



## Initial Study Checklist/Negative Declaration

(form updated January 2019)

- 1. Project Title:** Ontrail Vineyards Micro-Winery Use Permit, P25-00139-UP
- 2. Property Owner Contact:** Ozegna Vineyards, LLC, c/o Jim Fassio, 501 El Cerrito Avenue, Hillsborough, CA 94010. Phone: (650) 333-3155 or email: ozegna@comcast.net
- 3. County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Wendy Atkins (707) 259-8757, wendy.atkins@countyofnapa.org
- 4. Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):**
  - 3252 Silverado Trail, Napa, CA 94558, APN: 039-610-003
  - Section 22, Township 06 North, Range 04 West, Mt. Diablo Principal Meridian
  - Latitude 38° 21' 18.031" N / Longitude 122° 17' 2.337" W
- 5. Project Sponsor's name and address:** Covell Architects c/o Michell Covell, 1407 Main Street, Ste. 102, St. Helena, CA 94574. Phone: (707) 968-9280 or email: michelle@covellarchitects.com
- 6. General Plan description:** Agricultural Resource (AR)/Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space (AWOS)
- 7. Zoning:** Agricultural Watershed District (AW)
- 8. Background/Project History:** On October 24, 2023, an Application for a Certificate of Legal Nonconformity (CLN) (P22-00261-CLN) was approved which determined the legal nonconformity of an existing barn and chicken coop. The CLN recognized the non-conforming location and height of the existing barn constructed within the required side yard setback.
- 9. Description of Project:** Approval of a phased Micro-Winery Use Permit for a new 5,000 gallon per year winery with daily tours and tastings by appointment on a 13.33 acre parcel.

Phase 1 consists of the following:

- Convert the existing 1,951 sq. ft. barn to production space for barrel fermentation and aging of up to 5,000 gallons of wine per year, with all crush activities occurring at an offsite facility, and utilizing an on-site self-contained mobile bottling services, which will

be located south of the existing barn.

- Convert the existing 529 sq. ft. farm labor office to winery tasting and accessory uses.
- By appointment visitation, tours and tasting, and retail wine sales for up to 10 visitors per day, or 70 visitors per week.
- On-premises consumption of wine (Business and Professions Code Section 23358, 23390, and 23396.5) in a 2,500 sq. ft. area located on the outdoor patio of the tasting room.
- Hours of operation include seven days a week from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., except during harvest for production, and seven days a week from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. for visitation.
- One (1) full-time and one (1) part-time employee (one employee is an owner-operator who lives onsite).
- Installation of four (4) parking spaces [one (1) accessible, two (2) standard, and one (1) compact].
- Construction of a fire truck turnaround south of the proposed Fire Truck Staging Area.
- Use of an existing domestic wastewater treatment system to serve the tasting room and winery. No winery process wastewater would be generated during Phase 1 winery facility; cleaning of equipment will occur offsite.
- Use of an existing groundwater well (Well #1).
- Improve the existing driveway to comply with the Napa County Road and Street Standards.

Phase 2 consists of the following:

- Convert the 1,951 sq. ft. barn to a non-winery use.
- Construct either a new 4,103 sq. ft. winery building or a 2,152 sq. ft winery building (provided the 1,951 sq. ft. barn continues use as a winery building).
- Installation of five each 5,000-gallon water storage tanks.
- Removal of 0.13 acres of existing vineyards to accommodate the new 4,103 sq. ft. winery production building.
- Construction of a fire truck turnaround in between the farm labor office and proposed new winery building.

Phase 3 consists of the following:

- Construction of a 730 sq. ft. covered crush pad.
- On-site production and the installation of either a production wastewater system to accommodate on-site treatment or utilization of a hold and haul wastewater system.

Phases 2 and 3 may occur any time after completion of the Phase 1 improvements.

**10. Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses.** The site is currently developed with two residences, an agricultural barn, a farm labor office, 8.3 net acres of commercial vineyards, three wells, and a pump house. A winery (approximately 210 feet from the proposed production building) and a residence (approximately 276 feet from the proposed

production building) are located to the north of the site, to the east of the site are vineyards, and to the south is a single family residence (approximately 389 feet from the proposed tasting room). Across Silverado Trail is a single family residence and vineyards. An unnamed significant stream traverses the site approximately 700-feet east of the proposed development area. An extrapolated channel, i.e. "ephemeral" or "intermittent stream" as defined by Napa County Code section 18.108.030, is shown on County of Napa Environmental Mapping (GIS mapping extrapolated channel network layer) along the east side of the development area. However, the area of the site that includes this channel was planted in vines sometime between 2016 and 2018, which predates the GIS layer and definition which became effective May 2019. Soda Creek, another significant stream, lies approximately 967 feet west of the development area, across Silverado Trail. The site is accessed from a private driveway off of Silverado Trail.

The site contains slopes ranging from 2.24% to 10.01%. Soil types include Coombs gravelly loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes. State of California, Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program designates the vineyards on the parcel as 'Prime Farmland', while the remainder of the parcel is designated 'Important Farmland. Napa County Environmental Resource Map (GIS layer: vegetation) designates the vineyard area as agriculture, the area of the barn, and residences as Urban or Built-up, and the area along the unnamed significant stream/extrapolated channel as Oak Woodlands. No earth disturbance is proposed within the Oak woodland area. The project wells that supply the winery site lie entirely within the two Significant Streams 1500-foot buffer and within the Groundwater Sustainability Agency boundary. The entire site is located within a Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone / WUI.

The project parcel is not located in the Napa River Watershed and is within the Napa Valley Floor-Napa groundwater subarea. An unnamed significant stream traverses the eastern portion of the site. The nearest neighboring residence is located approximately 276 feet to the northwest.

The site is surrounded by rural residential uses and agricultural (vineyard) uses. Within one mile of the site there are 14 approved wineries.

#### **11. Other agencies whose approval is required.**

The project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County, including but not limited to building permits, grading permits, waste disposal permits, water supply permits, and an encroachment permit, in addition to meeting CalFire standards. Permits are required by the

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

California Air Resources Board (R)

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Region 3 (R)(T)

Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board,

San Francisco Bay Region 2 (R)

State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Quality (R)(T)  
State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water (R)  
California Department of Transportation District 4 (Caltrans) (R)  
California Department of Forestry and Fire protection (T)

**Other Agencies Contacted**

Middletown Rancheria  
Mishewal Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley  
Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation

**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.?

Notice of the proposed project was sent certified mail to Middletown Rancheria, Mishewal Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley, and Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation on February 2, 2026. The County received a response letter from the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation on March 2, 2026, (Identification Number YD-02052026-01) indicating that the project area was not within their aboriginal territories. On April 23, 2026, the County replied to the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation and closed the consultation invitation because the Tribe did not request consultation. The County received a response letter from Middletown Rancheria on February 19, 2026, which concluded that the project location to be outside the Middletown Rancheria's traditional territory and deferred to the Mishewal Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley for comments and concerns. On April 23, 2026, the County replied to the Middletown Rancheria on April 23, 2026, and closed the consultation invitation because the Tribe did not request consultation. The County received a letter from the Mishewal Wappo Tribe on February 5, 2026, requesting consultation. The tribe requested a Cultural Monitoring Plan. This recommendation has been included as a condition of approval.

**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.

Other sources of information used in the preparation of this Initial Study include site-specific studies conducted and filed by the applicant in conjunction with #P25-00139, as listed below, and the environmental background information contained in the permanent file on this project. These documents and information sources are incorporated herein by reference and available for review at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services located at 1195 Third Street, Suite 210, Napa, CA 94559, or on the County's website at: [Current Projects Explorer | Napa County, CA \(napacounty.gov\)](#)

- Architectural Plans (**Exhibit A**)
- Wastewater Feasibility Study (**Exhibit B**)
- Water Availability Analysis (**Exhibit C**)
- Noise Study (**Exhibit D**)
- Site inspections conducted by Napa County Planning Division staff (Wendy Atkins, October 31, 2025)
- Napa County Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Environmental Maps/Layers.
- Napa County Permit History Records for 3252 Silverado Trail, Napa.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL FINDING:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation, I find that the proposed project Could not have a significant effect on the environment. A Negative Declaration will be prepared.



Jun 9, 2026

Signature

Date

Name: Wendy Atkins, Planner II

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This section analyzes the potential environmental impacts of this project based on the criteria set forth in the State CEQA Guidelines and the County's implementing ordinances and guidelines. For each item, one of four responses is given:

**No Impact:** The project would not have the impact described. The project may have a beneficial effect, but there is no potential for the project to create or add increment to the impact described.

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project would have the impact described, but the impact would not be significant. Mitigation is not required, although the project applicant may choose to modify the project to avoid the impacts.

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation:** The project would have the impact described, and the impact could be significant. One or more mitigation measures have been identified that will reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

**Potentially Significant Impact:** The project would have the impact described, and the impact could be significant. The impact cannot be reduced to less than significant by incorporating mitigation measures. An environmental impact report must be prepared for this project.

Each question was answered by evaluating the project as proposed, that is, without considering the effect of any added mitigation measures. The Initial Study includes a discussion of the potential impacts and identifies mitigation measures to substantially reduce those impacts to a level of insignificance where feasible. All references and sources used in this Initial Study are listed above and are incorporated herein by reference.

## **1. AESTHETICS:**

**Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:**

**a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?**

Discussion:

Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms, geological features, water, trees and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of a beautiful or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken in. As generally described in the Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses section, above, this area is defined by a mix of vineyard, winery, and residential uses. The project would not result in substantial damage to scenic resources or substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because the existing 1,951 sq. ft. barn and 529 sq. ft. farm labor office are proposed to be converted to production and hospitality/accessory space (Phase 1), the proposed 4,103 sq. ft. new winery building (Phase 2), and proposed 730 sq. ft. covered crush pad (Phase 3) will be screened from Silverado Trail by the existing residence #1 and are compatible with the colors surrounding the natural landscape. The site is currently developed with two residences, an agricultural barn, a farm labor office, 8.3 net acres of commercial vineyards, three wells, and a pump house.

The project is not subject to the Napa County Viewshed Protection Program (NCC Chapter 18.106):no new structures are located on slopes of 15% or more.

Significance Level: No Impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

**b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?**

Discussion:

The project does not endanger any scenic resources within a state scenic highway, such as trees, rock outcroppings or historic buildings, because the project is not viewable from a designated state scenic highway. There are no rock outcroppings visible from the road or other designated scenic resources on the property.

Significance Level: No Impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- 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 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?**

Discussion:

Silverado Trail is a Viewshed designated road per County Code Chapter 18.106 Viewshed Protection Program. The Viewshed Program applies to development on slopes greater than 15 percent and applies design criteria to minimize effects on the natural terrain and views from designated roads. The existing winery is located on slopes less than 15 percent; therefore, the project is not subject to the Viewshed ordinance. Although Silverado Trail is a designated scenic road, winery activities, the internal access driveway, and buildings cannot be seen from the road. External modifications to the site are limited and would not degrade scenic vistas, scenic resources, and the existing views of the site because the project is not in area considered a scenic vista or scenic resources.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- d) **Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime view in the area?**

Discussion:

Construction of the proposed 4,103 sq. ft. new winery building (Phase 2) and proposed 730 sq. ft. covered crush pad (Phase 3) may have the potential to impact nighttime views. Pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approval for wineries, any new outdoor lighting will be required to be shielded and directed downwards, with only low-level lighting allowed in parking areas. As designed, and as subject to the standard conditions of approval, below, the project will 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.*

Pursuant to standard Conditions of approval for wineries, the winery will be prohibited from installing highly reflective surfaces, therefore the project would not have a significant impact resulting from new sources of glare.

**6.15(d) COLORS**

*The colors used for the roof, exterior walls and built landscaping features of the project shall be limited to earth tones that will blend the facility into the colors of the surrounding site-specific vegetation; or colors required by the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties; or natural earth tone building materials. The permittee shall obtain the written approval of the Planning Division in conjunction with building permit review and/or prior to painting the building. Highly reflective surfaces are prohibited.*

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

## **2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES<sup>1</sup>:**

**Would the project:**

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

Discussion:

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, a portion of the 13.33-acre project site includes approximately 8.3 acres of vineyards on the parcel which is designated 'Prime Farmland'. This area includes slopes of 0.25% to over 6.35%. The remainder of the 5.03 parcel is designated 'Other Land' and is developed with two single family residence, a portion of the vineyard, and an undeveloped area. No portions of Prime Farmland are proposed to be converted to non-agricultural use.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?**

---

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

Discussion:

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 agricultural. The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. The parcel has a recorded Williamson Act contract (414\_83). A winery is a permitted use upon the grant of a use permit.

Significance Level: No Impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- 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)?**

Discussion: ‘Forest Land’ is defined in California Public Resource Code Section 12220(g) as “land that can support 10% 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.” According to Napa County GIS Sensitivity Layers (Vegetation Map), there are no forest lands on-site. According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps (based on the following layers – Sensitive Biotic Oak Woodlands, Agriculture, and Riparian Woodland Forest) the project contains Agriculture and Valley Oaks.

The project does not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. Wineries and accessory uses are considered agricultural uses in Napa County. No impacts will occur

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- 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?**

Discussion: See response to Subsection 2(c) above.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- 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 or conversion of forest land to non- forest use?**

Discussion: See response to 2(a) above.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

### **3. AIR QUALITY:**

*Background information<sup>2</sup>:*

*On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) (now known as the Bay Area Air District) (BAAD) 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 BAAD believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA and were posted on BAAD's website and included in BAAD'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*

---

<sup>2</sup> CEQA Thresholds and Guidelines Update (baaqmd.gov): <https://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/california-environmental-quality-act-ceqa/updated-ceqa-guidelines>

*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 BAAD to any specific course of regulatory action.*

*The Air District published a new version of the Guidelines dated May 2017, which includes revisions made to address the Supreme Court's 2015 opinion in Cal. Bldg. Indus. Ass'n vs. Bay Area Air Quality Mgmt. Dist., 62 Ca 4th 369.*

*See Section 8 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions) for the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions disclosure and impact assessment.*

**Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:**

**a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?**

Discussion:

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 PM<sub>2.5</sub>, 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 PM<sub>2.5</sub> occasionally does reach unhealthy concentrations. There are multiple reasons for PM<sub>2.5</sub> exceedances in Napa County. First, much of the county is wind-sheltered, which tends to trap PM<sub>2.5</sub> 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 PM<sub>2.5</sub> 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 (BAAD, In Your Community: Napa County, April 2016).

The thresholds of significance for use in determining whether a proposed project will have a significant impact on GHG's, and climate change (BAAD, April 2022) did not affect the Air Quality CEQA Thresholds of Significance for the above mentioned air pollutants (i.e., ROG, NOx, PM10 and PM2.5) identified in Table 3-1 of the BAAD 2022 Guidelines. As such, those thresholds will be used to determine the significance of potential air quality impacts associated with air pollutant emissions.

BAAD 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. BAAD 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 BAAD 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 BAAD 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 Bay Area Air District through May 2017). Given the size of the proposed project, which is approximately 5,000 sq. ft. for the winery compared to the BAAD's screening criterion of 105,000 square feet (high-quality restaurant) and 998,000 square feet (general light industry) for NOX (oxides of nitrogen), the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. (Please note: a high-quality restaurant is considered comparable to a winery tasting room for purposes of evaluating air pollutant emissions, but grossly overstates emissions associated with other portions of a winery, such as office, barrel storage and production, which generate fewer vehicle trips. Therefore, a general light industry comparison has also been used for other such uses.) The project falls well below the screening criteria as noted above, and consequently will not significantly affect air quality individually or contribute considerably to any cumulative air quality impacts

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- 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?**

Discussion: See response to Subsection 3(a) above.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

**c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

Discussion:

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 construction of a new 4,103 sq. ft. winery building, new 730 sq. ft. covered crush pad and infrastructure improvements. The nearest neighboring residence is located approximately 276 feet to the northeast. 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, if applicable. These potential construction impacts would be temporary in nature and subject to standard conditions of approval from the Engineering Division as part of the grading permit or building permit review process. 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 will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and are considered less than significant:

**7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS**

**c. AIR QUALITY**

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

- 1. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. The BAAQMD's phone number shall also be visible.*
- 2. Water all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) two times per day.*
- 3. Cover all haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site.*
- 4. Remove all visible mud or dirt traced onto adjacent public roads by using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.*

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

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

7.1 *SITE IMPROVEMENTS*

b. *DUST CONTROL*

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

While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. With exception of the applicant's residence on APN -008, the nearest offsite residence is approximately 276 feet to the northeast of the project site. 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

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?)**

Discussion: See response to Subsection 3(c) above.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

#### **4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:**

**Would the project:**

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

Discussion:

The proposed winery project will be constructed in up to three phases. Phase 1 will include converting the existing 1,951 sq. ft. barn to production space, converting the existing 529 sq. ft. farm labor office to winery tasting and accessory uses, and installing four parking spaces (one accessible, two standard, and one compact) and expanding the existing driveway. Phase 2 will include converting the 1,951 sq. ft. barn to a non-winery use and constructing a new 4,103 sq. ft. winery building. Phase 3 will include the construction of a 730 sq. ft. covered crush pad. According to the County of Napa Environmental Mapping (GIS Vegetation layer) the parcel is identified as Vineyard and Agriculture with Oak woodlands running along the unnamed significant stream, east of the development area. Soil types include Coombs gravelly loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes. No trees are proposed to be removed. The project proposes to remove 0.13 acres of vineyards to accommodate the proposed 4,103 sq. ft winery building.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- 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?**

Discussion:

According to the GIS layer – CNDDDB there are no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified on the site except for the Oak woodlands running along the unnamed significant stream.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- 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?**

Discussion:

According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps based on the following GIS layer – Wetlands and vernal pools and National Wetlands Inventory, the extrapolated channel traversing the east portion of the site contains a potential National Wetlands Inventory Riverine. The proposed project is located outside of the 35-foot intermittent/perennial stream setback. No impacts would occur.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- 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?**

Discussion:

The parcel is not within a mapped Natural Landscape Block or Essential Connectivity Area per the BIOS (Biogeographic Information and Observation System) Habitat Connectivity Viewer: BIOS Viewer@CDFW. In addition, according to the Napa County GIS database (Biological layer), the property is not located with any portion of the California Bay Area Linkage Network. At the local scale, the extrapolated channel will be avoided and no trees are proposed to be removed. The proposed new winery building and covered crush pad are in close proximity to the existing barn and existing vineyards, and no new fencing is proposed as part of the project. As such, access to the site and movement through it will remain similar to what is existing today and would provide for continued localized wildlife movement.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

Discussion:

No trees are proposed to be removed; therefore, the project does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

Significance Level: No Impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- 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: 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.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

## **5. CULTURAL RESOURCES:**

**Would the project:**

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?**

Discussion:

According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology surveys, sites, sensitive areas, and flags) no historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified on the property. Based on the proposed project plans, there would be no impact to cultural resources. However, if resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project,

construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval:

#### 7.2 Archeological Finding.

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

If human remains are encountered during the development, all work in the vicinity must be, by law, halted, and the Napa County Coroner informed so that the Coroner can determine if an investigation of the cause of death is required, and if the remains are of Native American origin. If the remains are of Native American origin, the nearest tribal relatives as determined by the State Native American Heritage Commission would be contacted to obtain recommendations for treating or removal of such remains, including grave goods, with appropriate dignity, as required under Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.”

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

**b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?**

Discussion: See response to Subsection 5(a) above.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

**c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?**

Discussion:

No human remains have been encountered on the property and no information has been encountered that would indicate that this project would encounter human remains. However, if resources are found during grading of the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified

archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard conditions of approval noted above.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

## **6. ENERGY:**

**Would the project:**

- a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation?**

Discussion:

During construction of the proposed project, the use of construction equipment, truck trips for hauling materials, and construction workers' commutes to and from the project site would consume fuel. Project construction is anticipated to occur over a three year period, one year for each the three phases. Construction activities and corresponding fuel energy consumption would be temporary and localized. In addition, there are no unusual project characteristics that would cause the use of construction equipment or haul vehicles that would be less energy efficient compared with other similar agricultural construction sites within Napa County.

Once construction is complete, equipment and energy use would be slightly higher than existing levels and the proposed project would not include any unusual maintenance activities that would cause a significant difference in energy efficiency compared to the surrounding developed land uses. Thus, the proposed project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary energy use. This impact would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?**

Discussion:

The transportation sector is a major end-user of energy in California, accounting for approximately 39 percent of total statewide energy consumption in 2014 (U.S. Energy Information Administration 2016). In addition, energy is consumed in connection with construction and maintenance of transportation infrastructure, such as streets, highways, freeways, rail lines, and airport runways. California's 30 million vehicles consume more than 16 billion gallons of gasoline and more than 3 billion gallons of diesel each year, making California the second largest consumer of gasoline in the world (CEC 2016). In Napa County, farm equipment (not including irrigation pumps) accounted for approximately 60% of agricultural emissions in Napa County in 2014, with the percentage anticipated to increase through 2050 (Napa County 2018 - <https://www.countyofnapa.org/DocumentCenter/View/9247/Revised-Draft-Climate-Action-Plan>).

With respect to transportation energy, existing energy standards are promulgated through the regulation of fuel refineries and products such as the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS), which mandates a 10% reduction in the non-biogenic carbon content of vehicle fuels by 2020. Additionally, there are other regulatory programs with emissions and fuel efficiency standards established by USEPA and the California ARB such as Pavley II/LEV III from California's Advanced Clean Cars Program and the Heavy-Duty (Tractor-Trailer) GHG Regulation. Further, construction sites will need to comply with State requirements designed to minimize idling and associated emissions, which also minimizes use of fuel. Specifically, idling of commercial vehicles and off-road equipment would be limited to five minutes in accordance with the Commercial Motor Vehicle Idling Regulation and the Off-Road Regulation<sup>13</sup>. The proposed project would comply with these State requirements; see the Air Quality conditions of approval. Napa County has not implemented an energy action plan. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency or impede progress towards achieving goals and targets, and impacts would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

## **7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS:**

**Would the project:**

- 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.**

Discussion:

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.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

**ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?**

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

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

**iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**

Discussion:

No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Although the project site is identified as having a VL Very Low (VL) liquefaction potential according to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (liquefaction layers), compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

**iv. Landslides?**

Discussion: According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) there are no landslide deposits in the proposed development area.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

**b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?**

Discussion:

The proposed development will consist of construction a new 4,103 sq. ft. winery building and the construction of a 730 sq. ft. covered crush pad on slopes ranging from 2% to 3%. Based upon the Soil Survey of Napa County, prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the soils on site are comprised of Coombs gravelly loam (2 to 5 percent slopes). The project will require incorporation of best management practices and will be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

**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?**

Discussion:

According to preliminary geologic mapping of the St. Helena Quadrangle, performed by the California Geologic Survey (CGS-2004), the property is underlain by Volcanics (Pliocene-Miocene). Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the project site has a very low susceptibility for liquefaction. Development will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

**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.**

Discussion: See response to Subsection 7(c) above.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- 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?**

Discussion: A Wastewater Feasibility Study, November 24, 2025, was prepared by CMP Civil Engineering & Land Surveying Inc. Based on the Wastewater Feasibility Study analysis, the project site already has suitable domestic wastewater treatment system capable of treating the domestic wastewater needs of the proposed winery. Phases 1 and 2 of the winery will not need an onsite process wastewater treatment system. However, in Phase 3 of this project, the process wastewater generated by the winery will have the option of utilizing a hold and haul type system or installation of an onsite process wastewater system that meets the requirements of the Statewide WDR. Should an onsite process wastewater system be installed, the site's existing vineyard is substantially larger than the area required for the compliant land-application of treated process wastewater. Based on this information, it is feasible to treat and dispose of the domestic and production wastewater associated with the proposed winery in accordance with County and State requirements.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- f) **Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

Discussion:

No paleontological resources or unique geological features have been identified on the property. The project as proposed would require minimal earth disturbing activities and construction is unlikely to uncover paleontological or unique geological features. Impacts would be less than significant

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

## **8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:**

*Background information:*

*On April 20, 2022, the BAAD adopted updated thresholds of significance for climate impacts (CEQA Thresholds for Evaluating the Significance of Climate Impacts, BAAD April 2022)<sup>3</sup>. The updated thresholds evaluate GHG and climate impacts from land use projects are qualitative and geared toward building and transportation projects. Per the BAAD, all other projects should be analyzed against either an adopted local Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy (i.e., Climate Action Plan (CAP)) or other threshold determined on a case-by-case basis by the Lead Agency. If a project is consistent with the State's long-term climate goals of being carbon neutral by 2045, then a project would have a less-than-significant impact as endorsed by the California Supreme Court in *Center for Biological Diversity v. Department of Fish & Wildlife* (2015) 62 Cal. 4th 204). There is no proposed construction-related climate impact threshold at this time. Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from construction represent a very small portion of a project's lifetime GHG emissions. The proposed thresholds for land use projects are designed to address operational GHG emissions which represent the vast majority of project GHG emissions.*

*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 BOS 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 addition, the BOS recommended utilizing the emissions checklist and associated carbon stock and sequestration factors in the Draft CAP to assess and disclose potential GHG emissions associated with project development and operation pursuant to CEQA.*

*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*

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/california-environmental-quality-act-ceqa/updated-ceqa-guidelines>, April 2022

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. On July 24, 2018, the County prepared a Notice of Preparation of a Draft Focused EIR for the Climate Action Plan. The review period was from July 24, 2018, through August 22, 2018. The Draft Focused EIR for the CAP was published May 9, 2019. Additional information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or online at <https://www.countyofnapa.org/589/Planning-Building-Environmental-Services>. The County's draft CAP was placed on hold, when the Climate Action Committee (CAC) began meeting on regional GHG reduction strategies in 2019. The County is currently preparing an updated CAP to provide a clear framework to determine what land use actions will be necessary to meet the State's adopted GHG reduction goals, including a quantitative and measurable strategy for achieving net zero emissions by 2045.

For the purposes of this assessment the carbon stock and sequestration factors identified within the 2012 Draft CAP are utilized to calculate and disclose potential GHG emissions associated with agricultural "construction" and development and with "ongoing" agricultural maintenance and operation, as further described below. The 2012 Draft CAP carbon stock and sequestration factors are utilized in this assessment because they provide the most generous estimate of potential emissions. As such, the County considers that the anticipated potential emissions resulting from the proposed project that are disclosed in this Initial Study reasonably reflect proposed conditions and therefore are considered appropriate and adequate for project impact assessment.

Regarding operational emissions, as part of the statewide implementation of Senate Bill (SB) 743, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (LCI) settled upon automobile vehicle miles of travel (VMT) as the preferred metric for assessing passenger vehicle-related impacts under CEQA and issued revised CEQA Guidelines in December 2018, along with a Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA to assist practitioners in implementing the CEQA Guidelines revisions. The CEQA Guidelines and the LCI Technical Advisory concluded that, absent substantial evidence otherwise, the addition of 110 or fewer daily trips could be presumed to have a less than significant VMT impact.

The County maintains a set of Transportation Impact Study Guidelines (TIS Guidelines) that define situations and project characteristics that trigger the need to prepare a TIS. The purpose of a TIS is to identify whether the project is likely to cause adverse physical or operational changes on a County roadway, bridge, bikeway or other transportation facility, to determine whether the project should be required to implement or contribute to improvement measures to address those changes, and to ensure that the project is developed consistent with the County's transportation plans and policies. Per the

County's current TIS Guidelines, a project is required to prepare a TIS if it generates 110 or more net new daily vehicle trips.

*The TIS Guidelines also include VMT analysis requirements for projects based on trip generation, which includes a screening approach that provides a structure to determine what level of VMT analysis may be required for a given project. For a new project that would generate less than 110 net new daily vehicle and truck trips, not only is the project not required to prepare a TIS, it is also presumed to have a less-than-significant impact for VMT. However, applicants are encouraged to describe the measures they are taking and/or plan to take that would reduce the project's trip generation and/or VMT. Projects that generate more than 110 net new passenger vehicle trips must conduct a VMT analysis and identify feasible strategies to reduce the project's vehicular travel; if the feasible strategies would not reduce the project's VMT by at least 15%, the conclusion would be that the project would cause a significant environmental impact.*

**Would the project:**

- a) Generate a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions in excess of applicable thresholds adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District or the California Air Resources Board which may have a significant impact on the environment?**

Discussion:

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.

The County requires project applicants to consider methods to reduce GHG emissions consistent with Napa County General Plan Policy CON-65(e). Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, this assessment focuses on impacts that are "peculiar to the project," rather than the cumulative impacts previously assessed, because this Initial Study assesses a project that is consistent with an adopted General Plan for which an EIR was prepared. GHGs are the atmospheric gases whose absorption of

solar radiation is responsible for the greenhouse effect, including carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane, ozone, and the fluorocarbons, which contribute to climate change. CO<sub>2</sub> is the principal GHG emitted by human activities, and its concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity. It also serves as the reference gas to which to compare other GHGs. For the purposes of this analysis potential GHG emissions associated with winery ‘construction’ and ‘development’ and with ‘ongoing’ winery operations have been discussed.

GHG emissions from construction represent a very small portion of a project’s lifetime GHG emissions. The BAAD recommended thresholds do not include a construction-related climate impact threshold at this time. One time “Construction Emissions” associated with the project include: emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area, construction and construction equipment, and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as Equipment Emissions). The physical improvements associated with this project include construction of a new 4,103 sq. ft. winery building and the construction of a 730 sq. ft. covered crush pad, and removing 0.13 acres of vineyard. As discussed in Section III. Air Quality, construction emissions would have a temporary effect and BAAD recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction impacts. If the proposed project adheres to relevant best management practices identified by the BAAD and the County’s standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts are considered less than significant. See Section III. Air Quality for additional information.

The BAAD proposed thresholds for land use projects are designed to address “Operational” GHG emissions which represent the vast majority of project GHG emissions. Operational emissions associated with a winery generally include: i) any reduction in the amount 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).

As noted above, Napa County has not adopted a qualified GHG reduction strategy or an air quality plan, therefore projects will be evaluated per the BAAD recommended minimum design elements.

Specifically for buildings, the project must not:

- Include natural gas appliances or natural gas plumbing (in both residential and nonresidential development); and
- Result in any wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary electrical usage as determined by the analysis required under CEQA section 21100(b)(3) and CEQA Guidelines section 15126.2(b).

The project will be required, through conditions of project approval, to prohibit the use of natural gas appliances or plumbing. Additionally, at the time of construction the project will be required to comply with the California Building Code, which heavily restricts natural gas appliances by setting strict, high-efficiency standards favoring electric heat pumps for new construction. The new construction will be required to install energy efficient fixtures complying with CA Building Code Title 25 standards. See section #6. Energy for additional information on energy usage.

Specifically for transportation, the project must:

- Achieve compliance with electric vehicle requirements in the most recently adopted version of CALGreen Tier 2, and
- Achieve a reduction in project-generated vehicle miles traveled (VMT) below the regional average consistent with the current version of the California Climate Change Scoping Plan (currently 15 percent) or meet a locally adopted Senate Bill 743 VMT target reflecting the following recommendations:
  - Residential projects: 15 percent below the existing VMT per capita;
  - Office projects: 15 percent below the existing VMT per employee; or
  - Retail projects: no net increase in existing VMT

The project will be required to comply with the recently adopted version of CALGreen Tier 2. Project approval will include a condition of approval to ensure this is reviewed and implemented at the time of construction through adherence to the California Building Code.

As discussed above and in section #17. Transportation, the County maintains TIS Guidelines that include VMT analysis requirements for projects based on trip generation. The project trip generation numbers did not require completion of a traffic study and VMT analysis. See section XVII. Transportation for additional detail.

The applicant proposes implementing a GHG reduction strategy through limiting the amount of grading and no tree removal. A condition of approval will be included to require implementation of the checked Voluntary Best Management Practices Measures submitted with the project application. If the proposed project adheres to these relevant design standards identified by BAAD, the requirements of the California Building Code, and the County's conditions of project approval, impacts are considered less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- 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: See response to Subsection 8(a) above.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

## **9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:**

**Would the project:**

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

Discussion:

The proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts normally used in winery operations. A Business Plan will be filed with the Environmental Health Division should the amount of hazardous materials reach reportable levels. However, in the event that the proposed use or a future use involves the use, storage or transportation of greater than 55 gallons or 500 pounds of hazardous materials, a use permit and subsequent environmental assessment would be required in accordance with the Napa County Zoning Ordinance prior to the establishment of the use. During construction of the project some hazardous materials, such as building coatings/ adhesives/ etc., will be utilized. However, given the quantities of hazardous materials and the limited duration, they will result in a less-than- significant impact.

Significance Level: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- 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?**

Discussion:

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 operations of a new winery that would not be expected to use any substantial quantities of hazardous materials. Therefore, it would not be reasonably foreseeable for the proposed project to create upset or accident conditions that involve the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

**c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

Discussion:

There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed winery. According to Google Earth, the nearest school to the project site is Vichy elementary, located approximately 2.3 miles to the south. No impacts would occur.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

**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?**

Discussion:

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.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

**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?**

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

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

**f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

Discussion:

No improvements are proposed to Silverado Trail with the project. Driveway improvements consist of increasing the width of the existing driveway to 22 feet consistent with the Napa County Road and Street Standards. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division and found acceptable, as conditioned. Therefore, the proposed project would not obstruct emergency vehicle access and impacts would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

**g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires?**

Discussion:

The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps (based on the following GIS layer – Fire Hazard Severity Zones) the development area is within an area designated as a moderate fire risk. The proposed onsite driveway improvements would provide adequate access to Silverado Trail. . The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. Impacts would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

## **10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:**

*Background information:*

*The County requires all discretionary permit applications (such as use permits and ECPAs) 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.*

*On June 7, 2022, the Napa County Board of Supervisors provided interim procedures to implement provisions of the Napa County Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) for issuance of new, altered or replacement well permits and discretionary projects that would increase groundwater use. The direction limits a parcel's groundwater allocation to 0.3- acre feet per acre per year, or no net increase in groundwater use if that threshold is exceeded already for parcels located in the GSA Subbasin. For parcels not located in the GSA Subbasin (i.e., generally located in the hillsides), a parcel-specific Water Availability Analysis would suffice to assess potential impacts on groundwater supplies. The project well is located inside the GSA Subbasin and within the Northeast Napa Management Area.*

*To assess potential impacts resulting from project well(s) interference with neighboring wells within 500 feet and/or springs within 1,500 feet, the County's WAA guidance<sup>4</sup> requires applicants to perform a Tier 2 analysis where the proposed project would result in an increase in groundwater extraction from project well(s) compared to existing levels.*

*To assess the potential impacts of groundwater pumping on hydrologically connected navigable waterways and those non-navigable tributaries connected to navigable waters, the County's WAA guidance requires applicants to perform a Tier 3 or equivalent analysis for new or replacement wells, or discretionary projects that would rely on groundwater from existing or proposed wells that are located within 1,500 feet of designated "Significant Streams"<sup>5</sup>.*

*Public Trust: The public trust doctrine requires the state and its legal subdivisions to "consider," give "due regard," and "take the public trust into account" when considering actions that may adversely affect a navigable waterway. (Environmental Law Foundation v. State Water Resources Control Bd.; San Francisco Baykeeper, Inc. v. State Lands Com.) There is no "procedural matrix" governing how an agency should consider public trust uses. (Citizens for East Shore Parks v. State Lands Com.) Rather, the level of*

---

<sup>4</sup> The County's Water Availability Guidelines (adopted May 2015)

<sup>5</sup> Refer to Figure 1: Significant Streams for Tier 3, located at [www.countyofnapa.org/3074/Groundwater-Sustainability](http://www.countyofnapa.org/3074/Groundwater-Sustainability). The "Significant\_Streams" and "Significant\_Streams\_1500ft\_buffer" GIS layers are published as publicly-available open data through the County's ArcGIS Online Account.

*analysis “begins and ends with whether the challenged activity harms a navigable waterway and thereby violates the public trust.” (Environmental Law Foundation, 26 Cal.App.5th at p. 403.). As demonstrated in the Environmental Law Foundation vs State Water Resources Control Board Third District Appellate Court Case, that arose in the context of a lawsuit over Siskiyou County’s obligation in administering groundwater well permits and management program with respect to Scott River, a navigable waterway (considered a public trust resource), the court affirmed that the public trust doctrine is relevant to extractions of groundwater that adversely impact a navigable waterway and that Counties are obligated to consider the doctrine, irrespective of the enactment of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA).*

*On January 10, 2024, Napa County released the Interim Napa County Well Permit Standards and WAA Requirements - January 2024, providing guidance to comply with the Public Trust.*

**Would the project:**

- a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?**

Discussion:

As discussed in Section 7 (Geology and Soils) a Domestic & Production Wastewater Feasibility Report, dated November 24, 2025, was prepared for the project by CMP Civil Engineering & Land Surveying Inc. Currently the project site has suitable domestic wastewater treatment system capable of treating the domestic wastewater needs of the proposed winery. Further, in Phases 1 and 2 of this project the winery will not need an onsite process wastewater treatment system. In Phase 3 of this project, the process wastewater generated by the winery will have the option of utilizing a hold and haul type system or the installation of an onsite process wastewater system that meets the requirements of the Statewide WDR. Should an onsite process wastewater system be installed, the site’s existing vineyard is substantially larger than the area required for the compliant land-application of treated process wastewater. Based on these findings, it is feasible to treat and dispose of the domestic and production wastewater associated with the proposed winery in accordance with County and State requirements. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?**

### Discussion:

A Water Availability Analysis was prepared by CMP Civil Engineering & Land Surveying Inc., dated October 8, 2025, as directed by the County's Water Availability Analysis Guidance Document of May 2015 (WAA) and the Interim Well Permit Standards (January 2024).

Tier 1 (Water Use / Parcel Specific Recharge Analysis): The Tier 1 analysis considered existing uses onsite to include vineyard irrigation , residential water use, and farm labor office water use. The existing groundwater usage of the project parcel is estimated at 6.87 af/yr. The proposed project would result in a net decrease in groundwater use of 0.88 af/yr. The project is proposing a reduction of 0.88 af/yr in overall groundwater use by revamping the existing vineyard irrigation system and scheduling methodology, removal of 0.13 acre of vineyard and conversion of the existing farm office to winery accessory use. Regulated Deficit Irrigation (RDI) practices will be implemented on the site. RDI will be achieved through careful monitoring of soil moisture conditions, evapotranspiration rates and distribution uniformity. The physical improvements expected to be installed onsite to facilitate RDI will be as follows: installation of an onsite weather station, installation of onsite soil moisture sensors, installation of water meters on irrigation supply mains, and, installation of pressure compensating emitters. Within a given year and at the maximum expected flow rate of the project well, it is expected that Well #1 total proposed pump time will be decreased by 1,195 minutes compared to current conditions.

|                      | Well      | Existing (AF/yr) | Proposed (af/yr) | Difference (af/yr) |
|----------------------|-----------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Residential          | #2 and #3 | 1.2              | 1.2              | 0                  |
| Agricultural         | #1        | 5.64             | 4.65             | -0.99              |
| Winery               | #1        | 0                | 0.14             | +0.14              |
| Commercial<br>(Farm) | #2        | 0.03             | 0                | -0.03              |
| Total                |           | 6.87             | 5.99             | -0.88              |

The project parcel currently contains three (3) wells and no new wells are proposed. The proposed winery will be served by the existing Well #1 (Project Well). Well #1 will also continue to serve the vineyard. Well #2 and #3 will continue to provide water to the two residences and not be used for the winery. The existing farm office is served by Well #2. The project site and all three wells are within the GSA boundary and the Northeast Napa Management Area. Napa County's WAA guidelines allocate 0.3

AFY of water per acre of land within the GSA; therefore, the 13.33 acres of project parcel with the GSA has an estimated groundwater allocation of 3.99 af/yr. If existing groundwater use exceeds the .30 AFY of water per acre threshold, applicants must demonstrate no net increase in groundwater use. Currently, Well #1 is estimated to draw 6.87 af/yr, which is higher than the parcel's groundwater allocation of 3.99 af/yr, as calculated using the County's Interim Well Standards. The proposed project with the updated irrigation distribution system, advanced irrigation scheduling techniques, vineyard removal and office conversion, would result in a decrease in overall groundwater use by 0.88 af/yr. A condition of approval would be imposed to install well flow meters on Wells #1, # 2, and #3 to verify they do not exceed 5.99 af/yr. (see COA below).

#### 6.15(b) Groundwater Demand Management Program

1. The permittee shall install meters on Wells #1, #2, and #3. The meters shall be placed in a location that will allow for the measurement of all groundwater used for Wells #1, #2, and #3. Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit for the winery the permittee shall submit for review and approval by the PBES Director a groundwater demand management plan which includes a plan for the location and the configuration of the installation of a meter on the two wells serving the parcel.
2. The plan shall identify how best available technology and best management water conservation practices will be applied throughout the parcel.
3. The Plan shall identify how best management water conservation practices will be applied where possible in the structures on site. This includes but is not limited to the installation of low flow fixtures and appliances.
4. As groundwater consuming activity already exists on the property, meter installation and monitoring shall begin immediately and the first monitoring report is due to the County within 120 days of approval of this Use Permit.
5. For the first twelve months of operation under this permit, the permittee shall read the meter at the beginning of each month and provide the data to the PBES Director monthly. If the water usage on the property exceeds, or is on track to exceed, the maximum groundwater usage values in i through ii below, or if the permittee fails to report, additional reviews and analysis and/or a corrective action program at the permittee's expense shall be required to be submitted to the PBES Director for review and action. In addition to monthly meter readings, Permittee shall also provide well level data to the PBES Director.
  - I. Annual cumulative groundwater usage for Well #1, #2, and #3 shall not exceed 5.99 af/yr.

6. The permittee's wells shall be included in the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring program if the County finds any of the wells suitable.
7. At the completion of the reporting period per 6.15(b)(5) above, and so long as the water usage is within the maximum acre-feet per year as specified above, the permittee may begin the following meter reading
  - I. On or near the first day of each month the permittee shall read the water meter and provide the data to the PBES Director during the first weeks of April and October. The PBES Director, or the Director's designated representative, has the right to access and verify the operation and readings of the meters during regular business hours.

Tier 2 (Well and Spring Interference Analysis): Pursuant to County's WAA, a Tier 2 analysis is required when a neighboring off-site well is located within 500 feet of the project well, the well is located within 1,500 feet from a spring, and the proposed project requests an increase in groundwater usage. The project does not request an increase in groundwater usage; therefore, a Tier 2 analysis is not required.

Tier 3 (Groundwater/Surface Water Interaction): While a Tier 3 review is the County's adopted method for complying with its duties under the Public Trust Doctrine, as discussed herein, the project will comply with the WAA Guidance document because the project well will reduce existing groundwater use and reduce pumping time. Well #1 is located 412 feet from a County identified unnamed significant stream and the overall water use for the parcel will be reduced by 0.88 af/yr. This will be accomplished through the revamping of the existing vineyards irrigation system and scheduling methodology. However, a stream interference study is not required if modifications to the location, construction, or operation of the project well are made to reduce any assumed harm relative to current conditions. In the case of this project, the project is proposing a reduction of 0.88 acre-feet per year in overall groundwater use through revamping of the existing vineyard irrigation system and scheduling methodology. Through these changes in well operation, the project will reduce overall well pumping time, and will therefore reduce any assumed harm relative to current conditions. As part of the conditions of approval of this project, well meters will be installed and pumping logs will be maintained in order to verify the water use reduction. Groundwater use on the property will also be capped.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- 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 offsite;**
- 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; or**
- iv. **Impede or redirect flood flows?**

Discussion:

The project would not substantially alter any drainage patterns on site or cause an increase in erosion on or off site. Improvement plans prepared prior to the issuance of a grading or 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 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 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. The project would be required to incorporate an erosion control plan to manage onsite surface drainage and erosion of onsite soils during construction and winter months (October to April). By incorporating a Standard Measures erosion control plan, this project would have a less than significant impact on drainage and siltation. There are no existing or planned stormwater systems that would be affected by this project.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?**

Discussion:

The site is within the boundaries of the 100 year flood hazard boundaries. Any new construction will be required to obtain a floodplain management permit pursuant to Chapter 16.04 of the Napa County

Code. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

**e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?**

Discussion:

The proposed project would not conflict with a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

## **11.LAND USE AND PLANNING:**

**Would the project:**

**a) Physically divide an established community?**

Discussion:

The project would not occur within an established community, nor would it result in the division of an established community. There are five existing buildings on the property: two residences, an agricultural barn (a legal nonconforming barn, constructed in 1906), a farm labor office (constructed in 2025), and a pump house. All other aspects of the project comply with the Napa County Code and all other applicable regulations. 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. The County has adopted the Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO) to protect agriculture and open space and to regulate winery development and expansion in a manner that avoids potential negative environmental effects. Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-1 of the 2008 General Plan states that the County shall, “preserve existing agricultural land uses and plan for agriculture and related activities as the primary land uses in Napa County.” The property’s General Plan land use designation is AR (Agriculture Resource) and 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 fully consistent with the Napa County General Plan. The proposed use of the property for the “fermenting and processing of grape juice into wine” (NCC §18.08.640) supports the economic viability of agriculture within the county consistent with General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-4 (“The County will reserve agricultural lands for agricultural use including lands used for grazing and watershed/open space...”) and General Plan Economic Development Policy E-1 (The County’s economic development will focus on ensuring the continued viability of agriculture...). The General Plan includes two complimentary policies requiring wineries to be designed generally of a high architectural quality for the site and its surroundings. There are no applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the property.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- 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: See response to Subsection 11(a) above.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

## **12. MINERAL RESOURCES:**

**Would the project:**

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?**

Discussion:

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.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

**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: See response to 12(a) above.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

### **13. NOISE:**

**Would the project result in:**

**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?**

Discussion:

The project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during the brief construction of the project. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. The project would not result in potentially significant temporary construction noise impacts or operational impacts. Given the proximity to the neighbors, the closest of whom is located 276 feet away from the existing barn structure, there is a relatively low potential for impacts related to construction noise to result in a significant impact. Furthermore, construction activities would generally occur during the period of 7:00 a.m. 7:00 p.m. on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity. All construction activities will be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). The proposed project will not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts. The winery, as part of its entitlement, would include the County's standard condition of approval, below, requiring construction activities to be limited to daylight hours, vehicles to be muffled, and backup alarms adjusted to the lowest allowable levels.

### “7.3 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 project proposes a maximum of ten winery visitors per day and 70 visitors per week. The applicant also proposes to allow for on-site consumption in conformity with Business and Professions Code Sections 23358, 23390, and 23396.5 in a 2,500 sq. ft. area located on the outdoor patio of the tasing room.

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

The nearest off-site residence to the proposed winery is approximately 276 feet to the northwest (this adjoining property also includes an operating winery). Under the proposed project, the winery would host a maximum of ten winery visitors per day and 70 visitors per week. Winery operations would occur between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. (production, excluding harvest) and 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. (tours and tastings). The potential for the creation of significant noise from visitation is significantly reduced, since the tasting areas are predominantly within the converted barn office itself, except for the outdoor patio. 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 winery activities do not create a significant noise impact. Amplified music or sound systems would not be permitted for outdoor tastings as identified in Standard Condition of Approval 4.10 below. Temporary events would be subject to County Code Chapter 5.36 which regulates proposed temporary events.

The proposed project would increase permanent ambient noise levels due to converting the existing barn structure to winery production and accessory space in Phase 1 and constructing a new 4,103 sq. ft. winery production building (Phase 2). As previously mentioned, the nearest off-site residence (sensitive receptor) is approximately 276 feet away from the existing barn structure.

**“4.10 AMPLIFIED MUSIC**

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

A Noise Study was prepared by CIH Services, dated October 8, 2025, and an Addendum to Micro-Winery Noise Study was prepared on April 20, 2026. The Noise Study reviewed the proposed project’s potential impacts to noise resources and provided the following conclusions:

| Phase                                                                                                    | Sound Level (DBA) at Neighboring Residence | Table 8.16                 | Phase |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------|
| <b>Estimated Noise Levels at the Residence for each Phase using Most Probable Sound Power Levels (1)</b> |                                            |                            |       |
| Phase 1                                                                                                  | 24                                         | Night 45 dBA<br>Day 50 dBA | 46-55 |
| Phase 1 and 2                                                                                            | 26                                         | Night 45 dBA<br>Day 50 dBA | 46-55 |
| Phase 1, 2, 3                                                                                            | 45                                         | Night 45 dBA<br>Day 50 dBA | 46-55 |
| <b>Estimated Noise Levels at the Residence for each Phase using Worst Case Sound Power Levels (1)</b>    |                                            |                            |       |
| Phase 1                                                                                                  | 34                                         | Night 45 dBA<br>Day 50 dBA |       |
| Phase 1 and 2                                                                                            | 34                                         | Night 45 dBA<br>Day 50 dBA | 46-55 |

|               |    |                            |       |
|---------------|----|----------------------------|-------|
| Phase 1, 2, 3 | 50 | Night 45 dBA<br>Day 50 dBA | 46-55 |
|---------------|----|----------------------------|-------|

Table Notes:

<sup>1</sup> The sound power levels for various winery activities is discussed in the October 8, 2025, report.

## Conclusion

Using the “most probable” sound power levels, the noise levels at the residence would comply with Napa County Noise Control Regulations for both day and nighttime. Using “worst case” sound power levels, the noise levels at the residence would comply with the regulations during the day and night for Phases 1 and 2. Phase 3 would exceed the nighttime regulations. Phase 3 of the project adds a crush pad operation. To address this issue, the winery would not operate the crush pad between the hours of 10:00 pm and 7:00 am. This statement has been included as the following condition of approval:

### 6.15 (f) Noise

The winery will not operate the crush pad between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7 a.m.

To further demonstrate that noise attenuation will not exceed the allowable levels in Napa County Code Section, 8.16.070, staff has provided the following assessment.

As described in the Project Setting, above, land uses within vicinity of the project are rural residential properties, vineyards, and wineries. Of those 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 dBA for more than half of any hour in the window of daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.), and 45 dBA during the nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.).

Noise from winery operations is generally limited and intermittent, meaning the sound level can vary during the day and over the course of the year, depending on the activities at the winery. The primary noise-generating activities are wine tasting, mobile bottling services, Barrel Fermentation and Aging, Temperature Control, Tank Fermentation, Glycol Chiller, and Crush Pad Activities. The Napa County General Plan EIR indicates the average, or equivalent, sound level (Leq) for winery activities is 51dBA in the morning and 41dBA in the afternoon. Audibility of a new noise source and/or increase in noise levels within recognized acceptable limits are not usually considered to be significant noise impacts, but these concerns should be addressed and considered in the planning and environmental review processes.

The following are the main activities at the winery that could produce noise. The most probable noise levels are provided in parentheses for each of the activities.

- Wine Tasting (most probable Noise Level Estimation at the noise source is 60 dBA): The winery will offer wine tasting for small numbers of visitors. Wine tasting will be conducted indoors in the converted farm labor office and outside on the deck surrounding the converted farm labor office. The converted farm labor office is approximately 338 feet from the closest point of the residential receptor. For micro-wineries, Napa County allows a maximum of ten visitors per day. The winery will not host onsite marketing events. Live music will not be a part of the wine tasting experience. Therefore, the expected noise levels will be low for this activity. A noise study of a similar wine tasting activity was conducted at a Sonoma County winery. This event was attended by six visitors on an outdoor patio. Music was not played during the noise evaluation. At 50 feet from the tasting event the noise levels were 53 dBA. Following the ‘inverse square law’ where noise attenuates by 6 dBA for every doubling of distance (53 dBA at 50 feet, 47 dBA at 100 feet, 41 dBA at 200 feet), sound levels from the outdoor tasting area would be expected to reduce to approximately 41 dBA at a 338-foot distance in an unobstructed environment. However, noise from the outdoor tasting area is expected to be further reduced by screening from the existing converted farm labor office<sup>6</sup>. Therefore, outdoor wine tasting activities will not exceed the Rural Noise Levels allowed in Napa County Code Section 8.16.070 of 50 dBA.
- Mobile Bottling Services (most probable Noise Level Estimation at the noise source is 67 dBA<sup>7</sup>): The project proposes using a self-contained mobile bottling service during Phase 1, during production hours (Monday through Sunday, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.). The mobile bottling service truck is proposed to be parked just south of the Barn Winery, approximately 345 feet from the closest point of the residential receptor. Following the ‘inverse square law’ where noise attenuates by 6 dBA for every doubling of distance (67 dBA at 50 feet, 61 dBA at 100 feet, 55 dBA at 200 feet, 49 at 400 feet), sound levels from the mobile bottling services area would be expected to reduce to approximately 49 dBA at a 345-foot distance in an unobstructed environment. However, the placement of the mobile

---

<sup>6</sup> Jay Fencing. (n.d.). *How much sound does noise reducing fencing block?* Retrieved June 2, 2026, from <https://jayfencing.com/how-much-sound-does-noise-reducing-fencing-block/>

<sup>7</sup> Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc., (2015). Environmental Noise Assessment Rudd Wines Westside Road Tasting Room and Winery Use Permit Application PLP14-0031 4603 Westside Road Soma County, California, page 8, [https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/wasa/pages/53/attachments/original/1496597594/PLP14-0031\\_MND\\_Attachment\\_Noise\\_Report.pdf?1496597594](https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/wasa/pages/53/attachments/original/1496597594/PLP14-0031_MND_Attachment_Noise_Report.pdf?1496597594)

bottling vehicle south of the 27 foot tall wood barn will further reduce sound attenuation by 10 to 15 dBA<sup>8</sup>, resulting in a sound level of between 30 to 34 dBA.

- Barrel Fermentation and Aging (most probable Noise Level Estimation at the noise source is 55 dBA): The remodeled enclosed barn will be used for wine fermentation and barrel aging of the wine. The closest point of the residential receptor is located approximately 276 feet from the remodeled barn area. Noise levels during wine barrel fermentation and aging should be low and are not expected to contribute significantly to the overall noise levels coming from the micro-winery. Following the 'inverse square law' where noise attenuates by 6 dBA for every doubling of distance (55 dBA at 4.5 feet, 49 dBA at 9 feet, 43 dBA at 18 feet, 36 dBA at 72 feet, 30 dBA at 144 feet, 24 dBA at 288 feet), sound levels from the outdoor tasting area would be expected to reduce to approximately 24 dBA at a 276-foot distance in an unobstructed environment. Barrel Fermentation and Aging activities will not exceed the Rural Noise Levels allowed in Napa County Code Section 8.16.070 of 50 dBA.
- Temperature Control (most probable Noise Level Estimate is 75 dBA): Areas of the remodeled barn used for fermentation and barrel storage may require air conditioning to maintain appropriate temperatures for wine production. According to the project engineer, it is estimated that the air conditioning equipment will require a four-ton condenser unit that will be located outside the barn. The proposed location of the condenser will be at least 20 feet from the north property line, approximately four feet in height, and screened by a 6 foot tall fence. According to information from an equipment manufacturer, air conditioner condenser units can produce a noise level of 57 to 75 dBA<sup>9</sup>. This equipment will be operated during the hotter months. The closest point of the nearest residential receptor is located approximately 350 feet from the air conditioner equipment area. Following the 'inverse square law' where noise attenuates by 6 dBA for every doubling of distance (75 dBA at 20 feet, 69 dBA at 40 feet, 60 dBA at 80 feet, 54 dBA at 160 feet, 48 dBA at 320 feet), sound levels from the air conditioner equipment area would be expected to reduce to approximately 28 dBA at a 350-foot distance in an unobstructed environment. Barrel Fermentation and Aging activities will not exceed the Rural Noise Levels allowed in Napa County Code Section 8.16.070 of 50 dBA.
- Tank Fermentation (most probable Noise Level Estimate is 75 dBA): After the construction of the new production facility in Phase 2, the fermentation may be conducted in a 5000-gallon tank or

---

<sup>8</sup> Jay Fencing. (n.d.). *How much sound does noise reducing fencing block?* Retrieved June 2, 2026, from <https://jayfencing.com/how-much-sound-does-noise-reducing-fencing-block/>

<sup>9</sup> Stack Heating, Cooling, Plumbing & Electric. (2025, July 6). *How loud should my air conditioner be?* Stack Heating, Cooling, Plumbing & Electric. <https://stackheating.com/air-conditioning/how-loud-should-my-air-conditioner-be/>

multiple smaller tanks with an aggregate volume of 5000 gallons. Noise from tank fermentation is typically from the equipment used for tank pump-overs. The nearest residential receptor is located approximately 390 feet from the new production facility. Following the ‘inverse square law’ where noise attenuates by 6 dBA for every doubling of distance (75 dBA at 20 feet, 69 dBA at 40 feet, 60 dBA at 80 feet, 54 dBA at 160 feet, 48 dBA at 320 feet), sound levels from the tank fermentation area would be expected to reduce to approximately 48 dBA at a 390-foot distance in an unobstructed environment. The equipment for the pump-overs will be located inside the building where the exterior noise levels will be further reduced by 15 to 30 dBA<sup>10</sup>, resulting in a sound level of between 13 and 18 dBA. Tank Fermentation activities will not exceed the Rural Noise Levels allowed in Napa County Code Section 8.16.070 of 50 dBA.

- Glycol Chiller (most probable Noise Level Estimate is 57 dBA): If jacketed glycol cooling of the tanks is required there might be additional noise emitted from the glycol chiller that is a part of the cooling system. According to the project engineer, a five-ton chiller might be required. A chiller of this size will produce noise levels of approximately 57 dBA. The chillers will be located on the east or south side of the new production building. The chillers will be operational during the fermentation process which will occur for a few weeks following the harvest. The nearest residential receptor is located approximately 390 feet from the new production facility. Following the ‘inverse square law’ where noise attenuates by 6 dBA for every doubling of distance (57 dBA at 20 feet, 51 dBA at 40 feet, 45 dBA at 80 feet, 39 dBA at 160 feet, 33 dBA at 320 feet), sound levels from the Glycol Chiller would be expected to reduce to approximately 33 dBA at a 390-foot distance in an unobstructed environment. Glycol Chiller activities will not exceed the Rural Noise Levels allowed in Napa County Code Section 8.16.070 of 50 dBA.
- Crush Pad (most probable Noise Level Estimate is 75 dBA): After construction of the new production facility in Phase 2, Phase 3 will include the installation of a covered crush pad on the north side of the new production building. Three of the four sides will be open. The nearest residence is located 450 feet from the crush pad. Following the ‘inverse square law’ where noise attenuates by 6 dBA for every doubling of distance (75 dBA at 57 feet, 69 dBA at 114 feet, 63 dBA at 228 feet, 57 dBA at 456 feet), sound levels from the crush pad would be expected to reduce to approximately 57 dBA at a 450-foot distance in an unobstructed environment. However, the existing 6 foot tall wood fence will further reduce sound attenuation by 6 to 10 dBA<sup>11</sup>, and the

---

<sup>10</sup> Rulon International. (n.d.). *Reduce outside noise*. Rulon International. Retrieved June 2, 2026, from [Rulon International – Reduce Outside Noise](#)

<sup>11</sup> Jay Fencing. (n.d.). *How much sound does noise reducing fencing block?* Retrieved June 2, 2026, from <https://jayfencing.com/how-much-sound-does-noise-reducing-fencing-block/>

existing vegetation along the property line will further reduce sound attenuation by 10 dBA<sup>12</sup>, resulting in a sound level of between 37 and 41 dBA. Crush Pad activities at the residential receptor will not exceed 50 dBA and, therefore, will not exceed the daytime Rural Noise Levels allowed in Napa County Code Section 8.16.070 of 50 dBA. However, using the “worst case” sound power levels as stated in the Addendum to Micro-Winery Noise Study, the crush pad operation would exceed the nighttime regulations (45 dBA). To address this issue, the project narrative states that the winery would not operate the crush pad between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7 a.m. This statement has been included as the following condition of approval:

6.15 (f) Noise

The winery will not operate the crush pad between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7 a.m.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

**b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**

Discussion: See response to Subsection 13(a) above.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

**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: The project site is not located within the boundaries of an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

---

<sup>12</sup> USDA Forest Service, National Agroforestry Center. *Using agroforestry to buffer noise*. Agroforestry Note 42 (Windbreaks 05). Lincoln, NE: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, National Agroforestry Center; 2012. Available from: [USDA PDF](#).

## 14. POPULATION AND HOUSING:

**Would the project:**

- 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)?**

Discussion:

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

The Association of Bay Area Governments’ Plan Bay Area 2050 Growth Pattern figures indicate that the total households for Napa County are projected to increase some 10% by the year 2050, increasing from 50,000 to 56,000. Unincorporated Napa County, along with the cities of American Canyon, Napa, St. Helena, Calistoga and the town of Yountville all have existing compliant 6th Cycle Housing Elements certified by the State Department of Housing and Community Development. For the 6th Cycle, which runs from 2023 – 2031, Napa County jurisdictions have identified and have rezoned or are in the process of rezoning land to accommodate 3,844 dwelling units, more than half of the households projected by ABAG to develop in Napa County by 2050.

One full-time and one part-time employee are proposed. 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 on the local and regional population and housing balance would be less than significant. The proposed project does not require installation of any additional new infrastructure, including that which might induce growth by extending services outside of the boundaries of the

subject site or increasing the capacity of any existing roadway. Napa County collects fees from developers of nonresidential projects to help fund local affordable housing (see Napa County Code Section 18.107.060 – Nonresidential developments – Housing fee requirement). The fees are assessed with new construction and are collected at time of building permit issuance for new construction of winery buildings.

The policies and programs identified in the General Plan Housing Element, in combination with the County's housing impact mitigation fee, ensure adequate cumulative volume and diversity of housing. With limited staffing proposed and no off-site expansion of utilities or facilities to serve other developments, the project would have less than significant impact on population growth.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion: This application will not displace any existing housing or a substantial number of people and will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

## **15. PUBLIC SERVICES:**

**Would the project result in:**

- a) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:**
- i. Fire protection?**
  - ii. Police?**
  - iii. Schools?**
  - iv. Parks?**

**v. Other public facilities?**

Discussion:

Public services are currently provided to the project site and the additional demand placed on existing services would be marginal. Fire protection measures are required as part of the development pursuant to Napa County Fire Marshal's Office conditions of approval, and there will be no foreseeable impact to emergency response times with the adoption of standard conditions of approval. The Fire Department and Engineering Services Division have reviewed the application and recommend approval as conditioned. School impact mitigation fees, which assist local school districts with capacity building measures, will be levied pursuant to building permit submittal. The proposed project will have little to no impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from any building permit fees, property tax increases, and taxes from the sale of wine will help meet the costs of providing public services to the property. The proposed project will have a less than significant impact on public services.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

## **16. RECREATION:**

**Would the project:**

- a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?**

Discussion:

The project would not significantly increase the use of recreational facilities, nor does the project include recreational facilities that may have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- 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:

No new public recreational amenities are proposed to be built with, or as a result of, the requested use permit application. The proposed project would not result in substantial population growth, resulting in no increase in the use of recreational facilities and requiring no construction or expansion of recreational facilities. The proposed project would have no impact.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

## **17. TRANSPORTATION:**

**Would the project:**

- a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?**

Discussion:

As proposed, the project would not conflict with any plans, ordinances or policies addressing the circulation system. Existing pedestrian and transit facilities serving the site are limited, though given the rural location of the project site and anticipated demand for these modes, this is considered an acceptable condition. The existing driveway entrance is not proposed to be disturbed. Therefore, it would not increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or result in inadequate emergency access. The parcel is accessed by a private driveway off of Silverado Trail approximately 810 feet south of the intersection of Silverado Trail and Soda Canyon Road, Napa. The Napa County Road and Street Standards (NCRSS) requires a 22-foot minimum width for driveways serving commercial uses such as this proposed winery. The majority of the existing driveway meets the minimum width requirement. However, an approximately 224 foot length of the driveway is proposed to be increased by six feet in width to comply with the Napa County Road and Streets Standards.

Significance Level: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?**

Discussion:

As part of the statewide implementation of Senate Bill (SB) 743, the Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation (LCI) settled upon automobile vehicle miles of travel (VMT) as the preferred metric for assessing passenger vehicle-related impacts under CEQA and issued revised CEQA Guidelines in December 2018, along with a Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA to assist practitioners in implementing the CEQA Guidelines revisions. The County's General Plan Circulation Element contains a policy statement (Policy CIR-7) indicating that the County expects development projects to achieve a 15% reduction in project-generated VMT to avoid triggering a significant environmental impact. Specifically, the policy directs project applicants to identify feasible measures that would reduce their project's VMT and to estimate the amount of VMT reduction that could be expected from each measure. The policy states that "projects for which the specified VMT reduction measures would not reduce unmitigated VMT by 15 or more percent shall be considered to have a significant environmental impact." That policy is followed by an action item (CIR-7.1) directing the County to update its CEQA procedures to develop screening criteria for projects that "would not be considered to have a significant impact to VMT" and that could therefore be exempted from VMT reduction requirements.

The new CEQA Guidelines and the LCI Technical Advisory note that CEQA provides a categorical exemption (Section 15303) for additions to existing structures of up to 10,000 square feet, so long as the project is in an area that is not environmentally sensitive and where public infrastructure is available. LCI determined that "typical project types for which trip generation increases relatively linearly with building footprint (i.e., general office building, single tenant office building, office park, and business park) generate or attract 110-124 trips per 10,000 square feet". They concluded that, absent substantial evidence otherwise, the addition of 110 or fewer daily trips could be presumed to have a less than significant VMT impact.

The County maintains a set of Transportation Impact Study Guidelines (TIS Guidelines) that define situations and project characteristics that trigger the need to prepare a TIS. The purpose of a TIS is to identify whether the project is likely to cause adverse physical or operational changes on a County roadway, bridge, bikeway or other transportation facility, to determine whether the project should be required to implement or contribute to improvement measures to address those changes, and to ensure that the project is developed consistent with the County's transportation plans and policies. Per the County's current TIS Guidelines, a project is required to prepare a TIS if it generates 110 or more net new daily vehicle trips.

The TIS Guidelines also include VMT analysis requirements for projects based on trip generation, which includes a screening approach that provides a structure to determine what level of VMT analysis may be required for a given project. For a new project that would generate less than 110 net new daily vehicle and truck trips, not only is the project not required to prepare a TIS, it is also presumed to have

a less than significant impact for VMT. However, applicants are encouraged to describe the measures they are taking and/or plan to take that would reduce the project's trip generation and/or VMT.

Projects that generate more than 110 net new passenger vehicle trips must conduct a VMT analysis and identify feasible strategies to reduce the project's vehicular travel; if the feasible strategies would not reduce the project's VMT by at least 15%, the conclusion would be that the project would cause a significant environmental impact.

Based on maximum winery employee and visitor/guest date for the harvest/crush season, the proposed project would be expected to generate ten new daily trips on a weekday and ten daily trips on a Saturday. This count includes vehicle trips required for 7.8 tons of grape haul.

Since operational and visitor trips associated with the project is below the 110-trip threshold in the Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation guidelines and the County's TIS Guidelines and VMT screening criteria the project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b). Impacts would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

**c) Substantially increase hazards due to geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

Discussion: See response to Subsection 17(a) above.

Significance Level: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

**d) Result in inadequate emergency access?**

Discussion: See response to Subsection 17(a) above.

Significance Level:

Mitigation Measures:

**e) 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:

Developers of new or expanded land uses are required to provide adequate parking or demonstrate that adequate parking exists to meet their anticipated parking demand. Excess parking that could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or commercial activity exceeding the site's capacity is discouraged. The project is proposing to install four (4) parking stalls, one of which will be ADA compatible, which should accommodate employees and visitors. The proposed project would not be in conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-14

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

## **18. 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:**

- 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:**

### Discussion:

On February 2, 2026, 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. response from the Middletown Rancheria was received on February 19, 2026, which concluded that the project location to be outside the Middletown Rancheria's traditional territory and deferred to the Mishewal Wappo Tribe of Alexander for comments and concerns. A response from the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation was received on March 2, 2026, which concluded that the project is not within the aboriginal territories of the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation, and declined any comment on the project. A response from the Mishewal Wappo Tribe was received on February 5, 2026, requesting consultation. The tribe requested a Cultural Monitoring Plan. This recommendation has been included as the following condition of approval:

#### *6.15 (e) Cultural Monitoring Plan*

- i. The Permittee must meet and confer with the Mishewal Wappo Tribe of Alexander ValleyTribe, at least 45 days prior to commencing ground disturbance activities on the*

- Project to address notification, protection, treatment, care, and handling of tribal cultural resources potentially discovered or disturbed during ground disturbance activities of the Project. All potential cultural resources unearthed by Project activities shall be evaluated by the project Tribal Cultural Advisor. The Tribe must have an opportunity to inspect and determine the nature of the resource and the best course of action for avoidance, protection and/or treatment of tribal cultural resources to the extent permitted by law. If the resource is determined to be a tribal cultural resource of value to the Tribe, the Tribe will coordinate with the Project applicant to establish appropriate treatment and disposition of the resources with appropriate dignity which may include reburial or preservation of resources. The Permittee must facilitate and ensure that the determination of treatment and disposition by the Tribe is followed to the extent permitted by law. No laboratory studies, scientific analysis, collection, curation, or video recording are permitted for tribal cultural resources without the prior written consent of the Tribe.*
- ii. Prior to initial ground disturbance, the Permittee shall retain a project Tribal Cultural Advisor designated by the Tribe, to direct all mitigation measures related to tribal cultural resources.*
  - iii. All on-site personnel of the Project shall receive adequate cultural resource sensitivity training approved by the project Tribal Cultural Advisor or authorized designee prior to initiation of ground disturbance activities on the Project. The training must also address the potential for exposing subsurface resources and procedures if a potential resource is identified. The Project applicant will coordinate with the Tribe on the cultural resource sensitivity training.*
  - iv. Ground disturbing activities occurring in conjunction with the Project including surveys, testing, concrete pilings, debris removal, rescrapes, punch lists, erosion control, mulching, waddles, hydroseeding, etc., pot-holing or auguring, boring, grading, trenching, foundation work and other excavations or other ground disturbance involving the moving of dirt or rocks with heavy equipment or hand tools within the Project area shall be monitored on a full-time basis by qualified tribal monitor(s) approved by the Tribe. The tribal monitoring shall be supervised by the project Tribal Cultural Advisor. Tribal monitoring should be conducted by qualified tribal monitor(s) approved by the Tribe, who is defined as qualified individual(s) who has experience with identification, collection and treatment of tribal cultural resources of value to the Tribe. The duration and timing of the monitoring will be determined by the project Tribal Cultural Advisor. If the project Tribal Cultural Advisor determines that full-time monitoring is no longer warranted, he or she may recommend that tribal monitoring be reduced to periodic spotchecking or cease*

entirely. Tribal monitoring would be reinstated in the event of any new or unforeseen ground disturbances or discoveries.

- v. *The project Tribal Cultural Advisor and tribal monitor(s) may halt ground disturbance activities in the immediate area of discovery when known or suspected tribal cultural resources are identified until further evaluation can be made in determining their significance and appropriate treatment or disposition. There must be, at minimum, one tribal monitor for every separate area of ground disturbance activity that is at least 30 meters or 100 feet apart unless otherwise agreed upon in writing between the Tribe and applicant. Depending on the scope and schedule of ground disturbance activities of the Project (e.g., discoveries of cultural resources or simultaneous activities in multiple locations that requires multiple tribal monitors, etc.) additional tribal monitors may be required on-site. If additional tribal monitors are needed, the Tribe shall be provided with a minimum of three (3) business days advance notice unless otherwise agreed upon between the Tribe and applicant. The on-site tribal monitoring shall end when the ground disturbance activities are completed, or when the project Tribal Cultural Advisor have indicated that the site has a low potential for tribal cultural resources.*

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- 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:

See response to Subsection 19(a) above.

Significance Level: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

## **19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:**

**Would the project:**

- 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?**

Discussion:

A Wastewater Feasibility Study, dated November 24, 2025, was prepared by CMP Civil Engineering & Land Surveying Inc. Based on the Wastewater Feasibility Study analysis, the project site already has suitable domestic wastewater treatment system capable of treating the domestic wastewater needs of the proposed winery. Phases 1 and 2 of the project the winery will not need an onsite process wastewater treatment system. However, in Phase 3 of this project, the process wastewater generated by the winery will have the option of utilizing a hold and haul type system or installation of an onsite process wastewater system that meets the requirements of the Statewide WDR. Should an onsite process wastewater system be installed, the site's existing vineyard is substantially larger than the area required for the compliant land-application of treated process wastewater. Based on this information, it is feasible to treat and dispose of the domestic and production wastewater associated with the proposed winery in accordance with County and State requirements.

Stormwater drainage would be managed through the Napa Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Guidance. All on site civil improvements shall be constructed according to plans prepared by a registered civil engineer, which will be reviewed and approved by the Engineering Division. The project does not require the construction of new or expanded electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities. Impacts are expected to be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?**

Discussion:

As discussed in Section #10. Hydrology, a Water Availability Analysis was prepared by CMP Civil engineering & Land Surveying Inc., dated October 8, 2025. The report includes calculations for the existing and proposed water uses and a groundwater recharge analysis. An onsite water audit of existing uses was completed, and the existing water use associated with the vineyards, residence, and farm labor office is estimated to be 6.87 af/yr. The proposed project with the updated irrigation

distribution system and advanced irrigation scheduling techniques, would result in a decrease in groundwater use of 0.88 af/yr. A condition of approval would be imposed to install a well flow meter on Well #1 to verify it does not exceed 5.99 af/yr.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- 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?**

Discussion: Wastewater would be treated on-site and would not require a wastewater treatment provider; therefore, no impact would occur.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- 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?**

Discussion:

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.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- e) **Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

Discussion: See response to Section 19(d) above.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

## 20. WILDFIRE:

**If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:**

- a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

Discussion:

The proposed project is located within the State Responsibility Area. There are no project features that would substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project site is generally flat with slopes ranging from 2.24% to 10.01%, and is located on the valley floor with access from Silverado Trail, a County maintained road. There are existing overhead power lines along the 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.

Significance Level: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- 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?**

Discussion:

See response to Subsection 15(a) above.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- 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?**

Discussion:

See response to Subsection 15(a) above.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- 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:

See response to Subsection 15(a) above.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

## **21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

- 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?**

Discussion:

The site has been previously disturbed and does not contain any known listed plant or animal species. The project will not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. As identified in Section V Cultural Resources above, no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, or sites of unique geological features have been identified within the project site. No historic or prehistoric resources are anticipated to be affected by the proposed project nor will the proposed project eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. In the event archaeological artifacts are found, a standard condition of approval and mitigation measure would be incorporated into the project (See Above, Section V. Cultural Resources, COA 7.2 Archaeological Findings). Impacts would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant with mitigation incorporation.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

- 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)?**

Discussion:

The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emission, hydrology, noise, and traffic are discussed in the respective sections above and were determined to have a less than significant impact. As discussed in Section VIII. Green House Gas and Section XVII. Transportation, potential impacts to air pollution and GHG emissions are being addressed through meeting BAAD recommended design elements, with the addition of Greenhouse Gas and Voluntary Best Management Practices. The applicant intends to implement greenhouse gas reduction strategies limiting the amount of grading and no tree removal. Section X. Hydrology includes detail in the Water Availability Analysis which demonstrates that the proposed project would result in a decrease in groundwater use compared to the existing levels. Potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion: All potential impacts identified in this Negative Declaration are less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant environmental effects that cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.