

“D”

Initial Study/Negative Declaration

William Cole Winery Use Permit Major Modification P19-00101-MOD
and Variance P19-00441-VAR
Planning Commission Hearing Date (May 1, 2024)

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

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

1. **Project Title:** William Cole Winery Major Modification #P19-00101-MOD and Variance #P19-00441-VAR
2. **Property Owner:** William Ballentine Jr. and Jane Sorenson TR.
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Kelli Cahill, Planner III; phone (707) 265-2325 or email: kelli.cahill@countyofnapa.org.
4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):**
The project is located on a 5.72 acre parcel within the Agricultural Watershed (AW) zoning district. The parcel is accessed via a shared driveway off State Highway 29, approximately 485 feet northwest of the City of St. Helena. Project address: 2849 N. St. Helena Hwy, St. Helena, CA 94574; APN: 022-230-015-000
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Bill and Jane Ballentine, P.O. Box 692, Saint Helena, CA 94574
6. **General Plan description:** Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space (AWOS)
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Watershed (AW)
8. **Background/Project History:**

January 2000 – An application for a new winery Use Permit #99286-UP and Variance request #99287-VAR were considered by the Planning Commission on June 7, 2000, and denied based on findings contained in the staff report. The applicant filed an appeal to the Board of Supervisors, and on August 22, 2000, the decision of the Planning Commission was upheld, and the request denied.

October 2002 - The Planning Commission approved the original William Cole Winery Use Permit and Variance to the road setback requirements, permit number 02307-UP as follows:

 - 1) An annual production capacity of 20,000 gallons including custom production (crushing, fermentation, barrel ageing and bottling) for a maximum of four entities;
 - 2) A 2-story existing 5,424-sf pre-prohibition structure, the first-floor houses the winery and the second story is the residence;
 - 3) Crush pad area of 1,800 sf;
 - 4) Hours of operation, Monday through Friday, 7:00 AM to 5:00 PM;
 - 5) Six (6) off-street parking spaces;
 - 6) Five (5) visitors on the busiest day, 10 on average per week by appointment; and,
 - 7) Marketing activities between the hours of 12:00 to 4:00 PM and 6:00 to 10:00 PM with four events per year with a maximum of 15 people, three events per year with a maximum of 25 people, and one event per year with maximum of 50 people.
 - 8) The approved 4,000 sf Type 3 cave to be used for storage has not yet been constructed but remains entitled.
9. **Description of Project:** The pending application was submitted on March 26, 2019, to participate in the County's Compliance Program (Board Resolution No. 2018-164), which allows property owners to voluntarily remedy violations of their approved use permits. The application requests approval of a major modification and a variance for an existing 20,000 gallons per year winery to allow the following:
 - A. COMPONENTS NECESSARY TO REMEDY EXISTING VIOLATIONS:**
 - 1) Recognition of 22,000 gallons of production per year (approved for 20,000 gallons per year);
 - 2) Recognition of five (5) by-appointment visitors per day for tours and tastings for a maximum of 23 visitors per week (approved for five (5) visitors on the busiest day, 10 on average per week by appointment)

- 3) Recognition of six (6) additional full-time employees for as total of 8 (approved for two full-time and one part-time employees;
- 4) Recognition of the existing use of a 3,120 sf barn built in 2018 (Building Permit No. B16-01751) used for barrel storage (approved for agricultural use not for winery related use);
- 5) Recognition of existing parking east of the winery and east of the barn for an additional maximum of eight (8) unstriped parking spaces (approved for six (6) spaces);

B. EXPANSION BEYOND EXISTING ENTITLEMENTS:

- 1) Increase annual wine production from 22,000 gallons to 30,000 gallons;
- 2) Increase by-appointment visitation for daily tours and tastings to a maximum of 18 persons per day, 125 persons per week;
- 3) Modification of an existing Marketing Program to increase events as follows: three (3) events per year with 50 people per event and two (2) events per year with 75 people per event;
- 4) Convert the existing barn to production, fermentation, barrel storage, aging and bottling for the winery;
- 5) Utilize an existing office building that is connected to the existing winery structure;
- 6) Addition of a process wastewater treatment system and a 10,000 gallon wastewater holding tank to be used during the rainy season, with the capacity to accommodate one full week of peak flow. The treated wastewater will be used to irrigate existing vineyard for disposal;
- 7) Widen a portion of the eastern edge of the existing driveway to 20 feet and 25 feet, and add a second hammerhead turnaround for Fire and Emergency vehicles next to the barn consistent with the County's Roads and Street Standards
- 8) Use of an existing 100 sq. ft. structure as an office and construct a new 180 sq. ft. office building; and
- 9) Conversion of the existing temporary 1,650 sf (30 ft x 50 ft) concrete patio outdoor hospitality area temporarily allowed during Covid-19 to remain as a permanent outdoor hospitality area, located on the west side of the winery; and
- 10) Request on-premises consumption of wines produced on site in outdoor areas in accordance with Business and Professions Code Sections 23358, 23390 and 23396.5.

The request also includes a Variance to the road setback requirement of 600 feet from Highway 29, where the existing barn is located less than 320 feet from Highway 29.

10. Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses.

The project site is approximately 5.72-acres, located at 2849 St. Helena Highway N., north of the City of St. Helena. The property is located on the east side of the Mayacamas Mountains. The existing winery, parking areas, associated improvements and approximately two (2) acres of vineyards are located within the middle and lower, eastern portion of the parcel. The western portion of the parcel begins the rise of steep wooded hillsides with the existing winery located approximately 273 feet and the barn is located 320 feet from the highway. Slopes on the property range from 5% at the St. Helena Hwy on the eastern side with slopes increasing to the west of greater than 15%. Prior review of the property in 2002 identified a water course running along the south property line, which was channelized and covered in the 1870s. The water course was determined to be a man-made feature. There are no other water courses identified onsite. The nearest significant stream is the Napa River located over 2,000 feet to the east.

Properties in the vicinity of the project site range in size from about a 1.50-acre to 26 acres. Surrounding uses include single-family homes with the nearest being approximately 450 feet to the west from the existing winery building and 110 feet from the barn to the north, vineyards, and a number of producing wineries (Grace Family, Revana, Ballentine, St. Cement Vineyards, Vineyard 29, Markham, and Morlet Family Estate). Undeveloped areas are generally heavily wooded.

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

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

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

CalTrans

Other Agencies Contacted

n/a

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 December 7, 2023, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of

Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. Staff did not receive a response for consult or to provide comments.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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



Signature

March 11, 2024

Date

Name: Kelli Cahill, Planner III
Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department

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

Discussion:

- a-c. Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms, geological features, water, trees and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of a beautiful or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken-in. As generally described in the **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses** section, above, this area is defined by a mix of vineyard, winery, and residential uses. The project would not result in a substantial damage to scenic resources, including trees and rock outcroppings, or substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The project site is currently developed with a winery, vineyards, water storage tanks and a pump house. The project site has entitlement for a 4,000 square foot cave to be used for winery related storage, which has not yet been built. External changes to the site are limited to new wastewater treatment tank, expansion of leach fields within the existing vineyard area, parking spaces on existing disturbed areas, driveway improvements, construction of a new 180 sf structure for office space. The proposed improvements would not be in an area which would damage any known scenic vista, or damage scenic resources, trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings.
- d. The project primarily proposes operational changes including increasing the number of by appointment tours and tastings, marketing events, and full-time/part-time employment. The expansion of marketing events could result in an increase in the amount of time existing and new sources of light are functioning during evening and nighttime hours, however, this increase would be temporary in nature and would only occur during marketing events. Marketing activities are allowed to occur during the hours of 12:00 to 4:00 PM and 6:00 to 10:00 PM. There are no proposed changes to these hours. The winery currently holds a total of eight events per year. The project proposes to add an additional four events per year. Pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approval for wineries, any new outdoor lighting would be required to be shielded and directed downwards, with only low-level lighting allowed in parking areas. As subject to the standard conditions of approval below, the project would not have a significant impact resulting from new sources of lighting. Impacts are expected to be less than significant.

6.3 LIGHTING – PLAN SUBMITTAL

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion:

a/b/e. The project site includes approximately 2+/- acres of vineyards. The area comprising the existing winery development is designated as "Other Land", while the vineyards along Highway 29 are designated as "Prime Farmland/Farmland of Statewide Importance" by the Napa County Important Farmland Map of 2018 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) of the California Resources Agency. The vineyard southeast of the winery is designated "Farmland of Statewide Importance." Most of the proposed physical improvements are located within previously developed areas. The project includes improvement the internal driveway that will increase the width from 20 to 25 feet, and a hammerhead for emergency vehicles, the work is not anticipated to remove existing vineyard.

General Plan Agriculture Preservation and Land Use policies AG/LU-2 and AG/LU-13 recognize wineries, and any use consistent with the Winery Definition Ordinance and clearly accessory to a winery, as agriculture. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. There are no other changes included in this proposal that would result in the conversion of Farmland. As a result, the proposed project would not result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use. No impacts would occur.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As mentioned above, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Operational-Related Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursors Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. The size of the entire project is approximately 16,644 square feet, including the winery, barn and office buildings (15,764 square feet) and undeveloped caves (4,000 square feet). The winery building and outdoor areas includes approximately 1,366 square feet dedicated to accessory and hospitality uses and approximately 1,800 square feet of outdoor crush pad. The total development area encompasses approximately 17,100 square feet. Compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47,000 square feet (high quality restaurant) and 541,000 square feet (general light industry) for NO_x (oxides of nitrogen), the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. Please note: a high-quality restaurant is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, but grossly overstates emissions associated with other portions of a winery, such as office, barrel storage and production, which generate fewer vehicle trips. Therefore, a general light industry comparison has also been used for other such uses. The project falls below the screening criteria as noted above, and consequently will not significantly affect air quality individually or contribute considerably to any cumulative air quality impacts.

- c. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from improvements to the existing driveway and installation of the 10,000-gallon wastewater tank construction activities required for project. Improvements may result in minor earth work and construction emissions that would have a temporary effect; consisting mainly of dust during construction activities, exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles. Grading will result in off-haul of soils. These potential construction impacts would be temporary in nature and subject to standard conditions of approval from the Engineering Division as part of the grading permit and/or building permit review process.

The Air District recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction impacts. If the proposed project adheres to these relevant best management practices identified by the Air District and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts are considered less than significant:

7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

c. AIR QUALITY

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

1. *Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. The BAAQMD's phone number shall also be visible.*
2. *Water all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) two times per day.*
3. *Cover all haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site.*
4. *Remove all visible mud or dirt traced onto adjacent public roads by using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.*
5. *All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.*
6. *All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads*

- shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
7. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting off equipment when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five (5) minutes (as required by State Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
 8. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator. Any portable engines greater than 50 horsepower or associated equipment operated within the BAAQMD's jurisdiction shall have either a California Air Resources Board (ARB) registration Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) or a BAAQMD permit. For general information regarding the certified visible emissions evaluator or the registration program, visit the ARB FAQ http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/perp/perpfact_04-16-15.pdf or the PERP website <http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/portable.htm>.

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

7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

b. DUST CONTROL

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

- d. While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. The nearest residences are located over 500 feet to the south and west. The nearest school is the Culinary Institute of America located over 1,500 feet to the south in the St. Helena City limits. The physical improvements and operational changes would not significantly increase odors associated with the winery. Construction-phase pollutants would be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. The project would not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

IV.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

nursery sites?

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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"/> | |
| f) | Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a/b. According to the Napa County GIS Sensitivity Maps (Owl Habitat layer) the project site is located at the edge of known Northern spotted owl (NSO) habitat, which may be located within the hillsides west of the project site. The Project Area is currently developed with the existing winery, residence, pool, barn, parking areas, vineyards, and entitled cave. The project site's upper elevations, west of the Project Area, include a dense growth of mixed oak-bay woodland that extends over 900 feet to higher elevations that support dense conifer forest predominately mapped as Douglas fir. The project proposal consists of primarily changes to the winery's operations (increases to wine production, visitors, and employees). Physical improvements include driveway widening, a new process waste treatment system, new office structure and 10,000 gallon holding tank for treated wastewater. The physical improvements are proposed on already disturbed and/or developed areas of the site. No development is proposed within the undeveloped upper elevations of the site.

Based on nearby surveys, NSO nest, roost, and feed in a variety of habitat types and forest stand conditions. Tree species used for these activities include western hemlock, Douglas-fir, redwood, ponderosa pine, and western red cedar; while habitat types used include mixed evergreen forests, mixed coniferous forests, Douglas-fir/hardwood mixed forests, evergreen hardwood forests, pine-oak mixed forests, and riparian corridors. Steep, rocky canyons are occasionally used for nesting, roosting, and feeding in different parts of the NSO range. Douglas fir is present, approximately 900 feet uphill of the project site. There are no steep, rocky canyons or riparian corridors on the project site.

Most observations of habitat use by NSOs are in areas having some elements of old-growth or mature forest; no such elements occur on the project site. NSOs generally use forests with the utmost complexity and structure. The upper elevations of the project site where woodland occurs is dominated almost exclusively by oak woodland. Roost sites selected by NSOs generally consist of dense vegetation characterized by high canopy closure, large-DBH (diameter at breast height) trees, and multiple canopy layers. None of these conditions exist on the project site. Further, the project site would not likely provide suitable NSO habitat due to the proximity of Highway 29 which is actively travelled at all times of the day and night and generates a high volume of noise that reverberates all the way up to the upper project site elevations.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion:

- a/b. A Cultural Resource Reconnaissance, dated August 26, 2019, was prepared by Flaherty Cultural Resource Services (FCRS) to determine the presence or absence of potentially significant cultural resources within the development area. The evaluation included a check of the information on file with ARS's office and the Regional Office of the California Historical Resources Information System, to determine the presence or absence of previously recorded historic or prehistoric cultural resources; a check of appropriate historic references to determine the potential for historic era archaeological deposits; and, a surface reconnaissance of all accessible parts of the project area to locate any visible signs of potentially significant historic or prehistoric cultural deposits. The overall literature search determined that the current project area has not been the subject of a previous cultural resource study and there are no previously recorded archaeological sites located within the project area. FCRS contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to determine the presence or absence of listed Sacred Lands within the project area and all appropriate Native American organizations or individuals designated by the Native American Heritage Commission as interested parties for the project area.

As noted above, a surface examination was conducted to locate any visible signs of potentially significant historic or prehistoric cultural deposits. The field site evaluation reviewed an area approximately one (1) acre in size, encompassing the project area. No cultural resources were discovered within the project boundary as a result of the survey. The investigation resulted in a negative finding, indicating that no artifacts or potentially significant cultural features were observed.

The existing winery dates to approximately 1876 according to an Amended Historical Architectural Review and Evaluation prepared by Napa County Landmarks. Review of historical documentation indicates construction of what is today the winery and residence began in 1873, with an addition in 1878. The Review and Evaluation were to consider eligibility to the California Register of Historical Resources. The report concluded that the historic J.C. Weinberger Winery and Thomas D. Church landscape met all seven qualities of; integrity, location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. The recommendation was the use of the California State Historic Building Code in order to ensure the protection of historic resources. The J.C. Weinberger Winery is a recognized Historic Site with the Napa County GIS. The project proposes the continued use of the existing winery structure with no proposed changes to the historic building.

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

However, if resources are found associated with the project, a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval. Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

7.2 ARCHEOLOGICAL FINDING

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

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

Discussion:

- a.
- i.) There are no known faults that run beneath the project site on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing of a known fault. Impacts would be less than significant.
 - ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project would be required to comply with the latest standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level in relation to seismic ground shaking.
 - iii.) According to Napa County GIS Sensitivity Maps (based on the following layer – Liquefaction) the property is designated in an area with a Very Low susceptibility for liquefaction. No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. There were no known issues with the construction of the existing building and caves. Compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.
 - iv.) The Napa County GIS Sensitivity Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) did not indicate the presence of landslides within the development area. The physical improvements are proposed in already developed areas. Impacts are expected to be less than significant.
- b. The proposed improvements would occur within the previously disturbed and/or developed portions of the site. The project would require incorporation of best management practices and would be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c/d. According to the Napa County GIS Sensitivity Maps (based on the following layers - Geology, Surficial deposits, and Soil Type), the western vineyard block, winery residence and barn are located in an area composed of Hambright – Rock Outcrop Complex (2 to 30% slopes) and in the area of the eastern portion of the parcel with vineyard and existing parking and driveway is composed of Bale Clay loam, (0 to 2% slopes), respectively. The majority of the site is underlain by Early Tertiary Assemblages with a small portion underlain by Terrace deposits (Holocene) closer to Highway 29. The property includes areas generally subject to liquefy nearest Highway 29 in an area mapped as approximately 1.1 acres in size, whereas the remaining area is considered to be very low, which includes all areas of existing development and as part of the subject project. All proposed building alterations will be within existing structures required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction. The project is not proposed on an unstable geologic unit or soil that would become unstable or would create direct or indirect risks to life or property. Compliance with the latest editions of the California Building Code for seismic stability would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible, resulting in less than significant impacts.
- e. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The Napa County Division of Environmental Health has reviewed this application and recommends approval based on the submitted wastewater feasibility report prepared by Applied Civil Engineering, Inc., dated July 23, 2019. The existing system was evaluated to determine if sufficient to process the increase in process waste and domestic waste. The recommendation is to separate the domestic and process waste, with domestic waste continuing to flow to the existing leach field and process waste to be upgrade the existing leach lines from 24 to 36 inch, and to separate the process wastewater collected separately, treated and disposed of via irrigation to the existing vineyard and hillside. A tank is proposed for temporary holding of waste when it cannot be applied, such as during wet periods. The recommended tank size is 10,000 gallons which is sized to hold one full week of peak flows. The proposed waste separate and upgrades have been determined to be adequate to support the on-site treatment and dispersal of wastewater generated by the project including the winery's process waste

resulting from the increased wine production capacity as well as sanitary wastewater based on the proposed number of employees and visitors.

- f. No paleontological resources or unique geological features have been identified on the property in the project area or were encountered on the property when the existing building was constructed, and the vines were planted. Use Permit #02307 also included entitlements for a 4,000 square foot cave, which has not yet been constructed. The cave was previously evaluated under CEQA including the disposal of cave spoils offsite to an approved disposal site. The project as proposed would require minimal earth disturbing activities and construction is unlikely to uncover paleontological or unique geological features. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion: On April 20, 2022, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) adopted new recommended thresholds for determining the significance of individual projects' greenhouse gas impacts under CEQA. Under the new thresholds, proposed land use projects may be analyzed for consistency with a qualified greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction strategy in the event one has been adopted. To date, Napa County has not adopted a qualified GHG reduction strategy pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15183.5. Absent an adopted strategy, BAAQMD recommends that a land use project must include specified minimum design elements to ensure that the project is contributing its "fair share" toward achieving the state's key climate goal of carbon neutrality by 2045. Napa County has not adopted a qualified GHG reduction strategy or an air quality plan, therefore projects will be evaluated per the BAAQMD recommended minimum design elements.

- a-b. Overall increases in Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions in Napa County were assessed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the Napa County General Plan Update and certified in June 2008. GHG emissions were found to be significant and unavoidable in that document, despite the adoption of mitigation measures incorporating specific policies and action items into the General Plan. Note: Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, because this initial study assesses a project that is consistent with an adopted General Plan for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was prepared, it appropriately focuses on impacts which are "peculiar to the project," rather than the cumulative impacts previously assessed.

Consistent with the General Plan action items, Napa County participated in the development of a community wide GHG emissions inventory and "emission reduction framework" for all local jurisdictions in the County in 2008-2009. This planning effort was completed by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency in December 2009 and served as the basis for development of a refined inventory and emission reduction plan for unincorporated Napa County. During our ongoing planning effort, the County requires project applicants to consider methods to reduce GHG emissions consistent with Napa County General Plan Policy CON-65(e). For the purposes of this analysis potential GHG emissions associated with winery 'construction' and 'development' and with 'ongoing' winery operations have been discussed.

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from construction represent a very small portion of a project's lifetime GHG emissions. The BAAQMD recommended thresholds do not include a construction-related climate impact threshold at this time. One time "Construction Emissions" associated with the project include: emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area, construction, and construction equipment, and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as Equipment Emissions). If the proposed project adheres to relevant best management practices identified by the BAAQMD and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts are considered less than significant. See Section III. Air Quality for additional information.

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

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

Specifically for transportation, the project must:

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

The project will be required to comply with the recently adopted version of CALGreen Tier 2. Project approval will include a condition of approval to ensure this is reviewed and implemented at the time of construction through adherence to the California Building Code. As discussed above and in section XVII. Transportation, the County maintains TIS Guidelines that include VMT analysis requirements for projects based on trip generation. The applicant has already implemented the following greenhouse gas reduction methods at the winery: generation of on-site renewable energy, and shade trees planted within 40 feet of the south side of the building. The winery also intends to provide bicycle incentives, bicycle route improvements through involvement with the Countywide vine trail, use of recycled water. The applicant will need to include as part of the conditioned of approval two EV charging stations, and energy conserving lighting. A condition of approval will be included to require implementation of the checked Voluntary Best Management Practices Measures submitted with the project application. The increase in emissions expected as a result of the project would be relatively modest, and the project is in compliance with the County’s efforts to reduce emissions as described above. For these reasons, project impacts related to GHG emissions are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

X.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

- c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces which would:
- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
- d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?
- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
- e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?
- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: On April 21, 2021, Governor Gavin Newsom declared a drought emergency in the state of California and as of July 8, 2021, 50 counties are under the drought state of emergency, including Napa County. The Governor directed the Department of Water Resources to increase resilience of water supplies during drought conditions. On June 8, 2021, the Napa County Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution declaring a Proclamation of Local Emergency due to drought conditions which are occurring in Napa County. On October 19, 2021, the Governor issued a proclamation extending the drought emergency statewide. The County requires all discretionary permit applications (such as use permits and ECPAs) to complete necessary water analyses in order to document that sufficient water supplies are available for the proposed project and to implement water saving measures to prepare for periods of limited water supply and to conserve limited groundwater resources.

In March 2022, Governor Newsom enacted Executive Order N-7-22, which requires prior to approval of a new groundwater well (or approval of an alteration to an existing well) in a basin subject to the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act and that is classified as medium- or high-priority, obtaining written verification from the GSA (Groundwater Sustainability Agency) managing the basin that groundwater extraction would not be inconsistent with any sustainable groundwater management program established in any applicable GSP (Groundwater Sustainability Plan) and would not decrease the likelihood of achieving sustainability goals for the basin covered by a GSP, or that it is determined first that extraction of groundwater from the new/proposed well is (1) not likely to interfere with the production and functioning of existing nearby wells, and (2) not likely to cause subsidence that would adversely impact or damage nearby infrastructure.

On March 28, 2022, August 9, 2022, and November 8, 2022, the Napa County Board of Supervisors adopted resolutions proclaiming a continued state of Local Emergency due to the 2021-2022 drought. On June 7, 2022, the Napa County Board of Supervisors provided direction regarding interim procedures to implement Executive Order N-7-22 for issuance of new, altered or replacement well permits and discretionary projects that would increase groundwater use during the declared drought emergency. The direction limits a parcel's groundwater allocation to 0.3 acre feet per acre per year, or no net increase in groundwater use if that threshold is exceeded already for parcels located in the GSA Subbasin. For parcels not located in the GSA Subbasin (i.e., generally located in the hillsides), a parcel-specific Water Availability Analysis would suffice to assess potential impacts on groundwater supplies. Although the Governor, through Executive Order No. N-5-23, rolled back some of the drought emergency provisions in late March 2023, due to current water conditions, the Governor's Emergency Order N-7-22 remains in place and the remaining criteria for the County's interim actions and procedures also remain. On May 30, 2023, the Napa County Board of Supervisors terminated the Local Emergency due to the 2021-2022 drought but acknowledged that there are still adverse conditions that will continue to affect the Napa Valley groundwater subbasin and the need to continue groundwater management efforts including the interim actions and procedures still exists. This parcel is located in the GSA Subbasin and therefore is subject to the .30 acre feet per acre per year allocation or no net increase if that threshold is already exceeded.

- a. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. According to the *Winery Wastewater Feasibility Report* prepared by Applied Civil Engineering, Inc., dated July 23, 2019, the project site and proposed upgrade of the leach

lines from 24 to 36 inches and the installation of a 10,000 gallon holding tank will provide adequate disposal capacity to serve the project. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality. Any earth disturbing activities will be subject to the County's Stormwater Ordinance which complies with State requirements, would include measures to prevent erosion, sediment, and waste materials from entering waterways both during and after any construction activities. By following the above mentioned measures the project would not have the potential to significantly impact water quality and discharge standards. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

- b. According to the *Water Availability Analysis Memorandum (WAA)* prepared by Richard C. Slade & Associates, Inc., dated February 6, 2024, the existing domestic residential water use including the pool and associated landscaping are provided by the City of St. Helena, while the winery and vineyard irrigation are supplied through an existing onsite groundwater well. There are two existing wells on the property that have been mapped adjacent to the existing onsite driveway and directly west of the vineyard block that fronts Highway 29. Historically the winery has been served by one well, while the second serves as irrigation for the vineyard.

The project site is located within the GSA Subbasin and within 500 feet of an off site well, requiring a Tier 1 and 2 well interference analyses. A Tier 3 analysis was not required as the project well is located over 2,000 feet from the nearest significant stream. Parcels within the GSA are subject to a .30 acre feet per acre per year allocation (.30 x 5.72 acres) or 1.72 acre feet per year for this project.

The Tier 1 analysis considered existing uses onsite to include the winery and vineyard as the domestic uses including residence and landscaping irrigation are provided by public water service from the City of St. Helena. An onsite water audit was completed, and the existing water use based on existing entitlements associated with the winery, and vineyards is estimated to be 1.43 acre-feet/year (af/yr). Due to the increases in production, employees and hospitality guests, total water use for existing and proposed uses would be 1.8 af/yr. The project proposes operational changes to slightly reduce the proposed water demand, including but not limited to re-use of rinse water, use of floor squeegees in lieu of hosing down the floors, high pressure/high temperature washing of tanks and barrels, and monthly tracking of water use via meter readings to allow for ongoing better use management. These operational changes would reduce proposed demand by .28 af/yr from 1.8 af/yr to 1.71 af/yr.

Overall, the proposed project would implement operational changes to reduce water use as follows:

Source of Demand	Existing (acre-ft.)	Proposed (acre-ft.)	Proposed w/ reductions (acre ft)
Winery Production	0.43	0.65	0.55
Winery Domestic Use	0.05	0.198	0.205
Landscape Irrigation*	0.0	0.0	0.0
Residential*	0.0	0.0	0.0
Vineyard Irrigation	0.95	0.95	0.95
Total Use	1.43	1.8	1.71
*Public Water from the City of St. Helena serves the residence and is used for landscape irrigation.			

A Tier 2 well interference analysis was performed as the nearest offsite well is located approximately 375 feet to the southwest of winery well. There are two wells on the property, including the irrigation wells constructed to a depth of 170 feet, and the winery well constructed to a depth of 250 feet.

As part of the Tier 2 a pump test was performed to determine if the wells have sufficient water for the groundwater demands, to monitor the amount of drawdown created during pumping and the water level recovery once pumping ended, and to monitor water level decline, and to determine if the aquifer parameters of transmissivity and possible storativity were encountered.

As part of the pump test, the irrigation well was observed since the depth to perforation is similar to that of the winery well. An 8-hour constant rate of pumping test was performed on the winery well at a rate of 15 gpm. A pre-test static water level was taken at 54.5 feet below the reference point, which was measured at 77.6 ft below the reference point at the end of the pump test, for a maximum drawdown of 23.1 feet. Water level recovery was measured 3 hours after completed pump test which was 94%. As mentioned, the irrigation well was also monitored and showed no changes during the pumping period, and thus no water level drawdown interference impacts were observed.

To determine if increase pumping would create interference with the offsite well, RCS performed a theoretical drawdown calculation that considered well penetration, aquifer thickness and transmissivity and storativity. The result conservatively indicated that the onsite irrigation well would result in a theoretical water level drawdown of 2.5 feet; however, actuals as noted above with the irrigation well

resulted in no drawdown.

The project is estimated to increase water usage by approximately 16% (from 1.43 af/yr to 1.71 af/yr), less than the estimated water allotment for the parcel which is calculated to be 1.72 af/yr. The proposed increase in water usage associated with the project is within the Tier 1 and Tier 2 criteria set forward by the Napa County Interim WAA requirements. The project is unlikely to substantially deplete groundwater supplies with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.

The project will include project specific Condition of Approval setting a limitation on groundwater use for the parcel to the estimated proposed use of 1.71 af/yr and requiring well monitoring. The proposed project would not impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. Impacts would be less than significant.

The following condition would also include the potential to modify/alter permitted uses on site should groundwater resources become insufficient to supply the use.

4.20 OTHER CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO THE OPERATIONAL ASPECTS OF THE PROJECT

- a. Groundwater Management - The parcel shall be limited to 1.71 acre-feet of groundwater per year for all water consuming activities (utilizing wells) on the parcel. A Groundwater Demand Management Program shall be developed and implemented for the property as outlined in COA 6.15(a) below.

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

¹ Substantial evidence is defined by case law as evidence that is of ponderable legal significance, reasonable in nature, credible and of solid value. The following constitute substantial evidence: facts, reasonable assumptions predicated on facts; and expert opinions supported by facts. Argument, speculation, unsubstantiated opinion or narrative, or clearly inaccurate or erroneous information do not constitute substantial evidence.

6.15 OTHER CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO THE PROJECT PERMITTING PROCESS

- a. Groundwater Demand Management Program
 1. The permittee shall install a meter on each well serving the parcel. Each meter shall be placed in a location that will allow for the measurement of all groundwater used on the project parcel. Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit for the winery or expanding any operations as approved under this modification, the permittee shall submit for review and approval by the PBES Director a groundwater demand management plan which includes a plan for the location and the configuration of the installation of a meter on all wells serving the parcel.
 2. The Plan shall identify how best available technology and best management water conservation practices will be applied throughout the parcel.
 3. The Plan shall identify how best management water conservation practices will be applied where possible in the structures on site. This includes but is not limited to the installation of low flow fixtures and appliances.
 4. As a groundwater consuming activity already exists on the property, meter installation and monitoring shall begin immediately and the first monitoring report is due to the County within 120 days of approval of this modification.
 5. For the first twelve months of operation under this permit, the permittee shall read the meters at the beginning of each month and provide the data to the PBES Director monthly. If the water usage on the property exceeds, or is on track to exceed, 1.71 acre-feet per year, or if the permittee fails to report, additional reviews and analysis and/or a corrective action program at the permittee's expense shall be required and shall be submitted to the PBES Director for review and action.
 6. The permittee's wells shall be included in the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring program if the County finds the well suitable.
 7. At the completion of the reporting period per 6.15(a)(5) above, and so long as the water usage is within the maximum acre-feet per year as specified above, the permittee may begin the following meter reading schedule:
 - i. On or near the first day of each month the permittee shall read the water meter, and provide the data to the PBES Director during the first weeks of April and October. The PBES Director, or the Director's designated representative, has the right to access and verify the operation and readings of the meters during regular business hours.

9.9 OTHER CONDITIONS APPLICABLE PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF A FINAL CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY

- a. All required meters shall be installed and all groundwater usage monitoring required in COA 4.20(a) and 6.15(a) above shall commence prior to final occupancy.
- c. Prior review of the property in 2002 identified a water course running along the south property line, which was channelized and covered in the 1870s. The water course was determined to be a man-made feature. There are no other water courses identified onsite. The project includes the installation of a 10,000-gallon holding tank, an upgrade to existing leach lines that are located within the vineyard, interior alterations to the barn, road improvements and accessory structures. The project would not alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off the project site. These improvements would require permitting through the County, and prior to the issuance of permits, the improvement plans would ensure that the proposed project does not increase runoff flow rate or volume as a result of project implementation. General Plan Policy CON-50 requires discretionary projects, including this project, to meet performance standards designed to ensure peak runoff in 2-, 10-, 50-, and 100-year events following development is not greater than predevelopment conditions. The proposed project would implement standard stormwater quality treatment controls to treat runoff prior to discharge from the project site. The incorporation of these features into the project would ensure that the proposed project would not create substantial sources of polluted runoff. In addition, the proposed project does not have any unusual characteristics that create sources of pollution that would degrade water quality. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d. The site lies outside the boundaries of the 100- and 500-year flood hazard boundaries. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. No impacts would occur.
- e. In January 2022, the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) was approved by the Department of Water Resources (DWR). As discussed above, although the operational changes would increase water use, the applicant would use treated wastewater for vineyard irrigation resulting in an overall reduction in water use below the existing conditions. The project would not result in an impact to water use and would therefore comply with the GSP. Water quality would be maintained through standard stormwater quality treatment control measures and compliance with Engineering Division Conditions of Approval. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion:

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

County will reserve agricultural lands for agricultural use including lands used for grazing and watershed/ open space...” and General Plan Economic Development Policy E-1 (The County’s economic development will focus on ensuring the continued viability of agriculture...). There are no applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the property. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion: The parcel is bordered on the east State Highway 29 which contributes to a high ambient noise level. The closest offsite residence is located on the parcel that borders the project site to the north. The residence is located approximately 450 feet from the existing winery building and 110 feet from the barn proposed to be converted to winery use as barrel storage, fermentation, processing and bottling. The residence sits approximately 30 feet higher than the winery and barn. Additionally, there are a number of trees on both properties between the existing residence and existing winery. Additionally, there is an existing winery on the neighboring parcel to the north of the residence with a shared driveway on the

south side, adjacent to the subject parcel. No tree removal is included in this project.

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

7.3. CONSTRUCTION NOISE

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

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

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

The proposed increases to production, visitation and marketing events would not change or extend the hours of operations of the winery. An existing outdoor area was converted for temporary hospitality use during Covid-19, which the project proposes to make permanent. The space measures 1,650 sf and is located on the west side of the winery. The space is shielded by a portion of the building and vegetation from nearby residences. The space has been in use since 2020 with no noise related complaints. Thus, while there might be a minor increase in noise generated by vehicles used for shipment of the increased volume of fruit and wine and by visitors and vehicles used by visitors, noise generated by the winery operations would continue to fall within the current hours of operation, excluding harvest, and in existing outdoor areas.

Continuing enforcement of Napa County's Noise Ordinance by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff, including the prohibition against amplified music, should further ensure that marketing events and other winery activities do not create a significant noise impact. Temporary events would be subject to County Code Chapter 5.36 which regulates proposed temporary events. The proposed project would not result in long-term, significant, permanent noise impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion:

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

The State of California’s Department of Finance projects the total population of Napa County to increase 4% between the year 2020 and 2060 (State of California Department of Finance Projections, July 19, 2021, <https://dof.ca.gov/forecasting/demographics/projections/>). Unincorporated Napa County, and the five incorporated jurisdictions, all have existing state compliant Fifth Cycle (2014-2022) Housing Elements and are working on developing compliant Sixth Cycle (2023-2031) Housing Elements, as required by state law. Complaint Housing Elements indicates that the jurisdictions have enough dwelling units programed over the cycle to meet or exceed state growth projections.

The requested use permit major modification would facilitate the continued operation of an existing winery on the project site, with expanded production, visitation, employees and hospitality service. The addition of six (8) new employees (four (4) full-time and two (2) part time is not anticipated to generate a substantial need for additional housing.

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion:

- a./c./d. The parcel is accessed via a private driveway off State Highway 29. The project proposes to widen a section of the existing 20 foot driveway to 25 feet and add a hammerhead for emergency vehicle turnaround in order to meet the Napa County Roads and Street Standards. The improvements will require equipment during construction that will be temporary with staging within the property boundary. The driveway serving the parcel also serves the Morlet Family Winery, as well as two private residences to the southwest. The driveway is located 450 feet north of the intersection of Highway 29 and Deer Park Road. There is an existing center lane that totals 1,082 feet (0.20 miles), extending 855 feet from the driveway north and 221 feet to the south before becoming a left turn lane from Highway 29 onto Deer Park Road. The center lane currently serves the subject project and Morlet, as well as Markham Vineyard, Ballentine Vineyards and Faust serving as both a left turn lane and deceleration lane.

As proposed the project would not conflict with any plans, ordinances or policies addressing the circulation system. The proposed development complies with County Roads and Street Standards and Public Works standards for safe access into and throughout the site. The project would not substantially increase hazards due to design features or result in inadequate emergency access. Impacts would be less than significant.

- b. As part of the statewide implementation of Senate Bill (SB) 743, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) settled upon automobile vehicle miles of travel (VMT) as the preferred metric for assessing passenger vehicle-related impacts under CEQA and

issued revised *CEQA Guidelines* in December 2018, along with a *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA* to assist practitioners in implementing the *CEQA Guidelines* revisions.

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

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

The County maintains a set of Transportation Impact Study Guidelines (TIS Guidelines) that define situations and project characteristics that trigger the need to prepare a TIS. The purpose of a TIS is to identify whether the project is likely to cause adverse physical or operational changes on a County roadway, bridge, bikeway or other transportation facility, to determine whether the project should be required to implement or contribute to improvement measures to address those changes, and to ensure that the project is developed consistent with the County's transportation plans and policies. However, operational changes on a County roadway, bridge, bikeway or other transportation facility, to determine whether the project should be required to implement or contribute to improvement measures to address those changes, and to ensure that the project is developed consistent with the County's transportation plans and policies. Per the County's current TIS Guidelines, a project is required to prepare a TIS if it generates 110 or more net new daily vehicle trips. Based on the County's winery trip generation assumptions, the proposed project would be expected to generate 39 new daily trips on Fridays and 40 on Saturdays, including 7 new trips during the Friday p.m. peak hour and 9 during the Saturday p.m. peak hour, compared to permitted conditions. During harvest the proposed project would be expected to generate 22 new daily trips on a Friday and 28 on Saturdays, including 6 new trips during the Friday p.m. peak hour and 9 during the Saturday p.m. peak hour, compared to permitted conditions. When compared to existing conditions, the project would be expected to generate 66 daily trips on a Friday, 54 during harvest, and 68 on Saturdays, 58 during harvest, including 10 trips during the Friday p.m. peak hour, 11 during harvest, and 14 during the Saturday p.m. peak hour, 15 during harvest. The trip generation does not exceed 110 net new daily trips; therefore, the project is not required to prepare a traffic impact study.

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

- e. Developers of new or expanded land uses are required to provide adequate parking or demonstrate that adequate parking exists to meet their anticipated parking demand. Excess parking that could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or commercial activity exceeding the site's capacity is discouraged. The winery currently has six (6) parking spaces with approximately five (5) to eight (8) additional unstriped spaces located east of the existing winery and barn outside the turnarounds. Pursuant to the Napa County Roads and Street Standards and PBES Engineering Memorandum dated, November 9, 2023, all parking stalls are required to be delineated. 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 December 7, 2023, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on the project, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. Staff did not receive a request to consult or provide comments.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

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

☐☐☒☐

Discussion:

- a. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. A Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study, dated July 23, 2019, was prepared by Applied Civil Engineering, Inc., detailing the existing system and proposed changes to accommodate the changes in production, employees, and hospitality. The existing leach field was evaluated based on current uses and proposed increases. It was determined that the leach fields were undersized with 24-inch lines. Upgrading the line to 36 inches would provide sufficient disposal; however, the expansion was found to be infeasible due to trenching within the existing vineyard. In order to accommodate the increased flows, Applied Civil Engineering proposed separation of the waste stream from the domestic waste stream. The domestic flows would continue to the existing leach field, while process wastewater would be collected separately, treated and disposed of onsite via irrigation to the vineyard or hillside landscaping. The applicant proposes the addition of a wastewater treatment system with a holding tank for treated wastewater of 10,000 gallons, sized to hold one full week of peak flows. Per Napa County guidelines, a Registered Civil Engineer, Registered Environmental Health Specialist, or Licensed Contractor will provide ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the system. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings, conditioning that the selected design and plans shall be designed by a licensed Civil Engineer or Registered Environmental Health Specialist and approved by the Division of Environmental Health. Impacts would be less than significant.

Per the Environmental Health memo dated, November 22, 2023, the water supply and related components must comply with the California Safe Drinking Water Act and Related Laws. This will require plan review and approval prior to approval of building permits. The technical report must be completed by a licensed engineer with experience in designing water systems. The preliminary technical report must be submitted to the Regional Water Quality Control Board in accordance with the California Health and Safety Code, Section 116527. Prior to issuance of a final certificate of occupancy, the owner will be required to apply for an obtain an annual operating permit for the water system from County Environmental Health. The applicant must comply with all required monitoring and reporting. As previously discussed, there are two groundwater wells on the property with one serving the winery and the second used for vineyard irrigation. The onsite residence, pool, and landscaping including lawns are served by a public water system from the City of St. Helena.

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

- b. As discussed in Section X, a Water Availability Analysis was prepared by Richard C. Slade & Associates, Inc., dated July 2, 2021 and an addendum dated, November 21, 2022, and updated on February 6, 2024 proposed water use of 1.71 af/yr is slightly higher than the Permitted use and the Existing levels of 1.43 af/yr; however, within the .30 limitation for wells in the GSA Subbasin, The proposed water use is not anticipated to impact groundwater availability.
- c. As discussed above and in Section X, Hydrology, the existing on-site domestic waste system cannot accommodate the proposed increases to employees and visitors. The waste streams will be separated with domestic waste continuing to flow to the existing leach field, while winery process waste will be treated by a new onsite system, with new 10,000 gallon holding tank which has been sized to accommodate the proposed production capacity of 30,000 gallons. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings, conditioning that the selected design and plans shall be designed by a licensed Civil Engineer or Registered Environmental Health Specialist and approved by the Division of Environmental Health. The project is not served by a wastewater treatment provider; therefore, no impact would occur.
- d/e. The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

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

Discussion:

- a. There are no proposed project features that would substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The access to the project is approximately 240 feet along a shared driveway to Highway 29. The driveway and internal circulation of the project site with the proposed widening from 20 feet to 25 feet and the addition of a hammerhead for emergency vehicle access and turnaround comply with the County's Roads and Street Standards. Access onto and throughout the parcel includes design components to accommodate fire and emergency apparatus. The Fire Marshal's office has reviewed the plans, which demonstrate that the project would have adequate emergency access to the existing development. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps (based on the following GIS layer – Fire Hazard Severity Zones), the winery buildings and associated improvements are within an area designated as a high fire risk, along with the hillsides west of the winery. The proposed physical improvements are within the existing developed area of the site and vineyards along State Highway 29. Although the project results in a larger amount of people on site, the physical improvements and operational changes would not result in a physical modification to the slope of the site, change prevailing winds, or alter other factors that would likely exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.
- c. The existing driveway meets the current standards for adequate emergency access to the existing development. The project does not require installation or maintenance of infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. Impacts will be less than significant.
- d. The physical improvements are in an area of the site which is already graded and paved or plated in vines. The proposed project would not physically alter the site in a way, which would expose people or structures to risks such as downstream or downslope flooding or landslides resulting from runoff, post-fire instability or drainage changes. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

XXI.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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?

- 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)? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
- c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion:

- a. As discussed in Section IV. Biological Resources, there are limited potential wildlife species and habitats in the area that could be impacted by the proposed project. The project site's upper elevations, west of the Project Area, include a dense growth of oak woodland with Douglas fir forest mapped approximately 900 feet uphill of the project site. The Project Area is currently developed with the existing winery, residence, pool, barn, caves (entitled but not built yet), parking areas, and vineyards. The project proposal consists of primarily changes to the winery's operations (increases to wine production, visitors, and employees). Physical improvements include road improvements, an accessory office, a new process waste treatment system, and 10,000 gallon holding tank for treated wastewater. The physical improvements are proposed on already disturbed and/or developed areas of the site. No tree removal is required as part of the project. Based on site conditions the proposed project does not have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal.

As identified in Section V. Cultural Resources, Flaherty Cultural Resource Services (FCRS), prepared a Cultural Resource Reconnaissance, dated August 26, 2019, to determine the presence or absence of potentially significant cultural resources within the development area. According to the report, no significant or potentially significant prehistoric artifacts, archaeological deposits, or features were identified within the project area. The soil observed did not indicate any subsurface deposits or evidence of prehistoric human occupation. Since no significant cultural resources were identified on the property, no further recommendations are warranted for cultural materials. The proposed improvements would be in previously disturbed areas of the site, accidental upset of unidentified resources is unlikely. The project would not result in significant impacts or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Impacts would be less than significant.

- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology, and traffic are discussed in the respective sections above and were determined to have a less than significant impact. As discussed in Section VIII. Green House Gas and Section XVII. Transportation, potential impacts to air pollution and GHG emissions are being addressed through meeting BAAQMD recommended design elements, with the addition of Greenhouse Gas Voluntary Best Management Practices, and VMT reduction strategies. The applicant already implements the following greenhouse gas reduction methods at the winery: generation of on-site renewable energy, and shade trees planted within 40 feet of the south side of the building. The winery also intends to provide bicycle incentives through involvement in the Countywide vine trail and use of recycled water. A condition of approval will be included to require implementation of the checked Voluntary Best Management Practices Measures submitted with the project application. Section X. Hydrology includes details on the Water Availability Analysis which demonstrates that the proposed project would not increase water use beyond its allocation (total parcel size 5.72 x 0.3 af/ac/yr = 1.72 af/yr) for the parcel. Additionally, process waste would be treated onsite and processed wastewater used for irrigation. Proposed increases in traffic as detailed in Section XVII, Transportation, concluded that the proposed project would not have significant impacts on the County roadway system. Potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant.
- c. All impacts identified in this negative declaration are less than significant and do not require mitigation. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in environmental effects that cause substantial adverse effects on human being either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.