

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:** Ehlers Estate Winery, Use Permit Major Modification #P19-00146-MOD
2. **Property Owner:** New Vavin, Inc, 3200 Ehlers Lane, St. Helena, CA 94574; (707) 694-9611
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 13.83 acre site within the AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning district at 3200 Ehlers Lane, St. Helena; APN: 022-100-029.
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Laura Diaz Munoz, 3222 Ehlers Lane, St. Helena, CA 94574; (707) 694-9611
6. **General Plan description:** Agricultural Resource (AR) Designation
7. **Zoning:** AP (Agricultural Preserve)
8. **Background/Project History:**
  - Ehlers Estate Winery was approved by the Planning Commission on November 19, 1975 (U-297576) to operate a winery within an existing stone structure on a 14-acre parcel.
  - On November 20, 1991 the Planning Commission approved Use Permit U-91-15 to permit the addition of a 1,925 square foot structure to be utilized for the storage of barrels and casegoods as well as a marketing program.
  - The use of temporary fermentation tanks for the 2002 and 2003 fall crush seasons was authorized by staff via a modification of Use Permit #U-91-15 on August 23, 2002.
  - The Planning Commission approved Use Permit Modification #03217-MOD on September 17, 2003 which permitted the removal of an existing 1,925 square foot winery building, construction of a new 14,614 square foot winery production building and a 900 square foot walkway leading to the main cave portal, 11,220 square feet of caves, addition of a restroom within the historic winery building, parking space reconfiguration, fermentation tank relocation and a lot line adjustment to locate all winery uses on one parcel.
  - Use Permit Modification #04022-MOD was approved by staff on March 2, 2004 and authorized relocation and reduction in size of the previously permitted 14,614 square foot winery production building to 8,395 square feet, relocation of the cave portals and extension of the cave access covered walkway by 260 square feet, relocation of the mechanical equipment pad, and an entry structure and sign.
  - Use Permit Modification #P05-0231-MOD was approved by staff on June 28, 2005 and included the deletion of the construction of a previously approved 8,395 square foot building, the construction of a new 3,600 square foot building attached to the rear of the existing stone winery building, and the construction of a 3,000 square foot barrel building with 750 square feet of covered barrel washing area in the location of the previously approved building.
  - The most recent Use Permit modification, P06-0016-MODVMIN, was approved by staff on January 30, 2006 and permitted a 400 square foot production building addition and a 96 square foot covered fire equipment addition to the northeast corner of the barrel storage building.

The 13.83 acre parcel is relatively flat and is currently developed with a hospitality building, wine production building, barrel storage building, outdoor work area, garden, single-family residence, well, 51,300 gallon domestic and fire protection water storage tank, wastewater treatment system, and approximately nine acres of planted vineyard.

9. **Description of Project:** Approval of a Use Permit Major Modification to an existing 25,000 gallon per year winery to allow the following:

**A. COMPONENTS NECESSARY TO REMEDY EXISTING VIOLATIONS:**

- 1) Recognition of an existing annual production capacity of 29,000 gallons. Currently authorized for an annual production capacity of 25,000 gallons.
- 2) Recognition of daily tastings of 90 persons per day, 630 visitors maximum per week by appointment. Currently authorized for 11 visitors maximum per week;
- 3) Recognition of an existing marketing program of: a) one event per year with up to 300 guests; b) two events per year with up to 100 guests; c) one event per year with up to 70 guests; and d) 10 events per year with up to 20 guests. (770 total guests for existing marketing program). Currently authorized for three events per year with up to 75 guests and eight events per year with up to 35 guests (505 total guests for approved marketing program); and
- 4) Recognition of 12 full-time employees and two part-time employees. Currently authorized for eight full-time employees.

**B. EXPANSION BEYOND EXISTING ENTITLEMENTS:**

- 1) Increase in maximum annual permitted wine production from 29,000 to 35,000 gallons (existing conditions to be recognized via the County's Code Compliance program) ;
- 2) Increase existing daily tastings from 90 persons per day, 630 visitors maximum per week (existing conditions to be recognized via the County's Code Compliance program) to 100 persons per day, 700 visitors maximum per week. All visitation would be by appointment only;
- 3) Modification of an existing Marketing Program to increase events from 14 events per year (770 guests) (existing conditions to be recognized via the County's Code Compliance program) to 14 events per year (800 guests) as follows:
  - a. One annual event for up to 300 guests;
  - b. Three annual events for up to 100 guests; and
  - c. 10 annual events for up to 20 guests.
- 4) On-premises consumption of wines produced on site in the olive grove adjacent to the winery building in accordance with Business and Professions Code Sections 23358, 23390 and 23396.5;
- 5) Change the winery's tasting room hours of operation from 9:30 AM to 3:30 PM to 9:30 AM to 5:00 PM (Seven days a week);
- 6) Relocate the existing parking area and construct a new parking area with 22 parking spaces which would require the removal of approximately 0.3 acres of existing vineyards;
- 7) Increase the number of employees from 12 full-time employees and two part-time employees (existing conditions to be recognized via the County's Code Compliance program) to 14 full-time employees, four part-time employees and two harvest season employees;
- 8) Re-configure the existing on-site circulation pattern;
- 9) Installation of a 100,000 gallon water irrigation storage tank;
- 10) Upgrade the existing wastewater system consistent with County and Regional Water Quality Control Board standards; and
- 11) Creation of a right-turn pocket via striping on the Ehlers Lane approach to State Highway 29.

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

Access to the site is via two driveways connecting to Ehlers Lane. Soil types include Bale clay loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes and Aiken loam, 2 to 15 percent slopes. The majority of the site lies outside 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 Trinchero winery, and vineyards. The existing winery is located approximately 265 feet to the north of the nearest neighboring residence which is located at 1105 Ehlers Lane.

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 January 2, 2020, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. The Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation responded and declined comment as the project site is not located within their aboriginal territories. No other responses were received within 30-days of the tribe's receipt of the invitations.

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:**

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

*Jason R. Hade*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

August 9, 2021

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Name: Jason R. Hade, Principal Planner

Napa County  
Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department

| I. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact        | No Impact                           |
|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input 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 while Ehlers Lane is not 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 includes a relocated parking area, improvements to an existing driveway and a 100,000 gallon water storage tank. Visual impacts would be minimal as the physical changes are limited in scope and would occur within previously disturbed areas. Remaining proposed changes are operational in nature (production capacity, visitation and marketing program revisions, and number of employees). No changes to the existing buildings are proposed. 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 relocated 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 spotting. Low-level lighting shall be utilized in parking areas as opposed to elevated high-intensity light standards.*

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None 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," farmland of statewide importance" and "other land" as shown on the Napa County Important Farmland Map 2002 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. All changes as a result of the project would occur within the portion of the site mapped as "other land" with the exception of the removal of approximately 0.3 acres of existing vineyards within "prime farmland" and "farmland of statewide importance" as part of the proposed parking lot relocation. The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. There are no agricultural contracts on the property. There are no other changes included in this proposal that would result in the conversion of Farmland. General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use policies AG/LU-2 and AG/LU-13 recognize wineries, and any use consistent with the Winery Definition Ordinance and clearly accessory to a winery, as agriculture. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

<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 that no changes to the existing buildings are proposed compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47ksf (high quality restaurant) and 541ksf (general light industry) for 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 265 feet to the north of the nearest neighboring residence which is located at 1105 Ehlers Lane. 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 and Riparian Woodland Forest along the eastern edge of the parcel. However, no trees or vegetation is proposed for removal. Proposed project construction would occur within previously disturbed areas. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c/d. According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps, the project area does not contain any wetlands, vernal pools, aquatic or riparian habitat. The project parcel is located approximately 0.15 miles west of the Napa River. The project includes operational changes at 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 type="checkbox"/>                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) | Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?                                       | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a-b. A "Prehistoric Cultural Resource Reconnaissance" was prepared for the project site by Archaeological Services Incorporated on August 11, 2003. No archaeological sites were identified during the study. If resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval:

7.2 ARCHEOLOGICAL FINDING

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

*If human remains are encountered during project development, all work in the vicinity must be halted, and the Napa County Coroner informed, so that the Coroner can determine if an investigation of the cause of death is required, and if the remains*

are of Native American origin. If the remains are of Native American origin, the permittee shall comply with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

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

Discussion:

- a.
- i.) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.
  - ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project would be required to comply with the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
  - iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicate a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. The project site is identified as having a very low or low liquefaction potential according to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (liquefaction layers). As such, compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.
  - iv.) According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) there are no known landslide areas on the subject site.
- b. The proposed improvements would occur on slopes of five percent to 15 percent. The project would require incorporation of best management practices and would be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c/d. Soil types include Bale clay loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes and Aiken loam, 2 to 15 percent slopes. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the improvements are proposed for an area which has a very low or low susceptibility for liquefaction. Compliance with the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code, would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level of less than significant.
- e. According to the Onsite Wastewater Dispersal Feasibility Study for Ehlers Estate Winery, 3200 Ehlers Lane, Napa County, California, APN 022-100-029 prepared by Bartelt Engineering in November 2019, the project site and proposed wastewater system improvement options 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) and the "Prehistoric Cultural Resource Reconnaissance" was prepared for the project site by Archaeological Services Incorporated on August 11, 2003, no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified within the project site. If resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard condition of approval 7.2 identified in **Section V** above.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

In July 2015, the County re-commenced preparation of the CAP to: i) account for present day conditions and modeling assumptions (such as but not limited to methods, emission factors, and data sources), ii) address the concerns with the previous CAP effort as outlined above, iii) meet applicable State requirements, and iv) result in a functional and legally defensible CAP. On April 13, 2016 the County, as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP, released Final Technical Memorandum #1: 2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016. This initial phase included: i) updating the unincorporated County's community-wide GHG emissions inventory to 2014, and ii) preparing new GHG emissions forecasts for the 2020, 2030, and 2050 horizons. Additional information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or <https://www.countyofnapa.org/2876/Current-Projects-Explorer>

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 (CO2e)]. 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 parking area relocation and 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 includes a relocated parking area, improvements to an existing driveway and a 100,000 gallon water storage tank. Remaining proposed changes are operational in nature (production capacity, visitation and marketing program revisions, and number of employees). No changes to the existing buildings are proposed. 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 no additional floor area is proposed when compared to the BAAQMD's GHG screening criteria of 121,000 sf for general industrial, and compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 9,000 sf. for a high quality restaurant, the project was determined not to exceed the 1,100 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr GHG threshold of significance.

Furthermore, the applicant intends to implement the following GHG reduction methods at the winery: installation of energy efficient lighting fixtures; utilization of low-impact development for treatment of storm water runoff; installation of electric vehicle charging stations; minimal grading for project implementation and no tree removal; and education to staff and visitors on sustainable practices. The winery has already implemented the following GHG reduction methods: certification as Napa Green Land; use of 70 to 80 percent cover crop; retaining biomass removed via pruning and thinning by chipping the material and using it rather than burning on-site; and the winery has been certified as organic by the CCOF since 2008.

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 The Culinary Institute of America at Greystone, located approximately 1.4 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 and configuration would provide adequate access to Ehlers Lane. 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 April 21, 2021, the Governor of the State of California proclaimed a State of Emergency for the Counties of Sonoma and Mendocino due to extremely low reservoir levels and drought conditions. On May 11, 2021, the Governor expanded the drought emergency to an additional 39 counties, including the County of Napa. This potentially historic drought in Napa County may result in broad impacts and considerations that extend beyond drinking water and conservation efforts. The local agricultural system, general county operational practices, tourism, fire services and prevention, maintenance of environmental health, protection of vulnerable ecosystems, and consideration of the public's health are all



important aspects. On May 11, 2011, the Napa County Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution declaring a Proclamation of Local Emergency due to drought conditions which are occurring in Napa County.

Napa County requires all discretionary permit applicants to complete necessary water analyses in order to document that sufficient water supplies are available for the proposed project and to implement water saving measures to prepare for periods of limited water supply, as well as to conserve limited groundwater resources. In general, recent studies have found that groundwater levels in the Napa Valley Floor exhibit stable long-term trends with a shallow depth to water. Historical trends in the Milliken-Sarco-Tuluca (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 understanding of groundwater resources in the County, the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan recommended 18 Areas of Interest (AOIs) for additional groundwater level and water quality monitoring. Through the well owner and public outreach efforts of the Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee (GRAC,) approximately 40 new wells have been added to the monitoring program within these areas. Groundwater Sustainability Objectives were developed and recommended by the GRAC and adopted by the Board. The recommendations included the goal of developing sustainability objectives, providing a definition, and explaining the shared responsibility for Groundwater Sustainability and the important role of monitoring as a means to achieving groundwater sustainability.

In 2009, Napa County began a comprehensive study of its groundwater resources to meet identified action items in the County's 2008 General Plan update. The study, by Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE), emphasized developing a sound understanding of groundwater conditions and implementing an expanded groundwater monitoring and data management program as a foundation for integrated water resources planning and dissemination of water resources information. The 2011 baseline study by LSCE, which included over 600 wells and data going back over 50 years, concluded that "the groundwater levels in Napa County are stable, except for portions of the MST district". Most wells elsewhere within the Napa Valley floor with a sufficient record indicate that groundwater levels are more affected by climatic conditions, are within historical levels, and seem to recover from dry periods during subsequent wet or normal periods. The LSCE Study also concluded that, on a regional scale, there appear to be no current groundwater quality issues except north of Calistoga (mostly naturally occurring boron and trace metals) and in the Carneros region (mostly salinity). The subject property is located within the Napa Valley Floor Calistoga subarea of Napa County according to the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2013. 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 average Allowable Water Allotment for the project parcel is 13.83 acre-feet per year (af/yr), determined by multiplying the 13.83 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 Onsite Wastewater Dispersal Feasibility Study for Ehlers Estate Winery, 3200 Ehlers Lane, Napa County, California, APN 022-100-029 prepared by Bartelt Engineering in November 2019, the project site and proposed wastewater system improvement options would have adequate disposal capacity to serve the project. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings.

The subject parcel contains two groundwater wells. The existing domestic (winery) well is located near the wine production building and provides domestic, landscape, fire, and process water uses. The existing irrigation (vineyard) well is located near Ehlers Lane on the northwesterly side of the subject parcel within the vineyard and is currently used for vineyard irrigation water uses only. No changes to the existing water sources are proposed as part of this project. According to the Well Drillers Report, filed by McLean & Williams, Inc. Well, Drilling & Pump Service, the winery well was drilled in April 2006 to a total depth of 350 feet with a completed well depth of 350 feet. The well casing is 8 inch internal diameter F480, 200 gauge polyvinyl chloride (PVC) with factory screen/slots between depth of 110 feet to 190 feet and 250 feet to 350 feet. The well was constructed with a 59 foot deep concrete annular seal. When the domestic (winery) well was drilled, the estimated safe yield was determined to be approximately 75 gallons per minute (gpm) although this may not be representative of the well's longterm yield.

According to the Water Availability Analysis for Ehlers Estate Winery, 3200 Ehlers Lane, Napa County, California, APN 022-100-029 prepared by Bartelt Engineering in November 2019, the anticipated total overall water demand for the project site would be 5.21 AF/YR representing a 0.07 AF/YR increase of the existing water demand of 5.14 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               | 3.97           | 3.78           |
| Winery                            |                |                |
| Wine Production                   | 0.54           | 0.75           |
| Domestic & Landscaping            | 0.13           | 0.18           |
| Residential Water Use             | 0.50           | 0.50           |
| <b>Net Use (Acre-ft per Year)</b> | <b>5.14</b>    | <b>5.21</b>    |

The estimated groundwater demand of 5.21 AF/YR, represents an increase of 0.07 AF/YR over the existing condition and is below the average Allowable Water Allotment of 13.83 acre-feet per year (af/yr) 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 very 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. Treated process wastewater from the winery is proposed to be beneficially reused onsite as part of the proposed project for onsite vineyard irrigation. The proposed water demand would likely be less than what is calculated in this analysis with the proposed beneficial reuse, however the most conservative analysis is presented to provide flexibility in water sources available for onsite vineyard irrigation. Based on review of neighboring property records from the Napa County PBES online parcel files, neighboring wells or surface water sources do not appear to interfere with the existing domestic (winery) well. The existing (vineyard) irrigation well is located less than 500 feet from an existing well that is located on the neighboring parcel (APN 022-100-008). This neighboring parcel is under the same ownership as the subject parcel. Since the two existing wells (vineyard well on project parcel and well on adjacent parcel) are under the same ownership and both used for vineyard irrigation a well interference analysis is not being performed. 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 site lies outside the boundaries of the 100 and 500-year flood hazard boundaries. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. 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. The subject parcel is located in the AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning district, which allows wineries and uses accessory to wineries subject to use permit approval. The proposed project is compliant with the physical limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance, including the Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO). The County has adopted the WDO to protect agriculture and open space and to regulate winery development and expansion in a manner that avoids potential negative environmental effects.

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

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

The General Plan includes two policies requiring wineries to be designed generally of a high architectural quality for the site and its surroundings. Visual changes would be minimal as the physical changes are limited in scope (parking lot relocation, water tank, and driveway improvements) and would occur within previously disturbed areas. Remaining proposed changes are operational in nature (production capacity, visitation and marketing program revisions, and number of employees). 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 parking lot relocation. 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 265 feet to the south 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 recognition of an existing marketing program including 14 events on an annual basis with the largest event permitting up to 300 guests. The proposed project also requests an annual maximum production capacity increase from 29,000 gallons (existing conditions) to 35,000 gallons. No change to the wine processing location is proposed

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 265 feet to the south 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 300 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 3:30 p.m. (excluding harvest). The potential for the creation of significant noise from increased visitation is significantly reduced, since the tasting areas are within the winery building itself. On-premise consumption is requested to occur within olive grove to the south of the hospitality building. With the location of the closest receptor residence  $\pm 265$  feet away to the south of the project site, potential noise impacts from periodic bottling activities would have a less than significant impact on local residences. Recent noise studies of bottling activities measured 630 feet from the activity itself found the noise levels to be 36 dBA. (Paul Hobbs - Nathan Coombs Winery Environmental Noise Assessment, Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc, June 25, 2016). The noise studies further state that such point source sound levels are reduced with distance in accordance with the "inverse square law", which yields a six (6) dB sound reduction for each doubling of the distance from the source. Based upon the measurements and calculation stated in that study, the receptor residence located  $\pm 265$  feet away, the noise level for the bottling activity at the adjacent residence would be approximately 8 decibels more than the measured 36 dBA noise level 630 feet from the bottling line, or 44 dBA. Additionally, the proposed 14 marketing events for up to 300 people would generate vocal noise (amplified music would be prohibited). But, by using the noise measurements taken at a winery event with an attendance of 100 people (plus background music) in the previously mentioned report, 38 dBA at 600 feet, it can be calculated that at a 265 foot distance, the noise level for an event would be 7 dB higher, or 45 dBA. The calculated noise levels do not exceed the County's Noise Ordinance "Exterior Noise Limits" at the nearest residence (45dBA). As part of this proposal, the existing parking area would be relocated further away from the nearest residence to the south. The current existing conditions would experience minimal change. No noise complaints have been received for the existing events already occurring at the winery.

Continuing enforcement of Napa County's Noise Ordinance by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff, including the prohibition against amplified music, should further ensure that marketing events and other winery activities do not create a significant noise impact. Events and non-amplified music, excluding quiet clean-up, are required to finish by 10:00 p.m. Amplified music or sound systems would not be permitted for outdoor events as identified in standard Condition of Approval 4.10 below. Temporary events would be subject to County Code Chapter 5.36 which regulates proposed temporary events.

#### 4.10 *AMPLIFIED MUSIC*

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures None required.

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

Discussion:

a. The project includes an increase in the number of employees from 12 full-time employees and two part-time employees (existing conditions to be recognized via the County's Code Compliance program) to 14 full-time employees, four part-time employees and two harvest season 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 two additional full-time employees, two additional part-time employees and two harvest season additional employees (changes from existing conditions to be recognized) which are part of this project could lead to minor population growth in Napa County. Relative to the County's projected low to moderate growth rate and overall adequate programmed housing supply that population growth does not rise to a level of environmental significance. In addition, the project would be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

|                             |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| ii) Police protection?      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Schools?               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Parks?                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| v) Other public facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures:

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

Discussion:

a/b. The study area consists of the section of Ehlers Lane fronting the project site and the project access point, as well as the intersection of State Route (SR)-29/Ehlers Lane and the segments of SR-29 to the north and south of Ehlers Lane. Operating conditions during the Friday and Saturday p.m. peak periods were evaluated as these time periods reflect the highest traffic volumes area-wide and for the proposed project. SR-29/Ehlers Lane is an unsignalized tee-intersection, stop-controlled on the westbound Ehlers Lane approach. The Ehlers Lane approach has a flared right-turn area with storage space to accommodate approximately one vehicle. SR-29 generally runs north-south and has two 12-foot travel lanes with a posted speed limit of 50 miles per hour (mph) in the study area. The roadway is mostly straight adjacent to the site. SR-29 varies in width between approximately 36 and 46 feet depending on the width of the shoulders and the presence of a left-turn lane. Based on count data collected during harvest in August 2017, the average daily traffic (ADT) south of Ehlers Lane is approximately 15,000 on Fridays and 14,000 on Saturdays. Ehlers Lane is a rural two-lane roadway that runs east-west between SR-29 and the Ehlers Estate Winery, and north-south along the winery frontage. The roadway is approximately 24 feet wide, does not include a marked centerline, and has a posted speed limit of 25 mph. North of the winery entrance, Ehlers Lane is narrower, approximately 18 feet wide. The ADT along the roadway segment between SR 29 and the project site is approximately 400 on weekdays and 270 on weekend days. Access is provided by an existing driveway on Ehlers Lane.

W-Trans prepared a *Traffic Impact Study for the Ehlers Estate Winery* on May 18, 2021. According to the study, the proposed modifications to the Use Permit would be expected to result in a net increase of 18 daily trips on a Friday during harvest season, including six new trips during the p.m. peak hour, and a net increase of 17 new trips on a Saturday during harvest season, with seven new trips during the p.m. peak hour compared to existing conditions. The largest requested marketing event would have up to 300 attendees per event and be held once a year.

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

The study roadway segments of SR-29 are projected to operate acceptably at LOS D or better under existing, near-term, and cumulative conditions, and would continue to do so with the addition of project traffic. The study intersection of SR-29/Ehlers Lane is operating acceptably at LOS A overall under existing conditions and would be expected to continue doing so under near-term and cumulative conditions and with project-related traffic added. According to the study, the stop-controlled approach at the SR-29/Ehlers Lane intersection is operating acceptably at LOS D under existing conditions and would continue to do so under near-term conditions. Upon the addition of project trips, the stop-controlled approach is expected to operate unacceptably at LOS E during the Friday p.m. peak. Under cumulative conditions, the stop-controlled approach is expected to operate unacceptably at LOS F during both peak hours. With the addition of project-related traffic to cumulative volumes, the approach is expected to continue to operate at LOS F; however, the increase in delay is expected to be more than five seconds during the Friday p.m. peak period, resulting in an adverse effect. Implementation of mitigation measure TRANS-1 identified below would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. 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 based upon the implementation of mitigation measure TRANS-1. 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, while there are no pedestrian facilities serving the project site, pedestrian trips to and from the site are not expected given the rural context of the project, so this condition is acceptable. Transit facilities serving the project site are adequate considering the anticipated demand. Bicycle facilities serving the project site are adequate to serve the project site. A minimum of ten on-site bicycle parking spaces would be provided as part of the project.

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

The project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b). The proposed Ehlers Estate Winery Use Permit modification project is estimated to generate 18 net new daily trips, which is well below the 110 trip threshold in the Office of Planning and Research guidelines. The traffic study provided strategies such as carpool incentives, active transportation incentives, on-site lunches, and a guaranteed ride home to be considered for implementation via a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan. A condition of approval would require implementation of a TDM with strategies such as these for the life of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

- d-f. The traffic impact study found that "adequate sight distance is available at the project driveway in both travel directions." (W-Trans, 2021). Upon the addition of project trips to cumulative volumes, a left-turn lane would not be warranted at the project driveway. Proposed site access was reviewed and approved by the Napa County Fire Department, Engineering Services Division, and Public Works Department, as conditioned.

The project was analyzed to determine whether the proposed parking supply would be sufficient for the anticipated daily demand during harvest conditions. The project site, as proposed, would have a total of 22 parking spaces. Napa County does not currently have parking requirements for winery projects. Applying guidelines employed in other Napa County winery traffic studies, daily parking demand for the winery and tasting room could be accommodated by providing at least one space for every employee, as well as parking stalls for about 25 percent of the expected daily tasting room visitors. During typical operation, there would be a maximum of 13 employees (nine full-time and four part-time) on site at any one time, which would be monitored through the scheduling of shifts. The Use Permit would allow for a maximum of 100 daily visitors to the tasting room. Assuming the County's standard occupancy rate of 2.8 guests per vehicle, a total of 36 guest vehicles would visit the site over the course of the day; to accommodate 25 percent of the visitors at one time, nine parking spaces would be required. Therefore, 13 spaces would be required to accommodate employee parking needs and nine spaces would be needed for guest parking; the proposed on-site parking supply of 22 spaces would be sufficient for the estimated number of employees and guests. Therefore, the proposed parking supply is expected to be adequate to accommodate the anticipated peak demand during typical operations.

Mitigation Measures:

MM TRANS-1: The westbound approach of Ehlers lane to SR-29 shall be restriped to accommodate a dedicated right turn lane to reduce the increase in delay to less than five seconds.

**Monitoring:** Improvement plans shall be submitted for review and approval by the Director of Public Works prior to commencement of operational changes in this major modification, including increasing production or visitation levels or number of employees, or holding modified marketing activities or prior to issuance of any building permits associated with Use Permit Major Modification P19-00146. Prior to the issuance of Final Certificate of Occupancy of any uses authorized by Use Permit P19-00146, installation of a dedicated right turn lane on Ehlers Lane at the approach to SR-29 shall be installed by the applicant to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works.

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

Discussion:

a/b. On January 2, 2020, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. The Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation responded and declined comment as the project site is not located within their aboriginal territories. No other responses were received within 30-days of the tribe's receipt of the invitations. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| XIX. | UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact        | No Impact                |
|------|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
|      | a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of a new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|      | b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|      | c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?   | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input 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 13.83 acre-feet per year (af/yr), determined by multiplying the 13.83 acre Valley floor site by a one AF/YR/acre fair share water use factor.

The subject parcel contains two groundwater wells. The existing domestic (winery) well is located near the wine production building and provides domestic, landscape, fire, and process water uses. The existing irrigation (vineyard) well is located near Ehlers Lane on the northwesterly side of the subject parcel within the vineyard and is currently used for vineyard irrigation water uses only. No changes to the existing water sources are proposed as part of this project. According to the Well Drillers Report, filed by McLean & Williams, Inc. Well, Drilling & Pump Service, the winery well was drilled in April 2006 to a total depth of 350 feet with a completed well depth of 350 feet. The well casing is 8 inch internal diameter F480, 200 gauge polyvinyl chloride (PVC) with factory screen/slots between depth of 110 feet to 190 feet and 250 feet to 350 feet. The well was constructed with a 59 foot deep concrete annular seal. When the domestic (winery) well was drilled, the estimated safe yield was determined to be approximately 75 gallons per minute (gpm) although this may not be representative of the well's longterm yield.

According to the Water Availability Analysis for Ehlers Estate Winery, 3200 Ehlers Lane, Napa County, California, APN 022-100-029 prepared by Bartelt Engineering in November 2019, the anticipated total overall water demand for the project site would be 5.21 AF/YR representing a 0.07 AF/YR increase of the existing water demand of 5.14 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 project site is outside of a designated Fire Hazard Severity area. 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 Ehlers Lane. 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. 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 or drainage issues present at the site. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?
- c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Discussion:

- a. As discussed in **Section IV** 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 and Riparian Woodland Forest along the eastern edge of the parcel. However, no trees or vegetation is proposed for removal. Proposed project construction would occur within previously disturbed areas. As identified in **Section V** above, according to an archaeological reconnaissance conducted at the subject site in 2003 by Archaeological Resource Service, no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified within the project site. If resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard condition of approval 7.2 identified in **Section V** above.
- 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 energy efficient lighting fixtures; utilization of low-impact development for treatment of storm water runoff; installation of electric vehicle charging stations; minimal grading for project implementation and no tree removal; and education to staff and visitors on sustainable practices. The winery has already implemented the following GHG reduction methods: certification as Napa Green Land; use of 70 to 80 percent cover crop; retaining biomass removed via pruning and thinning by chipping the material and using it rather than burning on-site; and the winery has been certified as organic by the CCOF since 2008.
- c. Potential impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The project trip generation was calculated from winery operations, where the calculated trips reflect total visitation, on-site employees and wine production trips generated by the winery. Under the Napa County General Plan, traffic volumes are projected to increase and will be caused by a combination of locally generated traffic as well as general regional growth. The General Plan EIR indicates that much of the forecasted increase in traffic on the arterial roadway network will result from traffic generated outside of the county, however the project would contribute a small amount toward the general overall increase.
- General Plan Policy CIR-16 states that “The County will seek to maintain an arterial Level of Service D or better on all County roadways, except where the level of Service already exceeds this standard and where increased intersection capacity is not feasible without substantial additional right of way.” According to the traffic study prepared for the project, the study intersection of SR 29/Ehlers Lane is operating acceptably at LOS A overall under existing conditions and would be expected to continue doing so under Near-Term and cumulative conditions and with project-related traffic added. The study roadway segments of SR-29 are projected to operate acceptably at LOS D or better under existing, near-term, and cumulative conditions, and would continue to do so with the addition of project traffic. Under cumulative conditions, the stop-controlled approach at the Ehlers Lane/SR-29 intersection is expected to operate unacceptably at LOS F during both peak hours. With the addition of project-related traffic to cumulative volumes, the approach is expected to continue to operate at LOS F; however, the increase in delay is expected to be more than five seconds during the Friday p.m. peak period, resulting in an adverse effect. Potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measure TRANS-1 above.
- d. 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.