

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

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated January 2019)

1. **Project Title:** Far Niente Winery Major Modification No. P19-00129-MOD
2. **Property Owner:** FN Land, LLC., P.O. Box 327, Napa, CA 94562; (707) 944-2861; gallen@farniente.com
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Charlene Gallina, (707) 299-1355, Charlene.gallina@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number(s) (APN):** 1350 Acacia Dr., Oakville, CA 94562; Split for Assessment Purposes (SFAP) with APN: 027-280-018 (13.65 acres - Winery) and APN 027-480-034 (33.30 acres – Vineyard, Winery Process Wastewater & Irrigation Pond and a Solar PV System) for a total acreage of 46.95 acres.
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Donna B. Oldford, Plans4Wine; 2620 Pinot Way, St. Helena, CA 94574.(707) 963-5832 dboldford@aol.com
6. **General Plan description:** Agricultural Resource (AR)
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Preserve (AP)
8. **Background/Project History:**

Far Niente Winery is located within an approximately 18,000 square foot stone winery structure that was built in 1885. On February 28, 1979, the property was listed on the National Register of Historic Places and was noted as one of the earliest stone three-level gravity flow wineries. Rehabilitation of the structure began the same year.

On February 21, 1979, the Napa County Planning Commission approved Use Permit U-177879 to allow for a 75,000 gallon per year Far Niente winery within the existing 13,000 sf stone structure, including public tours and tastings (50 visitors estimated per week). The Final Conditions of Approval for the project required retrofit of the existing winery structure for seismic safety; preservation of the historical integrity of the stone winery consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's standards and guidelines for rehabilitation of historical structures; installation of a northbound left turn lane on State Highway 29 at the intersection with Acacia Drive with installation of acceleration and deceleration tapers, pavement of Acacia Drive from the intersection of Highway 29 and Acacia Drive to the site access driveway; on-site parking area (20 spaces); and retainment of the existing vegetation screening of the fermentation tank pad from view of State Highway 29. Two – One-year extensions to this use permit were granted by the Zoning Administrator on January 24, 1980 and March 12, 1981.

On March 20, 1981, Gil Nickel of Far Niente Winery sent a letter to the Conservation, Development and Planning Department requesting modifications to Condition Nos. 3, 12, 13 and 15 of Use Permit U-177879 that related to public tours and tastings and on- and off-site improvements. Mr. Nickel requested postponement of the public tours and tastings and the improvements, as the purpose of the improvement conditions was to accommodate public visitation. On April 7, 1981, the Conservation, Development and Planning Department Director sent correspondence approving the request, noting that commencement of tours and tastings would re-instate the postponed conditions.

On May 7, 1981, an Administrative Action was taken by the Conservation, Development and Planning Department Director to modify Use Permit No. 177879 to reduce the maximum production of 75,000 gallons per year to 60,000 gallons per year. The purpose of the modification was to reduce production waste to eliminate the necessity of a larger on-site septic system as the existing system could not accommodate 75,000 gallons of production waste.

On September 3, 1986, Use Permit No. U-598586 was approved by the Napa County Planning Commission to allow for an increase in

production from 60,000 gallons per year to 75,000 gallons per year and for the construction of a new 12,000 sf winery structure for a wine cellar, bottling line and barrel storage. Once again, no public tours and tastings were permitted unless improvements were installed pursuant to conditions of approval included in U-177879.

On November 19, 1997, Use Permit Modification No. 96569-UP was approved by the Planning Commission to allow the following: 1) an increase in production capacity from 75,000 gallons per year to 175,000 gallons per year; 2) conversion of an irrigation reservoir to an aerated process wastewater treatment pond; 3) to bring the following unpermitted existing improvement and uses into compliance: (a) 29,000 sf of winery storage caves, (b) recognition of a 8,660 sf lower outdoor terrace area with catering facilities utilized for private marketing events but not public tours and tastings and the upper terrace for private residential use only as a switch of existing uses, (c) recognition of the conversion of the 2,025 sf upper floor of the carriage house from winery storage to winery related office use, (d) recognition of 287 sf kitchen and 76 sf staff coffee room on main floor of the winery, and (e) recognition of Oakville Grade/Acacia Drive as the primary access to the winery and the easterly extension of Acacia Drive to State Route 29 as an emergency access only; 4) an interior remodel of the historic 18,000 sf winery building by conversion of a 1,087 sf residence to winery offices; 5) an increase in the number of full-time employees from 20 to 30 during a single shift; 6) recognition of a marketing plan with average of 10 events per week and the winery's right to hold public tours and tastings; and 7) to excavate (under Phase II) 10,000 sf of new caves for barrel and tank fermentation, aging, and storage of wine. Approval of the visitation and marketing plan included private tours and tastings up to two (2) per day for not more than 15 persons for each event, private promotional meals for wine trade and invited guests up to 100 per year for no more than 100 persons per event, and Napa Valley Wine Auction related events up to two (2) per year for not more than 300 persons. Review of the permit materials revealed that public tours and tastings were occurring at 50 to 100 persons per day with an average of 75 persons per day.

On February 15, 2019, the Napa County Zoning Administrator approved Very Minor Modification No. P18-00237-VMM for a Napa County Road and Street Standard exception to "allow the existing width of the driveway, 17.5 feet to 19.1 feet, in lieu of the standards 20 foot width, as well as, to allow the existing one-way loop driveway width, 9.6 feet to 15.6 feet in lieu of the standard 12 foot width" (Condition of Approval No. 1.1); and to allow for on-premise consumption within the 1,250 square foot "Lower Site Picnic Area" (located north of the winery and adjacent to the onsite pond as depicted on the approved P18-00237-VMM site plan). In addition, hours of operation were modified to 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Sunday for production and 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Sunday for hospitality.

On January 19, 2019, a Lot Line Adjustment (W18-00360) over APNs 027-480-030 and 027-280-018 was authorized by the County's Public Works Department expanding the 13.65 acre winery parcel (APN 027-280-018) with the vineyard, winery process wastewater and irrigation storage pond parcel (027-480-034) for a total of 46.95 acres.

An easement was perfected and recorded with Constellation Brands APN 027-280-017, Far Niente's neighbor to the west to allow a certain segment of the newly proposed winery access road address herein below.

9. Description of Project:

The applicant is requesting approval of a Major Modification to Use Permit U-177879 and subsequent modifications to allow the following:

1. Increase wine production from 175,000 gallons per year to 225,000 gallons per year;
2. Increase the number of employees from 30 full time employees to 45 full time and seven (7) part time employees on weekdays and 39 full time and seven (7) part time employees on weekends;
3. Increase the number of tours and tasting visitors from 100 public visitors per day plus 30 by appointment tours and tastings per day totaling 130 visitors per day, 650 visitors per week and 33,800 visitors per year to 145 visitors per day Monday through Thursday and 190 visitors per day Friday through Sunday, with expanded visitors being by appointment to a maximum of 1,150 visitors per week and 59,800 visitors per year;
4. Increase the number of existing marketing events (100 private events for up to 100 guests and two (2) events per year with up to 300 guests) to add the following:
 - a. One – 1,000 guest weekend day events to be held between the hours of 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. with no more than 250 guests on site at any given time and including transportation via shuttle bus and including valet parking,
 - b. One – 900 guest weekend day event to be held between the hours of 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. with no more than 250 guests on site at any given time and including transportation via shuttle bus and including valet parking,
 - c. One – 400 guest seated dinner event to be held between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 11:00 p.m. with transportation via shuttle bus and including valet parking;
 - d. Guest arrival and departures from the project site shall not occur between the hours of 2:45 p.m. to 3:45 p.m. on Fridays and during the hours of 2:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in order to reduce the trips to and from the project site during peak hours;
 - e. Portable restrooms to be brought onsite for large events; and
 - f. Use of the Carriage House for marketing events
5. Retrofit the existing 40,950 sf cave from a Type I (storage only) to a Type III (public access) to conduct tours and tastings and marketing

- events;
6. Change in accessory and production uses within the existing 22,155 sf historic Stone Winery building. Conversion of 130 sf of production use (laboratory) into accessory use broken down as 4,561 sf of accessory use and 17,666 sf of production use;
 7. Expansion of the Carriage House from 11,930 sf to 26,046 sf to accommodate increased production, administrative offices, and marketing events (broken down as follows: an increase in square footage on the cellar floor from 4,948 sf to 12,998 sf (which includes covering over the existing 3,021 sf outdoor crush pad, press and bottling areas and 1,444 sf for administrative winery office and laboratory uses), an increase in square footage on the first floor from 4,948 sf to 9,223 sf (which includes 3,670 sf allocated for marketing events), and an increase in square footage on the second floor from 2,034 sf to 3,825 sf, and an addition of an 840 sf loading dock at the cellar level for production;
 8. Establishment of two outdoor tasting and event areas: 1) a 16,308 sf outdoor tasting and event area located at the Cabernet Grill area on the northeast side of the property near an existing decorative pond; and 2) a 6,687 sf outdoor tasting and event area located at the Chardonnay Terrace area on the hilltop west of the historic Stone Winery building and south of the Carriage House. Both areas to include on-premise consumption of wines produced on-site in accordance with Business and Professions Code Sections 23358, 23390 and 23396.5. Such areas to be accessed by installation of 440 sf of new non-pervious stone pathways and 1,700 sf pervious gravel pathways;
 9. Addition of a new 261 sf trash enclosure;
 10. An increase in the number of parking spaces from 48 to 70 spaces broken down as follows: 21 guests spaces in the existing parking area and 49 spaces (seven (7) of which would be tandem) for employees located within the proposed parking area, including a total of three (3) ADA spaces and eight (8) EV charging stations;
 11. Improvements to the winery access road to widen Acacia Drive, including a one-way traffic flow throughout the winery and the replacement of an existing bridge with a clear-span bridge with minor widening to approximately 20 feet that crosses an ephemeral watercourse;
 12. Installation of a left-turn lane on Oakville Grade to Acacia Drive, including installation of a stop control on Acacia Drive and Doak Road;
 13. Installation of a new sanitary waste disposal system;
 14. Relocation of an existing onsite fuel depot and propane filling station;
 15. Replacement and relocation of an existing electrical generator;
 16. Demolition of an existing fire suppression system and installation of all-new tanks (including a 32' diameter fire protection storage tank), pump and control systems; and
 17. Approval of a phasing plan for winery improvements, as follows:
 - a. Phase 1: Retrofit work on the wine cave, expansion of winery access roads and replacement of existing bridge, remodel of stone winery and re-use of some of the areas therein, employee parking lot, installation of new domestic wastewater treatment system, relocation of the fire system, electric charging stations in both parking areas, relocation of fuel depot and propane filling station and the left-hand turn lane; and
 - b. Phase 2: Construction of the addition to the Carriage House (including additional production area and winery administrative offices that are relocated from the historic Stone Winery building) and the construction of the outdoor production area cover.

Application materials are available on the Department's website "Current Projects Explorer" at:

<https://www.countyofnapa.org/2876/Current-Projects-Explorer>

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

The project site is located at 1350 Acacia Drive in the Oakville area, approximately 1.5 vehicle miles from the intersection of St. Helena Highway and Oakville Grade. The subject property is comprised of two SFAP parcels totaling approximately 47 acres. The primary parcel where the winery is located (APN 027-280-018) is comprised of approximately 13.65 acres and contains moderately sloping topography with an average slope of 20-25 and is at an elevation of 175 to 230 Mean Sea Level. Vegetative land cover on the property consists of fragmented oak woodland, groomed lawns, decorative landscaping and a small garden. The property is developed with an access driveway and parking areas, a 9,475 sf three bedroom single-family residence, a 77,006 sf winery which includes the following four (4) buildings: Building 1 - the 11,930 sf Carriage House; Building 2 - a 40,995 sf cave for wine storage; Building 3 - a 1,971 sf Kitchen and Restrooms; and Building 4 - the 22,155 sf historic Stone Winery. The property also includes groomed lawns and picnic areas, three manmade ponds and a seasonal watercourse that traverses through the property. The property gradually slopes to the center of the property, which results in a knoll that rises to 230 MSL and provides area for the underground cave. There are multiple existing and pervious gravel pathways and non-pervious stone pathways (approximately 40,555 sf in coverage) that meander through the property. There are a total of 177 trees or groups of trees on the winery site including Valley oaks, Cork oaks, Coast live oaks, Fremont poplars and other decorative landscape trees. APN 027-480-034 (33.30 acres) is also owned by the applicant and is developed with vineyards, a process wastewater and irrigation storage pond and a solar PV system.

There is a road, sewer and public utility easement through parcels APN 027-480-034 (owned by FN Land, LCC), APN 027-480-030 (owned

by FN Land, LLC), and APN 027-280-017 (owned by Robert Mondavi Properties, Inc.), which is developed with vineyards. Other surrounding properties to the north, south, west and east include large rural properties planted with vineyards. The north of the winery site is a residence located on 10.96 acres and surrounded by dense vegetation. It is located approximately 500 feet from the north existing outdoor event area of the winery (1357 Oakville Grade). There are two blue line streams near Far Niente Winery - To Kalon Creek which travels in an west to east direction and cuts across the valley floor and flows into the Napa River is approximately 2,200 feet to the north and east of the winery, and Doak Creek which also travels in an east to west direction and parallels Oakville Grade Road on the south side eventually connecting to To Kalon Creek is approximately 1,500 feet to the north of the winery.

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 CalFire standards. Permits may also be required by the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, & Firearms, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Use Army Corps of Engineers, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies:	Other Agencies Contacted:
California Department of Fish and Wildlife	Federal Trade and Taxation Bureau
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control
Regional Water Quality Control Board	

12. **Tribal Cultural Resources.** Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resource, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

On October 20, 2020, County staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to native American tribes who have a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested invitation for consultations on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. No 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.

Charlene Gallina

December 15, 2021

Signature

Date

Name: Charlene Gallina
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b/c. Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms, geological features, water, trees and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of a beautiful or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken-in. As generally described in the **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses** section above, the project site is defined by a mix of vineyard and residential uses. The project would not result in a substantial damage to scenic resources, including trees and rock outcroppings, or substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The proposed project is located within the viewshed corridors of State Highway 29 and Oakville Grade, both of which are designated Viewshed Roads on the County Environmental Sensitivity Maps. The property gradually slopes (175 MSL) to the center of the property which results in a knoll that rises to 230 MSL. Due to the topography, landscaping and natural vegetation on the site, none of the proposed modifications are visible from either of these viewshed roads. While some vegetation would be removed to allow for construction of the project, this vegetation removal would not affect the visibility of the winery from nearby roadways. The project is not located within an urbanized area and would not conflict with applicable AP zoning regulations. As such, the project would not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista or damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway. As such, there are no impacts.

d. The project proposes expansion of the existing Carriage House, interior remodel of the historic Stone Winery building, installation of a new parking area, installation of a trash enclosure located within the lower parking area and roadway and internal circulation improvements. Installation of lighting associated with these modifications would have the potential to impact nighttime views in the area. 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. With the implementation of the condition below, potential impacts resulting from lighting associated with the project would result in a less than significant impact:

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: No mitigation measures are required.

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

Discussion:

a/b/e. The project site is designated as “urban and built up land” as shown on the Napa County Important Farmland Map 2002 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. As such, the project would not result in conversion of Prime or Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide importance. The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. There are no changes included in the project 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. No impacts would occur.

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

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

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

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 (NOx and ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO2), and suspended particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5). Other criteria pollutants, such as lead and sulfur dioxide (SO2), would not be substantially emitted by the proposed development or traffic, and air quality standards for them are being met throughout the Bay Area.

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

As mentioned above, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Operational-Related Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursors Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. Given the size of the entire project – 92,295 sf (20,354 sf dedicated as accessory space and 71,680 sf dedicated as production space), only 15,028 sf is being added as part of this project proposal. Specifically, 7,042 sf is dedicated as accessory space and 7,986 sf is dedicated as production space compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47,000 sf (high quality restaurant) and 541,000 sf (general light industry) for NOX (oxides of nitrogen), the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. (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 materials off-site.*
- 4. Remove all visible mud or dirt traced onto adjacent public roads by using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.*
- 5. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.*
- 6. All roadways, driveways and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.*
- 7. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting off equipment when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five (5) minutes (as required by State Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.*
- 8. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator. Any portable engines*

greater than 50 horsepower or associated equipment operated within the BAAQMD's jurisdiction shall have either a California Air Resources Board (ARB) registration Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) or a BAAQMD Permit. For general information regarding the certified visible emissions evaluator or the registration program, visit the ARB FAQ http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/perp/perpfact_04-16-15.pdf or the PERP website <http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/portable.htm>.

Furthermore, while earthmoving and construction on the site would 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 to be operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. The existing winery is located approximately 500 feet (from the northern existing outdoor event area) south of the nearest offsite residence, which is located at 1357 Oakville Grade. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-e The proposed project site is fully developed with an existing Winery and residence, and would only include an increase in production, employees, visitation and marketing uses on the property. Construction activities on the property is proposed to only consist of on- and offsite access improvements, including the realignment of the onsite driveway and construction of a new driveway to allow for one way circulation through the site to minimize disturbance to existing nature and man-made vegetation. Specifically, the offsite improvements would include construction of a left-hand turn lane for access from Acacia Drive to the project site. No trees are proposed for removal with the left-hand turn lane. The On-site improvements would include paving and widening of the driveway, installation of a rail span over an interior existing bridge that crosses an on-site seasonal stream channel, and an expansion to the parking area, as well as an approximately 14,116 sf addition to the Carriage House.

There are a total of 177 trees or groups of trees on the winery site. Project plans identify a total of 12 trees proposed to be removed as a result of the construction of the paving and widening of the driveway (six trees) and construction of the Carriage House addition (six trees). Trees to be removed include the following: Three 16" DBH, two - 20" DBH, one 22" DBH, and one 24" DBH Valley oaks; one 22" DBH and one 26" DBH Cork oaks; one 16" DBH Coast live oaks; and one 14" DBH and one 24" DBH Fremont poplars.

Proposed Rail Bridge and Setbacks from Seasonal Stream Drainage Channel: With the submittal of the project, Kjeldsen Biological Consulting submitted a report dated May 30, 2018, which addressed potential biological and permit considerations relevant to a possible internal road improvements to enhance and upgrade traffic circulation for guests, staff, and shipping. To achieve the proposed one-way internal circulation improvement, a stream channel must be crossed to reach the Winery. This seasonal drainage is considered a "Waters of the U.S." and or Waters of the State (drainage transports rainfall from the upslope watershed). Seasonal stream channels with a definable bed and bank fall within the jurisdiction of California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Any fill or impact to the bed and or bank will require a CDFW 1600 permit, USACE 404 permit, and a RWQCB 401 Water Quality Certification. Furthermore, any oak tree removal would require mitigation from CDFW as well as Napa County. Valley Oaks are considered a special resource in the county, and the existing trees are within the riparian corridor of the drainage adding to their biological value.

The goal of Kjeldsen's report was to review the following three improvement options and recommend an option that had an environmental superior solution.

Option 1 - Achieve traffic circulation goal by culverting/piping the existing watercourse (Approximately 200 - feet). Will require Valley Oak removal.

Option 2 - Achieve traffic circulation goal by adding a second crossing of the drainage and expand the existing crossing for automobile traffic with truck access for loading. This option will also require removal of Valley Oaks. This option would avoid culverting/piping the existing watercourse.

Option 3 - Achieve traffic circulation goal by expanding the existing crossing, (this could be accomplished by spanning the drainage where there is an existing crossing). This will provide a truck loading access road at an angle to the existing road (trucks must back up). This option would not require removal of Valley Oak trees and include the replacement of the existing bridge crossing with a clear span bridge over the watercourse.

Option 3 as proposed would result in widening an existing bridge that spans a drainage way to approximately 20 feet. The existing bridge is located between the upper and lower parking lots associated with the winery and integral to the proposed one-way vehicle circulation path. The watercourse in this location is proposed to have a railcar span solution, where the span is laid over the creek, outside of the bed and bank and its setback, thus eliminating the need to for doing work within the setback. As recommended, this option was determined to have the least environmental impact, which provides the following benefits: 1) avoid or limit impacts to the drainage; 2) minimizes impacts to the native Valley Oak trees; 3) requires vine removal from neighboring vineyard; and 4) requires trucks to back-up for loading dock access. Potential mitigation identified was to revegetate and replant onsite Native Trees removed at a 5:1 ratio and require a revegetation plan and mitigation plan with a minimum 5-years monitoring. A mitigation measure as provided below for CDFW, USACE and RWQCB review prior to issuance of a grading or building permit issuance and the submittal of a revegetation plan/mitigation plan for monitoring activities will be required of the project (Refer to MM BIO-1; MM BIO-4).

It should be further noted that this Major Modification application predates the effective date of the Water Quality & Tree Protection Ordinance (WQTPO), dated April 9, 2019, so the ephemeral drainage that parallels the new access road is not subject to the newer setback requirements, assuming it doesn't meet the definition of a stream as previously defined prior to the adoption of the WQTPO. However, from a CEQA perspective, those oaks trees that are functioning as habitat and within and/or in close proximity to the drainage and the ponds have value and in turn increases the need to require they be avoided. Given this issue, the County during review of the final grading plans will want to see if there are opportunities to avoid this tree by slightly moving the location of the bridge to the south, assuming the tree warrants avoidance.

Northern Spotted Owls: Staff reviewed the Napa County GIS Map (GIS Map) biological layer for biological sensitivities on the subject property. The biological layer displays the locations of recorded special status species occurrences on file with the California National Diversity Database (CNDDDB). A special status species commonly recorded within Napa County is the Northern Spotted Owl (NSO), a Federal and State listed threatened species. According to the GIS layer for NSO, the project site is within 5,000 feet of a number of recorded occurrences, with the closest occurrence approximately 3,500 feet from the project site. Therefore, the likelihood of NSO being impacted is low given the location of the nest site relative to the project site. Furthermore, it is unlikely that NSO would nest on the project site given all the current activities being conducted on the property. However, in order to ensure that no impacts to NSO habitat would occur, a preconstruction survey would be required as a mitigation measure (Refer to MM BIO-2).

Tree Removal: Staff conducted field review of the project site on May 21, 2021. The project site consists of moderately sloping terrain, averaging 20-25 percent slopes. A pond located on the most northern corner of the property feeds a seasonal watercourse that traverses the property from the pond to the western boundary and then along the proposed driveway on the west property line. A second pond is located southeast of the north pond watercourse running southwest from St. Helena Highway. A third pond is located at the southwest edge of the property, at intersection of the new driveway and Acacia Drive. Vegetation on the project site consists of groomed lawns, landscaping and fragmented oak woodland over story. Once again, the property is fully developed with the Historic Stone Winery, the Carriage House, driveway, parking areas, accessory uses (e.g. bottling, production) and the property owner residence. The property is located on the valley floor and surrounding properties are generally level in topography and developed with grape vineyards. Implementation of the proposed project noted on the project landscape plans indicated the removal of 12 trees as identified above.

A Tree Care Plan was prepared by Joseph Borden, licensed arborist of Briton Tree Care, on December 15, 2020, detailing the status and recommendations for 26 trees in the vicinity of the lower parking lot. Key findings are that one tree is missing (it fell over a few years ago), 12 trees have health or balance issues requiring pruning, and three trees are dead and should be removed. Trees #7, #21 and #23 were recommended for removal based on evidence of decay or death. All three trees have been removed, since these trees posed the greatest falling risk. This report also identifies 10 trees that are in the proposed development area and will have to be removed to accommodate future construction. In May 2021, another report was prepared by Joseph Borden, which evaluated nearly all the trees around the winery buildings, roads and private resident. Each tree was tagged and numbered. The reason for this undertaking was to inform the winery about tree care planning and budgeting towards promoting the health of the winery's heritage oaks and wooded areas, find opportunities to reduce tree-falling dangers, and generally take a good, hard look at all the trees onsite just to gather recommendations. Of these 177 trees, two oaks were found to have serious issues warranting removal. No tree-related action has been taken, other than to approve the pruning, thinning and cabling one tree. With guidance from the Winery's Arborist and from a representative of CalFire, the Winery has also removed underbrush from the trees, replaced spray irrigation with drip irrigation, and pruned large trees as part of a comprehensive plan to restore tree health and reduce fire dangers. The applicant has made it clear that they are holding off on non-urgent tree removals until they are authorized by the County on construction. To ensure that a minimal amount of trees are removed for construction activities reducing the project to less than significance a mitigation measure will be added to require the submittal of final tree removal plan (Refer to MM BIO-3).

No other special status species were identified under the GIS biological layer.

- 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:

MM BIO-1: Minimize Potential Impacts to Seasonal Watercourse

Prior to commencing construction of the replacement bridge, the permittee shall first obtain all required permits from applicable resource agencies, including a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement (LSAA) from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), a 404 permit from the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and a 401 water quality certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). All work performed shall be in conformance with CDFW, USACE, and RWQCB requirements.

Method of Monitoring: Prior to any activities in the Stream Channel (i.e. bridges), the Permittee shall submit to the Planning Division the executed Lake and Streambed Alterations Agreement, Nationwide Permit #39, or other appropriate authorization under the USACE.

Responsible Agency(ies): CDFW; USACE; RWQCB; Napa County PBES - Planning Division

MM BIO-2: Minimize Potential Impact to Raptors and Northern Spotted Owls:

Prior to approval of a grading permit, the permittee shall include the following measures to minimize impacts associated with the potential loss and disturbance of special-status and nesting birds and raptors consistent with and pursuant to California Fish and Game Code Sections 3503 and 3503.5:

- a. For earth-disturbing activities occurring between February 1 and August 31 (which coincides with the grading season of April 1 through October 15 – NCC Section 18.108.070.L, and bird breeding and nesting seasons), a qualified biologist (defined as knowledgeable and experienced in the biology and natural history of local avian resources with the potential to occur at the project site) shall conduct a preconstruction survey for nesting birds within all suitable habitat on the project site, and where there is potential for impacts adjacent to the project areas (typically within 500 feet of project activities). The preconstruction survey shall be conducted no earlier than seven (7) days prior to when vegetation removal and ground disturbing activities are to commence. Should ground disturbance commence later than seven (7) days from the survey date, surveys shall be repeated. A copy of the survey shall be provided to the Napa County PBES Planning Division and the CDFW prior to commencement of work.
- b. After commencement of work if there is a period of no work activity of seven (7) days or longer during the bird breeding season, surveys shall be repeated to ensure birds have not established nests during inactivity.
- c. In the event that nesting birds are found, the owner/permittee shall identify appropriate avoidance methods and exclusion buffers in consultation with the County PBES Planning Division and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and/or CDFW prior to initiation of project activities. Exclusion buffers may vary in size, depending on habitat characteristics, project activities/disturbance levels, and species as determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with County PBES Planning Division and the USFWS and/or CDFW.
- d. Exclusion buffers shall be fenced with temporary construction fencing (or the like), the installation of which shall be verified by Napa County prior to the commencement of any earthmoving and/or development activities. Exclusion buffers shall remain in effect until the young have fledged or nest(s) are otherwise determined inactive by a qualified biologist.
- e. Alternative methods aimed at flushing out nesting birds prior to preconstruction surveys, whether physical (i.e., removing or disturbing nests by physically disturbing trees with construction equipment), audible (i.e., utilizing sirens or bird cannons), or chemical (i.e., spraying nesting birds or their habitats) would be considered an impact to nesting birds and is prohibited. Any act associated with flushing birds from project areas should undergo consultation with the USFWS/CDFW prior to any activity that could disturb nesting birds.

Method of Monitoring: The above measures shall be incorporated with grading permit processing and survey recommendations shall be implemented in conjunction with all construction activities. A copy of the preconstruction surveys if required shall be provided to the Napa County PBES Planning Division.

Responsible Agency(ies): CDFW, USFWS, Napa County PBES Planning Division

MM BIO-3: Project Tree Removal

Prior to issuance of a demolition and/or a grading permit, a final tree removal plan prepared by a certified arborist shall be required of the project.

Monitoring: The final tree removal plan with recommendations shall be required of the project prior to commencement of project construction and shall be submitted for review and approval to the Planning Division prior to the issuance of a demolition permit and/or a grading permit.

Responsible Agency(ies): Napa County PBES Planning Division

MM BIO-4: Project Revegetation/Replanting Plan and Monitoring Program

Prior to issuance of a building permit, a project revegetation/replanting plan and a mitigation program prepared by a certified arborist shall be required of the project. The permittee will be required to revegetate 600 linear feet of drainage or uncovering 600-feet of a drainage that has been previously converted. Revegetation and replanting onsite for Native Trees removed shall be replaced at a 5:1 ratio. The revegetation plan shall also include a 5-year mitigation-monitoring program.

Monitoring: The final revegetation plan and mitigation plan including the 5-year monitoring action plan shall be submitted for review and approval to the Planning Division prior to the issuance of the building permit.

Responsible Agency(ies): Napa County PBES Planning Division

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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. The three-story stone winery structure is a historical resource that was originally constructed in 1885 and is listed in the National Register of Historic Places (listed on February 28, 1979) and is subject to review under CEQA. As such, the applicant submitted a memorandum, dated March 15, 2019 that was prepared by Architectural Resources Group (ARG) assessing the proposed project's potential to impact the historical integrity of the structure. As stated in the report, upon purchase of the property in 1979, Gil Nickel rehabilitated the deteriorated building and reintroduced winemaking operations. The memorandum notes that generally under CEQA, a project that follows *Standards for Rehabilitation (Rehabilitation Standards)*, contained within *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*, is considered to have mitigated any impacts to a historical resource to a less than significant level (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, Determining the Significance of Impacts to Archaeological and Historical Resources). ARG's memorandum provides a review of the project's consistency with the noted standards and concludes that, as proposed, these standards are met with regards to the historic stone building interior remodel of the on the Great Hall Level for accessory/hospitality tasting room uses and any proposed requirements to cover the crush pad area (Note: No changes have been requested or required), expansion and remodel of the Carriage House (Note: Determined by ARG not to be a historical building), and the new trash enclosure building.

Of note, the conclusion included in ARG's memorandum states "As a result of meeting the standards, [any impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed] project can be considered as mitigated to a level of less than significant ... on the historic resource." Staff concurs with ARC that the project is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards; staff has determined that potential impacts are less than significant without incorporation of the standards as mitigation measures. This was determined because, based on the design of the project, the project does not trigger an action to remedy any impacts in order to meet the standards. As such, the standards are not included as mitigation measures in the environmental document. Impacts are less than significant.

- b. Correspondence from Julia Franco with Tom Origer and Associates, Archaeological and Historical Research, dated February 8, 2019, indicates that a cultural resources study conducted in May of 2018 found two cultural resources on the project site. A review of the location of proposed project determined that the project would not result in impacts to these resources. As such, impacts are less than significant. However, in order to ensure that construction of the project would not impact any undiscovered archaeological resources, the following standard condition of approval would apply to the project:

7.2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL FINDING

In the event that archaeological 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 the 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.

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. As identified as a continued greenhouse gas emissions reduction measure in the Greenhouse Gas Emissions section below, the applicant has indicated that Far Niente Winery's energy usage was 750,000 kWh in 2006 prior to adding a 440 kWAC solar PV system located on APN 027-480-034. This system currently offsets an average of 87% of the winery's annual usage. With the proposed project expansion, energy usage is estimated to increase to approximately 825,000 kWh of which continued use of the existing solar PV system will offset 78% of the winery's annual usage. 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 regarding to rupturing a known fault.
 - ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project would be required to comply with the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
 - iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. 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 at the project site.
- b. The proposed improvements would occur on slopes of 5-30 percent. The project would require incorporation of best management practices and would be subject to the Napa County Storm Water Ordinance that addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c/d. Soil types on the project site include Sobrante loam, 5 to 80 percent slopes. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity maps (liquefaction layer) the proposed improvements would occur in an area with very 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. The proposed project includes installation of a new sanitary sewage (SS) wastewater management system in accordance with all necessary Napa County criteria and Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements for Title 22 recycled water to accommodate the proposed increase in visitation, marketing, employees and wine production. According to the Wastewater Feasibility Report prepared for the Far Niente Use Permit Major Modification by Summit Engineering, dated November 19, 2020, SS flows will be treated in a package treatment plant and disposed of via surface irrigation. The study demonstrated that all sanitary wastewater generated from an increase in visitation, marketing, employees and production can feasibly be treated and dispersed onsite. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings. Impacts would less than significant.
- f. No known paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified on the project site. In addition, the prepared by Tom Origer and Associates, discussed above, determined that such sensitivities being located within the parcel boundary would be unlikely. As such, impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

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

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 (CO₂) 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). Equivalent Carbon Dioxide (CO₂e) 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 (CO₂) is used as the reference atom/compound to obtain atmospheric carbon CO₂ effects of

GHG. Carbon stocks are converted to carbon dioxide equivalents (CO2e) 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 the project include: emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area, construction, and construction equipment and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as Equipment Emissions). These emissions also include underground carbon stocks (or Soil carbon) associated with any existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed. As previously stated, this project includes the construction of a replacement winery office building and improvements to existing internal access road.

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. Given the size of the entire project – 92,295 sf (20,354 sf dedicated as accessory space and 71,680 sf dedicated as production space), only 15,028 sf is being added as part of this project proposal. Specifically, 7,042 sf is dedicated as accessory space and 7,986 sf is dedicated as production space 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 high quality restaurant, the project was determined not to exceed the 1,100 MT of CO2e/yr. GHG threshold of significance.

Furthermore, the applicant intends to implement the following GHG reduction methods at the winery: Continue using existing 440 kWAC solar PV System for energy reduction; continue implementation of the winery's VMT program for employees and visitors; continue use of energy conserving lighting; expansion of Carriage House roof to meet Cool Roof Standards; proposes use of reuse sanitized wastewater from the proposed MBR system for landscape irrigation; continue use of water efficient fixtures; installation of Low-Impact Development facilities with storm water system improvements; installation of water efficient landscaping in new areas; continuation of composting 75% food and garden material; maintain existing native oaks and invasive species on the south side of the property for cooling of buildings; installation of EV charging stations for visitor and employee use; continue use of existing cave for winery operations; project proposal will limited amount of grading and tree removal; Carriage House expansion to use of recycled post-consumer products; continue use of local food products; continue education to staff and visitors on sustainability practices; continuation of 70-80% cover crop practices; and continuation of organically farmed vineyards.

The proposed project has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds and determined that the project would not exceed the 1,100 MT/yr. of CO2e. 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 will not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amount normally used in winery operations. The proposed project would not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts utilized in typical winery operations. An updated 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 fuels 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 environment. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the project site. According to the Napa County GIS Map school layer, the nearest school is 2.6 miles from the project site. As such, no impacts would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project.
- d. Based on a search of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control Database, the project site does not contain any known EPA National Priority List sites, State response sites, voluntary cleanup sites, or any school cleanup sites. No impact would occur, as the project site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.
- e. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan and therefore, no impacts would occur.
- 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 and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. The proposed driveway improvements would provide adequate access to Acacia Drive, Oakville Grade and State Highway 29. The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

On April 21, 2021, 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 Napa County. 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 June 8, 2021, the Napa County Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution declaring a Proclamation of Local Emergency due to drought conditions, which are occurring in Napa County. More recently, an updated State of Emergency Proclamation was issued by the Governor on October 19, 2021 proclaiming that the drought state of emergency is now in effect statewide.

Napa County requires all discretionary permit applicants to complete necessary water analysis 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-Tulocay (MST) area, however, have shown increasing depths to groundwater, but recent stabilization in many locations. Groundwater availability, recharge, storage and yield are not consistent across the County. More is known about the resource where historical data have been collected. Less is known in areas with limited data or unknown geology. In order to fill existing data gaps and to provide a better understand of groundwater resources in the County, the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan recommended 18 Areas of Interest (AOIs) for additional groundwater level and water quality monitoring. Through the well owner and public outreach efforts of the Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee (GRAC,) approximately 40 new wells have been added to the monitoring program within these areas. Groundwater Sustainability Objectives were developed and recommended by the GRAC and adopted by the Board. The recommendations included the goal of developing sustainability objectives, providing a definition, and explaining the shared responsibility for Groundwater Sustainability and the

important role of monitoring as a means to achieving groundwater sustainability.

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

Minimum thresholds for water use have been established by the Department of Public Works using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS). These reports are the result of water resources investigations performed by the USGS in cooperation with the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. Any project which reduces water usage or any water usage which is at or below the established threshold is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels. The project is categorized as being located within the Valley Floor in an area that has an established acceptable water use criteria of 1.0-acre foot per acre per year based upon current County Water Availability Analysis policies. Based upon those criteria, the Allowable Water Allotment for the project site is 46.95 acre-feet per year (af/yr), determined by multiplying the total acreage of 46.95 acres by a one acre- feet/year per acre fair share water use factor.

- a. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality. According to the Wastewater Feasibility Study prepared by Summit Engineering dated November 19, 2020, the proposed winery production, employees, visitation and marketing plan increases are feasible in terms of wastewater treatment and dispersal on the project site. As part of the project, the existing septic system would be replaced by a new treatment and disposal system and the process wastewater treatment system would remain in place. In the alternative, the septic system and process waste systems would be combined. With the implementation of one of these systems, the project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality. As such, impacts are less than significant.
- b. The findings of the Water Availability Analysis (WAA) completed by Summit Engineering November 23, 2020, demonstrate that the project would not substantially deplete local groundwater supplies and would not have a significant impact on groundwater resources. There are three wells currently serving the winery (Well 1) and vineyards (Wells 2 & 3). The existing domestic well (Well 1) on the winery parcel was drilled in 1978, with a 25-foot sanitary seal, and an estimated yield of 440-gpm yield during initial testing. According to the Tier I water availability analysis, the existing groundwater use for the winery and vineyard parcel is 32.4 af/yr. The proposed project would result in an anticipated total water demand of 36.9 af/yr, an increase of 4.5 af/yr. The chart below details the existing and proposed groundwater demand use:

Usage Type	Existing Usage (ac-ft)	Proposed Usage (ac-ft)
Vineyard Irrigation	8.9	8.9
Frost Protection	0.9	0.9
Winery:		
- Wine production	3.2	4.1
- Domestic (Employees and Visitors)	1.6	2.1
- Landscaping Irrigation	17.2	20.3
Residential Water Use	0.5	0.5
Total	32.4	36.9

The estimated groundwater demand of 36.9 af/yr represents a net increase of 4.5 af/yr over the existing condition. This amount represents 78% of the water allotment for the project site. The resultant groundwater demand for the parcel will be less than the associated groundwater permits and use permit allocation. The domestic well (Well 1), with an estimated 440 gpm, will be required to supply sufficient water to meet the domestic and process demands. The annual water demand averaged over 365 days includes 2,330 gpd of domestic water and 3,700 gpd of process water for a total of 6,030 gal/day. The peak water demand includes 3,360 gpd of domestic water and 7,400 gpd of process water for a total of 10,760. Therefore, the domestic well will be required to supply a peak flow of 22.4 gpm over 8 hours. The domestic well should have sufficient capacity to supply potable water demand.

It should be noted that a Tier II analysis was also prepared for reference and to estimate any interference between wells and springs that could affect their supply capacity due to water usage. The objective of the Tier II analysis is to determine if any well (existing or in the future) within 500 feet of the project's wells could be affected by the drawdown of the project's wells. The analysis was performed for all wells three wells (the domestic well on the winery parcel and two irrigation wells located on the vineyard and winery parcels). However, no off-site wells were identified to be located within 500'. Using very conservative estimates for aquifer thickness, specific storage, and hydraulic conductivity based on values from the WAA guidelines, it was determined that none of the on-site wells should produce a drawdown greater than 10 feet on any existing or future wells that could be adjacent to the property. Therefore, no significant drawdown impact is expected for wells on adjacent parcels.

The WAA also indicated that a Tier III analysis was not prepared for project due to lack of substantial evidence that there would be no groundwater or surface water interaction with project wells. It should be noted that Doak Creek is located on the south side of Oakville Grade Road, which is just over 1,500 (approximately) feet away to the north, as well as, To Kalon Creek, which is located approximately 2,200 feet to the northeast. Given the WAA guidance for a Tier III analysis, the performance of the well and calculations under the Tier II analysis, as well as, the geography of the area (winery and property adjacent to the north are both at an elevation of 175-230 MSL) with regards to the location of these two creeks, it is unlikely that there would be any groundwater/surface water interference.

The winery, as part of its entitlement would include the County's standard condition of approval noted below requiring well monitoring, as well as, the potential to modify/alter permitted uses on site should groundwater resources become insufficient to supply the use.

4.9 GROUND WATER MANAGEMENT - WELLS

This condition is implemented jointly by the Public Works and PBES Departments:

The permittee shall be required (at the permittee's expense) to record well monitoring data (specifically, static water level no less than quarterly, and the volume of water no less than monthly). Such data will be provided to the County, if the PBES Director determines that substantial evidence¹ indicates that water usage at the winery is affecting, or would potentially affect, groundwater supplies or nearby wells. If data indicates the need for additional monitoring, and if the applicant is unable to secure monitoring access to neighboring wells, onsite monitoring wells may need to be established to gauge potential impacts on the groundwater resource utilized for the project. Water usage shall be minimized by use of best available control technology and best water management conservation practices.

In order to support the County's groundwater monitoring program, well monitoring data as discussed above will be provided to the County if the Director of Public Works determines that such data could be useful in supporting the County's groundwater monitoring program. The project well will be made available for inclusion in the groundwater monitoring network if the Director of Public Works determines that the well could be useful in supporting the program.

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

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

In response to regional drought and the general Statewide necessity to protect groundwater resources, the Governor enacted new legislation requiring local governments to monitor and manage groundwater resources. Napa County 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 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-Agora 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 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 resources. Additionally, the legislation provides measurable objectives and milestones to reach sustainability and a State role of limited intervention when local agencies are unable or unwilling to adopt sustainable management plans. Napa County supports this legislation and has begun the process of developing a local groundwater management agency, which is anticipated to be in place and functioning within the timeline prescribed by the State.

The proposed project would result in a modest increase on the demand of ground water supplies and therefore would not interfere with groundwater recharge or lowering of the local groundwater level. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Water Deficient Areas/Storage Areas*), the project site is not located within a water deficient 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 have been reviewed by the Engineering Division. The proposed project would implement standard storm water 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 of the 100 and 500-year flood hazard boundaries. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiche, or mudflows. No impacts would occur.
- 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 project site. Therefore, there are no impacts.

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

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project is located in an area dominated by agriculture and rural residential uses and has been an active, 175,000 gallon winery for the better part of the last 40 years. Considering the baseline of the project and the length of time the winery has been in existence (having been originally constructed in 1885), the winery itself is part of the established community wherein it is located. As such, a modification that includes an approximately 30 percent increase in wine production and a modest increase in employees, visitation and marketing, a modest increase in existing building size to accommodate operational changes in addition to onsite improvements to the existing access roads and parking areas would result in a substantial change such that it would cause a divide in the established community. As such, there are no impacts.
- b. The proposed project is located in the AP zone district, which allows for wineries and uses accessory to wineries with the approval of a use permit. The applicant is requesting approval of a modification to the existing use permit to allow for an increase in production, visitation and marketing and employees, a minor increase in existing building size, and improvements to existing onsite access roads and parking areas, uses that are consistent with those allowed within the AP zone district. Napa County has adopted the Winery Definition ordinance (WDO)

to protect agriculture and open space and to regulate winery development and expansion in a manner that avoids potential negative environmental effects. The 2008 Napa County General Plan ensures that every important land use decision will be scrutinized and assessed for its potential to affect the quality of life, the environment we live in, the ability to farm, process agricultural products, and get those products to market. The intent of the Agricultural Land Use Goal AG/LU-1 is to preserve existing agricultural land uses and plan for agriculture and related activities as the primary land use. The intent of Land Use Goal AG/LU-3 is to support the economic viability of agriculture, including grape growing, winemaking, other types of agriculture and supporting industries to ensure the preservation of agricultural lands. The project would allow for the continuation of agriculture as a dominant land use within the county and is fully consistent with the Napa County General Plan.

Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU 1 of the 2008 General Plan states “agriculture and related activities are the primary land uses in Napa County” and Land Use Policy AG-LU-2 states that: “agriculture” is defined as the raising of crops, trees and livestock, the production and processing of agricultural products, and the related marketing, sales, and other accessory uses...”. The property’s General Plan land use designation is Agricultural Resource (AR), which allows “agriculture, processing of agricultural products and single-family dwellings.” The proposed modification includes expansion of the existing winery for “fermenting and processing of grape juice into wine” (NCC Section 18.08.640) utilizing the grapes grown onsite and grapes produced in Napa County supports the continuation of agriculture as a dominant land use within the County. Further, the project supports the economic viability of agriculture consistent with the General Plan Economic Development Policy E-1, “The County’s economic development will focus on ensuring the continued viability of agriculture in Napa County.”

The General Plan also includes two policies (Policy AG/LU-10 and Community Character Element Policy CC-2) requiring new wineries to be designed generally of a high architectural quality for the site and its surroundings. Although Far Niente is not a new winery, the use permit major modification includes a request to construct a 14,116 sf expansion to the west side of the existing Carriage House, a 261 sf trash enclosure and a 840 sf loading dock area to serve the Carriage House. As depicted in the plans submitted with the use permit major modification application, the addition to the Carriage House is an alteration to a contemporary building, and is located further away from the historic stone winery, which is requesting interior renovations only. The Carriage House is set into a hillside, which reduces its scale and is not visible from Oakville Grade Road. The new cellar level addition will be clad in insulated metal panels, with a stone base and aluminum storefront windows at the offices, so will be differentiated from the character of the historic winery structure. The addition at the upper two levels will have wood siding and a new roof to match the existing, and will be similar to the aesthetic of the existing contemporary structure. The construction of the trash enclosure is located in a remote corner of the property. As such, no impacts would occur.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 addition of the carriage house, onsite road improvements, an employee parking areas, demolition and installation of a new fire suppression system and other infrastructure upgrades, and construction of the left hand turn lane. The project also includes a phasing plan for construction of such winery improvements. Construction activities would be limited to daylight hours and properly muffled vehicles would be utilized. Noise generated during construction 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 proposed project is located approximately 500 linear feet (measured from outdoor event area to the north/new parking area) and approximately 800 linear feet (measured from the Carriage House) from the closest off-site residence, there is a low potential for significant noise impacts. Further, construction activities would occur during the period of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity. All construction activities would be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Chapter 8.16 of Napa County Code). 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.

8.3 CONSTRUCTION NOISE

Construction noise shall be minimized to the greatest extent practicable 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 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

Winery Production Operations: 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 that surround the proposed parcel are predominantly agricultural (vineyards) but also include rural residences; of these land uses, the residential uses are considered the most sensitive to noise. Based on the standards in County Code Section 8.16.070, noise levels, measured at the exterior of a residential structure or residential use on a portion of a larger property, may not exceed 50 decibels for more than half of any hour in the window of daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) 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). Noise from winery operations is generally limited and intermittent, meaning the sound level can vary during the day and over the course of the year, depending on the activities at the winery. The primary noise-generating activities are equipment associated with wineries including refrigeration equipment, bottling equipment, barrel washing, de-stemmers and press activities occurring during the harvest crush season, delivery trucks, and other vehicles. The Napa County General Plan EIR indicates the average, or equivalent, sound level (Leq) for winery activities is 51dBA in the morning and 41dBA in the afternoon. Audibility of a new noise source and/or increase in noise levels within recognized acceptable limits are not usually considered to be significant noise impacts, but these concerns should be addressed and considered in the planning and

environmental review processes. Winery operations would occur between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. (excluding harvest). The nearest off-site residence to the existing winery is located approximately 500 linear feet (measured from outdoor event area to the north/new parking area) and approximately 800 linear feet (measured from the Carriage House). As proposed, the increase in wine production and related activities will likely take place within the Carriage House or the Historic Stone Winery Building, which is located further south to the closest residence. No complaints have been received to date on winery operations as it pertains to noise.

It should be further noted that any outdoor equipment proposed in the expansion Carriage Building design would be subject to the following standard conditions requiring that any exterior winery equipment be enclosed or muffled and maintained so as not to create a noise disturbance.

6.6 OUTDOOR STORAGE/SCREENING/UTILITIES

c. Exterior winery equipment shall be located, enclosed or muffled so as not to exceed noise thresholds in the County Code.

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

b. All landscaping and outdoor screening, storage, and utility structures shall be permanently maintained in accordance with the landscaping and building plans approved by the County. No stored items shall exceed the height of the screening. Exterior winery equipment shall be maintained so as to not create a noise disturbance or exceed noise thresholds in the County Code.

Visitation & Marketing Activities: The proposed project also includes a modification to the existing visitation and marketing plan in order to increase visitation and marketing event activities, as well as, the location for such activities to be expanded in the caves, on the ground floor of the Carriage House and the outdoor Chardonnay Terrace located directly south of the Carriage House and the Cabernet Grill area on the northeast side of the property near an existing decorative pond. Outdoor events would occur anywhere between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 11:00 p.m. and would have the potential to create a permanent increase in intermittent ambient noise. The Cabernet Grill area is the closest to the nearest residence that would be subject to noise activities resulting from marketing events. However, the proposed additional events are nominal by comparison to those already entitled and as such, would not result in significant impacts beyond those already existing. To date, there have not been any noise complaints associated with any existing hospitality activities conducted by the winery. Letters of support for the project has been submitted.

Continuing enforcement of Napa County’s Noise Ordinance by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff, including the prohibition against amplified music, should further ensure that marketing events and other winery activities do not create a significant noise impact. Events and non-amplified music, excluding quiet clean-up are required to finish by 10:00 p.m.

Amplified music or sound systems would not be permitted for outdoor events as identified in standard Condition of Approval 4.10 below. Temporary events would be subject to County Code Chapter 5.36, which regulates proposed temporary events. The proposed project would not result in long-term significant permanent noise impacts.

4.10 AMPLIFIED MUSIC

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

c. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, there are no impacts.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

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

Discussion:

a. The project is requesting an additional 15 full time and seven (7) part time employees. The Association of Bay Area Governments' *projections 2003* figures indicates 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 addition of fifteen full time and seven part time employees could result in minor population growth in Napa County. Relative to the County's projected low to moderate growth rate and overall adequate programmed housing supply, such population growth would 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 Section 65580, the County of Napa must facilitate the improvement and development of housing to make adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community. Similarly, CEQA recognizes the importance of balancing the prevention of environmental damage with the provision of a "decent home and satisfying living environment for every Californian". [See Public Resources Code Section 21000(g)] The 2008 Napa County 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 implementation of the proposed 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: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project includes no new residential units or accompanying introduction of new residents that would utilize existing parks in the area, potentially accelerating those recreational facilities' deterioration. The proposal would add additional employees at the winery and visitors to the property, some of whom might visit recreational facilities in the area during breaks, before or after work, or on the way to or from other wineries. However, given that the purpose of employees' and guests' trips are to and from the winery as the primary destination, such visits to area recreational facilities are anticipated to be infrequent and would not drastically accelerate the deterioration of the park amenities. The project would not 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: None required.

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

The updated CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 states that a project's potential environmental impacts should evaluate the generation of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and that a project's effect on automobile delay and Level of Service (LOS) shall no longer constitute a significant environmental impact. The project applicant submitted a Transportation Impact Report prepared by Crane Transportation Group (CTG) dated December 11, 2020.

- a. The project site is located off of the east side of Acacia Drive, on the south side of Oakville Grade Road and about a mile west of State Route 29 (SR 29). Acacia Drive via Oakville Grade Road is the primary access route to the subject property and State Highway 29 (SR 29) to Acacia Drive is the secondary and emergency access route. SR 29 and Acacia Drive run in general north south directions through the project area and Oakville Grade Road runs in an east-west direction.

SR 29 provides the only major regional access to the west side of the Napa Valley and a connection to Oakville Grade Road. In the vicinity of the Oakville Grade Road intersection, it has two well-paved 12-foot travel lanes and eight-foot-wide paved shoulders. The roadway is level and straight and the posted speed limit is 50 miles per hour (mph). SR 29 is not controlled on its approaches to the Oakville Grade Road T-intersection, but a left turn lane is provided on the northbound intersection approaches and a median refuge area is provided north of the intersection to facilitate left turns from Oakville Grade Road.

Oakville Grade Road is a two-lane well paved rural collector County road extending westerly from its T-intersection with SR 29 into Sonoma County. It is stop sign controlled on its single-lane approach to the state highway. It also crosses the single track of the Napa Wine Train just west of SR 29. Flashing gates and lights protect the crossing. There is never more than one train crossing an hour during the afternoon and early evening, currently the only times of train activity. Oakville Grade Road is also stop-sign controlled on its eastbound approach to the railroad crossing. Oakville Grade Road is straight and level about 95 percent of the distance from SR 29 to the Acacia Drive-Doak Road intersection. There is no posted speed limit near SR 29. A curve just east of Acacia Drive is posted at 35 mph. West of Acacia Drive, Oakville Grade Road has a posted speed limit of 25 mph and numerous horizontal curves along its uphill grade. There is no left turn lane on the westbound Oakville Grade Road approach to Acacia Drive or to the shared use driveway just to the west of Acacia Drive. The Acacia Drive-Doak Road connection to Oakville Grade Road is about one mile west of SR 29.

Acacia Drive is a private, well-paved, 19-foot-wide roadway with no centerline stripe and no stop sign on its northbound approach to Oakville Grade Road. There is a north leg of the Oakville Grade Road/Acacia Drive intersection. It is primarily a one-lane paved facility named Doak Road and it provides access to the residences, vineyards and a Catholic Monastery.

The shared use driveway just west of Acacia Drive is a private, well paved roadway that averages 14 feet in width. The posted speed limit is 20 mph along its narrowest segment.

A Final Traffic Impact Report dated December 11, 2020 was prepared by Crane Transportation Group for the proposed project in order to determine whether expanded activities, including an increase in production, visitors and marketing events, would result in any significant circulation impacts to the local roadway network. The scope of the analysis therein included an evaluation of SR 29 and Oakville Grade Road and the Oakville Grade Road intersections with Acacia Drive, SR 29 and Dry Creek Road for harvest year 2019, Year 2024 and the cumulative (Year 2030) horizons. The scope of service for the traffic study was developed for and approved by Napa

County Public Works and the Planning, Building and Engineering Department. According to the study, based on the results of traffic counts conducted between the hours of noon and 6:00 p.m. on Friday and Saturday during two weekends in September and October of 2019, peak traffic hours at the Oakville Grade Road intersections with SR 29, Dry Creek Road and Acacia Drive-Doak Road were 2:45 p.m. to 3:45 p.m. on Fridays and 2:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Saturday. Per the study, the project as proposed would result in an increase of three (3) in-bound and three (3) out-bound p.m. peak hour trips on a Friday and five (5) inbound and six (6) outbound p.m. peak hour trips on a Saturday.

- b. There are no pedestrian walkways along Oakville Grade Road nor along Acacia Drive and none are planned by the project. There are no Class 1 to 4 Bicycle facilities either and none are planned by the project. Vine bus service is provided along SR 29 extending between Calistoga and the City of Napa, with connections to adjacent counties in Napa. The closest stop to the Winery is at Oakville Cross Road about 1½ mile from the Winery. According to the traffic impact study, while there are no pedestrian or transit 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. To address any bicycle riders accessing the site via SR 29, Oakville Grade Road and Acacia Drive and in response to the requested increase in parking for the winery, a minimum of ten on-site bicycle parking spaces would be provided as part of the project. As proposed, the project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.
- 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 Far Niente Winery Use Permit modification project is estimated to generate 53 net new daily trips (Friday, Harvest Season) and 89 net new daily trips (Saturday, Harvest Season) which is below the 110 trip threshold in the Office of Planning and Research guidelines. The traffic study included the applicant's proposed strategies such as carpool incentives, active transportation incentives for daily visitors and marketing events, electric vehicle charging stations, alternative work week employee opportunities, and a guaranteed ride home to be considered for implementation via a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan. Furthermore, the applicant has indicated the desire to designate the Human Resources Manager to administer the TDM program for the Winery. A condition of approval would be added to the project requiring the submittal and implementation of a final TDM program for the winery with strategies such as these for the life of the project, including annual monitoring requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

- d/e. As described above, the proposed project requests a 50,000 gallon per year increase in production, an increase in employees, daily visitation and marketing events. The project includes off- and on-site circulation improvements to address any potential project impacts and to reduce any vehicular hazards to less than significant impact. The project will be providing a left turn lane on the westbound Oakville Grade Road approach to Acacia Drive based upon current County left turn lane warrants. However, if the County changes criteria before construction of the turn lane, and if the new criteria indicate that a left turn lane is not required, the applicant will request the option of not building the turn lane. The traffic impact study found that site lines at Oakville Grade Road/Acacia Drive-Doak Road intersection are currently acceptable to the east and west from Acacia Drive along Oakville Grade Road. Site line to the east was calculated at 470 feet and to the west 540 feet. The posted speed limit on Oakville Grade Road at the project entrance is 25 mph. However, some vehicles were observed during two field surveys conducted by CTG traveling higher than the posted limit. Based upon a 40 mph criteria of the Caltrans Highway Design Manual (July 2020), resultant sight lines to the east and west would be acceptable. Currently, neither the Acacia Drive approach to Oakville Grade Road (or the opposing Doak Road approach to Oakville Grade Road) are stop sign controlled. At the County's request, an evaluation was conducted to determine if these approaches met California MUTCD 2014 Revision 5 (March 2020) criteria for provision of stop signs. Based on Caltrans criteria, neither approach warranted the need for a stop sign (e.g., volumes were low, there were no accidents occurring and the site lines were acceptable). However, Far Niente management indicated that there was an existing safety issue on the Acacia Drive approach based upon their observation of drivers in the area and indicated support for a stop sign, a painted stop message on the pavement as well as a stop bar and centerline on Acacia Drive near the intersection. In conjunction with this measure, the applicant would also provide a stop sign on the opposing Doak Road intersection approach such that all side street drivers would be stop sign controlled. The existing one-way (one lane) entry road beginning at the entry gate and the new one-way (one lane) exit driveway has been proposed to meet the Napa County Roads and Street Standards criteria for slope, width and turning radii. This one-way system will accommodate all winery-related traffic including the larger trucks, as well as emergency vehicles. Two existing one-lane roadways west of the winery will be used for internal service vehicles. The proposed

project, existing access and proposed site and access improvements have been reviewed by the Engineering Services Division and Fire, and both divisions have found the proposed access safe and sufficient for service to the project site as conditioned. Impacts would be less than significant.

- f. The project was analyzed to determine whether the proposed parking supply would be sufficient for the anticipated daily demand during harvest conditions. The project proposes to increase the existing number of parking spaces from 48 spaces to 70 spaces to accommodate an requested increase in employees (30 full time to 45 full-time and seven part-time on weekdays and 39 full time and seven part-time on weekends) and an increase in visitation (145 visitors per day Monday – Thursday and 190 visitors per day Friday - Sunday. This proposed parking program is to allocate 21 spaces to the guests and 49 spaces for employees of the winery. 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. Assuming the County's standard occupancy rate of 2.8 guests per vehicle, a total of 52 weekday guest vehicles and 68 weekend guest vehicles would visit the site over the course of the day; to accommodate 25 percent of the visitors at one time, 13 to 17 parking spaces would be required for visitors and. 42-45 spaces would be required to accommodate employee parking needs for a total of 62 spaces. The proposed on-site parking supply of 70 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. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required

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

Discussion:

- a/b. On October 20, 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 invitation to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. No responses were received within 30-days of the tribes' receipt of invitation.

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

construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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/c. The project would require the construction of an expanded wastewater treatment and storm water drainage and increase electric power natural gas and telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

There is an existing well on the site (Domestic Well 1) that is estimated to operate at 440 gpm will be used to supply sufficient water to meet the domestic and process demands. The annual water demand averaged over 365 days includes 2,330 gpd of domestic water and 3,700 gpd of process water for a total of 6,030 gal/day. The peak water demand includes 3,360 gpd of domestic water and 7,400 gpd of process water for a total of 10,760 gpd. Therefore, the domestic well will be required to supply a peak flow of 22.4 gpm over 8 hours. The domestic well should have sufficient capacity to supply potable water demand. As discussed in Section X above, a WAA for the proposed project was prepared by Summit Engineering in November of 2020. As noted in the WAA, the project is categorized as being located on the Valley Floor and per the County's WAA Guidance Document, dated May 12, 2015, the water use criteria for a parcel located on the Napa Valley Floor and/or All Other Areas that are not designated as a groundwater deficient area without any well or spring interference must follow Tier 1 analysis requirements.

The County Water Availability Analysis policies provide an established acceptable water use criteria of 1.0-acre foot per acre per year (af/yr). Based on this criteria, the Allowable Water Allotment for the project site is 46.95 acre-feet per year (af/yr), determined by multiplying the total acreage of 46.95 acres by the one acre-feet per year/acre fair share water use factor. According to the Tier 1 analysis, the existing groundwater use for the winery and vineyard parcel is 32.4 af/yr. The proposed project would result in an anticipated water demand total of 36.9 af/yr, an increase of 4.5 af/yr. Because the increase in water demand would not result in a total exceeding the parcel's allowable water allotment, impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is necessary. In addition, the entitlement would include a standards condition requiring well monitoring, allowing for modification/alteration of the permitted uses should groundwater resources become insufficient to supply the use. In summary, the subject property's existing water yield would be sufficient to serve all proposed uses on the property. Any project with water usage 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.

As for wastewater generated, it would be treated on-site and would not require a wastewater treatment provider. Impacts would be less than significant. Grading for the construction and installation of the updated stormwater system and wastewater treatment system improvements would occur concurrently in Phase 1 with all other proposed winery improvement systems, which would be subject to the dust suppression measures listed in Section III, Air Quality, of this initial study. Given these measures, 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-d The proposed project is located within a non-wildland/non-urban fire hazard severity zone and in the Napa County Local Responsibility Area (LRA district). The project site is generally flat with slopes ranging from 0-5% and is located on the valley floor. The project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan because the proposed driveway and circulation improvements would provide adequate access to Acacia Drive, Oakville Grade and Highway 29. There are currently overhead power lines along the south side of Oakville Grade and cross over to the north side just east of the Acacia Drive. Acacia Drive has underground power lines. The existing overhead lines on Oakville Grade will not be affected by the project. 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.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Discussion:

- a. As discussed in Section IV, Biological Resources, all potential biological related impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. As identified in Section V, Cultural Resources above, no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified within the project site. In the event archaeological artifacts are found, a standard condition of approval would be incorporated into the project. Impacts would be less than significant with the incorporation of the biological resources mitigation measures and standard condition of approval related to cultural resources.
- b. The project would have limited 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 minimally increase demands for public services, traffic and air pollutants, all of which would contribute to cumulative effects when existing and future development in Napa County are considered. Cumulative impacts of this nature are discussed in previous sections of this document. Therefore, potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant.
- c. All impacts identified in this document are considered less than significant or less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation measures. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in environmental effects that cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: See Mitigation Measures in Section IV.
