

COUNTY OF NAPA  
PLANNING, BUILDING & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT  
1195 THIRD ST., SUITE 210, NAPA, CA 94559  
(707) 253-4416

Initial Study Checklist  
(form updated September 2010)

1. **Project Title:** Girard Winery Use Permit P14-00053
2. **Property Owner:** Vintage Wine Estates, 205 Concourse Blvd Santa Rosa, CA 95403; (877) 289-9463
3. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Pat Roney, 205 Concourse Blvd Santa Rosa, CA 95403; (707) 289-9463
4. **Representative:** Heather McCollister, 1512 D Street, Napa, CA 94559, (707) 287-5999; bhmccolli@sbcglobal.net.
5. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Wyntriss Balcher; (707) 299-1351; wyntriss.balcher@countyofnapa.org
6. **Project Location and APN:** The project is located on a 25.63 acre parcel on the east side of Dunaweal Lane, approximately 1000 feet south of its intersection with Silverado Trail, within the AP (Agricultural Preserve) Zoning District; 1077 Dunaweal Lane; Calistoga, CA 94515, APN: 020-150-017.
7. **General Plan description:** Agricultural Resource (AR) Designation.
8. **Zoning:** Agricultural Preserve (AP) District.
9. **Background/Project history:** The existing parcel is 26.53 acres in area and includes an existing storage building, three ponds for the wastewater processing system, water well, and associated infrastructure that is currently serving Clos Pegase Winery(200,000 gallons), also owned by the applicant, located at 1060 Dunaweal Lane (APN: 020-150-012), directly across the street. There are currently 12± acres of vineyards planted on the property, but there has been a history of a total of 18 acres of vineyard, of which 6± acres is now fallow. There are no other improvements on the property.
10. **Project Description:** Approval for a Use Permit to establish a new winery as follows:
  - A. 200,000 gallons per year production capacity;
  - B. Construction of new winery building, totaling 32,771 sq.ft. in area to include: 28,955 sq.ft. production area (crush area, fermentation and barrel storage, restrooms); 3,816 sq.ft of accessory use area (offices, tasting rooms, retail storage, catered food prep area, and visitor restrooms), maximum height 35 ft. with 45 ft. tall cupolas. In addition a 2,628 sq. ft. covered veranda; and a 2,871 sq. ft. covered work area are proposed;
  - C. Hosted daily tours and tastings for wine trade personnel and consumers by appointment only for a maximum 75 persons per weekday (Monday-Friday); maximum 90 persons per weekend day (Saturday-Sunday);
  - D. Hours of operation: 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM (production hours, except during harvest) and 10:00 AM to 6:00 PM (visitation hours), 7-days a week;
  - E. Employment of more than 25 employees: 11 employees (8 full time; 3 part-time) non harvest; during harvest, 19 additional employees (12 full time and 7 part time);
  - F. Employee hours: production, 7:00 AM to 3:00 PM; hospitality/ tasting room, 9:30 AM to 6:30 PM; administration, 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM;
  - G. Construction of twenty-two (22) parking spaces;
  - H. Installation of landscaping, entry gate and a winery sign;
  - I. Establish a Marketing Program as follows:
    - i. Four (4) events per year with a maximum of 75 guests;
    - ii. Four (4) events per year with a maximum of 200 guests;
    - iii. One (1) Harvest event per year with a maximum of 500 guests;
    - iv. All food to be catered utilizing a ±184 sq. ft. small prep/staging area;

- J. On-premise consumption of wines produced on site within the tasting room and in the landscaped winery gardens in accordance with AB 2004;
- K. Construct new 24" wide winery access driveway from Dunaweal Lane to the winery;
- L. Construction of additional piping and service connections to the existing water system with an update to the existing Transient Non-Community Water System contract to include Girard Winery;
- M. Installation of on-site sanitary disposal improvements and installation of connections into the existing on-site winery waste water ponds serving Clos Pegase Winery (APN:020-150-012); and,
- N. Installation of 25,000 gallon water storage tank.

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

The 26.53 acre parcel is relatively flat at the 330± elevation. The property has frontage on the east side of Dunaweal Lane, with hills to the east and south with elevations of 550'± and mountains starting to the north along Silverado Trail, reaching the 3,000'± elevation. Currently approximately 12 acres of the 26.53 acres is planted in vineyard. Native vegetation in the area consists of Valley Oak Savanna, with most of the Oaks scattered on the small hills and along the banks of the Napa River. The geology of the land is Quaternary surficial deposits overlain by Holocene alluvium, undifferentiated and the majority of the soils on site are Bale loam (0 to 2 percent slopes), with Cole silt loam (0 to 2% slopes); and Clear lake clay, drained along the most easterly side of the parcel near the base of the hill. The property is located within the Napa River Watershed, located approximately 1200 feet south of the parcel, outside of the 100 year flood hazard zone, but a portion within the 500-year flood hazard zone.

The property is located within an area delineated by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife Natural Diversity Maps as a potential community of the Calistoga Popcornflower, Jepsons's leptosiphon, Baker's navarretia papose tarplant, narrow-anthered brodiaea, and pallid bat.

In addition to the existing 12± acres of vineyards, the parcel is developed with a wastewater processing system with three ponds serving the Clos Pegase Winery located on an adjacent parcel, an agricultural storage building, and water well with associated infrastructure. Clos Pegase Winery is located at 1060 Dunaweal Lane (APN:20-150-012), directly across from the subject parcel. The well on the subject property provides water to the Clos Pegase winery (also owned by the applicant) and also the residence existing on that property, under a Transient Non-Community water system. The Water System Feasibility Report prepared by Always Engineering (dated 2/21/2014) states that the demand from Clos Pegase Winery and the residence are 4.7 acre feet per year (af/yr). The surrounding land uses include vineyards, wineries (Clos Pegase; Sterling Vineyards, Twomey Cellars, Paoletti Estates Winery) and residential development on large parcels. The nearest residence is approximately 400 feet from the winery site. The City of Calistoga waste processing facilities are located approximately 600 feet south of the winery property, on the west side of Dunaweal Lane.

12. **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, and waste disposal permits, in addition to CalFire. Permits may also be required by the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, & Firearms.

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

None Required.

**Other Agencies Contacted**


Federal Trade and Taxation Bureau  
Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control

**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.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Wynness Balcher, Planner II  
Napa County Planning, Building, and Environmental Services

11/25/2014  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. <b>AESTHETICS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-c Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms, geological features, water, trees and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of a beautiful or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken-in. This area is defined by a mix of vineyards, wineries, residential uses, small tree-covered knolls, and the tall distant mountain vistas. The proposed winery building will settle against the immediate small hills backdrop and will not obstruct the scenic distant hillsides. The project would not result in substantial damage to scenic resources or substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings since the proposed design of the buildings will utilize earth tones and stone textures, with a low angle roofline, and will include grounding landscaping, all which will complement the mountain views and tree-covered knolls. There are no rock outcroppings visible from the road or other designated scenic resources on the property.
- d. The construction of winery uses will result in the installation of additional lighting that may have the potential to impact nighttime views. The installation of new sources of nighttime lights may affect nighttime views. Pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approval for wineries, outdoor lighting will be required to be shielded and directed downwards, with only low level lighting allowed in parking areas. As designed, and as subject to the standard condition of approval, below, the project will not have a significant impact resulting from new sources of outside lighting.

*All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward, shall be located as low to the ground as possible, and shall be the minimum necessary for security, safety, or operations and shall incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. 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. Lighting utilized during harvest activities is not subject to this requirement. Prior to issuance of any building permit for construction of the winery, 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 California Building Code.*

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.<sup>1</sup> Would the project:</b>				
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. Based on a review of Napa County environmental resource mapping (Department of Conservation Farmlands, 2008 layer), the site is classified as "Prime 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. As a result, this application will not result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use.
- b. The property is zoned Agricultural Preserve (AP) but is not subject to a Williamson Act contract. Since agricultural activities will continue on the site, there will be no resulting conflict with the zoning within which the subject property is located.
- c/d. The project site is zoned AP (Agricultural Preserve), which allows wineries upon grant of a use permit. The project site does not contain woodland or forested areas, and thus would not result in the loss of or conversion of forest lands to a non-forest use.
- e. As discussed in item "a.", above, the winery and winery accessory uses are defined as agricultural by the Napa County General Plan and are allowed under the parcels' AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning. Neither this project, nor any foreseeable consequence thereof, would result in changes to the existing environment which would result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>III. AIR QUALITY.</b> 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:				
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) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) 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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-c. On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Board of Directors unanimously adopted thresholds of significance to assist in the review of projects under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The thresholds were designed to establish the level at which the District believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA and were posted on the Air District's website and included in the Air District's May 2011 updated CEQA Guidelines.

On March 5, 2012 the Alameda County Superior Court issued a judgment finding that the Air District had failed to comply with CEQA when it adopted the thresholds. However, on August 31, 2013, the Court of Appeals reinstated the Air District's thresholds of significance provided in Table 3-1 (Criteria Air Pollutants & Precursors Screening Levels Sizes) which are applicable for evaluating projects in Napa County.

Over the long term, emission sources for the proposed project will consist primarily of mobile sources including vehicles visiting the site. The Air District's threshold of significance provided in Table 3-1 has determined that similar projects such as a quality restaurant that do not exceed a threshold of 47,000 sq. ft. will not significantly impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2011 Pages 3-2 & 3-3.). Given the size of the entire project, which is approximately 32,771 sq. ft. of enclosed floor area including about 1,490 sq. ft. of floor area for tasting/hospitality uses compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47ksf (high quality restaurant) and 541ksf (general light industry) for NO<sub>x</sub> (oxides of nitrogen), the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. (Please note: a high quality restaurant is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, but grossly overstates emissions associated with other portions of a winery, such as office, barrel storage and production, which generate fewer vehicle trips. Therefore, a general light industry comparison has also been used for other such uses.)

The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plan. Wineries as proposed here are not producers of air pollution in volumes substantial enough to result in an air quality plan conflict. The project site lies within the Napa Valley, which forms one of the climatologically distinct sub-regions (Napa County Sub region) within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The topographical and meteorological features of the Valley create a relatively high potential for air pollution. Over the long term, emissions resulting from the proposed project would consist primarily of mobile sources, including production-related deliveries and visitor and employee vehicles traveling to and from the winery. The resulting busiest day plus marketing total is well below the threshold of significance. The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state Ambient air quality standard.

d. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from earthmoving and construction activities required for project construction. Earthmoving and construction emissions would have a temporary effect; consisting mainly of dust generated during grading and other construction activities, exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles, and relatively minor emissions from paints and other architectural coatings. The Air District recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction impacts. If the proposed project adhere 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:

*The permittee shall comply during all construction activities with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Basic Construction Mitigation Measures as provided in Table 8-1, May 2011 Updated CEQA Guidelines.*

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

*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 during windy periods.*

e. While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. The closest residence is approximately 160 feet from the southern property line and 400 ft. from the winery building. Construction-phase pollutants will be reduced to a less than significant level by the

above-noted standard condition of approval. The project will not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. <b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

a/b. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers - plants CNPS points & polygons, plant surveys, red legged frog core area and critical habitat, vernal pools & vernal pool species, Spotted Owl Habitat – 1.5 mile buffer and known fish presence and California Department of Fish and Wildlife Natural Diversity Map) the project site is located within an area delineated as a potential community as a potential community of the Calistoga Popcornflower, Jepsons's leptosiphon, Baker's navarretia papose tarplant, narrow-anthered brodiaea, and pallid bat. A Biological Resource Survey by Kjeldsen Biological Consulting, dated July 2014, was prepared to identify any biological resources that may be affected by the proposed project. Field work in the proposed project envelope, the property, and the adjoining environment was conducted during the spring and summer of 2014.

The Biologist's report found that the project footprint is within an agricultural landscape; that the project as proposed will not have any direct impacts to Federal or State protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act; and that the proposed project will not significantly reduce habitat for or have the potential to negatively impact any special-status plants or animals. No sensitive plants, sensitive plant habitat, or special-status plant species were identified on the property or on the project site. The biologist stated that it is unlikely that the proposed project would impact any of the special-status species known for the Quadrangle or the region based upon their fieldwork, the habitat present and historic use within and associated with the project footprint. In addition, the project site has been developed in agriculture for decades.

The biologist observed a juvenile western pond turtle on the bank of one the existing wastewater processing ponds; however, the biologist determined that it is unlikely that turtles would move in the area proposed for the winery site since the disturbed area and vineyard do not provide potential nesting habitat, due to soil compaction and dry ground with no cover or vegetated cover. The biologist stated that the turtles most likely have moved in from the adjacent pond southeast of the property. No raptor activity or nests were observed; no indication of the presence of sensitive natural communities regulated by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife was found within or directly associated with the project footprint. The project proposal and associated construction are minimal with no significant grading required. The removal of trees is limited to five non-native walnut trees planted along the road for the access driveway. Furthermore, the footprint of the project will not significantly contribute to habitat loss or habitat fragmentation.

Further, the report indicates that the project would not be expected to impact any off-site biological resources if Best Management Practices are implemented during development of the site. To reduce potential biological impacts by the proposed project to a less than significant level, Best Management Practices including silt and erosion control measures should be implemented to prevent offsite

movement of sediment and during and post construction. Standard conditions regarding stormwater control, which will require the incorporation of BMP's during development, is a standard site improvements and engineering services-specific condition that will applied to the project as follows:

**STORM WATER CONTROL**

*The permittee shall comply with all construction and post-construction storm water pollution prevention protocols as required by the County Engineering Services Division, and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (SRWQCB).*

The project would have a less than significant impact on biological resources with implementation of Best Management Practices required by the conditions of approval.

- c/d. According to the Biological Survey prepared for the project, there are no wetlands on the property or on neighboring properties that would be affected by this project. Therefore, the project activities will not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with their corridors or nursery sites, because no sensitive natural communities have been identified on the property and the project as proposed would have no impact to biological resources.
- e/f. This project would not interfere with any ordinances protecting biological resources. With the exception of the ten introduced trees along the road (where five are proposed for removal), there are no trees on the property. There are no tree preservation ordinances in effect in the County. 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.

Mitigation measure: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. <b>CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

- a-c. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology surveys, sites, sensitive areas, and flags) the property is located within an archaeological resources sensitive area and an archaeological study has been prepared and recorded (April 5, 1978, Archaeological Services). No archaeological or ethnographic sites have been identified on the property and no archaeological sites were found during the surficial survey. Based on the proposed project plans, there would be no impact to cultural resources. However, if resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval:

*"In the event that archeological artifacts or human remains are discovered during any subsequent construction in the project area, work shall cease in a 50-foot radius surrounding the area of discovery. The permittee shall contact the Planning, Building, and Environmental Services Department for further guidance, which will likely include the requirement for the permittee to hire a qualified professional to analyze the artifacts encountered and to determine if additional measures are required. If human remains are encountered during the development, all work in the vicinity must be, by law, halted, and the Napa County Coroner informed so that the Coroner can determine if an investigation of the cause of death is required, and if the remains are of Native American origin. If the remains are of Native American origin, the nearest tribal relatives as determined by the State Native American Heritage Commission would be contacted to obtain recommendations for treating or removal of such remains, including grave goods, with appropriate dignity, as required under Public Resources Code Section 5097.98."*



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

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to 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 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"/>

**Discussion:**

- a.
- i.) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.
  - ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to 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 editions 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 landslide deposits in the proposed development area.
- b. The proposed development is minimal and will occur on slopes 0% to 1%. Based upon the Soil Survey of Napa County, prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the soils on site are comprised of Bale loam (0 to 2 percent slopes), with Cole silt loam (0 to 2% slopes); and Clear lake clay, drained. The Bale loams and Cole silt loams are somewhat poorly drained, with a low runoff classification; the Clear Lake clay is poorly drained, but medium runoff classification. The project will require incorporation of best management practices and will be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable.
- c/d. According to preliminary geologic mapping of the Calistoga Quadrangle performed by the California Geologic Survey (CGS-2004), the geology of the land is Quaternary surficial deposits overlain by Holocene alluvium, undifferentiated. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the project site has medium susceptibility for liquefaction. Development will be required

to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible.

- e. The Use Permit Wastewater Feasibility Study prepared for the project by Always Engineering, dated May 5, 2014 indicates that the site evaluation was performed on November 14, 2013 and test pits displayed a sandy clay loam surface soil which ranged from 36" to 56", however at the time of preparation of the study, there had not been sufficient rainfall to perform groundwater monitoring, and therefore made an assumption that a minimum of 24" of suitable soil is available for septic system design. An alternative system (irrigation reuse) is also proposed with this feasibility study to ensure that there will be the required separation to seasonal groundwater. Prior to issuance of building permits, the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board will need to approve the alternative system. If future groundwater monitoring cannot occur in the time schedule appropriate for building permits, or does not provide at least 24 inches of separation to ground water, treatment, irrigation and reuse will be required for the project. In this event, The Division of Environmental Health must grant system approval prior to building permit issuance.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.</b> Would the project:				
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:**

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

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

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

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

The applicant proposes to incorporate GHG reduction methods including but not limited to: alternative fuel and electrical vehicles in fleet; build to CALGREEN Tier 2; new vegetation plantings; VMT reduction plan; energy conserving lighting; connection to an existing recycled water system; water efficient landscaping and shade trees; limiting the amount of grading and tree removal; composting; sustainable purchasing and shipping programs; electrical vehicle charging stations; bicycle incentives; and education of staff and visitors on sustainable practices.

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

The increase in emissions expected as a result of the project will 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.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII.	<b>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> Would the project:				
	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 for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, 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 for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

- a. The proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts normally used in winery operations. A Business Plan will be filed with the Environmental Health Division should the amount of hazardous materials reach reportable levels. However, in the event that the proposed use or a future use involves the use, storage or transportation of greater than 55 gallons or 500 pounds of hazardous materials, a use permit and subsequent environmental assessment would be required in accordance with the Napa County Zoning Ordinance prior to the establishment of the use. During construction of the project some hazardous materials, such as building coatings/adhesives/ etc., will be utilized. However, given the quantities of hazardous materials and the limited duration, they will result in a less-than-significant impact.
- b. The project would not result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site.
- d. The proposed site is not included on the Cortese List prepared in compliance with Government Code Section 65962.5.
- e. The project site is not located within two miles of any public airport.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.

- g. The proposed project has direct access to and will not cause obstruction of public roads or highways and will therefore not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan.
- h. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b> Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<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, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or 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"/>
e) 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"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

- a. The proposed project will not violate any known water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project will connect to the existing on-site process wastewater system used by the Clos Pegas Winery and will require the installation of a new sanitary sewage system to serve the winery employees, visitors and events. The "Use Permit Wastewater Feasibility Study" prepared by Always Engineering, Inc. (dated May 5, 2014), has been reviewed by Napa County Division of Environmental Health and recommends approval as conditioned. Additionally, any earth disturbing activities would be subject to the County's Stormwater Ordinance which would include measures to prevent erosion, sediment, and waste materials from entering waterways both during and after any construction activities. Given the County's Best Management Practices, which comply with RWQCB requirement

The proposed project will utilize the existing Clos Pegase Winery Transient Non-Community water supply system as its water supply source. Pumped groundwater is the water source for this regulated water supply system. As a regulated system, the State Department of Water Resources and County Division of Environmental Health require the system to meet State-mandated water quality standards. As such, proposed water supplies for this project will comply with all water quality standards, and the project does not have the potential to significantly impact water quality or discharge standards.

- b. On January 14, 2014 Governor Jerry Brown declared a drought emergency in the state of California. The declaration stopped short of imposing mandatory conservation measures statewide. Mandatory water restrictions are being left to individual jurisdictions. At this time the County of Napa has not adopted or implemented mandatory water use restrictions. The County requires all Use Permit applicants to complete necessary water analyses in order to document that sufficient water supplies are available for the proposed project. On June 28, 2011 the Board of Supervisors approved creation of a Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee (GRAC). The GRAC's purpose was to assist County staff and technical consultants with recommendations regarding groundwater, including data collection, monitoring, well pump test protocols, management objectives, and community support. The County completed a county-wide assessment of groundwater resources (Napa County Groundwater Conditions and Groundwater Monitoring Recommendations Report (Feb. 2011)) and developed a groundwater monitoring program (Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2013 (Jan. 2013)). The County also completed a 2013 Updated Hydrogeologic Conceptualization and Characterization of Groundwater Conditions (Jan. 2013).

In general, recent studies have found that groundwater levels in the Napa Valley Floor exhibit stable long-term trends with a shallow depth to water. Historical trends in the Milliken-Sarco-Tuluca (MST) area, however, have shown increasing depths to groundwater, but recent stabilization in many locations. Groundwater availability, recharge, storage and yield is 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 (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. In their recommendations, the Committee reviewed the goal of developing sustainability objectives, provides a definition, and explains the shared responsibility for Groundwater Sustainability. They reiterated the important role monitoring as a means to achieving groundwater sustainability and the principles underlying the sustainability objectives.

Groundwater Sustainability Objectives were also developed by the GRAC and recommended to the Board of Supervisors. In their recommendations, the Committee reviewed the goal of developing sustainability objectives, provides a definition of groundwater sustainability, and explained the shared responsibility for groundwater sustainability. They acknowledged the important role of monitoring as a means to achieving groundwater sustainability and the principles underlying the sustainability objectives. The Groundwater Sustainability Objectives are outlined, along with a Sustainability Objectives Implementation Table which provides additional recommendations on how, metrics of success, timeframes, responsibility, and estimated cost ranges

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 Napa Valley Floor, Calistoga; where monitoring wells evaluated in the LSCE report indicated no record declining groundwater supplies. The County has no record of problems or complaints of diminished groundwater supplies at the project site or in the general vicinity.

Minimum thresholds for water use have been established by the Napa County 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 located on the valley floor in an area that has an established acceptable water use criteria of 1.0 acre foot per acre per year.

Vintage Wine Estates owns and operates the existing "Clos Pegase Water System" located on the subject proposed Girard Winery parcel (APN:020-150-017). Clos Pegase Winery is located directly across Dunawael Lane from the proposed project. The water system is currently regulated as a Transient Non-Community water system. The existing water system consists of: one active onsite well (Well #2), pressure tanks, sediment filter, and softeners on parcel APN: 020-150-017; and a 58,000 gallon storage tank, UV disinfection treatment and potable use for the winery and residence on parcel APN: 020-150-012. Vintage Wine Estates is applying for a use permit to establish a new winery (the proposed Girard Winery) and the "Clos Pegase Water System" is proposed to also serve the new winery using the same water system. The existing water system permit will need to be updated to include additional piping, 25,000 gallon storage tank, and service connections for the proposed Girard Winery, as well as any additional documents which must be updated as a result.

Since the Clos Pegase Winery Water System is located on the Girard Winery parcel, the groundwater availability analysis evaluated groundwater demand generated from both the proposed project parcel and the Cloe Pegase Winery parcel. The Water Availability Analysis-Phase One Study prepared for the 20.39 acre, valley-area, Clos Pegase Winery property (APN:020-150-012), states that the Allowable Water

Allotment for the property is 20.39 acre feet per year (af/yr), determined by multiplying its 20.39 acre size by the one af/yr/acre fair share water use factor.

Clos Pegase Winery is a 200,000 gallon winery, with 10 employees (total 30 employees during harvest) and visitation an average 725 per week. The Clos Pegase Phase I study indicates the existing and proposed use total demand is 9.70 af/yr, specifically:

EXISTING CLOS PEGAS WINERY WATER DEMAND	
	Acre feet/year
Winery Processing	4.30
Employees	
Harvest (30 full-time)	.126
Non Harvest (10 full-time)	.126
Tasting Visitors (725/52 weeks)	.35
Event Visitors (150/24 events/year)	.05
Landscaping	1.00
4 acres Vineyard – Irrigation, frost protection and heat protection	3.00
Residence	.75
TOTAL	9.70

A Water Availability Analysis-Phase One Study was prepared for the 26.53 acre, valley-area, proposed Girard Winery property (APN:020-150-017), which states that the Allowable Water Allotment for the property is 26.53 acre feet per year (af/yr), determined by multiplying its 26.53 acre size by the one af/yr/acre fair share water use factor

The proposed Girard Winery is a 200,000 gallon winery, proposed 10 employees (total 30 during harvest), and maximum 100 visitors, and 9 events with a maximum 500 people. The proposed total demand from the Girard Winery 16.70 af/yr, specifically:

PROPOSED GIRARD WINERY WATER DEMAND	
	Acre feet/year
Winery Processing	4.30
Employees	---
Harvest (12 full time)	.05
Harvest (7 part time)	.015
Non-Harvest (8 full time)	.10
Non-Harvest (3 part time)	.02
Visitors	---
Weekday (75, 4 days/week)	.15
Weekend (100, 3 days/week)	.14
Event (Large – 500 people 1/year)	.01
Event (Medium - 200 people 4/year)	.01
Event (Small – 75 people 4/year)	.01
Landscaping	1.0
14.53 acres Vineyard – Irrigation, frost protection (no heat protection)	10.90
TOTAL	16.70

Combined allowable water use for both parcels is 46.92 af/yr. Existing and proposed water use for both parcels is 26.40 af/yr., which is 20.52 af/yr. below the threshold for both parcels, and approximately matching the 26.53 af/yr. allotment on the subject Girard property if it were considered without factoring in the acreage of the Clos Pegase Winery property. As such, the project meets the valley floor groundwater sustainability threshold in gross terms without consideration of other water sources such as reuse of treated process water and surface water captured within existing irrigation ponds. The water availability analysis indicates that currently all vineyard irrigation (both parcels) is provided for using the existing irrigation pond located on the property. The existing irrigation pond is filled with rainwater, vineyard subdrain collection water, and treated process wastewater. No well has been used to irrigate the existing vineyards and the existing landscaping. In addition, the proposed Girard Winery will contribute additional process wastewater into the reclaimed wastewater irrigation system. Therefore, with the removal of vineyard irrigation from the groundwater demand, the total demand from the project on groundwater supplies would be 12.49 af/yr :

Winery & Vineyards Groundwater Demand		Without Vineyard Irrigation Demand	
Clos Pegas Winery	9.70 af/yr		5.79 af/yr
Girard Winery	16.69 af/yr		6.70 af/yr
Total Demand	26.39 af/yr		12.49 af/yr

Based on these figures and the associated water reuse system which would eliminate the vineyard irrigation demands, proposed project will not result in a substantial increase the demand of ground water supplies or 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 and the County is not aware of, nor has it received any reports of groundwater deficiencies in the area.

- c.-e. The proposed project will not substantially alter the drainage pattern on the site nor cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off site. There are no existing or planned stormwater systems that would be affected by this project. The project disturbs more than one acre of land and the permittee will be required to comply with the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board addressing stormwater pollution during construction activities. The project site includes vineyards, landscaping and other pervious areas that have the capacity to absorb runoff.
- f. There is nothing included in this proposal that would otherwise substantially degrade water quality. As discussed in greater detail at, "a.," above, the Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the sanitary wastewater proposal and has found the proposed system adequate to meet the facility's septic needs as conditioned. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality.
- g.-i. The project does not include the placement of new housing on the property. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Floodplain and DAM Levee Inundation layers*), the parcel is located outside the 100-year flood zone, but a small portion of the property falls within the 500-year flood zone. The winery site, however, is well outside any area of potential flooding. The project would not impede or redirect flood flows, does not propose any housing or expose structures or people to flooding. The project site is not located within a dam or levee failure inundation zone.
- j. In coming years, higher global temperatures are expected to raise sea level by expanding ocean water, melting mountain glaciers and small ice caps, and causing portions of Greenland and the Antarctic ice sheets to melt. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change estimates that the global average sea level will rise between 0.6 and 2 feet over the next century (IPCC, 2007). However, the project area is located at approximately 330-ft. above mean sea level and there is no known history of mud flow in the vicinity. The project will not subject people or structures to a significant risk of inundation from tsunami, seiche, or mudflow.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

a-c. The project would not occur within an established community, nor would it result in the division of an established community. The project complies with the Napa County Code and all other applicable regulations. The subject parcel is located in the AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning district, which allow wineries and uses accessory to wineries subject to use permit approval. The proposed project is in compliance with the physical limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance. The County has adopted the Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO) to protect agriculture and open space and to regulate winery development and expansion in a manner that avoids potential negative environmental effects.

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

The proposed use of the property for the "fermenting and processing of grape juice into wine" (NCC §18.08.640) supports the economic viability of agriculture within the county consistent with General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-4 ("The County will reserve

agricultural lands for agricultural use including lands used for grazing and watershed/ open space...”) and General Plan Economic Development Policy E-1 (The County’s economic development will focus on ensuring the continued viability of agriculture...).

The General Plan includes two complimentary policies requiring wineries to be designed generally of a high architectural quality for the site and its surroundings. The proposed winery will convey the required permanence and improving the buildings overall attractiveness. There are no applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the property.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. <b>MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
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 or near the project site.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. <b>NOISE.</b> Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels 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) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in Ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in Ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 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"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, 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 will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during the brief construction of the project. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. The project would not result in potentially significant temporary construction noise impacts or operational impacts. Given the proximity to the neighbors, the closest of whom is located over 400 feet away, there is a relatively low potential for impacts related to construction noise to result in a significant impact. Furthermore, construction activities would generally occur during the period of 7AM-7PM on weekdays, during normal hours of



human activity. All construction activities will be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). The proposed project will not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts. Conditions of approval would require construction activities to be limited to daylight hours, vehicles to be muffled, and backup alarms adjusted to the lowest allowable levels.

c/d. Noise from winery operations is generally limited; however, the proposed marketing plan could create additional noise impacts. The submitted marketing plan includes a number of events on a weekly, monthly and annual basis, some of which would include up to 500 visitors (1 per year). The Napa County Noise Ordinance, which was adopted in 1984, sets the maximum permissible received sound level for a rural residence as 45 db between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. While the 45 db limitation is strict (45 db is roughly equivalent to the sound generated by a quiet conversation), the area surrounding the subject property is developed, with a scattering of homes located in the immediate vicinity and directly adjacent to the site with the nearest residences located about 400 feet to the south of the winery building site. 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 ensure that marketing events and other winery activities do not create a significant noise impact. Events and non-amplified music are required to finish by 10p.m. every evening.

e/f. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b> Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

a. Staffing for the winery would include a maximum 11 employees 8 full time and three part-time employees. The Association of Bay Area Governments' *Projections 2003* figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase some 23% by the year 2030 (*Napa County Baseline Data Report*, November 30, 2005). Additionally, the County's *Baseline Data Report* indicates that total housing units currently programmed in county and municipal housing elements exceed ABAG growth projections by approximately 15%. The eleven positions which are part of this project will most likely lead to some population growth in Napa County. However, relative to the County's projected low to moderate growth rate and overall adequate programmed housing supply, that population growth does not rise to a level of environmental significance. In addition, the project will be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs.

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

b/c. This application will not displace a substantial volume of existing housing or a substantial number of people and will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> Would the project result in:				
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:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 site and the additional demand placed on existing services would be marginal. Fire protection measures are required as part of the development pursuant to Napa County Fire Marshall conditions and there will be no foreseeable impact to emergency response times with the adoption of standard conditions of approval. The Fire Department and Engineering Services Division have reviewed the application and recommend approval as conditioned. School impact mitigation fees, which assist local school districts with capacity building measures, will be levied pursuant to building permit submittal. The proposed project will have little to no impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from any building permit fees, property tax increases, and taxes from the sale of wine will help meet the costs of providing public services to the property. The proposed project will have a less than significant impact on public services.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XV. RECREATION.</b> Would the project:				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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/b. The project would not significantly increase the use of recreational facilities, nor does the project include recreational facilities that may have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</b> Would the project:				
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-16, 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 an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a 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-23, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

a/b. The subject 26.53 acre parcel is located on the east side of Dunaweal Lane, between State Highway 29 and Silverado Trail. Access to the proposed winery would be from both directions of Dunaweal Lane, via a 24 ft. wide driveway. The intersections with State Highway 29 and Silverado Trail are unsignalized; southbound traffic on State Highway 29 has a left turn lane. There are three existing wineries on Dunaweal Lane: Clos Pegase Winery, Sterling Vineyards, and Twomey Cellars. The project proposes to establish a 200,000 gallon/year winery, and will include office use and hospitality functions. The project proposes 22 on-site parking spaces with 2 loading areas (15 visitor spaces and 7 employee spaces) to serve the facility. The parking area also proposes to include an electric vehicle charging station space and one visitor clean air vehicle space. The proposed maximum daily visitation will be 75 persons; 90 persons on weekends. There will be 25 or greater on-site employees: 8 full-time and 3 part-time, but will increase during harvest to 20 full-time and 10 part-time. Nine (9) marketing events per year are proposed: four (4) events with maximum 75 guests; Four (4) events with a maximum 200 guests; and one (1) harvest event with a maximum 500 guests.

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

- LOS A-** Free-flowing travel with an excellent level of comfort and convenience and freedom to maneuver.
- LOS B-** Stable operating conditions, but the presence of other road users causes a noticeable, though slight, reduction in comfort, convenience, and maneuvering freedom.
- LOS C-** Stable operating conditions, but the operation of individual users is substantially affected by the interaction with others in the traffic stream.
- LOS D-** High-density, but stable flow. Users experience severe restrictions in speed and freedom to maneuver, with poor levels of comfort and convenience.
- LOS E-** Operating conditions at or near capacity. Speeds are reduced to a low but relatively uniform value. Freedom to maneuver is difficult with users experiencing frustration and poor comfort and convenience. Unstable operation is frequent, and minor disturbances in traffic flow can cause breakdown conditions.
- LOS F-** Forced or breakdown conditions. This condition exists wherever the volume of traffic exceeds the capacity of the roadway. Long queues can form behind these bottleneck points with queued traffic traveling in a stop-and-go fashion. (2000 Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board)

The "Traffic Impact Study for Vintage Wine Estates Project" prepared by W-Trans (dated October 16, 2014) for the proposed Girard Winery incorporated a focused traffic analysis addressing potential traffic impacts and access needs for the proposed new winery. The report stated that mechanical tube counts were collected for three consecutive days in March 2014 and then intersection counts were taken during the PM. Peak period in September 2014 at the Silverado Trail/Dunaweal Lane and State Route 29/Dunaweal intersections. The volume of traffic ranged from 1,484 vehicles on Thursday to 1,691 vehicles on Saturday. The report concluded that both intersections are currently operating at LOS A or B overall and on all approaches.

The anticipated daily trip generation for the project, winery plus tasting room, is projected at 74 trips during weekdays, including 26 weekday PM peak hour (4:00–6:00 PM) trips and 58 daily trips on weekends with 29 weekend PM peak hour trips. Upon adding project-generated trips to existing volumes, both intersections are expected to continue operating at LOS A or B overall as well as on all approaches. Because the operation will remain acceptable, the impact on traffic is considered less-than-significant.

The report addresses the future projected traffic volumes, using the 2030 and 2010 model volumes from the Solano Transportation Authority growth factor of 1.45 for State Highway 29. This growth factor was applied to turning movements to and from Dunaweal Lane and the remainder of the future increase was added to the volumes for the through movements. Based upon the projected future volumes, the two intersections are expected to operate acceptably overall, though the northbound Dunaweal approach to Silverado Trail is expected to operate at LOS E and the southbound Dunaweal Lane approach to State Route 29 is expected to operate at LOS F at the PM Peak Hour. Under the Napa County General Plan EIR, under projected 2030 volumes, State Route 29 is expected to operate at a LOS F in this project's study area during the PM Peak Hour, and, Silverado Trail is expected to continue operating at LOS C during the PM Peak Hour.

General Plan Policy CIR-16 states that "The County will seek to maintain an arterial Level of Service D or better on all County roadways, except where maintaining this level of service would require the installation of more travel lanes than shown on the Circulation Map." State Highway 29 and Silverado Trail are listed as two-lane Rural Throughways on the General Plan Circulation Map, therefore expansion to a 4-lane throughway is not consistent with the General Plan Policy.

The traffic study proposes a mitigation measure that if the winery operation schedules employee shifts to minimize trips at the intersection during the PM peak periods stating it will reduce project's future potential impacts to the intersections at their most impacted time to a level of insignificance. The incorporation of a mitigation measure to reduce traffic during PM Peak Hour can occur during the 9 events if the finish time of activities is scheduled to minimize vehicles arriving or leaving between 4:00 PM and 6:00 PM, to further reduce potential future traffic impacts to a level of insignificance. Further, the installation of directional signs at the winery exit to direct traffic to right-turn actions, such as southbound traffic from Dunaweal Lane use Silverado Trail, and northbound traffic use State Highway 29, there would be a reduction in the LOS at those intersections, further reducing traffic impacts to a less than significant level.

- c. This proposed project would not result in any change to air traffic patterns. The project does not propose the construction of significantly tall structures.
- d-e. Access to the proposed winery will be via a 24-ft wide driveway from Dunaweal Lane, onto the site and would meet County Road and Street Standards. The traffic impact study indicates that the calculated collision rate for Dunaweal lane at .090 collision/million vehicle miles (c/mvm) is lower than the statewide average for similar facilities. The project will not require any changes to the existing roadway or introduce incompatible roadway use. The entrance driveway is not adequate to allow on-pavement parking and therefore the driveway will remain open and will not interfere with emergency access. Dunaweal Lane is relatively flat and straight and the sight distances are more than adequate and meet the recommended distance for the posted 45 MPH speed limit. It has been determined that the installation of a left turn pocket into the project is not warranted.
- f. General Plan Policy CIR-23 states that new uses shall provide adequate parking to meet their anticipated parking demand and shall not provide excess parking that could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or commercial activity exceeding the site's capacity. The project proposes the construction of 22 parking places (15 visitors, 7 employees) and one loading zone. Based upon estimates of 2.6 visitors/vehicle on weekday (20± vehicles) and 2.8 visitors/vehicle on weekends (22± vehicles) the parking demand per day would be satisfied by the 22 parking spaces. The parking demand generated from nine marketing events (179± vehicles at largest event) will exceed the number of parking spaces available in the parking lot. Addition parking in the paved area at the rear of the winery can be utilized during events or shuttling from off-site parking lots. The applicant proposes Best Management Practices to encourage a reduction of vehicle miles traveled with priority parking for efficient transportation and to use bus transportation for large marketing events. The applicant owns the winery property across the street and event guests can be shuttled over from there. No parking will be permitted within the right-of-way of Dunaweal Lane or on the entrance driveway, which is too narrow to accommodate parking.
- g. There is no aspect of this proposed project that would conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.

**Mitigation Measures/Method of Monitoring:**

- XVI-1 Prior to the final occupancy, the applicant/permittee shall implement the transportation demand management programs:
- A. Scheduling of employee work shifts to commence and conclude outside of PM peak periods between 4:00 and 6:00 p.m. weekdays, 2:00 to 4:00 on Saturday; and 1:00 to 3:00PM Sunday.
  - B. Schedule marketing event set up, arrival and departure to occur outside of weekday and Saturday PM peak traffic periods. Peak periods are between 4:00 and 6:00 p.m. weekdays, 2:00 to 4:00 on Saturday and 1:00PM to 3:00PM on Sunday.

**Method of Monitoring:** This mitigation measure requires submission of a transportation demand management plan.  
**RESPONSIBLE AGENCY(IES):** Planning, Building and Environmental Services

- XVI-2 Prior to final occupancy, the applicant/permittee shall install a directional sign to direct traffic to Silverado Trail for southbound travel and to use State Highway 29 for northbound travel. Such sign shall be submitted for review and approval by the Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department as well as the Public Works Department prior to installation.

**Method of Monitoring:** This mitigation measure requires the submission and approval of a sign plan and a possible encroachment permit.  
**RESPONSIBLE AGENCY(IES):** Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department; Public Works Department

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) 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"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

- a. The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and will not result in a significant impact.
- b. The project will connect to an existing water treatment system, and will not require construction of any new water treatment facilities that will result in a significant impact to the environment. Water will be provided by an existing well. A new sanitary wastewater system will be constructed on site. The system will be designed by a licensed engineer and will be reviewed and approved by the Division of Environmental Health.
- c. The project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, which will cause a significant impact to the environment.
- d. As discussed in **Section IX** above, the total County allowable water allotment for the two Clos Pegase Winery property and proposed Girard Winery property (APN: 020-150-017) is 64.92 af/yr. The Phase 1 Study prepared for the combined parcels indicates the existing

total water demand from the two wineries, the residence, and the vineyards will be a total 32.68 af/yr. (residence, .75 af/yr; winery, 13.4 af/yr; and vineyard, 18.53 af/yr), and the existing yield will be sufficient to serve all uses on the property. The existing wastewater processing system will further reduce the water demand.

- e. Wastewater will be treated on-site and will not require a wastewater treatment provider.
- f. The project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the projects demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the project.
- g. The project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVII.</b>	<b>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>				
a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion:**

- a. The project as proposed will not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. The project will be located on lands that have been historically developed in agriculture, and there is are existing wastewater ponds and an irrigation reservoir on the property.
- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology, and traffic impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The project would also increase the demands for public services to a limited extent, increase traffic and air pollutions, all of which contribute to cumulative effects when future development in Napa Valley is considered. Cumulative impacts of these issues are discussed in previous sections of this Initial Study, wherein the impact from an increase in air pollution is being addressed as discussed in the project's Greenhouse Gas Voluntary Best Management Practices including but not limited to use of alternative fuel and electrical vehicles in their operational fleet; vehicle miles travelled reduction plan through priority parking for efficient transportation; bus transportation for large marketing events; bicycling incentives; and installation of an electrical vehicle charging station. Potential impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The project trip generation was calculated from winery operations, where the calculated trips reflect total visitation, on-site employees and wine production trips generated by the winery. Under the Napa County General Plan, traffic volumes are projected to increase and will be caused by a combination of locally generated traffic as well as general regional growth. The General Plan EIR indicates that much of the forecasted increase in traffic on the arterial roadway network will result from traffic generated outside of the county, however the project will contribute a small amount toward the general overall increase. The Traffic Impact Study prepared for the project concluded that under future plus project conditions, the overall operation at the State Route 29/Dunaweal Lane intersection for the southbound (Dunaweal) approach is projected to be reduced to a LOS F.

General Plan Policy CIR-16 states that "The County will seek to maintain an arterial Level of Service D or better on all County roadways, except where maintaining this level of service would require the installation of more travel lanes than shown on the Circulation Map." State Highway 29 and Silverado Trail are listed as two-lane Rural Throughways on the General Plan Circulation Map. As discussed above under **Section XVI Transportation**, implementation of mitigation measures to eliminate the project's additional traffic at the peak hours will serve avoid a deterioration of the level of service on Highway 29 to LOS F at PM Peak Hour, reducing potential cumulative impact to a level of insignificance.

- c. There are no environmental effects caused by this project that would result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, whether directly or indirectly. No hazardous conditions resulting from this project have been identified. The project would not have any environmental effects that would result in significant impacts.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required

