Guidelines (adopted May 2015)

wells, or discretionary projects that would rely on groundwater from existing or proposed wells that are located within 1,500 feet of designated "Significant Streams."⁴

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 complying with the Public Trust.

As noted above, the City of American Canyon will provide water for the project and has issued a will-serve letter indicating that they have adequate supply to accommodate the project's water demand. The will-serve letter concludes that according to the 2015 Urban Water Management Plans, adequate long-term supplies exist for all planning horizons and supply scenarios, except for the "2030 single-dry scenario". The Project will offset its new demand by paying an ZWF Mitigation fee that will be used by the City of American Canyon to further its water conservation efforts to reduce potable water demands throughout its Water Service Area. These efforts will have no significant impacts to the physical environment. Moreover, it is unlikely that additional long-term supplies will need to be developed to meet the new demands attributable to the Project and it would be unnecessarily speculative to analyze the potential impact of such an unlikely activity. Lastly, the City of American Canyon City Council adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration in November 2003 in conjunction with the adoption of the Recycled Water Facilities Plan. That plan identifies a series of projects which in conjunction with the water conservation program will reduce potable water demands throughout its Water Service Area. Impacts caused by the implementation of the Recycled Water Facilities Plan are less than significant because the new recycled water distribution pipelines were to be located in existing paved public rights of way.

- a. The proposed project will not violate any known water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project will discharge into an approved storm drainage system designed to accommodate the drainage from this site. The applicant is required to obtain a stormwater permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) which is administered in part by the County Engineering Division on behalf of the RWQCB. Given the essentially level terrain, and the County's Best Management Practices, which comply with RWQCB requirements, the project does not have the potential to significantly impact water quality and discharge standards.
- b. The project will connect to municipal water provided by the City of American Canyon. No groundwater wells are associated with this property.
- c. The proposed project will not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off site. The project will incorporate erosion control measures appropriate to its maximum slope to manage onsite surface drainage and erosion of onsite soils during construction and winter months (October to April). As noted above, the project is required to comply with County Engineering Division requirements which are consistent with RWQCB standards. These established Best Management Practices have been successfully implemented on numerous previous projects within NVBPSP area. By incorporating erosion control measures, this project would have a less than significant impact. No substantial alteration of existing drainage is anticipated to occur. There will be an increase in overall impervious surface resulting from the new buildings, pavement, and sidewalks. However, given the size of the drainage basin, the increase in impervious surfaces will not discernibly change the amount of groundwater filtration or discernibly increase surface runoff from that which currently exists on site. Project impacts related to drainage patterns and off-site flows are expected to be less than significant.
- d. The parcel is located within the Zone X flood boundary (500 year), considered an area of minimal flood hazard. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. No impacts would occur.
- e. The proposed project would not conflict with a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. No impacts would occur.

⁴ Refer to Figure 1: Significant Streams for Tier 3, located at 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.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a./b. The proposed project would not occur within an established community, nor would it result in the division of an established community. The proposed project complies with the Napa County General Plan, the Napa County Zoning Ordinance, and related applicable County Code sections, the NVBPSP, and all other applicable regulations.

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:

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

- 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.

Any outdoor equipment would be subject to the following standard conditions requiring that any exterior winery equipment be enclosed or muffled and maintained so as not to create a noise disturbance.

The anticipated level of noise to occur following the completion of construction including operation of the facility would be typical of a winery or light industrial/manufacturing/warehouse/distribution use in an existing industrial park. The project is located within an industrial park and is not in an area where noise increases resulting from additional industrial development will impact sensitive receptor. The design of the proposed project, together with adherence to the County Noise Ordinance, would ensure the proposed project would not result in adverse noise impacts.

- c. The proposed project site is located within compatibility Zone D1 of the Napa County Airport, the primary traffic pattern zone. This is an area of frequent aircraft overflight at low elevations. As such, persons on the project site will be exposed to noise from regular aircraft overflight. The Napa County Zoning Code, section 8.16.070 Exterior noise limits, lists the maximum allowable level for Industrial areas as 75 dbA. Based on the County General Plan Community Character Element, figure CC-1: Napa County Airport Projected Noise Levels (dBA CNEL), the project site is located outside of the airport area projected to have levels of 55 dbA or less, which is less than the maximum allowed in the Industrial area. Therefore, the location of the project within the airport land use area will have a less than significant impact on people working in the project area. The nature of the uses allowed in the Industrial Park (IP) zoning is not sensitive to increased noise levels from aircraft, and is considered compatible with aircraft operations.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The project site is currently vacant and located in a developing industrial area. The project will increase the number of jobs within the industrial park. However, given the size of the project, the new jobs are considered to be relatively small compared to the overall business park and nearby communities; therefore, this increase in jobs will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable increase in the demand for housing units within Napa county and the general vicinity. Furthermore, the County has adopted a Housing Element which identifies locations for new affordable housing, and adopted a development impact fee, included as a standard condition of approval, as follows:
- "Prior to County issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall pay the Napa County Affordable Housing Mitigation Fee in accordance with the requirements of County Code Chapter 18.107 or as may be amended by the Board of Supervisors."*
- The fee provides funds for constructing affordable housing to off-set the cumulative existing affordable housing shortage in the County. The fee is paid at the time building permits are issued. This fee is charged to all new non-residential developments based on the gross floor area of non-residential space multiplied by the applicable fee by type of use as required under Chapter 18.107, of the Napa County Code and is considered to reduce housing impacts to a less than significant level.
- b. There are no existing homes on, or adjacent to, the project site. The project will not result in the displacement of any housing units or people.

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. The proposed project will have a less than significant impact on public services. Fire protection measures are required as part of the development and there would be no expected impact to response time as the property has good public road access. School impact mitigation fees will be levied with the building permit application. These fees assist local school districts with capacity building measures, and by law are considered full mitigation for any impacts. The project will have little impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from building permit fees, and property tax increases will help meet the costs of providing public services to the property.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a./b. This application proposes a new winery building and on-site employment. No portion of this project, nor any foreseeable result thereof, would significantly increase the use of existing recreational facilities. This project does not include recreational facilities that would have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

a./c./d. As proposed the project would not conflict with any plans, ordinances or policies addressing the circulation system. Existing pedestrian and transit facilities serving the site consist of existing sidewalks on the adjoining parcels and a bus stop located approximately 1,300 feet from the project site. Driveway access to the public right-of-way shall conform to the latest edition of the Napa County Road and Street Standards. The project shall construct improvements along Gateway Road East fronting the property, such as but not limited to curbs and gutters, ADA ramps, utility call outs, traffic control devices such as signing and striping, consistent with the NVBPSP design standards for minor streets. Improvement plans shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer, in compliance with the NVBPSP and the Napa County Road and Street Standards, for approval by the Department of Public Works. If needed, additional right-of-way shall be dedicated to the public as necessary to encompass the improvements. Improvement plans and right-of-way dedication, if needed, shall be completed prior to issuance of any permits. Landscaping adjacent to the project driveway shall be designed and maintained to not interfere with sight lines required for safe stopping distance on the public right-of-way. No items that are wider than 18 inches can be taller than 30 inches other than street trees and traffic control devices. Street trees should be deciduous and have branches lower than 6 feet in height removed once the tree is established.

All new connections to a public right-of-way shall require an encroachment permit. An encroachment permit, with the associated fee deposit, will be required during the building permit phase.

As mandated by Napa County, projects within the Napa Valley Business Park are responsible for paying "fair share" costs for the construction of improvements to impacted roadways within the Napa Valley Business Park. Since 1990, the County has imposed and collected traffic mitigation fees on all development projects with the Napa Valley Business Park. A developer's "fair share" fee goes toward funding roadway improvements within the Napa Valley Business Park area including improvements designed to relieve traffic on State Highways. The traffic mitigation fee is further described in Board of Supervisor's Resolution 2021-132. For this project, a traffic mitigation fee based on PM peak hour vehicle trips will be imposed and collected prior to the issuance of a building permit as determined by the Director of Public Works. In 2022 the Department of Public Works updated the Napa Valley Business Park traffic mitigation fee program. That program specifically addresses, and the associated fees will mitigate cumulative impacts at the 2008 General Plan revision sunset date of 2030. Cumulative traffic impacts at the 2030 horizon will be addressed by that larger document and are therefore not a specific subject of this review.

The applicant/permittee shall submit a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan that will include measures to reduce vehicle trips, prior to issuance of a Building Permit. The measures shall include, but not limited to, subsidized transit passes, carpool incentives, and bicycle trip-end facilities. Implementation and monitoring shall be included in the Final TDM Plan.

The project shall install secure long-term bicycle parking for use by employees. Bicycle parking should be provided per the County of Napa Municipal Code.

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 sq. ft, 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 sq. ft". 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. 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. Based on the County's winery trip generation assumptions, the proposed project would be expected to generate 72 new daily trips on a Friday and Saturdays, including 25 new trips during Friday p.m. peak hour and 30 during the Saturday p.m. peak hour. During harvest the proposed project would be expected to generate 23 new daily trips on a Friday and Saturdays, including eight (8) new trips during the Friday p.m. peak hour and nine (9) during the Saturday p.m. peak hour. The trip generation does not exceed 110 net new daily trips; therefore, the TIS that was prepared did not require the full operation study as the County Winery Trip Generation Worksheet estimated less than 110 net new daily passenger vehicle trips.

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 maximum employee and visitor/guest data for the harvest/crush season, the proposed project would be expected to generate 72 daily trips on a weekday and 72 daily trips on a Saturday, which is below the 110 trip threshold in the Office of Planning and Research guidelines and the County's TIS Guidelines and VMT screening criteria. As required by the Department of Public Works Conditions of Approval, dated October 29, 2024, a Traffic Demand Management (TDM) Plan will be required with the intent of reducing vehicle miles traveled by a minimum of 15%. The Department of Public Works has reviewed the project and approved it as conditioned. The project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b).

The Fire Marshal's office has reviewed the plans, which demonstrate that the project would have adequate emergency access to the proposed project. The Napa County Fire Department and Engineering Division have reviewed the proposed plans for access and circulation and found them to be in compliance with the Napa County Road and Streets Standards. 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 project has been designed with 55 spaces, four (4) of which will be accessible, to meet the requirements of the NVBPSP. 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 April 24, 2025, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. The 30-day response period ended on May 24, 2025, and no responses were received from Yocha Dehe Wintun, Middletown Rancheria, or Mishewal Wappo. A response was received from the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation on May 28, 2025, highly recommending including cultural monitors during development and ground disturbance. This request has been included as condition of approval 7.5.

Mitigation Measures:

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

- e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

☐☐☒☐

Discussion:

- a./b./c. The project would not require the construction of a new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects. The project site is located in an area planned for industrial development and existing water and wastewater treatment facilities have been sized to accommodate the proposed project.

The project will receive water from the City of American Canyon. On October 23, 2007, the City of American Canyon adopted a Zero Water Footprint (ZWF) Policy which defines a ZWF as "no net loss of water service reliability or increase in water rates to the City of American Canyon's existing water service customers due to requested increase demand for water within the City's water service area." The City prepared a Request for Water Service ("Will-Serve" Letter) dated November 15, 2024, incorporated herein by reference, to determine if the requested water service is consistent with City ordinances, policies and practices; whether the City's water supply is sufficient to grant the request; and, establish a water allocation for the property. The Will-Serve Letter indicates the property has a baseline water footprint of zero gallons per day (gpd) because the project site is undeveloped and has no historic water use. The request includes an anticipated water demand of 2,631 gpd average daily demand (ADD) and 7,080 gpd maximum day demand (MDD.) The City has determined that in order to comply with the City's Zero Water Footprint (ZWF) Policy the applicant must offset the new ADD. According to the Will-Serve Letter, the applicant has committed to a financial contribution to the City's Zero Water Footprint Mitigation Fund which is the primary funding source for the City's Water Conservation Program. Payment of the mitigation funds offset the property's increased ADD. In accordance with the WSR, the City has issued a will-serve letter for water service subject the ZWF offset described above and other conditions outlined in the City's letter received November 15, 2024, and incorporated as conditions of project approval.

The project will occur within an urbanized area and connect to a publicly maintained wastewater treatment system. The wastewater provider, Napa Sanitation District (NSD), has provided a Will Serve letter, dated April 4, 2025, and NSD will provide sanitary sewer and recycled water service to this project. NSD also understands that the proposed building will dispose of industrial process wastewater using a hold-and-haul system, which NSD does not object. Alternatively, NSD will provide industrial sewer service to the parcel, if the applicant meets NSD's standards for industrial users. The NSD's wastewater treatment plant complies with all water quality discharge requirements, and therefore the project will comply with regional water quality control standards and therefore has a less than significant impact.

The proposed project includes self-retaining areas, as well as bioretention areas that in combination would serve as both stormwater quality and runoff management measures. Work areas of the proposed winery would be enclosed and process wastewater will be held in an underground storage tank, then plumped and hauled away ("hold and haul" system). Grading for construction of the bioretention basins, and storm drain pipelines would occur concurrently with site grading associated with the winery construction, which would be subject to the dust suppression measures listed in section III, Air Quality, of this initial study. The new drainage system will be designed by a qualified engineer and is subject to review and approval by the Engineering Division. The Engineering Division has included conditions of approval requiring that the drainage system be constructed according to plans prepared by a registered civil engineer, which will be reviewed and approved by the Engineering Division prior to the commencement of any on site land preparation or construction.

The electric power and natural gas provider has provided a letter which states that gas and electric service is available for the proposed project.

- d/e. Non-recyclable and non-organic waste generated on the property is collected by Napa Recycling and Waste Services (NRWS) and ultimately deposited at the Keller Canyon Landfill (located in unincorporated eastern Contra Costa County), which, having reached roughly 15 percent of its capacity in the first 12 years of its approximated 50 years of operation (which began in 1992), and extrapolating that same rate of material to date, has adequate capacity remaining to accommodate any non-recyclable and non-organic waste generated from the proposed winery.

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-d. There are no project features that would substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project site is generally flat with slopes ranging from 0-5% and is located within the business park area near the Napa County Airport, less than one mile from a fire station. There are currently no overhead power lines within the vicinity of the project site, nor will any new overhead power lines be constructed in the area. The proposed driveway improvements would provide adequate access to the site from Gateway Road East. The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None 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 site has been previously disturbed and does not contain any known listed plant or animal species. The project will not 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, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. As discussed in Section IV above, although no special-status species were found during site surveys, mitigation measures are proposed to conduct pre-construction surveys in the event that special-status species utilize the site prior to construction. All potential biological related impacts would be less than significant, with mitigation. As identified in Section V above, no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, sites of unique geological features have been identified within the project site. No historic or prehistoric resources are anticipated to be affected by the proposed project nor will the proposed project eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. In the event archaeological artifacts are found, a standard condition of approval and mitigation measure would be incorporated into the project. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology, and traffic impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The analysis determined that all potential impacts were less than significant and would not contribute significantly to cumulative impacts. The project does not propose new development that would have a significant impact on the environment or substantially change the existing conditions. With the imposition of standard and project specific conditions of approval, the project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- c. There are no schools or hospitals housing sensitive receptors within a quarter-mile of the winery site. Noise from construction that would occur with construction and installation of the proposed site improvements would be temporary, lasting approximately eight months, would be limited to day time hours, and would be subject to best management practices intended to limit fugitive dust and protect stormwater quality. Ongoing operations of the winery are also anticipated to have less than significant noise impacts on nearby residences due to distance between those residences and the proposed tasting room patio and partially enclosed work area.

Mitigation Measures: None are required

Gateway 24 (P24-00134)
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Potential Environmental Impacts	Adopted Mitigation Measure	Monitoring and Reporting Actions and Schedule	Implementation	Monitoring	Reporting & Date of Compliance/ Completion
Mitigation Measure BIO-1 – Swainson Hawk. Minimize impacts to nesting birds and Swainson's Hawk Foraging Habitat Mitigation	<p>If, prior to Project construction activities, nesting SWHA are detected within 0.25 miles of the Project site, impacts to SWHA foraging habitat shall be quantified by a qualified biologist based on the final Project design plans, and the Project shall obtain written acceptance of the acreage of foraging habitat impacts from CDFW. Prior to Project construction, the Project shall provide SWHA foraging habitat mitigation at a minimum 1:1 ratio, which shall include: 1) permanent preservation of the species' foraging habitat through a conservation easement and implementing and funding a long-term management plan in perpetuity, or 2) purchase of SWHA foraging habitat credits at a CDFW-approved mitigation bank, unless otherwise approved in writing by CDFW.</p> <p>If Project activities are scheduled during the nesting season for Swainson's hawk (March 1 to September 15), prior to beginning work on the Project, a qualified biologist shall conduct surveys according to the Recommended Timing and Methodology for Swainson's Hawk Nesting Surveys in California's Central Valley (https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=83990&inline) and prepare a report documenting the survey results. The Project shall obtain CDFW's written approval of the qualified biologist and survey report prior to starting construction activities between March 1 and September 15.</p>	<p>The permittee shall have a Swainson's hawk nesting survey completed prior to any construction activities scheduled to occur on the site from March 1 through September 30. The survey shall also be conducted in accordance with the Recommended Timing and Methodology for Swainson's Hawk Nesting Surveys in California's Central Valley (https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=83990&inline).</p> <p>The survey results shall be provided to CDFW and the Napa County Planning, Building & Environmental Services.</p>			

Gateway 24 (P24-00134)
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measure BIO-1 – Swainson Hawk. Minimize impacts to nesting birds. Continued	Survey methods shall be closely followed by starting early in the nesting season (late March to early April) to maximize the likelihood of detecting an active nest (nests, adults, and chicks are more difficult to detect later in the growing season because trees become less transparent as vegetation increases). Surveys shall be conducted: 1) within a minimum 0.5-mile radius of the Project site or a larger area if needed to identify potentially impacted active nests, unless otherwise approved by CDFW in writing, and 2) for at least the two survey periods immediately prior to initiating Project-related construction activities. Surveys shall occur annually for the duration of the Project. The qualified biologist shall have a minimum of two years of experience implementing the survey methodology resulting in detections. If active Swainson's hawk nests are detected, the Project shall immediately notify CDFW and implement a 0.5-mile construction avoidance buffer around the nest until the nest is no longer active as determined by a qualified biologist, unless otherwise approved by CDFW in writing. Any detected nesting Swainson's hawk shall be monitored by the qualified biologist to ensure it is not disturbed during construction activities, unless otherwise approved in writing by CDFW. If take of Swainson's hawk cannot be avoided, the Project shall consult with CDFW pursuant to CESA and obtain an ITP before Project activities may commence.	In the event If active Swainson's hawk nests are detected, the Project shall immediately notify CDFW and implement a 0.5-mile construction avoidance buffer around the nest until the nest is no longer active as determined by a qualified biologist, unless otherwise approved by CDFW in writing. Any detected nesting Swainson's hawk shall be monitored by the qualified biologist to ensure it is not disturbed during construction activities, unless otherwise approved in writing by CDFW.	P	PD, DFW	PC _/_/_
Mitigation Measure BIO-2 – Western Pond Turtle. Minimize impacts to Western Pond Turtle.	No more than two weeks prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities, a Qualified Biologist shall perform surveys for western pond turtles and other aquatic species within aquatic and upland habitat at the Project, unless otherwise approved in writing by CDFW. Surveys will encompass individual turtles and nest sites. An additional survey shall occur no more than 48 hours prior to Project activities. If a pond turtle or nest site is detected at any time, CDFW shall be notified immediately. Survey results shall be submitted to CDFW prior to construction activities. All western pond turtles observed on-site shall be avoided and allowed to leave the Project activity area of their own volition or may be relocated with prior written approval from CDFW. Any turtle nest sites shall be avoided with an appropriate buffer identified by a Qualified Biologist and accepted in writing by CDFW.	The permitted shall have a survey for western pond turtles within aquatic and upland habitat at the Project, unless otherwise approved in writing by CDFW completed no more than two weeks prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities. An additional survey shall occur no more than 48 hours prior to Project activities. The survey results shall be provided to the Napa County Planning, Building & Environmental Services.	P	PD, DFW	PC _/_/_

Gateway 24 (P24-00134)
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-3 – Nesting Bird Avoidance. Minimize impacts to nesting birds.</p>	<p>If Project construction activities, including but not limited to vegetation clearing, occur during the nesting season for birds protected under the California Fish and Game Code and Migratory Bird Treaty Act (approximately February 15-August 31) the Project shall retain a qualified biologist to perform preconstruction surveys for nesting birds, including but not limited to nesting raptors, on the Project site and in the immediate vicinity including a minimum 500 foot radius around the Project site. The survey shall be conducted no more than seven (7) days prior to the initiation of construction activities, including but not limited to vegetation clearing. If there is a lapse of seven (7) days or more in construction activities, another nesting bird survey shall be conducted. In the event that nesting birds are found on the Project site or within 500 feet of the Project site, the Project shall:</p> <p>Locate and map the location of the nest site and immediately notify CDFW if nesting special-status birds or evidence of their presence is found; Establish a clearly marked no-disturbance buffer around the nest site. Buffer distances for bird nests shall be site specific and an appropriate distance, as determined by a qualified biologist, unless otherwise approved in writing by CDFW. The buffer distances shall be specified to protect the bird's normal behavior thereby preventing nesting failure or abandonment. The buffer distance recommendation shall be developed after field investigations that evaluate the bird(s) apparent distress in the presence of people or equipment at various distances.</p>	<p>The permittee shall have a preconstruction nesting bird survey completed prior to any construction activities scheduled to occur on the site from February 15 through August 31. The survey shall be conducted no more than seven (7) days prior to the initiation of construction activities, including but not limited to vegetation clearing. If there is a lapse of seven (7) days or more in construction activities, another nesting bird survey shall be conducted. In the event that nesting birds are found on the Project site or within 500 feet of the Project site, the Project shall:</p> <p>Locate and map the location of the nest site and immediately notify CDFW if nesting special-status birds or evidence of their presence is found.</p>			
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--

Gateway 24 (P24-00134)
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measure BIO-3 – Nesting Bird Avoidance. Minimize impacts to nesting birds. Continued	Abnormal nesting behaviors which may cause reproductive failure include, but are not limited to, defensive flights/vocalizations directed toward project personnel, standing up from a grooming position, and flying away from the nest. The qualified biologist shall have authority to order the cessation of all nearby project activities if the nesting birds exhibit abnormal behavior which may cause reproductive failure (nest abandonment and loss of eggs and/or young) until an appropriate buffer is established. Within five working days of the nesting bird surveys prepare a survey report and submit it to CDFW; and Monitor any active nest daily and ensure that the no disturbance buffer is maintained, unless otherwise approved in writing by CDFW.	Establish a clearly marked no-disturbance buffer around the nest site. The survey results shall be provided to CDFW and the Napa County Planning, Building & Environmental Services. Following the "clear and grub" of the project site, and prior to the commencement of project-related trenching or grading, an Archaeologist who meets the Secretary or the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology conduct an updated survey. This shall be followed by Worker Environmental Awareness			
Mitigation Measure BIO-3 – Nesting Bird Avoidance. Minimize impacts to nesting birds. Continued		Program WEAP training for archaeological resources to be given to all construction personnel directly involved with project-related ground disturbance. The training shall include visual aids, a discussion of applicable laws and statutes relating to archaeological resources, types of resources that may found within the project site, and procedures to be followed in the event such resources are encountered.	P	PD, DFW	PC _/_/_

Gateway 24 (P24-00134)
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-4 – Burrowing Owl Avoidance. Minimize impacts to burrowing birds.</p>	<p>A qualified biologist shall conduct a habitat assessment and surveys for wintering burrowing owls prior to construction if construction starts during the burrowing wintering season (September 1 to January 31) Surveys shall be conducted if warranted based on the habitat assessment. The habitat assessment and surveys shall follow the Department of Fish and Game Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (2012) methodology (https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Survey-Protocols#377281284-birds) and the qualified biologist shall prepare a report documenting the survey results. The habitat assessment and surveys shall encompass the Project site and a sufficient buffer zone to detect owls nearby that may be impacted, which is up to 500 meters (1,640 feet) around the Project site pursuant to the above methodology. Habitat assessments and surveys shall occur each year of Project construction, as conditions may change annually and suitable refugia for burrowing owl, such as small mammal burrows, can be created within a few hours or days, unless otherwise approved in writing by CDFW.</p>	<p>The permittee shall have a wintering burrowing owl survey completed prior to an construction activities scheduled to occur on the site from September 1 through January 31. The survey results shall be provided to the Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services. In the event any burrowing owls are found to occur on-site construction activities will be scheduled to avoid nesting and breeding periods and consultation will be sought with CDFW to develop appropriate measures to reduce potential impacts to burrowing owls which may include preservation of potential foraging habitat.</p>	<p>P</p>	<p>PD, DFW</p>	<p>PC _/_/_</p>
<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-5 – Burrowing Bird Avoidance. Minimize impacts to burrowing birds. Continued</p>	<p>Surveys for non-breeding burrowing owls shall be spread over four visits during the nonbreeding season (i.e., wintering), September 1 to January 31. Time lapses between surveys or Project activities shall trigger subsequent surveys including, but not limited to, a final survey within 24 hours prior to ground disturbance. The qualified biologist shall have a minimum of two years of experience implementing the above methodology resulting in burrowing owl detections. The Project shall immediately notify CDFW if burrowing owl is detected and implement a construction avoidance buffer around any detected burrowing owl pursuant to the buffer distances outlined in the Department of Fish and Game Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (2012), which may be up to 500 meters (1,640 feet). Any detected owl shall be monitored by the qualified biologist to ensure it is not disturbed during construction activities, unless otherwise approved in writing by CDFW.</p>				

Gateway 24 (P24-00134)
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-5 – Burrowing Owl Avoidance. Minimize impacts to burrowing birds. Continued</p>	<p>If take of burrowing owl (BUOW) cannot be avoided, the Project shall consult with CDFW pursuant to CESA and obtain an ITP before Project activities commence. Take is likely to occur and the Project shall obtain an ITP if: 1) BUOW surveys of the Project site detect BUOW occupancy of burrows or burrow surrogates, or 2) there is sign of BUOW occupancy on the Project site within the past three years and habitat has not had any substantial change that would make it no longer suitable within the past three years. Occupancy means a site that is assumed occupied if at least one BUOW has been observed occupying a burrow or burrow surrogate within the last three years. Occupancy of suitable BUOW habitat may also be indicated by BUOW sign including its molted feathers, cast pellets, prey remains, eggshell fragments, or excrement at or near a burrow entrance or perch site. If BUOW, or their burrows or burrow surrogates, are detected within 500 meters (1,640 feet) of the Project site during BUOW surveys, but not on the Project site, the Project shall consult with CDFW to determine if avoidance is feasible, or an ITP is warranted and shall obtain an ITP if deemed necessary by CDFW.</p>		P	PD, DFW	<p>PC</p> <p>__/__/__</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	---	---------	---------------------------

Gateway 24 (P24-00134)
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measure CUL-1 – Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources Sensitivity and Awareness Training Program. Minimize impacts to historical and archaeological resources	Prior to ground disturbance activities on site, the project sponsor shall provide a cultural resources and tribal cultural resources sensitivity and awareness training program (Worker Environmental Awareness Program [WEA]) for all personnel involved in project construction, including field consultants and construction workers. The WEAP will be developed in coordination with an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Archeology and the site protection manager for the Yoche Dehe Wintun Nation tribe. The WEAP will include relevant information regarding sensitive cultural resources and tribal cultural resources, including applicable regulations protocols for avoidance, and consequences of violating State laws and regulations. The WEAP shall also describe appropriate avoidance and impact minimization measures for cultural resources and tribal cultural resources that could be located at the project site and will outline what to do and who to contact if any potential cultural resources or tribal cultural resources are encountered. Furthermore, the project sponsor shall sign the Cultural Sensitivity Training Agreement submitted by the Yoche Dehe Wintun Nation and deliver copies to the Napa County Planning, Building, and Environmental Services Department for the administrative file.	The project sponsor/permittee shall coordinate with the Yoche Dehe Wintun Nation to ensure that the WEAP is completed prior to any construction activities, including signing the Cultural Sensitivity Training Agreement. Verification that the WEAP has been conducted shall be provided to the Napa County Planning, Building & Environmental Services Department. In the event any previously undiscovered resources are found during grading of the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with condition of approval 7.2 Archeological Finding.	P	PD	PC _/_/_
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	----	-----------------

Notes: P = Permittee, PD = Planning Division, BD = Building Division, E = Engineering Division, DFW = Dept of Fish & Wildlife, CT = CALTRANS, EH = Environmental Health, PW = Public Works Dept

PE/G =Project Engineer/Geologist

PC = Prior to Project Commencement CPI = Construction Period Inspections FI = Final Inspection OG = Ongoing