

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

Initial Study Checklist  
(form updated January 2019)

1. **Project Title:** Ballentine Vineyards, Use Permit Major Modification #P18-00382-MOD & Variance #P19-00006
2. **Property Owner:** Frank Ballentine c/o The William Van & Betty P. Ballentine Trust et al, 2820 St. Helena Highway North, St. Helena, CA 94574; (415) 850-0898
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Jason R. Hade, Principal Planner, (707) 259-8757, jason.hade@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):** The project is located on an approximately 21 acre site within the AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning district at 2820 St. Helena Highway North; APN: 022-200-003.
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Frank Ballentine, 2820 St. Helena Highway North, St. Helena, CA 94574; (415) 850-0898
6. **General Plan description:** AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space) and Agricultural Resource (AR) Designations
7. **Zoning:** AP (Agricultural Preserve)
8. **Background/Project History:**

- Ballentine Vineyards was approved by the Planning Commission on December 8, 1993 (Use Permit 93080-UP) with a maximum annual production capacity of 50,000 gallons and use of a 7,000 square foot winery building and 400 square foot office. A Variance (Variance 93081-VAR) was also approved which permitted the winery to be located 310 feet from State Highway 29 within the required 600-foot winery setback.
- On August 19, 1994 the Zoning Administrator approved Use Permit Modification #94016-MOD to permit the expansion of the previously approved office to 720 square feet and for it to be attached to the winery building.
- The Planning Commission authorized the addition of a 9,600 square foot barrel storage building (Use Permit application 96661- MOD), with no change in production, visitation or marketing within the 600-foot winery setback (Variance 97023-VAR) on October 15, 1997.
- A 3,750 square foot winery storage building, conversion of existing winery office to tasting room and retail sales areas with a maximum of 10 visitors per week for wine tasting by appointment was approved by the Planning Commission on August 18, 2003 via Use Permit Modification #03215-MOD.
- On January 28, 2004 staff approved a reduction in size of the previously approved winery storage building via Use Permit application 04013-MOD.
- A tasting room remodel and office addition was approved by staff on June 5, 2007 (Minor Modification P07-00170-MODVMIN).
- The most recent Use Permit modification, P15-00281-VMM, was approved by staff on October 16, 2015 and permitted the replacement of the winery's septic system a more environmentally sustainable Lyve system.

The 21 acre parcel is relatively flat and is currently developed with a fermentation building and tasting room, two agricultural buildings, an agricultural building/office, outdoor crush pad and work areas, winery-associated driveway and parking improvements, irrigation pond, a residence, garage, pool, and approximately 15 acres of planted vineyard.

9. **Description of Project:** Approval of a Use Permit Major Modification to an existing 50,000 gallon per year winery to allow the following:
  - A. **COMPONENTS NECESSARY TO REMEDY EXISTING VIOLATIONS:**

- 1) recognition of daily tastings of 21 persons per day, 147 visitors maximum per week. Currently authorized for 10 weekly visitors;
- 2) recognition of an existing marketing program of six events per year (325 guests). Currently authorized for two events per month (120 guests); and
- 3) recognition of 11 full-time employees. Currently authorized for four full-time employees.

**B. EXPANSION BEYOND EXISTING ENTITLEMENTS:**

- 1) Construction of a 3,500 square foot freestanding covered crush pad and outdoor work area; remodel the existing tasting room including the addition of a 1,200 square foot outdoor tasting area adjacent to the tasting room; construction of a 240 square foot attached ADA compliant restroom, 215 square foot attached private tasting room, 250 square foot attached employee break room, and a 225 square foot pomace bin;
- 2) Increase in maximum annual permitted wine production from 50,000 to 125,000 gallons;
- 3) Increase existing daily tastings from 21 persons per day, 147 visitors maximum per week (existing conditions to be recognized via the County's Code Compliance program) to 40 persons per day Monday through Friday and 95 persons per day Saturday and Sunday; 390 visitors maximum per week. All visitation would be by appointment only;
- 4) Modification of an existing Marketing Program to increase events from six events per year (325 guests) (existing conditions to be recognized via the County's Code Compliance program) to 112 events per year (3,400 guests) as follows:
  - a. Ninety-Six (96) annual events for up to 25 guests;
  - b. Twelve (12) annual events for up to 50 guests;
  - c. Four (4) annual events for up to 100 guests; and
  - d. Closure of the winery for daily tastings during all 100 person events.
- 5) On-premises consumption of wines produced on site in the open air patio, tasting room, and private tasting room in accordance with Business and Professions Code Sections 23358, 23390 and 23396.5;
- 6) Change the winery's tasting room hours of operation from 10:00 AM to 5:00 PM to 10:00 AM to 6:00 PM (Seven days a week);
- 7) Increase parking spaces from 15 spaces to 37 spaces and provide a minimum of two on-site bicycle parking spaces;
- 8) Increase the number of employees from 11 (existing conditions to be recognized via the County's Code Compliance program) to 15;
- 9) Construct a new gate and re-configure the existing on-site circulation pattern;
- 10) Upgrade existing landscaping and the façade of the existing winery building and the provision of an accessible path of travel;
- 11) Potential relocation of the existing overhead power lines;
- 12) Improvement of the existing driveways to county standards; and
- 13) Upgrade the existing water system permit from a Transient Non Community (TNC) water system to a Non-Transient Non-Community (NTNC) water system.

A Variance application (P19-00006) is also requested to allow construction of the proposed covered work area approximately 375 feet from the centerline of State Highway 29 and the proposed covered pomace bin approximately 430 feet from the centerline of State Highway 29. Both would be located within the minimum 600-foot winery setback from State Highway 29.

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

Access to the site is via two driveways connecting to State Highway 29. Soil types include Bale clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes and Cole silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes. The majority of the site lies within the boundaries of the 100 and 500-year flood hazard boundaries. The project site is outside of a designated Fire Hazard Severity area.

Land uses in the area are dominated by large lot residential properties, wineries, including Markham Vineyards, and vineyards. The existing winery is located approximately 1,000 feet to the southwest of the nearest neighboring residence which is located at 2908 St. Helena Highway North.

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

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

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

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

**Other Agencies Contacted**

Federal Trade and Taxation Bureau  
Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control

**12. Tribal Cultural Resources.** Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested

consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resource, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

On October 30, 2019, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. The Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation responded and declined comment as the project site is not located within their aboriginal territories. The Middletown Rancheria requested consultation and met with the County on December 11, 2019 to discuss their concerns. A mitigation measure was developed in consultation with the tribe and is included in the Cultural Resources section below. No other responses were received within 30-days of the tribe's receipt of the invitations.

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:**

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

*Jason R. Hade*

July 27, 2020

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Name: Jason R. Hade, Principal Planner

Napa County  
Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department

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

Discussion:

- a. The project site is not located within a scenic vista. As such, no impacts would occur.
- b. State Highway 29 is identified as a Viewshed Road. However, the County's Viewshed Protection Program is not applicable to the proposed project as no construction is proposed on slopes in excess of 15 percent. No trees would be removed as part of project construction. No rock outcroppings or historic buildings are located at the subject site. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. The proposed project consists of the construction of a 3,500 square foot freestanding covered crush pad and outdoor work area; remodeling of the existing tasting room including the addition of a 1,200 square foot outdoor tasting area adjacent to the tasting room; construction of a 240 square foot attached ADA compliant restroom, 215 square foot attached private tasting room, 250 square foot attached employee break room, and a 225 square foot pomace bin. Proposed architectural design of the tasting room addition would utilize wood and corrugated metal siding, a living landscape wall and a painted corrugated metal roof to match the existing structure. The maximum height for the expanded structure would be approximately 12 feet measured from grade. All improvements would occur on previously disturbed areas of the site. Although the proposed covered work area would be located approximately 375 feet from the centerline of State Highway 29 within the minimum 600-foot winery setback from State Highway 29 requiring the Variance application, it would be mostly shielded behind an existing structure and the proposed additional landscaping. Visual impacts would be minimal. As such, the project would not degrade the existing character of the site and its surroundings and impacts would be less than significant.
- d. The installation of lighting that may have the potential to impact nighttime views could occur within the expanded parking area as part of the project. Pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approval for wineries, 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 outside lighting.

6.3 LIGHTING – PLAN SUBMITTAL

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

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

Discussion:

a/b/e. The project site is designated as “prime farmland” and “urban and built up land” as shown on the Napa County Important Farmland Map 2002 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. All changes as a result of the project would occur within the portion of the site mapped as “urban and built up land” with the exception of the partial removal on an existing vine row (0.05 acres of vineyard) which would be removed within “prime farmland” as part of the proposed parking lot reconfiguration. The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. There is an existing agricultural contract on the property which permits wineries and their continued operation. There are no other changes included in this proposal that would result in the conversion of Farmland. General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use policies AG/LU-2 and AG/LU-13 recognize wineries, and any use consistent with the Winery Definition Ordinance and clearly accessory to a winery, as agriculture. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

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

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

Ozone and fine particle pollution, or PM2.5, are the major regional air pollutants of concern in the San Francisco Bay Area. Ozone is primarily a problem in the summer, and fine particle pollution in the winter. In Napa County, ozone rarely exceeds health standards, but PM2.5 occasionally does reach unhealthy concentrations. There are multiple reasons for PM2.5 exceedances in Napa County. First, much of the county is wind-sheltered, which tends to trap PM2.5 within the Napa Valley. Second, much of the area is well north of the

moderating temperatures of San Pablo Bay and, as a result, Napa County experiences some of the coldest nights in the Bay Area. This leads to greater fireplace use and, in turn, higher PM2.5 levels. Finally, in the winter easterly winds often move fine-particle-laden air from the Central Valley to the Carquinez Strait and then into western Solano and southern Napa County (BAAQMD, *In Your Community: Napa County*, April 2016)

The impacts associated with implementation of the project were evaluated consistent with guidance provided by BAAQMD. Ambient air quality standards have been established by state and federal environmental agencies for specific air pollutants most pervasive in urban environments. These pollutants are referred to as criteria air pollutants because the standards established for them were developed to meet specific health and welfare criteria set forth in the enabling legislation. The criteria air pollutants emitted by development, traffic and other activities anticipated under the proposed development include ozone, ozone precursors oxides of nitrogen and reactive organic gases (NO<sub>x</sub> and ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), and suspended particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>). Other criteria pollutants, such as lead and sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), would not be substantially emitted by the proposed development or traffic, and air quality standards for them are being met throughout the Bay Area.

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

As mentioned above, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Operational-Related Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursors Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. Given the size of the entire project, which is approximately 685 additional square feet of enclosed floor area (tasting room addition) with 685 additional square feet of space dedicated to tasting/hospitality uses compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47ksf (high quality restaurant) and 541ksf (general light industry) for NO<sub>x</sub> (oxides of nitrogen), the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. (Please note: a high quality restaurant is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, but grossly overstates emissions associated with other portions of a winery, such as office, barrel storage and production, which generate fewer vehicle trips. Therefore, a general light industry comparison has also been used for other such uses.)

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

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

## 7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

### c. AIR QUALITY

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

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

7. *Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting off equipment when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five (5) minutes (as required by State Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.*
8. *All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator. Any portable engines greater than 50 horsepower or associated equipment operated within the BAAQMD's jurisdiction shall have either a California Air Resources Board (ARB) registration Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) or a BAAQMD permit. For general information regarding the certified visible emissions evaluator or the registration program, visit the ARB FAQ [http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/perp/perpfact\\_04-16-15.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/perp/perpfact_04-16-15.pdf) or the PERP website <http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/portable.htm>.*

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

7.1 **SITE IMPROVEMENTS**

b. **DUST CONTROL**

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

While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. The existing winery is located approximately 1,000 feet to the southwest of the nearest neighboring residence which is located at 2908 St. Helena Highway North. Construction-phase pollutants would be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. The project would not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

- e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
- f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. Evans & De Shazo, Inc. (EDS) conducted a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) of the Ballentine Vineyard property located at 2820 St. Helena Highway N., St. Helena, Napa County, California within Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 022-200-003 (project area). The 21.12-acre property currently contains eight residential and commercial buildings that include a ca. 1880 house, a ca. 1945 detached garage and ca. 1960 pool and associated landscape, as well as five contemporary commercial buildings associated with the Ballentine Vineyard business that include an agricultural/office building, a fermentation building with an attached tasting room, a barrel storage building, two additional agricultural buildings, and 15.0 acres of vineyards. No changes are proposed to any of these existing structures other than the tasting room which was constructed in the 1990s. Historical resources include properties eligible for listing on the CRHR, the NRHP, or a local register of historical resources (as defined at Public Resources Code §5020.1(k)). In compliance with CEQA regulations and guidelines, EDS Principal Architectural Historian Stacey De Shazo, M.A. and Senior Architectural Historian, Brian Matuk, M.S. conducted research and a survey to evaluate the built environment within the project area, including the ca. 1880 house, ca. 1945 detached garage and ca. 1960 pool, as well as the associated landscape to determine if the resource qualifies for listing on the CRHR, and if the proposed project would impact historical resources. The ca. 1880 house was previously evaluated by Caltrans under limited context and documented as P-28- 001449. 59 The current HRE completed by EDS, re-evaluated the ca. 1880 house and property using current standards and provided the necessary context for which to evaluate the ca. 1880 and property to make a determination of significance. In addition, EDS also evaluated the associated buildings and features within the property that are over 45 years in age including the ca.

1945 detached garage and ca. 1960 pool, as well as the associated landscape. The HRE determined that ca. 1880 house, ca. 1945 detached garage and ca. 1960 pool, as well as the associated landscape (P-28-001449) are not eligible for listing in the CRHR, and are therefore not considered historical Resources for the purpose of CEQA. Therefore, no project-specific recommendations are warranted, as it appears that the proposed project will not impact built-environment historical resources. Impacts would be less than significant.

- b. According to a Cultural Resources Study of the Ballentine Vineyards Property at 2820 St. Helena Highway N., St. Helena, Napa County, California, the proposed project has the potential to impact previously recorded lithic scatter during construction of the proposed bio-retention areas and potential relocation of the overhead power lines (Cultural Resources Study of the Ballentine Vineyards Property at 2820 St. Helena Highway N., St. Helena, Napa County, California, 2019). As a follow-up recommendation for the cultural resources study, an Archaeological Test Excavation of the Prehistoric Archaeological Site P-28-000951 (CA-NAP-831) Located Within the Ballentine Vineyards Property, 2820 St. Helena Highway North, St. Helena, Napa County, California, was conducted. Based upon the results of the archaeological test excavation, archaeological monitoring is recommended during the construction of the 3,500 square foot freestanding covered crush pad and outdoor work area, two bio-retention areas, and any other activities which may require excavation into native soil. Archaeological monitoring is not necessary for project activities located on the building pad that would not penetrate into native soil (tasting room remodel, 240 square foot ADA compliant restroom, 215 square foot attached private tasting room, 250 square foot attached employee break room, pomace bin construction, accessible path or travel, on-site circulation revision including the new gate and driveway widening, and additional landscaping). Implementation of mitigation measure CUL-1 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Further, if resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval:

#### 7.2 ARCHEOLOGICAL FINDING

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

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

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

#### Mitigation Measure:

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

- by the Tribe is followed to the extent permitted by law. No laboratory studies, scientific analysis, curation or video recording are permitted for tribal cultural resources without the prior written consent of the Tribe; and
- e. Presence of an archaeological monitor and tribal representative on-site during initial rough grading of improvements (freestanding covered crush pad and outdoor work area and two bio-retention areas) on the Ballentine Vineyards parcel.

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

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. The greenhouse gas emissions reduction measures identified in the Greenhouse Gas Emissions section below, such as the installation of approximately 1,500 square feet of additional solar panels adding approximately 20kWh to the current capacity of 75kWh capacity, would reduce the project's consumption of energy resources. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency because there are no plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

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

Discussion:

- a.
  - i.) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.
  - ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project would be required to comply with the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
  - iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Although the project site is identified as having a high liquefaction potential according to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (liquefaction layers), compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.
  - iv.) According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) there are known landslide areas on the subject site.
- b. The proposed improvements would occur on slopes of five percent to 15 percent. The project would require incorporation of best management practices and would be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c/d. Soil types include Bale clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes and Cole silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the improvements are proposed for an area which has a high susceptibility for liquefaction. Compliance with the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code, would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level of less than significant.
- e. According to the Wastewater Feasibility Report for Ballentine Vineyards Use Permit Modification prepared by Madrone Engineering on October 3, 2018, the project site and proposed system would have adequate disposal capacity to serve the project. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings. Impacts would be less than significant.
- f. According to Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Archaeological Resources Layer, historical site, points & lines), known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified within the project site. Implementation of mitigation measure CUL-1 and standard condition of approval 7.2 identified in **Section V** above would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

One time "Construction Emissions" associated with a winery development project include: i) the carbon stocks that are lost (or released) when existing vegetation is removed and soil is ripped in preparation for the driveway improvements; and ii) emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area, including construction equipment and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as Equipment Emissions). These emissions also include underground carbon stocks (or Soil carbon) associated with any existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed. As previously stated, the proposed project consists of the construction of a 3,500 square foot freestanding covered crush pad and outdoor work area; remodeling of the existing tasting room including the addition of a 1,200 square foot outdoor tasting area adjacent to the tasting room; construction of a 240 square foot attached ADA compliant restroom, 215 square foot attached private tasting room, 250 square foot attached employee break room, and a 225 square foot pomace bin. All improvements would occur on previously disturbed areas of the site.

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

As discussed in the Air Quality section of this Initial Study, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors & GHG Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, including GHG emissions, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. Because approximately 685 square feet of additional floor area (tasting room addition) is proposed when compared to the BAAQMD's GHG screening criteria of 121,000 sf for general industrial, and compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 9,000 sf. for a high quality restaurant, the project was determined not to exceed the 1,100 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr GHG threshold of significance. Approximately 685 square feet of additional space dedicated to tasting/hospitality uses is proposed.

Furthermore, the applicant intends to implement the following GHG reduction methods at the winery: installation of approximately 1,500 square feet of additional solar panels adding approximately 20kWh to the current capacity of 75kWh capacity; construction of approximately 350 linear feet of a vertical living garden within an existing paved area; energy efficient lighting fixtures; installation of four bicycle racks; project location along future Napa Vine Trail extension; treatment of process wastewater before recycling for use for agricultural irrigation purposes; installation of water efficient fixtures; replacement of asphalt pavement with an impervious paving system to filter and drain water towards landscape; planting of native vegetation; continued recycling of 75 percent of all waste; installation of an electric vehicle charging station; and minimizing grading by only disturbing previously disturbed areas as part of the project. The winery has already implemented the following GHG reduction methods: installation of solar panels which generate approximately 75kWh of on-site renewable energy; recycling of 75 percent of all waste; lining of highly exposed southern facades with trees; certification as a Napa Green Winery; education to staff and visitors on sustainable practices; and retaining biomass removed via pruning and thinning by chipping the material and using it rather than burning on-site.

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

IX.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<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. A business plan would be filed with the Environmental Health Division should hazardous materials reach reportable levels. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. Hazardous materials such as diesel, maintenance fluids, and paints would be used onsite during construction. Should they be stored onsite, these materials would be stored in secure locations to reduce the potential for upset or accident conditions. The proposed project consists of the continued operations of an existing winery that would not be expected to use any substantial quantities of hazardous materials. Therefore, it would not be reasonably foreseeable for the proposed project to create upset or accident conditions that involve the release of hazardous materials into the environments. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the project site. According to Google Earth, the nearest school to the project site is Robert Louis Stevenson Middle School, located approximately 1.2 miles to the southeast. No impacts would occur.

- d. Based on a search of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control database, the project site does not contain any known EPA National Priority List sites, State response sites, voluntary cleanup sites, or any school cleanup sites. No impact would occur as the project site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.
- e. No impact would occur as the project site is not located within an airport land use plan.
- f. The proposed access driveway improvements and on-site circulation configuration meets Napa County Road and Street Standards. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division and found acceptable, as conditioned. Therefore, the proposed project would not obstruct emergency vehicle access and impacts would be less than significant.
- g. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. The proposed driveway improvements would provide adequate access to State Highway 29. The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

X.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces which would:				
	i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 January 14, 2014, Governor Jerry Brown declared a drought emergency in the state of California. That declaration was followed up on April 1, 2015, when the Governor directed the State Water Resources Control Board to implement mandatory water reductions in cities and town across California to reduce water usage by 25 percent. These water restrictions do not apply to agricultural users. However, on April 7, 2017, Governor Jerry Brown signed an executive order lifting California's drought emergency in all but four counties (Fresno, Kings, Tulare and Tuolumne). The County of Napa had not adopted or implemented any additional mandatory water use restrictions. The County requires all discretionary permit applicants to complete necessary water analyses in order to document that sufficient water supplies are available for the proposed project and to implement water saving measures to prepare for periods of limited water supply and to conserve limited groundwater resources.

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

In 2009, Napa County began a comprehensive study of its groundwater resources to meet identified action items in the County's 2008 General Plan update. The study, by Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE), emphasized developing a sound understanding of groundwater conditions and implementing an expanded groundwater monitoring and data management program as a foundation for integrated water resources planning and dissemination of water resources information. The 2011 baseline study by LSCE, which included over 600 wells and data going back over 50 years, concluded that "the groundwater levels in Napa County are stable, except for portions of the MST district". Most wells elsewhere within the Napa Valley floor with a sufficient record indicate that groundwater levels are more affected by climatic conditions, are within historical levels, and seem to recover from dry periods during subsequent wet or normal periods. The LSCE Study also concluded that, on a regional scale, there appear to be no current groundwater quality issues except north of Calistoga (mostly naturally occurring boron and trace metals) and in the Carneros region (mostly salinity). The subject property is located within the Napa Valley Floor St. Helena subarea of Napa County according to the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2013. The County has no record of problems or complaints of diminished groundwater supplies at the project site or in the general vicinity.

Minimum thresholds for water use have been established by the Department of Public Works using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS). These reports are the result of water resources investigations performed by the USGS in cooperation with the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. Any project which reduces water usage or any water usage which is at or below the established threshold is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels. The project is categorized as being located within the Valley Floor in an area that has an established acceptable water use criteria of 1.0 acre foot per acre per year based upon current County Water Availability Analysis policies. Based upon those criteria, the Allowable Water Allotment for the project site is 21.12 acre-feet per year (af/yr), determined by multiplying the 21.12 acre Valley floor site by a one AF/YR/acre fair share water use factor.

- a/b. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements nor substantially deplete local groundwater supplies. According to the Wastewater Feasibility Report for Ballentine Vineyards Use Permit Modification prepared by Madrone Engineering on October 3, 2018, the project site and proposed system would have adequate disposal capacity to serve the project. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings.

Currently, there is only one well (Well #01) on the parcel. Historically, the yield on the well has exceeded 200 gpm. As part of this project, a new well (Well #02) with a 50' sanitary seal would be drilled and connected to all winery uses. Well #02 is expected to have a similar yield to Well #01. The proposed winery water use of 13.784 acre-feet per year equates to an average of approximately 12,300 gallons per day. At a constant rate of 9 gpm (only approximately 5 percent of expected Well #02 capacity), approximately 12,960 gallons of water would be available each day. Therefore, project water use is expected to be well within the physical capabilities of the proposed Well #02 (Madrone Engineering, 2018).

According to the Water Availability Analysis for Ballentine Vineyards 2820 St. Helena Highway North, St. Helena, CA 94574 APN: 022-200-003 prepared by Madrone Engineering on October 3, 2018, the anticipated total overall water demand for the project site would be 13.784 AF/YR representing a 2.443 AF/YR increase of the existing water demand of 11.341 AF/YR. Therefore, the impacts from the project would be less than significant and no further analysis is needed. Below is a table that details each source of existing and proposed groundwater use:

Usage Type	Existing Usage	Proposed Usage
Vineyard Irrigation	9.000	9.000
Winery		
Wine Production	1.075	2.688
Domestic (Employees & Visitors)	0.316	1.046
Landscaping	0.200	0.300
Residential Water Use	0.750	0.750
<b>Net Use (Acre-ft per Year)</b>	<b>11.341</b>	<b>13.784</b>

The estimated groundwater demand of 13.784 AF/YR, represents an increase of 2.443 AF/YR over the existing condition and is below the water allotment for the parcel. The winery, as part of its entitlement would include the County's standard condition of approval requiring well monitoring as well as the potential to modify/alter permitted uses on site should groundwater resources become insufficient to supply the use.

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

- By 2017, local groundwater management agencies must be identified;
- By 2020, overdrafted groundwater basins must have sustainability plans;
- By 2022, other high and medium priority basins not currently in overdraft must have sustainability plans; and
- By 2040, all high and medium priority groundwater basins must achieve sustainability.

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

The proposed project would result in a modest increase on the demand of ground water supplies, but would remain far below the parcel's water allotment, and therefore would not interfere with groundwater recharge or lowering of the local groundwater level. The winery would continue to use treated process wastewater derived from the Lyve system to irrigate its vineyards. There are no known offsite wells located within 500 feet of the project well. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Water Deficient Areas/Storage Areas*), the project site is not located within a water deficient area and the County is not aware of, nor has it received any reports of groundwater deficiencies in the area.

- c. The project would not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off the project site. Improvement plans prepared prior to the issuance of a building permit would ensure that the proposed project does not increase runoff flow rate or volume as a result of project implementation. General Plan Policy CON-50 c) requires discretionary projects, including this project, to meet performance standards designed to ensure peak runoff in 2-, 10-, 50-, and 100-year events following development is not greater than predevelopment conditions. The preliminary grading and drainage plan has been reviewed by the Engineering Division. The proposed project would implement standard stormwater quality treatment controls to treat runoff prior to discharge from the project site. The incorporation of these features into the project would ensure that the proposed project would not create substantial sources of polluted runoff. In addition, the proposed project does not have any unusual characteristics that create sources of pollution that would degrade water quality. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d. The majority of the site lies within the boundaries of the 100 and 500-year flood hazard boundaries. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant would be required to obtain a floodplain permit which would address any flood hazard related issues. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. Impacts would be less than significant.

- e. The proposed project would not conflict with a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan because there are no such plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

The project complies with the Napa County Code and all other applicable regulations with the exception of a Variance application (P19-00006) requested to allow construction of the proposed covered work area approximately 375 feet from the centerline of State Highway 29 and the proposed covered pomace bin approximately 430 feet from the centerline of State Highway 29. Both would be located within the minimum 600-foot winery setback from State Highway 29. As shown on the "Variance for Covered Crush Pad" exhibit prepared by MH Architects on February 13, 2019, strict application of the required setbacks would require removal of vineyards, disturbance of previously undisturbed areas and development within a floodway.

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

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

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

The General Plan includes two policies requiring wineries to be designed generally of a high architectural quality for the site and its surroundings. Proposed architectural design of the tasting room addition would utilize wood and corrugated metal siding, a living landscape wall and a painted corrugated metal roof to match the existing structure. The maximum height for the expanded structure would be approximately 12 feet measured from grade. As such, the project would fit within the context of its surroundings. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b. The project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during construction of the proposed driveway improvements and building improvements. Construction activities would be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. As such, the project would not result in potentially significant temporary construction noise impacts or operational impacts. Because the nearest residence to the project site is approximately 1,000 feet to the northeast of the winery, there is a low potential for impacts related to construction noise to be significant. Further, construction activities would occur during the period of 7am-7pm on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity. All construction activities would be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). The proposed project would not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts. Conditions of approval identified below would require construction activities to be limited to daylight hours, vehicles to be muffled, and backup alarms adjusted to the lowest allowable levels. Impacts would be less than significant.

8.3. **CONSTRUCTION NOISE**

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

The proposed project involves a marketing program including 112 events on an annual basis with the largest event permitting up to 100 guests. The proposed project requests the use of an outdoor space for marketing events, which has the potential to generate higher noise levels, compared to existing conditions.

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

The nearest off-site residence to the existing winery is approximately 1,000 feet to the northeast of the winery buildings and parking area. Under the proposed project, the largest outdoor event that would occur on the parcel would have an attendance of no more than 100 people, and all events would end by 10:00 p.m., with clean-up conducted afterwards. Winery operations would occur between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. (excluding harvest). The potential for the creation of significant noise from increased visitation is significantly reduced, since the tasting areas are predominantly within the winery building itself. On-premise consumption is requested to occur within open air patio, tasting room, and private tasting room. Continuing enforcement of Napa County's Noise Ordinance by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff, including the prohibition against amplified music, should further ensure that marketing events and other winery activities do not create a significant noise impact. Events and non-amplified music, excluding quiet clean-up, are required to finish by 10:00 p.m. Amplified music or sound systems would not be permitted for outdoor events as identified in standard Condition of Approval 4.10 below. Temporary events would be subject to County Code Chapter 5.36 which regulates proposed temporary events.

4.10 **AMPLIFIED MUSIC**

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures None required.

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

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Discussion:

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

- v) Other public facilities?

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures:

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures:

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

- |   |                          |                                     |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-14, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

a/b. Four intersections along State Route 29 (St. Helena Highway) at Lodi Lane, Ballentine Vineyards Winery (north and south driveways), and Deer Park Road were evaluated for existing and future operating conditions with and without the proposed project. In addition, the arterial segments of State Route 29 north and south of the project driveways as well as Lodi Lane and Deer Park Road were evaluated for peak hour weekday and weekend operating conditions. St. Helena Highway (SR 29) extends in a primarily north-south direction between Deer Park Road past the project site to Lodi Lane. In the project study area, SR 29 is a two-lane semi-rural highway with 10-foot striped shoulder lanes, two 12-foot travel lanes, and a 12-foot two-way-left-turn-lane (TWLTL) and provides access to agricultural (vineyard) and residential uses. The posted speed limit on SR 29 is 45 mph from St. Helena north to Deer Park Road. North of Deer Park Road, the speed limit increases to 50 MPH extending through Lodi Lane. Lodi Lane is located approximately 0.4 miles north of the project site and extends in an east-west direction between SR 29 and Silverado Trail. Lodi Lane is a two-lane semi-rural roadway with unimproved shoulders providing access to residential and agricultural areas east of First Avenue with a 45-mph speed limit. Deer Park Road is located approximately 1,000 feet south of the project site and (like Lodi Lane) extends in an east-west from SR 29 to Silverado Trail. Deer Park Road is two-lane roadway with Class II bike lanes (on-road, striped) that provides access to residential and agricultural areas in the Napa Valley. The posted speed limit is 55 mph on Deer Park Road in the project study area. Access is provided by two existing driveways east into the winery grounds.

GHD prepared a *Focused Traffic Analysis for the Proposed Ballentine Vineyards Use Modification* in January 2020. According to the study, proposed project daily and peak hour trip generation was conservatively based on Napa County Trip Generation ratios for winery production, employment, and visitation. Based on these County ratios, the project as modified is estimated to generate 93 daily trips with 33 weekday PM peak hour (4:00 PM to 6:00 PM) trips and 44 Saturday midday peak hour (1:00 PM to 4:00 PM) trips. However, the Winery is currently permitted to generate 19 daily trips with 7 weekday PM peak hour trips and 5 Saturday midday peak hour trips. Accounting for Ballentine Vineyards Winery permitted uses, the proposed project's net increase in vehicle trip generation would amount to 74 daily trips with 26 weekday PM peak hour trips and 39 Saturday midday peak hour trips. The largest requested marketing event would have up to 100 attendees per event and up to four times a year. These events would be scheduled to not start or end during the weekday PM hour (4:00 PM to 5:00 PM) or weekend midday peak hour (2:00 PM to 3:00 PM) on weekend days. The project includes the import of approximately 300 cubic yards of fill and associated approximately 19 truck trips.

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

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

- LOS A-** Free-flowing travel with an excellent level of comfort and convenience and freedom to maneuver.
- LOS B-** Stable operating conditions, but the presence of other road users causes a noticeable, though slight, reduction in comfort, convenience, and maneuvering freedom.
- LOS C-** Stable operating conditions, but the operation of individual users is substantially affected by the interaction with others in the traffic stream.
- LOS D-** High-density, but stable flow. Users experience severe restrictions in speed and freedom to maneuver, with poor levels of comfort and convenience.

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

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

Under existing conditions, the intersection of Deer Park Road/SR-29 currently operates at LOS F during both the weekday PM peak hour and Saturday midday peak hour for the outbound (westbound) left and right-turn movements from Deer Park Road onto SR-29. All other study intersections operate at acceptable (LOS D or better) conditions. Based on the CAMUTCD (California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices) for the peak hour signal warrant, the Deer Park Road/SR-29 intersection would qualify for signalization with existing (no project) weekday PM peak and Saturday midday peak hour volumes. Arterial operation along SR-29 is calculated at LOS E during both the weekday PM peak hour and Saturday midday peak hour conditions. Arterial operation along Lodi Lane and Deer Park Road is currently LOS C or better during both the weekday and weekend peak periods. It is noted that field observations indicate that during the weekday PM peak hour period southbound traffic flow on SR-29 can vary from free-flow conditions to intermittent periods of slowed or stop-and-go conditions between approximately 4:50 PM to 5:30 PM. (for typical weekday southbound direction traffic flow). With the addition of project-related traffic volumes, the Deer Park Road/SR-29 intersection would continue to operate at LOS F during both the weekday PM and weekend mid-day peak hours with proposed project traffic. The remaining study intersections of Lodi Lane/SR-29 and Ballentine North and South Driveways/SR-29 Road would continue to operate acceptable levels (LOS D or better) during the same peak time periods. Based on updated County significance criteria for unsignalized intersections the intersection of Deer Park Road/SR-29 has been evaluated for proposed project impacts since the LOS operates at an unacceptable level (LOS F) without proposed project trips during the weekday PM peak hour and weekend midday peak hour. County criteria indicate that a significant impact could occur if the proposed project contributes 1 percent or more of the total traffic at the intersection. Current County protocol go on to state "the peak hour signal warrant criteria should also be evaluated and presented for informational purposes." During the weekday PM peak hour, the proposed project would add 20 trips to the intersection. During the weekend midday peak hour, the project would add 27 trips to the intersection. Based on existing peak hour volumes of 2,137 and 1,748 at the intersection during these PM and midday peak hours; proposed project contribution would be less than one percent (1%) during the Friday PM peak hour. However, during the weekend (Saturday) midday peak hour the proposed project's contribution would total 1.5 percent. Under the County significance criteria, this would be considered a significant impact. The Deer Park Road/SR-29 intersection would continue to meet the peak hour signal warrant with or without proposed project. With existing plus project traffic, the arterial north-south segments of SR-29 would continue to operate an unacceptable conditions (LOS E). The roadway segments on Lodi Lane and Deer Park Road would continue to operate at acceptable levels (LOS D or better). The addition of proposed project trips to directional (southbound only or northbound only) peak hour volumes on SR-29 would represent a significant impact based on the project adding more than one percent to the overall directional volumes. During the weekday PM peak hour project trips would represent 1.6 percent of directional southbound volumes and 1.5 percent of directional northbound volumes. The implementation of mitigation measures MM TRANS-1 and MM TRANS-2 below would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

With proposed project traffic, there would be slight increases in vehicle delays at study intersection locations and overall LOS would remain unchanged from year 2030 cumulative (no project) conditions. Based on updated County significance criteria for unsignalized intersections the off-site intersections of Lodi Lane/SR-29 and Deer Park Road/SR-29 have been evaluated for proposed project impacts since the LOS operates at an unacceptable level (LOS F) without proposed project trips during the weekday PM peak hour and weekend midday peak hour. County criteria indicate that a significant impact could be found if the proposed project contributes 5 percent or more to the total cumulative traffic growth at these intersections. The guidelines go on to state "the peak hour signal warrant criteria should also be evaluated and presented for informational purposes." During the weekday PM peak hour, the proposed project would add 13 trips to the Lodi Lane/SR-29 intersection. During the weekend (Saturday) midday peak hour the project would add 17 trips to the intersection. Based on total cumulative traffic growth at the intersection these proposed project trips would represent increases of 1.5 percent (13/833) and 2.4 percent (17/708), respectively. At the Deer Park Road/SR-29 intersection, the total cumulative traffic growth related to proposed project uses would be 1.9 percent (20/1,002) and 3.2 percent (27/830) during the weekday PM peak hour and weekend (Saturday) midday peak hour time periods. Under the County significance criteria, the addition of proposed project trips to these intersections would be considered less-than-significant given that all project contributions would be under 5 percent of overall cumulative traffic growth. Related to arterial segment operation on SR-29, Lodi Lane, and Deer Park Road; the proposed project trips would be considered less-than-significant given that they represent less than a 5 percent increase in total cumulative traffic growth. Public Works Department staff reviewed the study and concluded that the study adequately demonstrates that the proposed use in the proposed location would not result in any significant impacts, either project-specific or cumulative, on traffic circulation in the vicinity. Therefore, the project would result in a nominal increase in trips on the study area transportation network. Additionally, a project specific condition would ensure that daily tastings would not occur during events of greater than 100 guests.

As proposed, the project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation. According

to the traffic impact study, pedestrian and bicycle circulation would occur primarily in the northern half of the project site where daily visitor parking spaces and bicycle facilities are located associated with access through the primary north driveway entrance. A new dedicated solid-paver path would be constructed between the existing residence on the west side of the site and new tasting room/support rooms on the far eastern end of the site. The path would be constructed in an area along the frontage of the existing residential garage/agricultural building and new parking spaces on the south side of the internal drive aisle. By situating the path in this area pedestrians would be removed from having to walk back and forth in the drive aisle to access winery facilities in the eastern portion of the site. Bicycle racks would be located in the northeast quadrant of the site adjacent to the new tasting room.  
" (GHD, 2020). A minimum of two on-site bicycle parking spaces would be provided as part of the project.

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

The project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b). The applicant provided information demonstrating the winery's efforts to reduce vehicle miles traveled via implementation of a VMT Reduction/Transportation Demand Management Plan (MM TRANS-1). Impacts would be less than significant.

- d-f. The proposed Ballentine Winery Use Modification project would involve a re-design of the existing site plan to allow improved site circulation, increased parking, emergency vehicle enhancements to access/turnaround areas, and dedicated pedestrian/bicycle facilities for safety and storage. Currently, vehicle and truck access to the proposed Ballentine Vineyards Winery is gained by two existing driveways (north and south) extending east from SR-29 into the winery grounds. Vehicle and truck access would continue from the two site driveways, but would be modified to better serve guests and site circulation. The northern entry driveway and aisle would be enlarged to serve all visitors and guests. This driveway would be 25-foot wide upon initial entry and expand to 74-foot to provide areas for vehicle parking and ADA spaces, dedicated pedestrian paths, and emergency vehicle turnaround. The southern Ballentine Winery driveway is located approximately 175-foot south of the northern driveway on SR 29 and would be used primarily for existing residential use, employees and truck access. The driveway extends east from SR 29 for approximately 200 feet with a 22-foot width (minimum County standard). At this juncture, the driveway has internal drive aisle extensions that continue north and further east. The northern drive aisle extension provides access to employee parking spaces and would also continue through an internal gated access to connect with the northerly Ballentine Driveway to complete a circular loop-access through the property. Continuing from SR 29, the southern driveway extends east between the existing fermentation and barrel storage buildings to the eastern-most portion of the project site. In this area, an additional parking field would be created to accommodate 21 parking spaces (valet event parking spaces) directly behind the open air production canopy and north of the agricultural building. There would also be a trash enclosure immediately east of the barrel storage building not in the direct line of vehicle traffic and/or parking access. Based on intersection LOS calculations for the Ballentine Winery north and south driveways at State Route 29, vehicle queuing at the driveways would not be significant.

Vehicle sight distance at the existing Ballentine Vineyards driveways (north and south) intersections were evaluated. The required vehicle visibility or "corner sight distance" is a function of travel speeds on SR-29. Caltrans design standards indicate that for appropriate corner sight distance, "a substantially clear line of sight should be maintained between the driver of a vehicle waiting at the cross road and the driver of an approaching vehicle in the right lane of the main highway". Caltrans design guidelines also indicate that the minimum corner sight distance "shall be equal to the stopping sight distance" where possible. The posted vehicle speed limit on SR-29 is 50 mph in the project area. The "critical" vehicle speed (the speed at which 85 percent of all surveyed vehicles travel at or below) along SR-29 has been conservatively estimated at 55-60 mph at the project driveways. Caltrans' design standards indicate that these vehicle speeds require a stopping sight distance of 580 feet both north and south of the driveways measured along the travel lanes of SR-29.13F12 F 13 Based on field measurements, sight distance from the Ballentine Vineyards north and south driveways exceeds 580 feet (at least 700 feet in each direction). Therefore, the sight distance recommendations would be met for the speed limit and observed vehicle speeds (GHD, 2020). The proposed project driveway sightlines would meet standards provided landscaping is maintained in a manner which does not interfere with these sightlines as provided in mitigation measure TRANS-3. Proposed site access was reviewed and approved by the Napa County Fire Department, Engineering Services Division, and Public Works Department, as conditioned.

The proposal includes the construction of 22 additional parking spaces for a total of 37 parking spaces at the subject site. Based upon the County standard of 2.6 persons per vehicle during weekdays and 2.8 persons per vehicle during weekends and 1.05 persons per

vehicle for employees the minimum parking required for weekend activities would be 49 parking spaces. However, it is unlikely that the winery would host 95 visitors at one time and have 15 employees at the site at one time. In addition to the standard and ADA parking spaces, there would 12 over-flow parking spaces (10 spaces along the north side and 2 spaces along the south side) to accommodate additional visitor demand or special event parking.

Mitigation Measures:

MM TRANS-1: An operations plan shall be adopted that reduces the impact to the intersection of Deer Park Road and SR-29 by limiting the Saturday midday peak hour ratio to 68 daily visitor trips and reduces the impact to the intersection of Deer Park Road and Lodi Lane by instituting an alternate schedule for employees to reduce the vehicle trips to and from the winery during the weekday PM peak hour and weekend midday peak hour, reducing the number of weekday PM peak hour trips by seven trips and weekend midday peak hour trips by five trips. The project shall also implement the VMT Reduction/Transportation Demand Management Plan as proposed in the *Focused Traffic Analysis for the Proposed Ballentine Vineyards Use Modification* in January 2020.

**Monitoring:** An operations plan shall be prepared that reduces the impact to the intersection of Deer Park Road and SR-29 by limiting the Saturday midday peak hour ratio to 68 daily visitor trips and reduces the impact to the intersection of Deer Park Road and Lodi Lane by instituting an alternate schedule for employees to reduce the vehicle trips to and from the winery during the weekday PM peak hour and weekend midday peak hour, reducing the number of weekday PM peak hour trips by seven trips and weekend midday peak hour trips by five trips. The Vehicle Miles Traveled Reduction/Transportation Demand Management Plan as proposed in the *Focused Traffic Analysis for the Proposed Ballentine Vineyards Use Modification* in January 2020, shall be finalized and submitted to the Planning Division prior to the issuance of a Final Certificate of Occupancy. After issuance of a Final Certificate of Occupancy, an Ongoing Monitoring and Reporting Statement shall be submitted to the Planning Division on a quarterly basis. Planning Division staff will review the statement to ensure compliance with the TDM Plan. Enforcement steps will be taken, if needed, to attain compliance status.

MM TRANS-2: The applicant/permittee shall revise the proposed marketing events to not start or end large marketing events (100 guests) during the weekday PM hour (4:00 PM to 5:00 PM) or weekend midday peak hour (2:00 PM to 3:00 PM). During (100 guests) events, the tasting room shall not be operating concurrently.

**Monitoring:** A TDM Plan which requires events at the winery with 100 persons to not start or end during the weekday PM hour (4:00 PM to 5:00 PM) or weekend midday peak hour (2:00 PM to 3:00 PM) and requires that during (100 guests) events, the tasting room shall not be operating concurrently shall be prepared and submitted to the Planning Division prior to the issuance of a Final Certificate of Occupancy. After issuance of a Final Certificate of Occupancy, an Ongoing Monitoring and Reporting Statement shall be submitted to the Planning Division on a quarterly basis. Planning Division staff will review the statement to ensure compliance with the TDM Plan. Enforcement steps will be taken, if needed, to attain compliance status.

MM TRANS-3: Landscaping at the project driveway shall be maintained to not interfere with sight lines required for safe stopping distance on public right-of-way. No items that are wider than 18 inches can be taller than 30 inches other than street trees and traffic devices. Street trees should be deciduous and have branches lower than four feet in height removed once the tree is established.

**Monitoring:** The final landscape plan shall reflect the implementation of these standards prior to issuance of a building permit.

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.

Discussion:

a/b. On October 30, 2019, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. The Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation responded and declined comment as the project site is not located within their aboriginal territories. The Middletown Rancheria requested consultation and met with the County on December 11, 2019 to discuss their concerns. A mitigation measure was developed in consultation with the tribe and is included in the Cultural Resources section above. No other responses were received within 30-days of the tribe's receipt of the invitations. Implementation of mitigation measure MM CUL-1 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures: Refer to MM CUL-1 under the Cultural Resources section above.

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

Discussion:

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

As discussed in **Section X** above, the project is categorized as being located within the Valley Floor in an area that has an established acceptable water use criteria of 1.0 acre foot per acre per year based upon current County Water Availability Analysis policies. Based upon those criteria, the Allowable Water Allotment for the project site is 21.12 acre-feet per year (af/yr), determined by multiplying the 21.12 acre Valley floor site by a one AF/YR/acre fair share water use factor.

Currently, there is only one well (Well #01) on the parcel. Historically, the yield on the well has exceeded 200 gpm. As part of this project, a new well (Well #02) with a 50' sanitary seal would be drilled and connected to all winery uses. Well #02 is expected to have a similar yield to Well #01. The proposed winery water use of 13.784 acre-feet per year equates to an average of approximately 12,300 gallons per day. At a constant rate of 9 gpm (only approximately 5 percent of expected Well #02 capacity), approximately 12,960 gallons of water would be available each day. Therefore, project water use is expected to be well within the physical capabilities of the proposed Well #02 (Madrone Engineering, 2018).

According to the Water Availability Analysis for Ballentine Vineyards 2820 St. Helena Highway North, St. Helena, CA 94574 APN: 022-200-003 prepared by Madrone Engineering on October 3, 2018, the anticipated total overall water demand for the project site would be 13.784 AF/YR representing a 2.443 AF/YR increase of the existing water demand of 11.341 AF/YR. The estimated groundwater demand of 13.784 AF/YR, represents an increase of 2.443 AF/YR over the existing condition and is below the water allotment for the parcel.

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

- c. Wastewater would be treated on-site and would not require a wastewater treatment provider. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d/e. According to the Napa County Baseline Data Report, all of the solid waste landfills where Napa County's waste is disposed have more than sufficient capacity related to the current waste generation. The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a/b. The proposed project is located within the local responsibility area and is classified as a non-wildland/non-urban fire hazard severity zone. The project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan because the proposed driveway improvements would provide adequate access to SR 29. The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. The project application was reviewed and approved by the Napa County Fire Department, as conditioned. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c/d. Implementation of the project would include the improvement of the existing access driveway to County standards. Vehicle sight distance at the existing Ballentine Vineyards driveways (north and south) intersections were evaluated. The required vehicle visibility or "corner

sight distance" is a function of travel speeds on SR-29. Caltrans design standards indicate that for appropriate corner sight distance, "a substantially clear line of sight should be maintained between the driver of a vehicle waiting at the cross road and the driver of an approaching vehicle in the right lane of the main highway". Caltrans design guidelines also indicate that the minimum corner sight distance "shall be equal to the stopping sight distance" where possible. The posted vehicle speed limit on SR-29 is 50 mph in the project area. The "critical" vehicle speed (the speed at which 85 percent of all surveyed vehicles travel at or below) along SR-29 has been conservatively estimated at 55-60 mph at the project driveways. Caltrans' design standards indicate that these vehicle speeds require a stopping sight distance of 580 feet both north and south of the driveways measured along the travel lanes of SR-29.13F12 F 13 Based on field measurements, sight distance from the Ballentine Vineyards north and south driveways exceeds 580 feet (at least 700 feet in each direction). Therefore, the sight distance recommendations would be met for the speed limit and observed vehicle speeds (GHD, 2020). The proposed project driveway sightlines would meet standards provided landscaping is maintained in a manner which does not interfere with these sightlines as provided in mitigation measure TRANS-3. Proposed site access was reviewed and approved by the Napa County Fire Department, Engineering Services Division, and Public Works Department, as conditioned. There are no steep slopes at the project site.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XXI.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<p>a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</p> <p>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)?</p> <p>c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>

Discussion:

- a. As discussed in **Section IV** above, according to the Napa County Environmental resource maps, the project site contains no sensitive biological resources with the exception of potential Northern Spotted Owl habitat. However, no trees or vegetation is proposed for removal. Proposed project construction would occur within previously disturbed areas. As identified in **Section V** above, the proposed project has the potential to impact previously recorded lithic scatter during construction of the proposed bio-retention areas and potential relocation of the overhead power lines (Cultural Resources Study of the Ballentine Vineyards Property at 2820 St. Helena Highway N., St. Helena, Napa County, California, 2019). As a follow-up recommendation for the cultural resources study, an Archaeological Test Excavation of the Prehistoric Archaeological Site P-28-000951 (CA-NAP-831) Located Within the Ballentine Vineyards Property, 2820 St. Helena Highway North, St. Helena, Napa County, California, was conducted. Based upon the results of the archaeological test excavation, archaeological monitoring is recommended during the construction of the 3,500 square foot freestanding covered crush pad and outdoor work area, two bio-retention areas, and any other activities which may require excavation into native soil. However, implementation of mitigation measure MM CUL-1 would mitigate any potential impacts to a level of less than significant.
- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology, and traffic impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The project would also increase the demands for public services to a limited extent, increase traffic and air pollutions, all of which contribute to cumulative effects when future development in Napa Valley is considered. Cumulative impacts of these issues are discussed in previous sections of this Initial Study,

wherein the impact from an increase in air pollution is being addressed through Greenhouse Gas Voluntary Best Management Practices including but not limited to: installation of approximately 1,500 square feet of additional solar panels adding approximately 20kWh to the current capacity of 75kWh capacity; construction of approximately 350 linear feet of a vertical living garden within an existing paved area; energy efficient lighting fixtures; installation of four bicycle racks; project location along future Napa Vine Trail extension; treatment of process wastewater before recycling for use for agricultural irrigation purposes; installation of water efficient fixtures; replacement of asphalt pavement with an impervious paving system to filter and drain water towards landscape; planting of native vegetation; continued recycling of 75 percent of all waste; installation of an electric vehicle charging station; and minimizing grading by only disturbing previously disturbed areas as part of the project. The winery has already implemented the following GHG reduction methods: installation of solar panels which generate approximately 75kWh of on-site renewable energy; recycling of 75 percent of all waste; lining of highly exposed southern facades with trees; certification as a Napa Green Winery; education to staff and visitors on sustainable practices; and retaining biomass removed via pruning and thinning by chipping the material and using it rather than burning on-site.

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

General Plan Policy CIR-16 states that "The County will seek to maintain an arterial Level of Service D or better on all County roadways, except where the level of Service already exceeds this standard and where increased intersection capacity is not feasible without substantial additional right of way." Within the project site vicinity, the intersections of Lodi Lane/SR-29 and Deer Park Road/SR-29 already operate at a LOS F and would continue to do so with the addition of the proposed project. The traffic impact study prepared for the project deemed that with proposed project traffic, there would be slight increases in vehicle delays at study intersection locations and overall LOS would remain unchanged from year 2030 cumulative (no project) conditions. Based on updated County significance criteria for unsignalized intersections the off-site intersections of Lodi Lane/SR-29 and Deer Park Road/SR-29 have been evaluated for proposed project impacts since the LOS operates at an unacceptable level (LOS F) without proposed project trips during the weekday PM peak hour and weekend midday peak hour. County criteria indicate that a significant impact could be found if the proposed project contributes 5 percent or more to the total cumulative traffic growth at these intersections. The guidelines go on to state "the peak hour signal warrant criteria should also be evaluated and presented for informational purposes." During the weekday PM peak hour, the proposed project would add 13 trips to the Lodi Lane/SR-29 intersection. During the weekend (Saturday) midday peak hour the project would add 17 trips to the intersection. Based on total cumulative traffic growth at the intersection these proposed project trips would represent increases of 1.5 percent (13/833) and 2.4 percent (17/708), respectively. At the Deer Park Road/SR-29 intersection, the total cumulative traffic growth related to proposed project uses would be 1.9 percent (20/1,002) and 3.2 percent (27/830) during the weekday PM peak hour and weekend (Saturday) midday peak hour time periods. Under the County significance criteria, the addition of proposed project trips to these intersections would be considered less-than-significant given that all project contributions would be under 5 percent of overall cumulative traffic growth. Related to arterial segment operation on SR-29, Lodi Lane, and Deer Park Road; the proposed project trips would be considered less-than-significant given that they represent less than a 5 percent increase in total cumulative traffic growth. Potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

---