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

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated January 2019)

1. **Project Title**: Chappellet Winery, Use Permit Major Modification #P18-00307-MOD

2. **Property Owner:** Chappellet Winery, Inc., 1581 Sage Canyon Road, St. Helena, CA 94574; (707) 963-7136

3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Jason R. Hade, Principal Planner, (707) 259-8757, jason.hade@countyofnapa.org

4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):** The project is located on an approximately 15.01 acre site within the AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district at 1579 Sage Canyon Road; APN: 032-010-090 and 1581 Sage Canyon Road; APN 032-010-098.

5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Dave Pirio, Director of Vineyard Operations, 1581 Sage Canyon Road; St. Helena, CA 94574; (707) 286-7137

6. **General Plan description:** AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space) Designation

7. **Zoning:** AW (Agricultural Watershed)

8. **Background/Project History:** The Chappellet Winery was established in the late 1960's in advance of the County's 1977 adoption of regulations requiring conditional use permit approval for new wineries in the AW zoning district. Use Permit No. P11-00138 was approved by the Planning Commission on August 17, 2011 and recognized wine production of 150,000 gallons per year, public tours and tastings of 40 visitors per day, a marketing program, 24 employees, an existing 19,636 square foot winery building, and Evans on-premise consumption in marketing areas within the winery building.

   The 15 acre winery parcel is relatively flat, with elevations ranging from 1,100 to 1,200 feet above sea level. It is currently developed with a 19,636 square foot winery building, barrel building, outdoor crush pad and work areas, winery-associated driveway and parking improvements, a large solar array, a residence, and approximately seven acres of producing vineyard. The existing winery was constructed in, or about, 1969 and has undergone little exterior change since that time. The winery's domestic wastewater system is located on the winery parcel. The 289 acre vineyard parcel is currently developed with a process winery waste water treatment and disposal system, a two acre off-stream irrigation reservoir, three residential structures, residential- and winery-accessory roadway improvements, and approximately 75 acres of producing vineyard.

9. **Description of Project:** Approval of a Use Permit Major Modification to an existing 150,000 gallon per year winery to allow the following:
   a) Increase in maximum annual permitted wine production from 150,000 to 250,000 gallons;
   b) Increase daily tours and tastings from 40 persons per day (no appointment required), 280 person per week maximum to 95 persons per day (appointment required for the additional 55 persons per day), 665 visitors maximum per week;
   c) Modification of an existing Marketing Program to increase events from 54 events per year (2,470 guests) to 76 events per year (4,230 guests) as follows:
      a. Ten (10) annual events for up to 20 guests;
      b. Six (6) annual events for up to 80 guests;
      c. Three (3) annual events for up to 160 guests;
      d. Three (3) annual events for up to 200 guests; and
      e. Use of shuttle service from an off-site pick up area for all events of greater than 100 persons.
   d) Increase parking spaces from 26 spaces to 38 spaces and provide a minimum of two on-site bicycle parking spaces;
   e) Increase the number of employees from 24 to 30;

f) Upgrade the existing water system permit from a Transient Non Community (TNC) water system to a Non-Transient Non-Community (NTNC) water system; and
g) Improvement of the existing access driveway and Pritchard Hill Road to County standards except for the request noted below.

The project also includes a request for an exception to the Napa County Road and Street Standards (RSS). The request proposes an exception to the Napa County RSS to allow for a reduction of driveway width for some portions of the existing driveway, and for a portion of road with slopes exceeding 18 percent but less than 20 percent without transition zones (sections of road not exceeding 10 percent for 100 feet in length immediately preceding and ensuing the section of road with the roadway grade of 18 to 20 percent). The RSS exception has been requested to preserve mature native trees on steeply sloping hillsides and to minimize the need for grading on steep slopes.

An exception was requested by the applicant and tentatively approved by the Public Works Department to allow the Chappellet Winery Use Permit Modification to be approved without the requirement that a left turn lane be installed at the intersection of the property driveway and Sage Canyon Road.

The project includes approximately 925 cubic yards of cut and approximately 400 cubic yards of fill. Excess soil cut would be transported off-site to a County approved location.

10. **Environmental setting and surrounding land uses:**
The project would affect two parcels, totaling 304 acres, which are located on Pritchard Hill, upslope from and to the south of Lake Hennessey. The existing Chappellet Winery, which began operations in the late 1960's, is located on Assessor's parcel 032-010-090 ("the winery parcel"). Winery-accessory improvements such as roadways and wastewater treatment and disposal systems spill over onto the larger surrounding APN 032-010-098 parcel ("the vineyard parcel"). Access to the winery site is via the first mile of a more than two mile long private road which was partially reconstructed and improved as a result of the Continuum Winery project. The unnamed private drive begins just to the northeast of the intersection of Sage Canyon Road and Long Ranch Road, across from the Lake Hennessey boat dock. The Chappellets' winery and vineyard parcels rise from approximately 850 feet in elevation to more than 1,800 feet along the hillsides that form the southern edge of Sage Canyon and Lake Hennessey. Soil types include Sobrante loam, 5 to 30 percent slopes. The site lies outside the boundaries of the 100 and 500 year flood hazard boundaries. The project site is in an area designated as High Fire Hazard Severity.

Land uses in the area are dominated by open space uses, large lot residential properties, wineries and smaller vineyards. As noted above, an unnamed private roadway provides access to both the subject parcel and a number of adjacent properties. The winery site is located about one mile southeast of the private road's intersection with Sage Canyon Road (alternately State Highway 128). Sage Canyon Road is a secondary east-west route connecting the Napa Valley to Lake Berryessa and from thence to the Central Valley; however no improvements in or near the Caltrans right-of-way are proposed as part of this application. The existing winery is located approximately 1,730 feet to the northeast of the nearest neighboring residence which is located at 1539 Sage Canyon Road.

11. **Other agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).
The project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County, including but not limited to building permits, grading permits, waste disposal permits, and an encroachment permit, in addition to meeting Cal Fire standards. Permits may also be required by the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, & Firearms.

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies
California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)

Other Agencies Contacted
Federal Trade and Taxation Bureau
Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control

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

On September 10, 2019, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. The Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation and Middletown Rancheria responded and declined comment as the project site is not located within their aboriginal territories. No other responses were received within 30-days of the

tribe's receipt of the invitations.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Jason R. Hade — Signature

3/17/2020 — Date

Name: Jason R. Hade, Principal Planner
Napa County
Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department

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

Discussion:

a. The project site is not located within a scenic vista. As such, no impacts would occur.

b. Sage Canyon Road is identified as a Viewshed Road. However, the County's Viewshed Protection Program is not applicable to the proposed project as no construction is proposed on slopes in excess of 15 percent and the project site is not visible from Sage Canyon Road based upon existing vegetation and topography. A total of 19 trees would be removed as part of project construction, including 17 oak trees, but they are not located within a state scenic highway. No rock outcroppings or historic buildings are located at the subject site. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. The proposed project includes an expanded parking area and improvements to an existing driveway. No changes to the existing buildings are proposed. As such, the project would not degrade the existing character of the site and its surroundings and impacts would be less than significant.

d. The installation of lighting that may have the potential to impact nighttime views could occur within the expanded parking area as part of the project. Pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approval for wineries, outdoor lighting would be required to be shielded and directed downwards, with only low level lighting allowed in parking areas. As subject to the standard conditions of approval, below, the project would not have a significant impact resulting from new sources of outside lighting.

6.3 LIGHTING – PLAN SUBMITTAL

a. Two (2) copies of a detailed lighting plan showing the location and specifications for all lighting fixtures to be installed on the property shall be submitted for Planning Division review and approval. All lighting shall comply with the CBC.

b. All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward, shall be located as low to the ground as possible, shall be the minimum necessary for security, safety, or operations; on timers; and shall incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. All lighting shall be shielded or placed such that it does not shine directly on adjacent properties or impact vehicles on adjacent streets. No flood-lighting or sodium lighting of the building is permitted, including architectural highlighting and spotting. Low-level lighting shall be utilized in parking areas as opposed to elevated high-intensity light standards.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.[1] Would the project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

a/b/e. The project site is designated as "grazing land" and "unique farmland" as shown on the Napa County Important Farmland Map 2002 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. All changes as a result of the project would occur within the portion of the site mapped as "grazing land." Proposed parking area changes would occur within an existing gravel surface area which has been previously disturbed. The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. There are no existing agricultural contracts on the property. There are no other changes included in this proposal that would result in the conversion of Farmland. General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use policies AG/LU-2 and AG/LU-13 recognize wineries, and any use consistent with the Winery Definition Ordinance and clearly accessory to a winery, as agriculture. As a result, this application would not result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use. No impacts would occur.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

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

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

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

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

Ozone and fine particle pollution, or PM2.5, are the major regional air pollutants of concern in the San Francisco Bay Area. Ozone is primarily a problem in the summer, and fine particle pollution in the winter. In Napa County, ozone rarely exceeds health standards, but

PM2.5 occasionally does reach unhealthy concentrations. There are multiple reasons for PM2.5 exceedances in Napa County. First, much of the county is wind-sheltered, which tends to trap PM2.5 within the Napa Valley. Second, much of the area is well north of the moderating temperatures of San Pablo Bay and, as a result, Napa County experiences some of the coldest nights in the Bay Area. This leads to greater fireplace use and, in turn, higher PM2.5 levels. Finally, in the winter easterly winds often move fine-particle-laden air from the Central Valley to the Carquinez Strait and then into western Solano and southern Napa County (BAAQMD, *In Your Community: Napa County,* April 2016)

The impacts associated with implementation of the project were evaluated consistent with guidance provided by BAAQMD. Ambient air quality standards have been established by state and federal environmental agencies for specific air pollutants most pervasive in urban environments. These pollutants are referred to as criteria air pollutants because the standards established for them were developed to meet specific health and welfare criteria set forth in the enabling legislation. The criteria air pollutants emitted by development, traffic and other activities anticipated under the proposed development include ozone, ozone precursors oxides of nitrogen and reactive organic gases (NOx and ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO2), and suspended particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5). Other criteria pollutants, such as lead and sulfur dioxide (SO2), would not be substantially emitted by the proposed development or traffic, and air quality standards for them are being met throughout the Bay Area.

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

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

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

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

7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

c. AIR QUALITY

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

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

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

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

7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

b. DUST CONTROL

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

While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. The existing winery is located approximately 1,730 feet to the northeast of the nearest neighboring residence which is located at 1539 Sage Canyon Road. Construction-phase pollutants would be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. The project would not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

Discussion:

a/b. Native vegetation of the general area consists of oak-grass and forbs with some scattered perennial grasses. According to a Biological Resources Report entitled "Chappellet Winery Driveway Improvement Project" prepared by Sol Ecology on November 8, 2018, "No federal or state listed plant species are likely present on the Project Site. One special status species, narrow-anthered brodiaea (Brodiaea leptandra), a Rank 1B.2. special status species is documented within the woodland habitat located on the property. However, due to the relatively disturbed nature of the Project Site it is not likely to be directly impacted by the proposed project. It may be present in adjacent habitat." To avoid potential impacts, all areas of woodland habitat to be avoided shall clearly be demarcated in the field prior to ground disturbing activities to ensure these habitats are completely avoided. Although no sensitive animal species were identified during the biological survey, construction during the bird breeding season of February 15 to August 31 has the potential to impact sensitive animal species, including bats. Accordingly, the mitigation measures identified below shall be implemented. The implementation of mitigation measures BIO-1, BIO-2 and BIO-3 would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level of less than significant.

c/d. The project area does not contain any wetlands, vernal pools, aquatic or riparian habitat. No wildlife corridors are present or subject to potential effects from the proposed project (Chappellet Winery Driveway Improvement Project Biological Resources Report, 2018). Accordingly, the project, would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors. Impacts would be less than significant.

e. As illustrated on the submitted plans, up to 17 oak trees may be removed as part of the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures BIO-5 and BIO-6 consistent with General Plan Policy CON-24(c) which requires the provision of replacement of lost oak woodlands or preservation of like habitat at a 2:1 ratio when retention of existing vegetation is found to be infeasible. Retention of these oak trees was determined to be infeasible as it would prevent the use of the existing road alignment resulting in additional environmental impacts. It would also require the disturbance of sloped areas in excess of 30 percent to relocate the existing road alignment. A minimum of seventy percent of the tree canopy cover on the parcel existing on June 16, 1993 along with any vegetation understory would be retained consistent with County Code Section 18.108.027 Sensitive Domestic Water Supply Drainages.

f. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans because there are no plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures:

MM BIO-1: All areas of woodland habitat containing narrow-anthered brodiaea (Brodiaea leptandra) are to be avoided and shall clearly be demarcated in the field by a qualified biologist prior to ground disturbing activities to ensure these habitats are completely avoided.

Monitoring: The grading plan shall reflect the installation of temporary protective fencing around the areas of woodland habitat containing narrow-anthered brodiaea (Brodiaea leptandra) to be avoided prior to issuance of the grading permit. The temporary protective fencing shall remain in place throughout the duration of project construction and all construction personnel shall be advised by the project contractor to avoid any disturbance to the area.

MM BIO-2: If vegetation clearing or other land disturbance is proposed during the bird breeding season (February 15 through August 31), the work shall be preceded by a survey for special-status bird species and migratory passerines (perching birds) by a qualified biologist within 14 days prior to the beginning of work. In the event that nesting birds are found during the survey, construction buffers shall be established by the biologist in cooperation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. These buffers shall remain in place until offspring have fledged or after August 31.

Monitoring: If vegetation clearing or other land disturbance is proposed during the bird breeding season (February 15 through August 31), the special-status bird species and other migratory passerines (perching birds) survey shall be submitted to Planning Division staff prior to issuance of the grading permit.

MM BIO-3: A qualified bat biologist, with documented experience conducting bat habitat assessments, shall conduct a bat habitat assessment of all trees proposed for removal at least 30 days prior to tree removal activities, to determine if any of the trees contain potential bat roost habitat. If any trees proposed for removal contain potential bat roost habitat, presence of roosting bats shall be presumed. All trees containing potential bat roost habitat shall be removed using a two-day phased removal method as described: On day 1, under the supervision of a qualified bat biologist who has documented experience overseeing tree removal using the two-day phased removal method, branches and small limbs not containing potential bat roost habitat (e.g. cavities, crevices, exfoliating bark) shall be removed using chainsaws only. On day 2, the next day, the rest of the tree should be removed.

All trees shall be removed during seasonal periods of bat activity: Prior to maternity season – from approximately March 1 (or when night temperatures are above 45°F and when rains have ceased) through April 15 (when females begin to give birth to young); and prior to winter torpor – from September 1 (when young bats are self-sufficiently volant) until about October 15 (before night temperatures fall below 45°F and rains begin).

Monitoring: If construction activity is to occur during the seasonal periods of bat activity identified above, the bat habitat assessment prepared by a qualified bat biologist shall be submitted to Planning Division staff prior to issuance of the grading permit.

MM BIO-4: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, a final tree removal plan and oak replacement and preservation plan shall be prepared by a certified arborist.

Monitoring: The final tree removal plan and oak replacement and preservation plan shall be submitted for review and approval to Planning Division staff with recommendations regarding trees to be retained or removed prior to issuance of the grading permit.

MM BIO-5: Prior to issuance of a final certificate of occupancy, an oak replacement and preservation plan shall be implemented in consultation with a certified arborist. The oak replacement and preservation plan is to include the planting of 2 times the number of oak trees removed within an appropriate location on the property as determined in consultation with a certified arborist with the replanting schedule to match the oak species to be removed. The oaks are to be gallon sized and planted at approximately 20 feet on center or as otherwise advised by a certified arborist. The oaks will be watered by hand, as necessary, during the first three years to promote survival. Successful planting will be considered an 80 percent survival rate at five years. If less than 80 percent of the trees are surviving, replanting will be necessary.

Monitoring: A letter from a certified arborist certifying that the replanting plan has been fully implemented shall be submitted to Planning Division staff prior to issuance of a Final Certificate of Occupancy.

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

Discussion:

a-b. According to Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Archaeological Resources Layer, historical site, points & lines), no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified within the project site. If resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval:

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a. The proposed project would comply with Title 24 energy use requirements and would not result in significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency because there are no plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829.	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:

a.

i.) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.

ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project would be required to comply with the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.

iv.) According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers), the project area is within a large landslide deposit area. However, minimal construction is proposed. Implementation of mitigation measure GEO-1 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

b. The proposed improvements would occur on slopes of five percent to 15 percent. The project would require incorporation of best management practices and would be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable. Impacts would be less than significant.

c/d. Soil types include Sobrante loam, 5 to 30 percent slopes. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the improvements are proposed for an area which has a very low susceptibility for liquefaction. Implementation of mitigation measure GEO-1 and compliance with the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code, would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level of less than significant.

e. According to the Onsite Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study prepared by Applied Civil Engineering on July 27, 2018, the wastewater flows associated with the proposed project can be accommodated within the capacities of the existing sanitary and process wastewater systems provided that daily tours and tastings be suspended on days when events are held with more than 20 guests and with meals prepared onsite prepared and portable toilets must be utilized for all events with more than 40 guests (Applied Civil Engineering, 2018). The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings. Impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measure GEO-2 which would require that daily tours and tastings be suspended on days when events are held with more than 20 guests and with meals prepared onsite and portable toilets must be utilized for all events with more than 40 guests.

f. According to Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Archaeological Resources Layer, historical site, points & lines), no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified within the project site. If resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard condition of approval 7.2 identified in **Section V** above.

Mitigation Measures:

MM GEO-1: Prior to grading or building permit submittal, a subsurface geological exploration of the proposed construction area shall be conducted by a qualified geologist and shall include a geologic hazard report containing the information and technical recommendations required under Napa County Code section 15.08.050.

Monitoring: The grading and building plans shall reflect the implementation of the final geotechnical report recommendations prior to issuance of a grading and building permit.

MM GEO-2: Daily tours and tastings shall be suspended on days when events are held with more than 20 guests and with meals prepared onsite. Portable toilets shall be utilized for all events with more than 40 guests.

Monitoring: Upon final occupancy and thereafter, daily tours and tastings shall be suspended on days when events are held with more than 20 guests and with meals prepared onsite and portable toilets must be utilized for all events with more than 40 guests.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions in excess of applicable thresholds adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District or the California Air Resources Board which may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:

Napa County has been working to develop a Climate Action Plan (CAP) for several years. In 2012, a Draft CAP (March 2012) was recommended using the emissions checklist in the Draft CAP, on a trial basis, to determine potential greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with project development and operation. At the December 11, 2012, Napa County Board of Supervisors (BOS) hearing, the BOS considered adoption of the proposed CAP. In addition to reducing Napa County's GHG emissions, the proposed plan was intended to address compliance with CEQA for

projects reviewed by the County and to lay the foundation for development of a local offset program. While the BOS acknowledged the plan's objectives, the BOS requested that the CAP be revised to better address transportation-related greenhouse gas, to acknowledge and credit past accomplishments and voluntary efforts, and to allow more time for establishment of a cost-effective local offset program. The Board also requested that best management practices be applied and considered when reviewing projects until a revised CAP is adopted to ensure that projects address the County's policy goal related to reducing GHG emissions.

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

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

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

In 2011, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) released California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Project Screening Criteria and Significance of Thresholds [1,100 metric tons per year (MT) of carbon dioxide and carbon dioxide equivalents (CO_2e)]. This threshold of significance is appropriate for evaluating projects in Napa County.

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

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

GHGs are the atmospheric gases whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for the greenhouse effect, including carbon dioxide, methane, ozone, and the fluorocarbons, that contribute to climate change (a widely accepted theory/science explain human effects on the atmosphere). Carbon Dioxide (CO_2) gas, the principal greenhouse gas (GHG) being emitted by human activities, and whose concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity, also serves as the reference gas to compare other greenhouse gases. Agricultural sources of carbon emissions include forest clearing, land-use changes, biomass burning, and farm equipment and management activity emissions (http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/glossary/letter_c.html). Equivalent Carbon Dioxide (CO_2e) is the most commonly reported type of GHG emission and a way to get one number that approximates total emissions from all the different gasses that contribute to GHG (BAAMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2017). In this case, carbon dioxide (CO_2) is used as the reference atom/compound to obtain atmospheric carbon CO_2 effects of GHG. Carbon stocks are converted to carbon dioxide equivalents (CO_2e) by multiplying the carbon total by 44/12 (or 3.67), which is the ratio of the atomic mass of a carbon dioxide molecule to the atomic mass of a carbon atom (http://www.nciasi2.org/COLE/index.html).

One time "Construction Emissions" associated with a winery development project include: i) the carbon stocks that are lost (or released) when existing vegetation is removed and soil is ripped in preparation for the driveway improvements; and ii) emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area, including construction equipment and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as Equipment Emissions). These emissions also include underground carbon stocks (or Soil carbon) associated with any existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed. As previously stated, this project includes the improvement of the existing access driveway, but no building construction.

In addition to the one time Construction Emissions, "Operational Emissions" of the winery are also considered and include: i) any reduction in the amount of carbon sequestered by existing vegetation that is removed as part of the project compared to a "no project" scenario (hereinafter referred to as Operational Sequestration Emissions); and ii) ongoing emissions from the energy used to maintain and operate the winery, including vehicle trips associated with employee and visitor trips (hereinafter referred to as Operational

Emissions). See Section XVI, Transportation/Traffic, for anticipated number of operational trips. Operational Emissions from the proposed winery would be the primary source of emissions over the long-term when compared to one time construction emissions.

As discussed in the Air Quality section of this Initial Study, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors & GHG Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, including GHG emissions, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. Because no additional floor area is proposed when compared to the BAAQMD's GHG screening criteria of 121,000 sf for general industrial, and compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 9,000 sf. for a high quality restaurant, the project was determined not to exceed the 1,100 MT of CO2e/yr GHG threshold of significance.

Furthermore, the applicant intends to implement the following GHG reduction methods at the winery: building within previously disturbed areas (parking): installation of water efficient landscaping; and minimizing grading. The winery has already implemented the following GHG reduction methods: LEED certification; supply of approximately 90 percent of its power via photovoltaic panels; staggered employee work shift schedules to reduce peak hour trips; carpool incentives for its employees; and provision of electric vehicle charging stations for employees and visitors.

The proposed project has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds and determined that the project would not exceed the 1,100 MT/yr of CO2e. GHG Emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the Cal Green Building Code, tightened vehicle fuel efficiency standards, and more project-specific on-site programs including those winery features noted above would combine to further reduce emissions below BAAQMD thresholds.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or	☐	☐	☐	☒

excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

f)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g)	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:

a. The proposed project would not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts utilized in typical winery operations. A business plan would be filed with the Environmental Health Division should hazardous materials reach reportable levels. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. Hazardous materials such as diesel, maintenance fluids, and paints would be used onsite during construction. Should they be stored onsite, these materials would be stored in secure locations to reduce the potential for upset or accident conditions. The proposed project consists of the continued operations of an existing winery that would not be expected to use any substantial quantities of hazardous materials. Therefore, it would not be reasonably foreseeable for the proposed project to create upset or accident conditions that involve the release of hazardous materials into the environments. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the existing winery buildings. According to Google Earth, the nearest school to the project site is Capell Valley Elementary School, located approximately 7.3 miles to the southeast. No impacts would occur.

d. Based on a search of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control database, the project site does not contain any known EPA National Priority List sites, State response sites, voluntary cleanup sites, or any school cleanup sites. No impact would occur as the project site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.

e. No impact would occur as the project site is not located within an airport land use plan.

f. The proposed access driveway improvements and on-site circulation configuration meets Napa County Road and Street Standards except for a limited request for an exception. The applicant proposes an exception to the Napa County RSS to allow for a reduction of driveway width for some portions of the existing driveway, and for a portion of road with slopes exceeding 18 percent but less than 20 percent without transition zones (sections of road not exceeding 10 percent for 100 feet in length immediately preceding and ensuing the section of road with the roadway grade of 18 to 20 percent). The RSS exception has been requested to preserve mature native trees on steeply sloping hillsides and to minimize the need for grading on steep slopes. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division and found acceptable, as conditioned. The improvement achieves the same overall practical effect of the NCRSS by providing defensible space and consideration toward life, safety and public welfare by providing the following permanent measures: 1) horizontal and vertical vegetation management as described in the RSS exception request shall be implemented along the entire length of the private lane and driveway connection to Sage Canyon Road; 2) significant improvements are proposed to bring a majority of the road into compliance with the NCRSS as illustrated on the Chappellet Winery Use Permit Modification Conceptual Site Plans prepared by Applied Civil Engineering; 3) substandard width road sections are mitigated with standard turnouts throughout and/or are short in length with standard width sections immediately before and after the substandard section; and 4) all portions of the driveway not discussed in the Engineering Division Road Exception Evaluation are proposed to meet commercial standards as defined in the NCRSS. An exception was also requested by the applicant and tentatively approved by the Public Works Department to allow the Chappellet Winery Use Permit Modification to be approved without the requirement that a left turn lane be installed at the intersection of the property driveway and Sage Canyon Road. Therefore, the proposed project would not obstruct emergency vehicle access and impacts would be less than significant.

g. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. The proposed driveway improvements would provide adequate access to Sage Canyon Road. The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

On January 14, 2014, Governor Jerry Brown declared a drought emergency in the state of California. That declaration was followed up on April 1, 2015, when the Governor directed the State Water Resources Control Board to implement mandatory water reductions in cities and town across California to reduce water usage by 25 percent. These water restrictions do not apply to agricultural users. However, on April 7, 2017, Governor Jerry Brown signed an executive order lifting California's drought emergency in all but four counties (Fresno, Kings, Tulare and Tuolumne). The County of Napa had not adopted or implemented any additional mandatory water use restrictions. The County requires all discretionary permit applicants to complete necessary water analyses in order to document that sufficient water supplies are available for the proposed project and to implement water saving measures to prepare for periods of limited water supply and to conserve limited groundwater resources.

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

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

Minimum thresholds for water use have been established by the Department of Public Works using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS). These reports are the result of water resources investigations performed by the USGS in cooperation with the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. Any project which reduces water usage or any water usage which is at or below the established threshold is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels. The project is categorized as "all other areas" based upon current County Water Availability Analysis policies and therefore water use criteria is parcel specific based upon a Tier 2 analysis. A Tier 2 analysis was completed by O'Connor Environmental, Inc. on July 27, 2018 which included a parcel specific recharge evaluation. The project recharge area also includes portions of six neighboring parcels. According to the recharge evaluation, groundwater recharge within the project recharge area is estimated to be 168.3 AF/YR in an average year and 95.6 AF/YR during drought conditions (O'Connor Environmental, Inc., 2018).

a/b. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements nor substantially deplete local groundwater supplies. According to the Onsite Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study prepared by Applied Civil Engineering on July 27, 2018, the wastewater flows associated with the proposed project can be accommodated within the capacities of the existing sanitary and process wastewater systems provided that daily tours and tastings be suspended on days when events are held with more than 20 guests and with meals prepared onsite prepared and portable toilets must be utilized for all events with more than 40 guests (Applied Civil Engineering, 2018). The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings. Impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measure GEO-2 which would require that daily tours and tastings be suspended on days when events are held with more than 20 guests and with meals prepared onsite and portable toilets must be utilized for all events with more than 40 guests.

The project well, Well 1, is also known as the Corral Well and is located 0.95 miles south of the winery on parcel number 032-010-092. This parcel is owned by Alexa Chappellet et al, an official easement allowing the winery to use this water is included in the 2014 Transient Non-community Water System technical, managerial and financial report by Applied Engineering (Applied Civil Engineering, 2014). The Corral Well was drilled in 2008 to a depth of 710 feet and completed to a depth of 627 feet. The geologic log describes a sequence of clays and gray rock for the first 125 feet, ash and gray rock were encountered between 125 feet and 450 feet, and hard light gray and hard green and gray rock from 450 feet to 615 feet. At 615 feet rocks described as "gray and green shale with streaks of serpentine" are recorded to the bottom of the hole at 710 feet, indicating that they penetrated the basement rocks of the Coast Range ophiolite. Well 1 is screened between 447 feet and 627 feet. Approximately 12 feet of the screened interval is within the serpentinite. Due to the generally poor aquifer characteristics of this rock and the relatively short section of perforated well casing in the serpentinite, the project aquifer is assumed to be within the Sonoma Volcanics. The well log reports depth to first water as 440 feet and a static water level of 400 feet after development in May 2008. A pump test was performed in August 2011 and reported a prepumping water level of 408 feet. After six hours of pumping at rate of 30 gallons per minute the water level had drawn down eight feet to 416 feet and remained stable for the last two hours of the test. Within four minutes after shutting off the pump the water level had recovered to its initial level of 408 (O'Connor Environmental, Inc., 2018).

According to the water analysis, the existing groundwater use within the project recharge area is 26.4 AF/YR. The anticipated total overall water demand for the project recharge area including the project site would be 29.4 AF/YR representing a 3.00 AF/YR increase of the existing water demand of 26.4 AF/YR. Therefore, the impacts from the project would be less than significant and no further analysis is needed. Below is a table that details each source of existing and proposed groundwater use:

Usage Type	Existing Usage	Proposed Usage
Vineyard Irrigation	15.0	15.0
Winery		
Wine Production	4.72	7.37
Domestic (Employees & Visitors)	0.76	1.09

Residential Water Use	5.97	5.97
Net Use (Acre-ft per Year)	**26.4**	**29.4**

The estimated groundwater demand of 29.4 AF/YR, represents an increase of 3.00 AF/YR over the existing condition. The average annual recharge of 168.3 AF/YR and 95.6 AF/YR during drought conditions is higher than the average annual groundwater demand estimated to be 29.4 AF/YR. The winery, as part of its entitlement would include the County's standard condition of approval requiring well monitoring as well as the potential to modify/alter permitted uses on site should groundwater resources become insufficient to supply the use.

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

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

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

The proposed project would result in a modest increase on the demand of ground water supplies, but would remain far below the groundwater recharge rate, and therefore would not interfere with groundwater recharge or lowering of the local groundwater level. There are no known offsite wells located within 500 feet of the project well. The nearest neighboring well that could be located (Well 4) is 580 feet southwest of Well 1 (O'Connor Environmental, Inc., 2018). According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Water Deficient Areas/Storage Areas*), the project site is not located within a water deficient area and the County is not aware of, nor has it received any reports of groundwater deficiencies in the area.

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

d. The site lies outside the boundaries of the 100 and 500 year flood hazard boundaries. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. No impacts would occur.

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Less Than	Less Than Significant	No

	Impact	Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Impact	Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:

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

The project complies with the Napa County Code and all other applicable regulations. The proposed access driveway improvements and on-site circulation configuration meets Napa County Road and Street Standards except for a limited request for an exception. The applicant proposes an exception to the Napa County RSS to allow for a reduction of driveway width for some portions of the existing driveway, and for a portion of road with slopes exceeding 18 percent but less than 20 percent without transition zones (sections of road not exceeding 10 percent for 100 feet in length immediately preceding and ensuing the section of road with the roadway grade of 18 to 20 percent. The RSS exception has been requested to preserve mature native trees on steeply sloping hillsides and to minimize the need for grading on steep slopes.The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division and found acceptable, as conditioned. An exception was also requested by the applicant and approved by the Public Works Department to allow the Chappellet Winery Use Permit Modification to be approved without the requirement that a left turn lane be installed at the intersection of the property driveway and Sage Canyon Road.

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

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

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

The General Plan includes two policies requiring wineries to be designed generally of a high architectural quality for the site and its surroundings. No changes to the existing winery buildings are proposed. As such, the project would fit within the context of its surroundings. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With	Less Than Significant	No Impact

	Impact	Mitigation Incorporation	Impact	
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b. The project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during construction of the proposed driveway improvements. Construction activities would be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. As such, the project would not result in potentially significant temporary construction noise impacts or operational impacts. Because the nearest residence to the project site is approximately 1,730 feet to the southwest of the existing winery buildings, there is a low potential for impacts related to construction noise to be significant. Further, construction activities would occur during the period of 7am-7pm on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity. All construction activities would be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). The proposed project would not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts. Conditions of approval identified below would require construction activities to be limited to daylight hours, vehicles to be muffled, and backup alarms adjusted to the lowest allowable levels. Impacts would be less than significant.

8.3. CONSTRUCTION NOISE

Construction noise shall be minimized to the greatest extent practical and feasible under State and local safety laws, consistent with construction noise levels permitted by the General Plan Community Character Element and the County Noise Ordinance. Construction equipment muffling and hours of operation shall be in compliance with the County Code. Equipment shall be shut down when not in use. Construction equipment shall normally be staged, loaded, and unloaded on the project site, if at all practicable. If project terrain or access road conditions require construction equipment to be staged,

loaded, or unloaded off the project site (such as on a neighboring road or at the base of a hill), such activities shall only occur daily between the hours of 8 am to 5 pm.

The proposed project involves a marketing program including 76 events on an annual basis with the largest event permitting up to 200 guests. The proposed project requests the use of an outdoor space for marketing events, which has the potential to generate higher noise levels, compared to existing conditions.

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

The nearest off-site residence to the existing winery is approximately 1,730 feet to the southwest of the winery buildings and parking area. Under the proposed project, the largest outdoor event that would occur on the parcel would have an attendance of no more than 200 people, and all events would end by 10:00 p.m., with clean-up conducted afterwards. Winery operations would occur between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. (excluding harvest). The potential for the creation of significant noise from increased visitation is significantly reduced, since the tasting areas are predominantly within the winery building itself. Previously permitted on-premise consumption would continue to occur within the marketing area of the existing winery building. Continuing enforcement of Napa County's Noise Ordinance by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff, including the prohibition against amplified music, should further ensure that marketing events and other winery activities do not create a significant noise impact. Events and non-amplified music, excluding quiet clean-up, are required to finish by 10:00 p.m. Amplified music or sound systems would not be permitted for outdoor events as identified in standard Condition of Approval 4.10 below. Temporary events would be subject to County Code Chapter 5.36 which regulates proposed temporary events.

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures None required.

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

Discussion:

a. Six additional employees are requested as part of the project for a total maximum of 30 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 six additional employees which are part of this project could lead to minor population growth in Napa County. Relative to the County's projected low to moderate growth rate and overall adequate programmed housing supply that population growth does not rise to a level of environmental significance. In addition, the project would be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs.

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

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

levied pursuant to building permit submittal. The proposed project would have minimal impact on public parks as no residences are proposed. Impacts to public services would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures:

XVI. RECREATION. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

a. The project would not significantly increase use of existing park or recreational facilities based on its limited scope. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. No recreational facilities are proposed as part of the project. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures:

XVII. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system and/or conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-38, which seeks to maintain an adequate Level of Service (LOS) at signalized and unsignalized intersections, or reduce the effectiveness of existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐

f)	Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-14, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:

a/b. The project study area includes the intersection of Silverado Trail/Sage Canyon Road (SR-128), the segment of Sage Canyon Road between Silverado Trail and Chiles Pope Valley Road, and the project access points on Sage Canyon Road. Operating conditions during the weekday P.M. and weekend midday peak periods were evaluated as these time periods reflect the highest traffic volumes area wide and for the proposed project. The weekday evening peak hour occurs between 4:00 and 6:00 P.M. and typically reflects the highest level of congestion of the day during the homeward-bound commute, while the weekend midday peak occurs between 12:00 and 4:00 P.M. and generally reflects conditions when tasting rooms are busiest. Silverado Trail/Sage Canyon Road (SR-128) is an unsignalized tee-intersection stop-controlled on the terminating southbound Sage Canyon Road approach. The south leg is a private driveway to Conn Creek Winery. Sage Canyon Road (SR-128) is a rural two-lane roadway that winds its way west-east, but north-south for evaluation purposes, from Berryessa Knoxville Road on the east to Silverado Trail on the west. The roadway is approximately 28 feet wide adjacent to the site and includes two 11-foot travel lanes marked with a double yellow centerline and edgelines. The roadway has posted speed limits that alternate between 40 and 45 miles per hour (mph). Based on traffic counts collected in October 2016 during harvest, the average daily trips (ADT) adjacent to the site is approximately 2,725 on weekdays. An unnamed private roadway provides access to both the subject parcel and a number of adjacent properties and would continue to provide access to the winery.

W-Trans prepared a *Traffic Impact Study for the Chappellet Winery Use Permit Modification* on November 27, 2019. According to the study, the project would be expected to result in an additional 60 daily trips on average during the harvest season, including seven new trips during the weekday P.M. peak hour and six new trips during the weekend midday peak hour; these trips represent the increase in traffic above current levels during the P.M. peak hour and above permitted levels during the weekend midday peak hour. The largest requested marketing event would have up to 200 attendees per event and up to three times a year. These events would be scheduled to conclude after 4:30 P.M. on weekend days. The project includes approximately 925 cubic yards of cut and approximately 400 cubic yards of fill. Excess soil cut would be transported off-site to a County approved location. The applicant anticipates up to an estimated 35 truck trips for spoils off-hauling would be required during project construction.

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

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

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

Under existing conditions, the study intersection of Silverado Trail/Sage Canyon Road (SR-128) is operating acceptably overall, but unacceptably at LOS F on the Sage Canyon Road approach during the weekday P.M. peak hour. Upon addition of the project-related traffic, the study intersection would continue operating acceptably overall, but with unacceptable delays on the minor street approach. Impacts would be less than significant in the short-term as the project would be responsible for an increase that represents less than 10 percent of the existing P.M. peak hour traffic volumes on the Sage Canyon Road approach. Under baseline conditions, which includes traffic associated with known winery projects in the study area that are approved or pending, the study intersection would continue to operate at the same levels of service as under existing conditions. The addition of project-related traffic volumes would drop from LOS

C to LOS D overall during the P.M. peak hour and Sage Canyon Road approach would continue to operate at LOS F. Impacts would still be less than significant in the short-term as the project would still be responsible for an increase that represents less than 10 percent of the existing P.M. peak hour traffic volumes on the Sage Canyon Road approach.

Under the anticipated future volumes, the study intersection would deteriorate to LOS F overall during the weekday P.M. peak hour. The project would add more than five percent of the anticipated growth on the Sage Canyon Road approach. Implementation of mitigation measure MM TRANS-1 which requires that an operations plan be adopted that does not generate more than 13 outbound trips within any one-hour period between 3:30 P.M. and 6:00 P.M. on weekdays would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Under mitigation measure MM TRANS-1, the project shall also implement the Transportation Demand Management Plan as proposed in the TIS, particularly the *Alternative Shift Schedule* that will require five employees to end their work day at 3:15 p.m. and another five employees to end their work day at 6:00 p.m. Similarly, under Future plus Marketing Event Conditions, the intersection deteriorates to LOS F with events with 200 people during the peak weekend days. The winery would schedule events with 160 or 200 persons to conclude after 4:30 PM on weekend days to avoid generating outbound trips during the midday peak hour (MM TRANS-2) to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Public Works Department staff reviewed the study and concluded that the study adequately demonstrates that the proposed use in the proposed location would not result in any significant impacts, either project-specific or cumulative, on traffic circulation in the vicinity. Therefore, the project would result in a nominal increase in trips on the study area transportation network. Additionally, a project specific condition would ensure that daily tastings would not occur during events of greater than 100 guests.

As proposed, the project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation. According to the traffic impact study, "pedestrian and transit facilities are adequate to serve the project site given the location and anticipated demand" (W-Trans, 2019). A minimum of two on-site bicycle parking spaces would be provided as part of the project.

c. The transition to VMT is not required of lead agencies until July 1, 2020. However, in anticipation of the transition, the Circulation Element includes new policies that reflect this new regulatory framework for transportation impact assessment, along with a draft threshold of significance that is based on reduction of VMT compared to the unmitigated project rather than the regional average VMT (Policies CIR-7 through CIR-9). Staff believes this alternative approach to determining the significance of a project's transportation impacts would be better suited to Napa County's rural context, while still supporting the efforts of the County to achieve the greenhouse gas emissions goals of its pending Climate Action Plan. The reduction in VMT and, correspondingly, GHG emissions from the transportation sector, is also necessary for Napa County, the region, and the state to achieve long-term, statewide mandates targeted toward reducing GHG emissions. Such mandates include, but are not limited to Executive Orders S-3-05 and B-16-12, which respectively, set a general statewide GHG emissions reduction target of 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050, and an 80 percent GHG emissions reduction below 1990 levels (also by 2050) specifically for the transportation sector.

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

d-f. After implementation of the proposed project, the site would continue to be accessed via an existing unnamed private roadway and driveway on Sage Canyon Road. Sight distance adequacy at the project driveway was evaluated and found to be acceptable to accommodate all turns into and out of the site (W-Trans, 2019). Proposed site access, including the RSS exception, was reviewed and approved by the Napa County Fire Department, Engineering Services Division, and Public Works Department, as conditioned.

Based on the existing volumes on Sage Canyon Road and expected daily volumes at the project driveway, a left turn lane is required at the proposed project driveway per the County's standard left turn lane warrant. However, an exception was requested by the applicant and approved by the Public Works Department to allow the Chappellet Winery Use Permit Modification to be approved without the requirement that a left turn lane be installed at the intersection of the property driveway and Sage Canyon Road. The applicant would be required to contribute an equivalent amount to the County's Traffic Impact Fee program as part of the Public Works Department's recommended conditions of approval.

The proposal includes the construction of 12 additional parking spaces for a total of 38 parking spaces at the subject site. Based upon the County standard of 2.6 persons per vehicle during weekdays and 2.8 persons per vehicle during weekends and 1.05 persons per vehicle for employees the minimum parking required for daily activities would be 66 parking spaces. However, it is unlikely that the winery would host 95 visitors at one time and have 30 employees at the site at one time. Implementation of the TDM plan, as required by mitigation measure TRANS-1 below, would address parking during the proposed events by requiring the use of a shuttle bus system for events of greater than 100 guests to transport guests from an off-site pick-up area to the winery. Therefore, the proposed parking would be adequate for the expected frequency of visitors and employees.

Mitigation Measures:

MM TRANS-1: An operations plan shall be adopted that does not generate more than 13 outbound trips within any one-hour period between 3:30 P.M. and 6:00 P.M. on weekdays. The project shall also implement the Transportation Demand Management Plan as proposed in the *Traffic Impact Study for the Chappellet Winery Use Permit Modification* dated November 27, 2019, particularly the *Alternative Shift Schedule* that will require five employees to end their work day at 3:15 P.M. and another five employees to end their work day at 6:00 P.M.

Monitoring: An operations plan shall be prepared that does not generate more than 13 outbound trips within any one-hour period between 3:30 P.M. and 6:00 P.M. on weekdays and Transportation Demand Management Plan, as proposed in the *Traffic Impact Study for the Chappellet Winery Use Permit Modification* dated November 27, 2019, shall be finalized and submitted to the Planning Division prior to the issuance of a Final Certificate of Occupancy. After issuance of a Final Certificate of Occupancy, an Ongoing Monitoring and Reporting Statement shall be submitted to the Planning Division on January 15 of each year. Planning Division staff will review the statement to ensure compliance with the TDM Plan. Enforcement steps will be taken, if needed, to attain compliance status.

MM TRANS-2: Events at the winery with 160 or 200 persons shall be scheduled to conclude before 4:30 PM on weekend days to avoid generating outbound trips during the midday peak hour.

Monitoring: A TDM Plan which requires events at the winery with 160 or 200 persons to be scheduled to conclude before 4:30 PM on weekend days shall be prepared and submitted to the Planning Division prior to the issuance of a Final Certificate of Occupancy. After issuance of a Final Certificate of Occupancy, an Ongoing Monitoring and Reporting Statement shall be submitted to the Planning Division on January 15 of each year. Planning Division staff will review the statement to ensure compliance with the TDM Plan. Enforcement steps will be taken, if needed, to attain compliance status.

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

Discussion:

a/b. On September 10, 2019, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. The Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation and Middletown Rancheria responded and declined comment as the project site is not located within their aboriginal territories. No other responses were received within 30-days of the tribe's receipt of the invitations.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

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

As discussed in **Section X** above, the project is categorized as "all other areas" based upon current County Water Availability Analysis policies and therefore water use criteria is parcel specific based upon a Tier 2 analysis. . A Tier 2 analysis was completed by O'Connor Environmental, Inc. on July 27, 2018 which included a parcel specific recharge evaluation. The project recharge area also includes portions of six neighboring parcels. According to the recharge evaluation, groundwater recharge within the project recharge area is estimated to be 168.3 AF/YR in an average year and 95.6 AF/YR during drought conditions (O'Connor Environmental, Inc., 2018).

The project well, Well 1, is also known as the Corral Well and is located 0.95 miles south of the winery on parcel number 032-010-092. This parcel is owned by Alexa Chappellet et al, an official easement allowing the winery to use this water is included in the 2014 Transient Non-community Water System technical, managerial and financial report by Applied Engineering (Applied Civil Engineering, 2014). The Corral Well was drilled in 2008 to a depth of 710 feet and completed to a depth of 627 feet. The geologic log describes a sequence of clays and gray rock for the first 125 feet, ash and gray rock were encountered between 125 feet and 450 feet, and hard light gray and hard green and gray rock from 450 feet to 615 feet. The sequence of rocks described to this depth is consistent with the Tsa unit. At 615 feet rocks described as "gray and green shale with streaks of serpentine" are recorded to the bottom of the hole at 710 feet, indicating that they penetrated the basement rocks of the Coast Range ophiolite. Well 1 is screened between 447 feet and 627 feet. Approximately 12 feet of the screened interval is within the serpentinite (sp). Due to the generally poor aquifer characteristics of this rock and the relatively short section of perforated well casing in the serpentinite, the project aquifer is assumed to be within the Sonoma Volcanics. The well log reports depth to first water as 440 feet and a static water level of 400 feet after development in May 2008. A pump test was performed in August 2011 and reported a prepumping water level of 408 feet. After six hours of pumping at rate of 30 gallons per minute the water level had drawn down eight feet to 416 feet and remained stable for the last two hours of the test. Within four minutes after shutting off the pump the water level had recovered to its initial level of 408 (O'Connor Environmental, Inc., 2018).

According to the water analysis, the existing groundwater use within the project recharge area is 26.4 AF/YR. The anticipated total overall water demand for the project recharge area including the project site would be 29.4 AF/YR representing a 3.00 AF/YR increase of the existing water demand of 26.4 AF/YR.

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

c. Wastewater would be treated on-site and would not require a wastewater treatment provider. Impacts would be less than significant.

d/e. According to the Napa County Baseline Data Report, all of the solid waste landfills where Napa County's waste is disposed have more than sufficient capacity related to the current waste generation The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b. The proposed project is located within the state responsibility area and is classified as a high fire hazard severity zone. The project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan because the proposed driveway improvements would provide adequate access to the Sage Canyon Road. The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. The project application was reviewed and approved by the Napa County Fire Department, as conditioned. Impacts would be less than significant.

c/d. Implementation of the project would include the improvement of the existing access driveway (on and off-site) to County standards except for the request noted above. The improvement achieves the same overall practical effect of the NCRSS by providing defensible space and consideration toward life, safety and public welfare by providing the following permanent measures: 1) horizontal and vertical vegetation management as described in the RSS exception request shall be implemented along the entire length of the private lane and driveway connection to Sage Canyon Road; 2) significant improvements are proposed to bring a majority of the road into compliance with the NCRSS as illustrated on the Chappellet Winery Use Permit Modification Conceptual Site Plans prepared by Applied Civil Engineering; 3) substandard width road sections are mitigated with standard turnouts throughout and/or are short in length with standard width sections immediately before and after the substandard section; and 4) all portions of the driveway not discussed in the Engineering Division Road Exception Evaluation are proposed to meet commercial standards as defined in the NCRSS. Proposed site access, including the RSS exception, was reviewed and approved by the Napa County Fire Department, Engineering Services Division, and Public Works Department, as conditioned. The project was designed to minimize impacts to steep slopes which would also minimize potential slope instability and drainage issues. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a. As discussed in **Section IV** above, the project site contains vegetation suitable for special-status birds and a special-status plant. Mitigation is proposed for those biological topics that would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level of less than significant. As identified in **Section V** above, no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified within the project site. In summary, all potentially significant effects on biological and cultural resources can be mitigated to a level of less than significant.

b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology, and traffic impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The project would also increase the demands for public services to a limited extent, increase traffic and air pollutions, all of which contribute to cumulative effects when future development in Napa Valley is considered. Cumulative impacts of these issues are discussed in previous sections of this Initial Study, wherein the impact from an increase in air pollution is being addressed through Greenhouse Gas Voluntary Best Management Practices including but not limited to: building within previously disturbed areas (parking): installation of water efficient landscaping; and minimizing grading. The winery has already implemented the following GHG reduction methods: LEED certification; supply of approximately 90 percent of its power via photovoltaic panels; staggered employee work shift schedules to reduce peak hour trips; carpool incentives for its employees; and provision of electric vehicle charging stations for employees and visitors.

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

General Plan Policy CIR-16 states that "The County will seek to maintain an arterial Level of Service D or better on all County roadways, except where the level of Service already exceeds this standard and where increased intersection capacity is not feasible without substantial additional right of way." Within the project site vicinity, the Silverado Trail/Sage Canyon Road approach already operates at a LOS F and would continue to do so with the addition of the proposed project. The traffic impact study prepared for the project deemed the deterioration of this intersection from LOS F to LOS F, with an increase volume increase of 8.3 percent, during the Future plus Project weekday p.m. peak hour to be a cumulatively significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measure MM TRANS-1 which

requires that an operations plan be adopted that does not generate more than 13 outbound trips within any one-hour period between 3:30 P.M. and 6:00 P.M. on weekdays would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Under mitigation measure MM TRANS-1, the project shall also implement the Transportation Demand Management Plan as proposed in the TIS, particularly the *Alternative Shift Schedule* that will require five employees to end their work day at 3:15 p.m. and another five employees to end their work day at 6:00 p.m. Similarly, under Future plus Marketing Event Conditions, the intersection deteriorates to LOS F with events with 200 people during the peak weekend days. The winery would schedule events with 160 or 200 persons to conclude after 4:30 PM on weekend days to avoid generating outbound trips during the midday peak hour (MM TRANS-2) to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of the mitigation measures discussed above.

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

Mitigation Measures: None required.
