Planning, Building & Environmental Services

1195 Third Street, Suite 210
Napa, CA 94559
www.napacounty.gov
Main: (707) 253-4417

Brian D. Bordona
Director

Initial Study Checklist/Mitigated Negative Declaration

(form updated January 2019)

1. **Project Title:** Bella Oaks Winery Use Permit Minor Modification (P23-00032-MM) and Administrative Permit (P25-00284-ADMIN)

2. **Property Owner Contact:** Manley Acquisition, LLC; P.O. Box 823, Rutherford CA, 94573

3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Emily Hedge, Planner III; (707) 259-8226, Emily.Hedge@countyofnapa.org.

4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):**

   - 1271 Manley Lane, Napa, CA 94573; APN 027-260-001
   - Section 16, Township 07 North, Range 05 West, Mt. Diablo Principal Meridian
   - Latitude 38° 27' 1.659" N / Longitude 122° 25' 8.848" W

5. **Project Sponsor's name and address:** Farella Braun+Martel, Attn: Katherine Philippakis; 899 Adams Steet, Suite G, St. Helena, CA 94574

6. **General Plan description:** Agricultural Resource (AR)

7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Preserve (AP)

8. **Background/Project History:** The 1.44-acre parcel has operated as a winery since the late 1970s. On January 5, 1977, the Napa County Planning Commission approved the original use permit (#U-167677) and adopted a Negative Declaration to establish a 3,984-square-foot winery and two outdoor crush pads with a 20,000-gallon annual capacity.

   On December 12, 1989, the Napa County Board of Supervisors certified Final Environmental Impact Report #EIR-058 and approved a permit modification (#U-288788). This allowed production to increase to 42,500 gallons per year and authorized a 3,840-square-foot expansion consisting of: a 2,080 sq. ft. production area; an 880 sq. ft. tasting/retail room; and an 880 sq. ft. second-floor office. The approval also permitted private tours and tastings, subject to visitor

limits and infrastructure improvements, including traffic mitigation on St. Helena Highway (SR 29).

In 1990, the landowner applied for a use permit minor modification to increase the previously approved expansion floor area by approximately 9% (from 3840 square feet to 4193 square feet). The Planning Director granted final approval of the site plan and building elevations in an April 17, 1990, letter that was subsequently appealed. On May 22, 1990, the Boad of Supervisors denied the appeal and upheld the Director's April 17, 1990, decision approving a modification to use permit #U-288788. The winery fulfilled all previous mitigation measures before expanding visitation to the site.

In summary, the winery's current use permit, #U-288788, as modified in 1990, authorizes the following:

- **Production Capacity:** A maximum annual production of 42,500 gallons of wine.
- **Main Winery Building*:** An 8,177 square foot facility featuring:
    - **Main Level:** 6,827 square foot production area, 440 square foot tasting room, and a restroom.
    - **Second Floor:** 861 square feet of office space and a kitchenette.
- **Exterior Features:** A 3,740 square foot uncovered concrete crush pad and a former 800 square foot barn/storage building (since demolished).
- **Parking:** 12 total onsite spaces, including eight for visitors and four for employees.
- **Staffing:** Four full-time employees.
- **Operating Hours:**
    - **Production:** 8:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m., seven days per week.
    - **Tours & Tastings:** 10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m., seven days per week.
- **Visitation:** Private tours and tastings by appointment only. Accommodation for up to 25 vehicles per day and five tour buses per 30-day period (limited to one bus per day).

**While Use Permit records show discrepancies regarding the 1989 winery expansion, the square footages in this study follow the Director's 1990 approval record.*

Over the years, various modifications have been approved to the site, including a minor modification use permit to allow a third outdoor blending tank (#03216-MOD), a winery sign permit, and a fence/entry structure permit. After acquiring the property in 2021, Manley Acquisition, LLC renamed the facility "Bella Oaks Winery", demolished the main residence and barn, and replaced the original two groundwater wells. The replacement well (#E22-00755) was completed in 2023. The winery has not operated since ownership transferred in 2021.

The subject planning application (P23-00032) was submitted on February 23, 2023, and deemed complete on November 24, 2025. The application also includes a request for a Winery Administrative Use Permit (P25-00284) to allow minor site and operational changes. Although the application initially included a new commercial kitchen, the applicant withdrew that request in May 2026. While preceding technical documents, such as the Wastewater Feasibility Study and Water Availability Analysis, accounted for the kitchen, this Initial Study does not analyze it.

Comments received during the preparation of this study indicate public opposition to the project. This opposition primarily concerns the proposed architectural design, the preservation of private views, intensity of use, and compatibility with existing neighborhood character.

9. **Description of Project:** Request for a Winery Use Permit Minor Modification and a Winery Administrative Use Permit Modification to File No. U-288788 and 03216-MOD to allow the following:

    - **Winery Facility Expansion:** Reconstruct and expand the existing 8,177 square foot winery and 3,740 square foot crush pad into a two-story, 17,192 square foot facility. The new site plan features a main production building and an auxiliary building joined by a covered crush pad.
        - **Production (12,288+/- square feet):** Includes a 2,750 square foot covered crush pad and 9,538 square feet of enclosed space for expanded fermentation area, barrel storage, and a lab.
        - **Accessory Use (4,903+/- square feet):** Includes a tasting room, employee break rooms, and offices.

    - **Water Systems & Storage:** Install a public water system utilizing an existing well. New infrastructure includes a 10,000-gallon potable water tank, a well pump house, and a water treatment pad, plus a new fire pump house and a 45,000-gallon underground fire protection tank. The project also includes changes to the storm water control design to include pervious pavement and surface runoff and roofs to drain into a new 17,000-gallon storage tank for reuse for landscape irrigation.

    - **Wastewater Management:** Segregate and replace the existing systems:
        - **Sanitary Sewage:** Retain existing tanks; add a new pretreatment system and a 1,500-gallon grease interceptor; replace the mound system with a subsurface drip disposal field.
        - **Process Wastewater:** Install an underground hold-and-haul tank or a new onsite package treatment system with disposal on the neighboring vineyard

(APN 027-250-069).

- **Parking & Access:** Expand to 17 total spaces:
    - **New Employee Lot:** Six (6) standard and one (1) accessible stall plus 12 overflow valet spaces.
    - **Existing Visitor Lot:** Nine (9) existing standard and one (1) new accessible stall.
    - **Upgrades:** Two (2) new EV charging stations, bike racks, and 12 onsite valet overflow spaces.
    - **Entrances:** Upgrade existing driveways to Napa County Road and Street Standards; install new gates and entry fencing.
- **Production Volume:** Maintain existing permitted capacity of 42,500 gallons/year.
- **Employees:** Increase from four (4) to ten (10) full-time employees.
- **Production Hours:** Maintain 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., seven days a week.
- **Visitation Hours:** Expand by two hours to 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., seven days a week.
- **Visitation & Marketing:**
    - **Tours/Tastings:** Maintain 25 vehicles/day. Clarify attendance as an average of 60 visitors/day (420/week) and a maximum of 75 visitors/day (525/week).
    - **Transportation:** Eliminate tour buses; permit "sprinter-van" style vehicles.
    - **Marketing Program:** Establish 11 events per year (max one per month) held on the crush pad or front entry:
        - **Ten (10) Events:** Up to 40 attendees.
        - **One (1) Event:** Up to 80 attendees.

      Note: Tours and tastings will be closed to the public on marketing event days.
- **Landscaping:** Preserve over 20 existing trees. Replace 14 trees (sycamore, citrus, plum, walnut, and olive) with a refreshed palette of sycamores, grasses, shrubs, and perennials.

The project proposes approximately 370 cubic yards of net grading and a reduction in impervious surface area (winery coverage) from 25,870 to 22,677 square feet. This is achieved by replacing the existing parking lot and walkways with permeable gravel and stone paving. Overall winery development area (employee-exclusive footprint) will increase from 7,925 square feet to 14,427 square feet.

10. **Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses.** The 1.44-acre project site is situated on the Napa Valley floor within the Agricultural Preserve (AP) zoning district. It is bounded by Manley Lane to the north, with vineyards bordering the southern, eastern, and western perimeters. Primary access is provided via two existing driveways on Manley Lane, approximately 700 feet west of the St. Helena Highway (SR 29) intersection. The surrounding area is characterized by vineyards, wineries, and residences, with the nearest residential neighbors situated between 300 and 550 feet away. Currently, the site is fully developed and disturbed, featuring a 42,500-gallon winery (currently not in operation), onsite wastewater treatment systems, a 9-stall parking lot, a groundwater well with storage tanks, and existing landscaping.

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 Napa County Fire Department standards. Permits are required by the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, and the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board.

    Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies
    Alcoholic Beverage Control (R)
    San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (R)

    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 December 10, 2025. The County received a response letter from the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation on January 15, 2026 (Identification Number YD-12122025-01) indicating that the project area was not within their aboriginal territories. On March 17, 2026, the County replied to the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation and closed the consultation invitation because the Tribe did not request consultation. On

March 17, 2026, the County also sent consultation closure notices to the Middletown Rancheria and to the Mishewal Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley because no request for consultation was received, and more than 30 days had elapsed since the County's consultation invitation was provided. This is discussed in detail in **Section 18 (Tribal Cultural Resources)**.

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 #P23-00032 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)

- 1989 Certified Final EIR-058 for Swanson Vineyards and Winery **(Exhibit A)**
- 1977 Adopted Negative Declaration **(Exhibit B)**
- William Duff Architects, Inc., April 17, 2026, Bella Oaks Winery Architectural Plans **(Exhibit C)**
- Farrella Braun + Martel, May 28, 2026, Proposal Statement **(Exhibit D)**
- Summit Engineering, Inc., September 2025, Wastewater Feasibility Study **(Exhibit E)**
- Summit Engineering, Inc., April 2026, Water Availability Analysis **(Exhibit F)**
- Crane Transportation Group, September 4, 2025, (November 25, 2025, Memorandum) Revised

Traffic Study **(Exhibit G)**

- Salter, December 11, 2025 (updated February 13, 2026), Environmental Noise Assessment (**Exhibit H)**
- Napa County, December 18, 1989, Approval Letter for Swanson Vineyards and Winery **(Exhibit I)**
- Napa County Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Environmental Maps/Layers.
- Napa County Permit History Records for 1271 Manley Lane, Napa, CA 94573; APN 027-260-001
- Site inspection conducted by Napa County Planning Division staff (Hannah Spencer, Planner III, March 5, 2026)
- Napa County Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Environmental Maps/Layers.
- Napa County Permit History Records for 1271 Manley Lane, Napa, CA 94573; APN 027-260-001

ENVIRONMENTAL FINDING:

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

Signature

08/25/2026

Date

Name: Michael Parker, Planning Manager
Napa County Planning, Building, and Environmental Services Department (PBES)

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?

AND

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

AND

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: 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. New developments on ridgelines or slopes exceeding 15 percent fall under the Napa County Viewshed Protection Program if they are visible from designated roads. According to California State Scenic Highway System Map, SR 29 is an "eligible State Scenic Highway" and efforts should still be made to protect its scenic qualities as the highway is considered a part of the scenic highway system.

As generally described in the Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses section, above, the project parcel is situated on the Napa Valley floor, a rural landscape defined by vineyards, residences, and wineries. Located approximately 700 feet west of SR 29—a County-designated Viewshed Road—the site is accessed via Manley Lane. The proposed development utilizes an established winery site that remains substantially screened from SR 29 by existing structures and mature vegetation.

The project is not situated within nor will it obstruct views of a scenic vista. As the site is not visible from a designated state scenic highway, it does not impact scenic resources such as trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings. Furthermore, the proposal does not substantially degrade the existing visual character or public views from Manley Lane or Bella Oaks Lane, as the site is currently developed with an existing winery.

The project expands the building footprint by approximately 4,947 square feet and adds a cover to the existing crush pad. The proposed 31-foot-tall, two-story structure utilizes a Napa County-approved color palette, featuring light grey board-formed concrete, grey and reddish-brown perforated metal panels, and dark grey architectural metal. The design includes wood door panels in dark brown and accents of patinated copper cladding or integral color stucco in reddish-brown.

Planned landscaping includes new sycamore trees, grasses, shrubs, and perennials, while preserving more than 20 existing trees onsite. The proposed building and parking design changes reduce the winery's impervious coverage from 25,870 to 21,956 square feet by replacing the existing parking lot with permeable gravel. Standard Conditions of Approval reduce new sources of light pollution by requiring that all new exterior lighting will be shielded and directed downward (discussed further below).

Furthermore, the project aligns with the Napa County General Plan and Agricultural Preserve (AP) zoning development standards, including property line setbacks and the 35-foot building height limit.

As the parcel sits on the valley floor with slopes under 15 percent, it is exempt from the Napa County Viewshed Protection Program. Additionally, there are no significant rock outcroppings or geologic features on the project site that would be impacted by the proposed project.

For the reasons described above, impacts to scenic vistas and resources and the existing visual character would be less than significant.

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: The proposed new winery facility may result in the use of additional lighting that may have the potential to impact nighttime views. Pursuant to standard Napa County Conditions of Approval for wineries, outdoor lighting for the winery is required to be shielded and directed downwards, with only low-level lighting allowed in parking areas. As designed and operating subject to the County's standard condition of approval noted below, the project would not have a significant impact resulting from new sources of outside lighting.

6.3 LIGHTING – PLAN SUBMITTAL

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

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

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

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

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(g) 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[1]:

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: According to the Napa County Important Farmlands Map of 2020 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, the entire 1.44-acre Bella Oaks Winery parcel is mapped as Prime Farmland. The California Department of Conservation's "Important Farmland Categories"[2] define 'Prime Farmland' as farmland with the best combination of physical and chemical features able to sustain long term agricultural production. This land has the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields. Land must have been used for irrigated agricultural production at some time during the four years prior to the mapping date.

Although the project site is designated as Prime Farmland by the California Department of Conservation, the site is fully developed with a winery facility, including associated wastewater treatment systems, parking areas, and driveways. Vacant portions of the property consist of the

---

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

[2] California Department of Conservation, "Important Farmland Categories," Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, accessed February 10, 2026, https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/Pages/Important-Farmland-Categories.aspx

footprints of a former residence and barn, both of which were demolished in 2023. Before 2022, the site maintained a 0.26-acre vineyard over the wastewater treatment system, but it has since been removed. Because the project involves the redevelopment of an existing facility and does not remove any land currently or recently used for irrigated agricultural production, it will not result in the conversion of Important Farmland to a non-agricultural use. Furthermore, the project is considered an agricultural support use to local vineyard operations in Napa County and is consistent with the Agricultural Preservation and Land Use policies of the Napa County General Plan, as well as the site's zoning designation of Agricultural Preserve. No change in the land use or zoning is proposed. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion: The project parcel has an Agriculture Resource (AR) General Plan designation and is Zoned AP (Agricultural Preserve) which allows wineries upon the granting of a use permit. Napa County's General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use policies AG/LU-2 and AG/LU-13 recognize wineries, and any use consistent with the Winery Definition Ordinance and clearly accessory to a winery, as agriculture. As such, the proposed winery project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. Additionally, the project parcel is not encumbered by a Williamson Act contract. No impact would occur.

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 the Napa County GIS Sensitivity Layers (Vegetation Map), the property is categorized as "Developed" and contains approximately 0.26 acres of agriculture (since removed). There is no forest land onsite or in the surrounding area. Additionally, the project site is zoned as AP and is not zoned as forest land as

defined in Public Resource Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resource Code Section 4526, or a Timberland Production Zone (TPZ) as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g). 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[3]:
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

[3] CEQA Thresholds and Guidelines Update (baaqmd.gov): https://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/california-environmental-quality-act-ceqa/updated-ceqa-guidelines

Guidelines (updated May 2012). The Thresholds are advisory and may be followed by local agencies at their own discretion.

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

In view of the Supreme Court's opinion, local agencies may rely on Thresholds designed to reflect the impact of locating development near areas of toxic air contamination where such an analysis is required by CEQA or where the agency has determined that such an analysis would assist in making a decision about the project. However, the Thresholds are not mandatory and agencies should apply them only after determining that they reflect an appropriate measure of a project's impacts. These Guidelines may inform environmental review for development projects in the Bay Area, but do not commit local governments or 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 PM2.5, are the major regional air pollutants of concern in the San Francisco Bay Area. Ozone is primarily a problem in the summer, and fine particle pollution in the winter. In Napa County, ozone rarely exceeds health standards, but PM2.5 occasionally does reach unhealthy concentrations. There are multiple reasons for PM2.5 exceedances in Napa County. First, much of the county is wind-sheltered, which tends to trap PM2.5 within the Napa Valley. Second, much of the area is well north of the moderating temperatures of San Pablo Bay and, as a result, Napa County experiences some of the coldest nights in the Bay Area. This leads to greater fireplace use and, in turn, higher PM2.5 levels. Finally, in the winter easterly winds often move fine-particle-laden air from the Central Valley to the Carquinez Strait and then into western Solano and southern Napa County (BAAD, In Your Community: Napa County, April 2016).

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

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 2022. 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 BAAD through 2022. Given the size of the entire project, which is approximately 1,721 square feet of new floor area dedicated to production uses and approximately 3,602 square feet of new tasting room and office area compared to the BAAD's screening criterion of 998,000 square feet (general light

industry) and 105,000 square feet (high quality restaurant) 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 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: Land uses such as schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, hospitals and convalescent homes are considered sensitive to poor air quality, because infants and children, the elderly, and people with health afflictions, especially respiratory ailments, are more susceptible to respiratory infections and other air quality related health problems than the general public. Residential areas are also considered to be sensitive to air pollution because residents, which include children and the elderly, tend to be in close proximity of home for extended periods of time.

Surrounding land uses include vineyards, wineries, and rural residences. The project site is situated approximately 0.5 miles south of Rutherford, 1.3 miles north of Oakville, and over 3 miles south of the City of St. Helena. The nearest residence is roughly 300 feet to the west, and the closest schools (St. Helena Unified Primary and High Schools) are located more than 3.5 miles to the north.

In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from earthmoving and construction activities required for project construction. Earthmoving and construction emissions would have a temporary effect; consisting mainly of dust generated during grading and other

construction activities, exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles, and relatively minor emissions from paints and other architectural coatings. These sources would generally be temporary and/or seasonal in nature and would occur at least 3.5 miles from the closest school and 0.5 miles from the nearest residential community (Rutherford), providing dilution of pollutants and odors. However, proposed construction activities for the winery expansion are in proximity to sensitive receptors (neighboring residences). The Air District recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction impacts. If the proposed project adheres to these relevant best management practices identified by the Air District and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts are considered less than significant.

7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

c. AIR QUALITY

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

1. *Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. The BAAQMD's phone number shall also be visible.*
2. *Water all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) two times per day.*
3. *Cover all haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site.*
4. *Remove all visible mud or dirt traced onto adjacent public roads by using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.*
5. *All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.*
6. *All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.*
7. *Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting off equipment when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five (5) minutes (as required by State Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.*
8. *All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator. Any portable engines greater than 50 horsepower or associated equipment operated within the BAAQMD's jurisdiction shall have either*

a California Air Resources Board (ARB) registration Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) or a BAAQMD permit. For general information regarding the certified visible emissions evaluator or the registration program, visit the ARB FAQ http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/perp/perpfact_04-16-15.pdf or the PERP website http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/portable.htm.

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

7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

b. DUST CONTROL

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

While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, wineries are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. The project proposes to expand the winery facility while maintaining the current permitted production volume of 42,500 gallons per year. Construction-phase pollutants to neighboring residences 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: As previously discussed, the project site is fully developed and disturbed, featuring a 42,500-gallon winery, onsite wastewater treatment systems, a 9-stall parking lot, a groundwater well with storage tanks, and existing landscaping. Vacant portions of the property consist of the footprints of a former residence and barn, both of which were demolished in 2023. The site is bordered by Manely Lane to the north and lies 700 feet west of SR 29, with the surrounding area characterized by actively managed vineyards, rural residences, and scattered wineries. The project proposes to reconstruct/expand the existing winery facility in generally the same location and modify existing landscaping by replacing 14 existing trees—including sycamores, citrus, plum, walnut, and olive—with a refreshed landscape of new sycamore trees, grasses, shrubs, and perennials.

According to the Napa County GIS Environmental Maps (CNDDB layer), the project site is not within range of any documented occurrences of special status plant or wildlife species. No sensitive natural communities or riparian habitats are located within or immediately adjacent to the project site. The nearest blue-line streams are approximately 0.3 miles to the west (unnamed seasonal tributary to Napa River) and 0.6 miles to the east (Napa River). According to the Napa County GIS Sensitivity Layers (Vegetation Map), the property is categorized as "Developed" and contains approximately 0.26 acres of agriculture (since removed).

Nesting Birds/Raptors and Roosting Bats:
Although the project utilizes a developed landscape, there is still potential for nesting raptors and other native birds, as well as roosting bats in the trees on the property. All nesting native bird species are protected from harm under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (MBTA). Proposed tree removal and the temporary and intermittent increases in noise levels due to project construction may cause nest abandonment and death of young or loss of reproductive potential at active nests that could be located near project activities, resulting in potentially significant indirect and cumulative impacts to migratory birds and raptors. To mitigate any potentially significant impacts to protected birds and raptors, **Mitigation Measure BIO-1** requires preconstruction surveys for nesting birds and raptors and coordination with California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) as needed, to reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Additionally, roosting bats are protected from harassment under California Fish and Game Code Section 4150 and regulations regarding non-game animals. To mitigate

any potentially significant impacts to bat species, **Mitigation Measure BIO-2** requires bat habitat assessments and coordination with CDFW as needed, to reduce this impact to a less than significant level. By implementing Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, impacts to special status wildlife species would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Significance Level: Less than significant with mitigation incorporation.

Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation Measure BIO-1 (Pre-construction surveys for nesting birds and raptors): The owner/permittee shall implement the following measures to minimize impacts associated with the potential loss and disturbance of special-status and nesting birds and raptors consistent with and pursuant to California Fish and Game Code Sections 3503 and 3503.5:

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

Alternative methods aimed at flushing out nesting birds prior to preconstruction surveys, whether physical (i.e., removing or disturbing nests by physically disturbing trees with construction equipment), audible (i.e., utilizing sirens or bird cannons), or chemical (i.e., spraying nesting birds or their habitats) would be considered an impact to nesting birds and is prohibited. Any act associated with flushing birds from project areas shall undergo consultation with the USFWS/CDFW prior to any activity that could disturb nesting birds.

Method of Monitoring: The above measures shall be incorporated as Conditions of Approval of the project (if approved) and apply to associated building and grading permits with survey recommendations to be implemented in conjunction with all construction activities.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2 (Pre-construction bat tree habitat assessment and surveys): Prior to any tree trimming or removal, a qualified biologist shall conduct a habitat assessment for bats, unless otherwise approved in writing by CDFW. The habitat assessment shall be conducted a minimum of 30 to 90 days prior to tree trimming or removal and shall include a visual inspection of potential roosting features of trees to be removed (e.g., cavities, crevices in wood and bark, exfoliating bark for colonial species, suitable canopy for foliage roosting species). If suitable habitat trees are found, they shall be flagged or otherwise clearly marked, CDFW shall be notified immediately, and tree trimming or removal shall not proceed without approval in writing from CDFW. If the presence of bats is presumed or documented, trees may be removed only: a) using the two-step removal process detailed below during seasonal periods of bat activity, from approximately March 1 through April 15 and September 1 through October 15, or b) after a qualified biologist, under prior written approval of the proposed survey methods by CDFW, conducts night emergence surveys or completes visual examination of roost features that establish absence of roosting bats. Two-step tree removal shall be conducted over two consecutive days, as follows: 1) the first day (in the afternoon), under the direct supervision and instruction by a qualified biologist with experience conducting two-step tree removal, limbs and branches shall be removed by a tree cutter using chainsaws only. Limbs with cavities, crevices or deep bark fissures shall be avoided, and 2) the second day the entire tree shall be removed.

Method of Monitoring: The above measures shall be incorporated as Conditions of Approval of the project (if approved) and apply to associated building and grading permits with survey recommendations to be implemented in conjunction with all construction activities.

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: As discussed above, no sensitive natural communities or riparian habitats are located within or immediately adjacent to the project site. The nearest blue-line streams are approximately 0.3

miles to the west (unnamed seasonal tributary to Napa River) and 0.6 miles to the east (Napa River). According to the Napa County GIS Sensitivity Layers (Vegetation Map), the property is categorized as "Developed" and contains approximately 0.26 acres of agriculture (since removed). For these reasons, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities. Impacts would be less than significant.

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 County GIS layers and staff inspection of the site, the project development area does not contain vernal pools, wetlands, or seasonal wetlands. Therefore, no impacts to vernal pools or wetlands are expected.

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 Napa County Baseline Data Report emphasizes preservation of wildlife corridors and prevention of habitat fragmentation. According to the Napa County of Environmental Mapping (GIS CNDDB layer), there are no wildlife corridors on the parcel. The project activities would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with their corridors or nursery sites. The 1.44-acre site is currently developed as a winery and is surrounded by similar facilities, vineyards, and rural residences. Because the proposed improvements are confined to previously disturbed areas, the project will have a less-than-significant impact on wildlife movement.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion: All proposed project improvements are located within previously disturbed areas and sit well beyond established stream setbacks. Construction will occur on slopes of less than 5 percent. Additionally, because the property is zoned Agricultural Preserve (AP), it is exempt from the vegetation canopy cover retention and removal mitigation requirements of Napa County Code Section (NCC) 18.108.020. No impacts would occur.

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 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?

AND

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

Discussion: According to Napa County Environmental Resource, no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified within the project site. If resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified

archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval:

> *7.2 ARCHEOLOGICAL FINDING*
>
> *In the event that archeological artifacts or human remains are discovered during construction, work shall cease in a 50-foot radius surrounding the area of discovery. The permittee shall contact the PBES Department for further guidance, which will likely include the requirement for the permittee to hire a qualified professional to analyze the artifacts encountered and to determine if additional measures are required.*
>
> *If human remains are encountered during project development, all work in the vicinity must be halted, and the Napa County Coroner informed, so that the Coroner can determine if an investigation of the cause of death is required, and if the remains are of Native American origin. If the remains are of Native American origin, the permittee shall comply with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.*

On December 10, 2025, 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. No requests for consultation were received. See Section 18 (Tribal Cultural Resources) for further discussion.

Significance Level: Less than significant 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. If human remains are encountered during project development, construction of the project is required to cease, and the requirements of Condition of Approval 7.2, listed above, would apply. Impacts would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant 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. 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.

The proposed project would comply with Title 24 energy use requirements, and 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 proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency because there are no plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

Significance Level: No 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 active faults that run beneath the project site on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. According to Napa County GIS Environmental Maps (Fault layers), the project is over 3 miles from the nearest Alquist-Priolo Earthquake fault zone (West Napa fault). The project will need to comply with standard County building permit policies which require geotechnical reports and appropriate structural design considerations as a part of the building permit application. Geotechnical reports are prepared by a California licensed geotechnical engineer and include recommendations for appropriate setback widths from fault traces that may exist on a property. As such, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

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. The project site is identified as having a medium 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 required.

iv. Landslides?

Discussion: According to the Napa County GIS Environmental Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers), the project site is not in proximity to any landslide areas. Impacts would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion: The total proposed grading for development of the project is estimated to be 370 cubic yards. Based upon the Soil Survey of Napa County, Ca prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) the soil is classified as Bale Clay Loam (104). Soils from the Bale Clay Loam Series (0-2 percent slope) are found on alluvial fans and floodplains, are somewhat poorly drained and erosion hazard is low.

All on site civil improvements are required to be constructed according to plans prepared by a registered civil engineer, which will be reviewed and approved by the County Engineering Division prior to the commencement of any on site land preparation or construction. Grading and drainage improvements shall be constructed according to the current Napa County Road and Street Standards (RSS), Chapter 16.28 of the Napa County Code, and Appendix J of the California Building Code. Prior to issuance of a building or grading permit the owner shall submit the necessary documents for Erosion Control as determined by the area of disturbance of the proposed development in accordance with the Napa Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Guidance. Engineering Division Conditions of Approval have been included to ensure compliance with the requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

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: The project site features Bale Clay Loam soils (104) and Holocene fan deposits. Existing vegetation consists of domestic-introduced landscaping. While Napa County GIS Resource Maps indicate a medium liquefaction potential, all construction must meet current building standards. Adherence to the latest California Building Code for seismic stability will minimize potential risks, ensuring impacts remain less than significant.

Prior to permit issuance, a geotechnical report must be approved by the Building Division to ensure compliance with the California Building Code. This oversight addresses potential soil instabilities—including liquefaction and landslides—to prevent on- or off-site collapse. Additionally, earthwork will follow Engineering Division standards for slope stability, while erosion control measures will be implemented per the Napa Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program to manage runoff and drainage impacts. Thus, potential impacts relating to soil stability will be addressed through appropriate structural design and construction standards and as a result, will be reduced to less than significant.

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, dated September 2025, was prepared by Summit Engineering Inc. (**Exhibit E**), which outlines the required wastewater system to meet the needs of the

proposed increase in employees, visitation, marketing program, and 42,500-gallon annual wine production.

The Wastewater Feasibility Study estimates the project will generate up to 1,350 gallons of sanitary sewage on days with 80-person events. To manage this, the project proposes segregating and replacing existing systems; specifically, winery process wastewater will no longer be sent to the existing treatment system. Instead, sanitary sewage will be collected in two existing 1,500-gallon septic tanks, supplemented by a new pretreatment system (e.g., Orenco Systems AdvanTex). The existing mound system will be converted to subsurface drip disposal, with a 200% reserve area located on a neighboring parcel (APN 027-250-069). Additionally, a 1,500-gallon underground grease interceptor will be installed for the proposed commercial kitchen.

To support the annual production of 42,500 gallons of wine, a new process wastewater system is proposed. During peak flows, the winery is estimated to generate 1,417 gallons per day. Two options are being considered: Option 1 involves a "hold-and-haul" system utilizing a 10,000-gallon underground storage tank for off-hauling to a facility like EBMUD. Option 2 involves an onsite package treatment system with land-application across a 15,000-square-foot area on the offsite disposal parcel (APN 027-250-069). The new process water treatment system will be designed and installed in accordance with all necessary County and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) criteria and permits. It will also comply with the requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board General Waste Discharge Requirements for Winery Process Water (“General Order”). Environmental Health Division Conditions of Approval have been included to ensure compliance with County and State requirements, resulting in a less-than-significant impact.

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 in the project area or were encountered on the property when the existing building was constructed. 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 Standard Condition of Approval 7.2 identified in Section 5 above. 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)[4]. 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

[4] https://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/california-environmental-quality-act-ceqa/updated-ceqa-guidelines, April 2022

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 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?

AND

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: 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 (CO2), methane, ozone, and the fluorocarbons, which contribute to climate change. CO2 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 reconstruction of an existing 8,177 square foot winery building and 3,740 square foot uncovered crush pad and expanding them into a 17,192 square foot facility, as well as upgrades to the existing driveway entrances and eight (8) new parking spaces. As discussed in Section 3. (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 3. (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 of carbon sequestered by existing vegetation that is removed as part of the project compared to a "no project" scenario (hereinafter referred to as Operational Sequestration Emissions); and ii) ongoing emissions from the energy used to maintain and operate the winery, including vehicle trips associated with employee and visitor trips (hereinafter referred to as Operational Emissions).

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 is currently being updated to include regulations to assist in the reduction of air quality impacts associated with construction, such as prohibiting natural gas appliance and plumbing. The new construction will be required to install energy efficient fixtures complying with CA Building Code Title 24 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. According to the Traffic Study prepared by Crane Transportation Group in November 2024 (supplemented by a Memorandum dated November 25, 2025; Exhibit G), the project would generate less than 110 net new daily passenger vehicle and truck trips and is presumed to have a less-than-significant impact for VMT according to the LCI Technical Advisory and Napa County TIS Guidelines. However, the Traffic Study

recommends a Transportation Demand Management Plan to reduce the demand of vehicles to/from the site consistent with County General Plan policies and guidelines. See Section 17. (Transportation) for further discussion.

According to the checked Voluntary Best Management Practices Measures submitted with the project application, the applicant plans to implement the following GHG reduction strategies: install roof-mounted photovoltaic panels, add one electric vehicle to the winery's fleet, implement a transportation demand management plan, utilize energy conserving lighting, install a cool roof, provide bicycle incentives to employees, install water efficient fixtures, implement low-impact development principles and practices, comply with the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance, recycle 75% of all waste and compost 75% of the food and garden material generated onsite, implement a sustainable purchasing and shipping program, plant shade trees at the employee parking lot to cool the surfaces area and provide shading to the auxiliary building, install an electric vehicle charging station, and limit the amount of grading and 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.

The proposed tree removal is subject to GHG analysis required by General Plan Policy CON-65(e), as the proposed total tree removal would result in a loss of carbon sequestration capacity of the site. The project involves removing up to 14 trees—including sycamore, citrus, plum, walnut, and olive varieties—while preserving over 20 others. To offset tree removal, the project will plant 16 new sycamores and adhere to standard tree protection requirements.

By adhering to these relevant design standards identified by BAAD, the requirements of the California Building Code, and Conditions of Approval, the project would be consistent with the State's long-term climate goals of being carbon neutral by 2045. Impacts would be less than significant.

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 impact.

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

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 buildings. According to Google Earth, the nearest schools to the project site (St. Helena Unified Primary and High Schools) are over 3.5 miles north of the project site in St. Helena. 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 Environmental Protection Agency (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: The Napa County Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) outlines procedures, including establishing leadership roles and responsibilities of various agency staff, that guide local preparedness, response, recovery, and resource management efforts associated with occurrence of a natural disaster, significant emergency, or other threat to public safety. The project would not result in closure or permanent obstruction of adjacent public rights-of-way. No component of the implementation of the EOP would otherwise be impaired by the proposed modifications to the use permit. Proposed modifications to the driveway entrances will meet Napa County standards. The proposed winery modifications would not obstruct an emergency response or evacuation plan. 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. The project is located on Manley Lane, a county-maintained public road approximately 700 feet west of SR 29. Situated within a Local Responsibility Area and outside of any designated Fire Hazard Severity Zones, the project will comply with all applicable State and County Fire Codes. Key safety features include a 100-foot defensible space around structures, interior fire sprinklers, dedicated on-site firefighting water, and emergency vehicle access. Proposed upgrades to the driveway entrances will comply with Napa County Road and Street Standards (NCRSS) and California Fire Safe Regulations (FSR), ensuring safe ingress and egress for both visitors and emergency personnel. By requiring strict adherence to County Building and Fire Codes, and State Fire Safe Regulations, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant. See Section 20. Wildfire for additional detail.

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 Napa Valley Subbasin (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. Note: The project well is located in the GSA Subbasin.

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[5] 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."[6]

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 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.

---

[5] The County's Water Availability Guidelines (adopted May 2015)

[6] Refer to Figure 1: Significant Streams for Tier 3, located at 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.

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) the project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project proposes to segregate the existing process waste and sanitary sewage treatment systems so that process wastewater will no longer be sent to the existing wastewater treatment system. A Wastewater Feasibility Study, dated September 2025, was prepared by Summit Engineering Inc. (**Exhibit E**) which concludes the proposed replacement and wastewater treatment systems will provide sufficient capacity for disposal of the anticipated sanitary sewage and process wastewater flows.

The wastewater treatment systems will be designed and installed in accordance with all necessary Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services (PBES) and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) criteria and permits. The facility will also have to enroll for coverage under of the State Water Resources Control Board General Waste Discharge Requirements for Winery Process Water ("General Order") and monitoring requirements specific to the amount of waste discharged. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings, conditioning that the plans shall be designed by a licensed Civil Engineer or Registered Environmental Health Specialist and approved by the Division of Environmental Health. Ongoing water quality monitoring will be required. Impacts would be less than significant. Additionally, water quality would be maintained through standard stormwater quality treatment control measures and compliance with Engineering Division Conditions of Approval. Impacts would be less than significant.

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 (WAA) was prepared by Summit Engineering in April 2026 (**Exhibit F**). Following the County's May 2015 WAA Guidance Document and Interim Standards, this report includes a Tier 1 analysis demonstrating no net increase in baseline groundwater usage under existing entitlements. Tier 2 and Tier 3 analyses were not required, as the project well is located more than 500 feet from the nearest offsite well and over 1,500 feet from the nearest spring or significant stream.

Tier 1 (Water Use Analysis):

The project proposes to increase staff, establish a marketing program, and replace a portion of the winery's landscaping with WELO-compliant alternatives. To promote on-site water conservation, the facility will implement best management practices (BMPs) such as installing water-efficient fixtures and educating staff and visitors on sustainable practices. Additionally, the project incorporates low-impact development (LID) features into its stormwater control design, utilizing permeable pavement and directing roof and surface runoff into a new 17,000-gallon storage tank for landscape irrigation reuse. No changes are proposed to the previously approved wine production volume or daily visitation.

The property is 1.44 acres in size and contains one existing groundwater well that will supply all water uses onsite (project well). The project well is located within the Napa Valley Subbasin (GSA). The WAA documents the project well (#E22-00755) has a completed depth of 600 feet with a 50-foot annular seal. At the time of completion in 2023, the well yielded 200 gallons per minute during an 8 hour air lift pump test.

According to the Napa County WAA - Guidance Document and 2024 Interim Standards, properties located in the GSA are subject to a Reduced Water Use Screening Criteria of 0.3 acre-feet of water per acre of land per year except where current use is more than 0.3 acre-feet per year (AFY) in which case no-net increase in water use beyond existing baseline conditions is the applicable screening criteria.

The subject 1.44 acre parcel is in the GSA and therefore the water use screening criteria is calculated as follows:

Reduced Water Use Screening Criteria = 1.44 acres x 0.3 acre-feet per acre per year

Reduced Water Use Screening Criteria = 0.432 AFY

According to the WAA (**Exhibit F**), both the baseline water usage under existing entitlements (708,070 gallons/year or 2.17 AFY) and proposed water demands (659,980 gallons/year or 2.03 AFY) exceed the Reduced Water Use Screening Criteria (0.432 AFY). Because baseline water usage under existing entitlements is already above this screening threshold, the project must comply with the no-net-increase standard. Consequently, proposed water use cannot exceed baseline water usage under existing entitlements (2.17 AFY).

GROUNDWATER USAGE TOTAL:

Baseline water usage under existing entitlements: 2.17 AFY based on well flow data collected in 2020 (see Exhibit F).

Proposed: 2.03 AFY consisting of the following-

- Wine Production at 0.783 AFY (255,000 gal.)
- Full-Time Employees at 0.168 AFY (54,750 gal.)
- Daily Visitors at 0.543 AFY (177,000 gal.)
- Marketing Event Guests at 0.022 AFY (7,200 gal.)
- Landscaping at 0.509 AFY (166,030 gal.)

Difference: Net reduction of 0.14 AFY

By implementing Conditions of Approval 4.20(c) and 6.15(e) below, which limit pumping to 2.03 AFY (no net increase over baseline water usage under existing entitlements), the project satisfies the Tier 1 screening criteria. Additionally, standard Conditions of Approval require that new landscaping complies with the County's Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance (Chapter 18.118 of the County Code).

4.9 GROUND WATER MANAGEMENT – WELLS

This condition is implemented by the Planning, Building and Environmental Services (PBES) Department:

The permittee shall be required (at the permittee's expense) to record well monitoring data (specifically, static water level no less than quarterly, and the volume of water withdrawn no less than monthly). Such data will be provided to the County, if the Director of Planning, Building, and Environmental Services (PBES Director) determines that substantial evidence[7] indicates that water usage at the project is affecting, or would potentially affect, groundwater supplies or nearby wells. If data indicates the need for additional monitoring, and if the applicant is unable to secure monitoring access to neighboring wells, onsite monitoring wells may need to be established to gauge potential impacts on the groundwater resource utilized for the project. Water usage shall be minimized by use of best available control technology and best water management conservation practices.

In order to support the County's groundwater monitoring program, well monitoring data as discussed above will be provided to the County if the Director PBES determines that such

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

data could be useful in supporting the County's groundwater monitoring program. The project well will be made available for inclusion in the groundwater monitoring network if the Director of PBES determines that the well could be useful in supporting the program.

In the event that changed circumstances or significant new information provide substantial evidence[1] that the groundwater system referenced in this use permit would significantly affect the groundwater basin, the PBES Director shall be authorized to recommend additional reasonable conditions on the permittee, or revocation of this permit, as necessary to meet the requirements of the County Code and to protect public health, safety, and welfare.

6.15(e) Groundwater Demand Management Program:

1. *The owner/permittee shall install a flow regulation device on the project well (#*E22-00755*). Documentation of the installation of the flow regulation device shall be provided to the County prior to building permit final occupancy.*
2. *The permittee shall install a meter on the project well (#*E22-00755*). The meter shall be placed in a location that will allow for the measurement of groundwater used from the project well. Prior to the issuance of building permits for the winery and associated structures, as approved under this permit, 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 project well.*
3. *The Plan shall identify how best available technology and best management water conservation practices will be applied throughout the parcel.*
4. *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.*
5. *As groundwater consuming activities 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 permit.*
6. *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 from the project well exceeds, or is on track to exceed, 2.03 acre-feet per year, 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 and shall be submitted to the PBES Director for review and action.*
7. *The permittee's well shall be included in the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring*

program if the County finds the well suitable.

8. *At the completion of the reporting period per 6.16(e)(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 schedule:*
    - *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 meter during regular business hours. Upon continued increases in operations approved under this permit, the PBES Director, or the Director's designated representative, has the right to revise the data submittal schedule.*

Tier 2 (Well and Spring Interference Analysis):

According to the Napa County WAA - Guidance Document and 2024 Interim Standards, a Tier 2 interference analysis is required for any proposed increase in groundwater use within 500 feet of an offsite well or 1,500 feet of an offsite spring. However, this analysis is not required for discretionary projects using existing wells if there is no increase in groundwater extraction.

The project utilizes an existing well, and the WAA estimates a net reduction in pumping of approximately 0.14 AFY. Furthermore, the Project Conditions of Approval explicitly limit pumping to ensure no increase over existing levels. As such, the Tier 2 requirements are satisfied, and no further analysis is necessary.

Tier 3 (Groundwater/Surface Water Interaction):

A Tier 3 review is the County's adopted method for complying with its duties under the Public Trust Doctrine. As discussed herein, the existing project will comply with the WAA guidance document.

The latest Interim Napa County Well Permit Standards and WAA Requirements require an analysis of potential groundwater to surface water interaction for new, altered, or increased groundwater use occurring from project wells within 1,500 feet of any County-identified Significant Stream inside the Napa River Watershed. The project well is over 3,000 feet from the two nearest Significant Streams (the Napa River and an unnamed stream to the northwest), therefore a stream interference analysis is not required for the project.

Based on the analysis presented in the WAA and recommended Conditions of Approval, the project well presumptively meets Napa County's Tier 3 WAA guidelines for groundwater-surface water interaction. The County has satisfied its duty to consider impacts to trust resources and no further analysis is required. Impacts would be less than significant.

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 site is not located within a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 100-year flood zone, in a dam or levee failure inundation area, or in an area subject to seiche or tsunami (Napa County GIS FEMA flood zone and dam levee inundation areas layers; Napa County General Plan - Safety Element. pg. 10-20.) The project would not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off the project site. Improvement plans prepared prior to the issuance of a building permit would ensure that the proposed project does not increase runoff flow rate or volume as a result of project implementation. General Plan Policy CON-50 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. An estimated 370 cubic yards of spoils are proposed to be disposed of by hauling offsite. 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 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 parcel is not located in an area that is known to be subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. Impacts would be less than significant.

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: See response to Subsection 10(c) above.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion: In January 2022 the Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) submitted a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) to the Department of Water Resources (DWR). The project aligns with the GSA 'no net increase' standards by limiting annual pumping to 2.03 AFY, which represents a net reduction of roughly 0.14 AFY compared to existing conditions. Water quality would be maintained through standard stormwater quality treatment control measures and compliance with Engineering Division Conditions of Approval. Impacts would therefore be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING:

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

AND

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: The project would not occur within an established community, nor would it result in the division of an established community. The project complies with the Napa County Code and all other applicable regulations. The subject parcel is located in the AP (Agricultural Preserve) zoning district, which allows wineries and uses accessory to wineries subject to use permit approval. The proposed project is compliant with the physical limitations of the Napa County Zoning Ordinance. The County has adopted the Winery Definition Ordinance (WDO) to protect agriculture and open space and to

regulate winery development and expansion in a manner that avoids potential negative environmental effects.

Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-1 of the 2008 General Plan states that the County shall, "preserve existing agricultural land uses and plan for agriculture and related activities as the primary land uses in Napa County." The property's General Plan land use designation is AR (Agricultural Resource), which 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 continued use of the property for the "fermenting and processing of grape juice into wine" (NCC §18.08.640) and proposed marketing 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: Less than significant 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?
AND

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: 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.

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?

AND

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

Discussion: Noise from winery operations is generally limited and intermittent, meaning the sound level can vary during the day and over the course of the year, depending on the activities at the winery. The primary noise-generating activities are equipment associated with wineries including refrigeration equipment, bottling equipment, barrel washing, de-stemmers and press activities occurring during the harvest crush season, delivery trucks, and other vehicles. The Napa County General Plan EIR indicates the average, or equivalent, sound level (Leq) for winery activities is 51dBA in the morning and 41dBA in the afternoon. Audibility of a new noise source and/or increase in noise levels within recognized acceptable limits are not usually considered to be significant noise impacts, but these concerns should be addressed and considered in the planning and environmental review processes.

As described in the Project Setting, above, land uses within vicinity of the project consist of vineyard, residences 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 decibels for more than half of any hour in the window of daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.), the timeframe within which the winery would have visitation and marketing events. Noise impacts of the 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).

Construction:
The project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during grading and construction activities for the proposed reconstructed winery building and site improvements. The project is situated within 300 to 550 feet of four residences (1301 and 1205 Manely Lane; 1280 and 1250 Manley Lane). Impacts due to a temporary increase in ambient noise generated from construction activities, or from groundborne vibration, would remain below a level of significance through compliance with Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). The County Noise Ordinance limit construction activities to daylight hours (7 a.m. – 7 p.m.) on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity. In addition to the County Noise Ordinance, the project applicant will be required to comply with project Conditions of Approval (below) related to construction noise, which will limit activities further by requiring construction activities to be limited to daylight hours, vehicles to be muffled, and backup alarms adjusted to the lowest allowable levels. The proposed project would not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts and impacts would be less than significant.

> *"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."*

Additional regulations contained within County Code Chapter 8.16 establish exterior noise criteria for various land uses in the County.

Winery Operations:
The project proposes reconstructing and expanding the winery facility within its existing footprint. Permitted production will remain at 42,500 gallons per year, and operational hours will continue to align with normal daytime activity. Since production volume is not increasing, noise from winery truck traffic is expected to remain unchanged. According to County Traffic Impact Study Guidelines, a winery of this size typically generates an average of one truck trip per day, increasing to four during harvest. Additionally, the project includes replacing existing mechanical equipment located on a pad approximately 200 to 550 feet from four neighboring residences. According to the Environmental Noise Assessment prepared by Salter in December 2025 and updated February 2026 (**Exhibit H**), noise levels

from future mechanical equipment will be reduced to a level of less than significant by implementing **Mitigation Measure NOISE-1** below.

Other potential noise-generating activities include the addition of six employees, a new employee parking lot, and the establishment of a new marketing program. This program would consist of ten annual events for up to 40 guests each, plus one larger annual event for up to 80 guests; all events would occur between 10:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. Events would be held indoors and in two outdoor areas- one at the front entry to the winery and the other at the crush pad.

Note: While daily vehicle traffic will remain at the currently permitted 25 vehicles, the applicant requests that the modified Conditions of Approval replace the allowance for five monthly tour buses with sprinter-style vans. This change clarifies that visitor capacity is limited to an average of 60 people per day (420 per week) and a maximum of 75 people per day (525 per week). Because the existing permit already allows for up to 75 daily visitors (based on County Trip Generation estimates), this proposal represents no increase in daily visitation.

Parking Lots:
The nearest residences are approximately 150 feet west of the proposed employee parking lot and 160 feet east of the existing visitor lot. Noise from visitation, marketing events, and expanded employee parking is determined by vehicle volume and proximity to property lines. Under the proposed use permit, the following three scenarios were evaluated:

- Employee Commutes: An additional 12 daily trips (6 morning arrivals, 6 evening departures).
- Daily Operations & Small Events: Daily use including events for up to 40 people.
- Marketing Events: Events for up to 80 people.

Typical parking lot noise—including engine starts, car alarms, and conversations—was analyzed in the Environmental Noise Assessment. The study concludes that noise levels will decrease to 41 dBA at the nearest property lines, thereby complying with the County Noise Ordinance. Impacts would be less than significant.

Events:
The Environmental Noise Assessment confirms that proposed outdoor events will comply with County noise standards. To evaluate a worst-case scenario, the Assessment modeled a large-scale event (80 guests) held outdoors until 10:00 p.m., split between the front entry and the crush pad:

- Front Entry (30 Guests): Assuming 15 guests speak simultaneously with raised voices (82 dBA at the source), noise levels would dissipate to 37–39 dBA at nearby residences.
- Crush Pad (50 Guests): Assuming 25 guests speak simultaneously with raised voices (84 dBA at the source), noise levels would drop to 35–41 dBA at the nearest residential neighbors.

Based on these calculations, speech levels at all neighboring properties comply with County daytime and nighttime requirements. Furthermore, because ambient traffic noise from SR 29 ranges from 39 dBA to 48 dBA, guest speech would remain largely inaudible or masked by traffic, with the exception of occasional individual voices. Consequently, noise impacts are considered less than significant. To remain consistent with the Environmental Noise Assessment, project conditions limit the use of the front entry and crush pad to a maximum of 30 and 50 people, respectively.

As described above, changes to parking, events, and staffing will result in less-than-significant noise impacts. Furthermore, 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 the proposed changes do not create a significant noise impact. Project Conditions of Approval require events and non-amplified music to finish by 10:00 p.m., with quiet cleanup finished by 11:00 p.m. in accordance with the Exterior Noise Limits Table under Section 8.16.070 of the County Code. Amplified music or sound systems would not be permitted for outdoor events as identified in Standard Condition of Approval 4.10 below. Temporary events would be subject to County Code Chapter 5.36 which regulates proposed temporary events. The proposed project would not result in long-term significant permanent noise impacts.

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

Significance Level: Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporation.

Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation Measure NOISE-1: Prior to building permit issuance, a qualified acoustical consultant shall analyze the total noise of the selected mechanical system and submit a noise assessment to the Planning Division demonstrating that the aggregate noise level of all mechanical equipment 1) complies with the County Noise Ordinance and 2) is calculated to be less than 70dBA. Final design, location, and orientation of mechanical equipment shall be dictated by findings in the noise assessment. Compliance with this mitigation measure may necessitate one or more of the following noise reducing measures:

a. Reselect quieter equipment. Cooling units with variable speed capability often generate less noise than their constant speed counterparts.
b. Locate equipment close to the ground. Do not elevate equipment more than needed for ground water clearance.
c. Enclose the equipment in a solid mechanical yard with walls extending above the height of the tallest equipment. Exact heights may be determined later.

d. Line in the interior of the mechanical yard walls with an acoustically absorptive material such as perforated metal panels or acoustical plaster to reduce built up noise.

Method of Monitoring: The above measure shall be incorporated as Conditions of Approval of the project (if approved) and apply to associated building permits.

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 influence area of the Napa County Airport, according to the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: the closest airport to the subject parcel is the Angwin Airport located over 4-miles to the northeast. No impacts would occur.

Significance Level: No impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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.

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. Six (6) additional employees are requested as part of the project which could lead to negligible population growth in Napa County. Relative to the County's projected low to moderate growth rate and overall adequate programmed housing supply that population growth does not rise to a level of environmental significance. In addition, the project would be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs. Cumulative impacts 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.

Additional employees and visitors to the winery could increase demand for group transportation services to the winery, though the potential for employment changes of other businesses supporting the winery's requested operations is uncertain, unquantifiable, and speculative. 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 does not involve the conversion of housing. The proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people and will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. A less than significant impact would occur.

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 conditions and there will be no foreseeable impact to emergency response times with the adoption of standard Conditions of Approval. The Fire Department and Engineering Services Division have reviewed the application and recommend approval as conditioned. School impact mitigation fees, which assist local school districts with capacity building measures, will be levied pursuant to building permit submittal. The proposed project will have little to no impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from any building permit fees, property tax increases, and taxes from the sale of wine will help meet the costs of providing public services to the property. The proposed project will have a less than significant impact on public services.

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: Less than significant 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. TRANSPORATION:

Would the project:

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

Discussion: 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 project proposes increasing the winery's staff from four to 10 full-time employees, adding 12 daily commute trips (six arrivals and six departures). While daily vehicle traffic will remain at the currently permitted 25 vehicles, the applicant seeks to replace the allowance for five monthly tour buses with sprinter-style vans. The proposed marketing plan also includes 10 annual events for 40 guests and one larger event for 80 guests. To meet current County and State standards, the project includes widening the winery's existing driveway entrances.

Based on the Napa County Winery Trip Generation Worksheet, the winery's existing permit generates an average of 71 daily trips during non-harvest season and 75 during harvest. The proposed staff and marketing expansion would add a maximum of 18 new daily trips on both weekdays and weekends; as a result, the project did not require a full traffic impact study.

A September 2025 assessment prepared by Crane Transportation Group (**Exhibit G**) confirmed that the project's driveway sightlines and on-site parking are adequate, provided specific conditions are met. To ensure clear sightlines, the assessment recommends installing and maintaining landscaping that does not obstruct views east or west along the road. On-site parking is sufficient for daily use and events if 75% of event guests use shuttles and no more than six parking spaces are utilized by employees at any given time, as discussed further under subsection (e.) below.

The study also proposes a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan to meet County Code limits—specifically 24 Average Daily Trips (ADT) for 40-person events and 40 ADT for large events. This will be achieved by closing the winery to regular visitors and providing dedicated shuttles on event days. On January 9, 2026, the Department of Public Works accepted these findings, adding conditions for sight distance maintenance, encroachment permits for work in the county right-of-way, and TDM implementation.

Under the 1989 use permit modification (**Exhibit I**), the winery successfully implemented several safety and access improvements, including widening the driveway, installing SR 29 turn lanes and tapers, and funding railroad crossing gates on Manley Lane. All previous mitigation measures and Conditions of Approval have been met.

Current operational measures require the winery to schedule deliveries, tours, and tastings before 4:00 p.m. and avoid grape hauls during peak hours. However, the 4:00 p.m. restriction originally proposed in 1989 is no longer necessary now that all traffic safety infrastructure is complete. Furthermore,

standard Conditions of Approval already require that tours, tastings, marketing activities, and recurring site trips be scheduled to avoid peak hours. Consequently, the Department of Public Works recommends approving the request to extend daily visitation hours to 6:00 p.m., if sight distance is maintained at the winery driveways and the proposed Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan is implemented.

The Napa Countywide Bicycle Plan has been completed and adopted by the Napa Valley Transportation Authority (NVTA) and the County. The plan encourages new developments to incorporate bicycle friendly designs. St. Helena Highway is proposed as a Class II bike lane past the proposed project site therefore some visitors are expected to arrive by bicycle to access the proposed project. The project would provide bicycle racks for visitors in accordance with General Plan policies, as conditioned.

The proposed design plans were reviewed by the Engineering Division and Department of Public Works and determined to meet County Road and Street standards, as conditioned. Final plans will be reviewed and approved by the Department of Public Works. As proposed, the project would not conflict with any plans, ordinances or policies addressing the circulation system. All designs will comply with the County and State standards for safe access into and throughout the site. The project would not substantially increase hazards due to design features. Impacts would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

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 T*echnical 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 TIS Guidelines 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. According to the Napa County Winery Trip Generation Worksheet, the project is estimated to generate less than 110 net new daily passenger vehicle and truck trips and is presumed to have a less-than-significant impact for VMT according to the LCI Technical Advisory and Napa County TIS Guidelines. 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 impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

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

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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 was analyzed to determine if the proposed parking supply meets the daily demands of harvest and marketing events. According to the Crane Transportation Group assessment (**Exhibit G**), the site will provide 27 total spaces: 9 for visitors, 6 for employees, and 12 valet/overflow spaces. To manage this supply, the project will implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan that assumes employee carpooling and limits on-site staff parking to six vehicles at any given time.

Winery visitation remains by-appointment only. While daily traffic is capped at the existing limit of 25 vehicles, the project clarifies that visitor capacity is a maximum of 75 people per day. The previous allowance for five monthly tour buses will be replaced by sprinter-style vans. Under typical operations, visitor arrivals will be staggered so that no more than nine guest vehicles are on-site simultaneously, with overflow spaces accommodating the sprinter vans.

On days with marketing events, regular visitation will be suspended, and 75% of attendees must be shuttled to the site. The parking plan accommodates events as follows:

- 40-Person Events: Requires 11 spaces (2 for guest sprinter vans, 4 for guest vehicles, and 5 for employees).
- 80-Person Events: Requires 19 spaces (4 for guest sprinter vans, 8 for guest vehicles, and 7 for employees).

As discussed previously, Conditions of Approval require the winery to implement the proposed Transportation Demand Management Plan to reduce the demand of vehicles to/from the site consistent with County policies and guidelines. There would be no conflicts with General Plan Policy CIR-14 the project has demonstrated there is adequate onsite parking through the use of the above-described parking management strategies.

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:

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: As discussed in Section 5 (Cultural Resources) above, there are no known historical resources on site. On December 10, 2025, 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. Staff received a response from the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation on January 15, 2026, indicating the project area was not within their aboriginal territories. On March 17, 2026, the County also sent consultation closure notices to the Middletown Rancheria and to the Mishewal Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley because no request for consultation was received, and more than 30 days had elapsed since the County's consultation invitation was provided.

Adhering to the standard Conditions of Approval outlined in Section 5 (Cultural Resources) will protect inadvertently discovered resources and reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Significance Level: Less than significant impact.

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: As discussed in detail in Section 7 (Geology and Soils), a Wastewater Feasibility Study, dated September 2025, was prepared by Summit Engineering Inc. (**Exhibit E**) which outlines the required wastewater system to meet the needs of the proposed project. The project proposes segregating and replacing existing systems; specifically, winery process wastewater will no longer be sent to the existing treatment system. Instead, sanitary sewage will be collected in the existing septic tanks, supplemented by a new pretreatment system and a grease interceptor. The existing mound system will be converted to subsurface drip disposal, with a 200% reserve area located on the neighboring vineyard parcel at APN 027-250-069. The proposed process wastewater treatment system includes two alternatives for treatment and disposal: a 10,000-gallon underground 'hold-and-haul' storage system (Option 1), or a package treatment system that utilizes land application on the neighboring vineyard parcel (Option 2). The process wastewater treatment system will be designed per RWQCB and PBES requirements. The facility will have to enroll for coverage under the General Waste Discharge Requirements for Winery Process Water and meet discharge standards and monitoring requirements specific to the amount of waste discharged. The division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings, and conditioned that the plans shall be designed by a licensed Civil Engineer or Registered Environmental Health Specialist and approved by the Division of Environmental Health. Ongoing water quality monitoring will be required.

Based on the proposed uses, the onsite water system will be classified as a new public water system per the State of California Drinking Water Requirements. Typical infrastructure required for a public water system includes, but is not limited to, a well with a minimum 50-foot annular seal, water storage tanks that meet design and construction standards, UV light treatment (usually located in a pumphouse), and water lines that meet setbacks. The existing project well has a 50-foot annular seal and is proposed to be used for the public water system serving the project. Prior to occupancy, the owner/permittee is required to submit a technical report completed by a licensed engineer with experience in designing water systems. The technical report must be submitted to the Regional Water Quality Control Board prior to beginning any water-related improvements. Additionally, the owner/permittee must obtain an annual operating permit for the water system from County Environmental Health and comply with all required monitoring and reporting. Impacts would be less than significant.

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. Through compliance with County code impacts are less than significant.

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 and Water Quality), a Water Availability Analysis (WAA) was prepared by Summit Engineering Inc. in April 2026 (**Exhibit F**). The WAA indicates that both existing (2.17 AFY) and proposed (2.03 AFY) water use exceed the Reduced Water Use Screening Criteria of 0.432 AFY for the 1.44-acre parcel. Because the baseline water usage under existing entitlements already exceeds this threshold, the project must comply with "no net increase" criteria, requiring proposed use to remain at or below 2.17 AFY. The project aligns with these GSA standards by limiting annual pumping to 2.03 AFY—a net reduction of approximately 0.14 AFY. Adherence to Conditions of Approval 4.20(c) and 6.15(e) ensures pumping is capped at 2.03 AFY, preventing significant impacts to groundwater availability

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 on a neighboring parcel via a proposed private easement agreement. A wastewater treatment provider is not required; 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 of 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: There are no proposed project features that would substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The existing driveways will be designed and improved to meet the Napa County Road and Street Standards (RSS) and California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection State Minimum Fire Safe Regulations (FSR). Access onto and throughout the parcel includes design components to accommodate fire and emergency apparatus. The Fire Marshal's office has reviewed the plans, which demonstrate that the project would have adequate emergency access to the proposed project. The winery will be equipped with sprinklers and fire suppression equipment as required by the CA building Code. No impacts would occur.

Significance Level: No impact.

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: Wildfire risk is dependent upon existing environmental conditions, including but not limited to the amount of vegetation present, topography, and climate. The project is located on a relatively flat 1.44-acre parcel bounded by Manley Lane to the north, with vineyards bordering the southern, eastern, and western perimeters. Primary access is provided via two existing driveways on Manley Lane, approximately 700 feet west of the SR 29 intersection. The surrounding area is characterized by vineyards, wineries, and residences. According to Napa County GIS Environmental Maps (Hazards and emergencies layer), the project is within a Local Responsibility Area and outside of any designated Fire Hazard Severity Zones.

The reconstructed winery building and parking improvements would not result in a physical modification to the slope of the area, changes to prevailing winds, or alter other factors that would likely exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. As discussed above in Section IX. (Hazards and Hazardous Materials), the project will comply with all applicable State and County Fire Codes. Key safety features include a 100-foot defensible space around structures, interior fire sprinklers, dedicated on-site firefighting water, and emergency vehicle access. Proposed upgrades to the driveway entrances will comply with Napa County Road and Street Standards (NCRSS) and California Fire Safe Regulations (FSR), ensuring safe ingress and egress for both visitors and emergency personnel. By requiring strict adherence to County Building and Fire Codes, and State Fire Safe Regulations, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

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: As mentioned above, the existing driveways will be improved to meet County RSS and State FSR. Proposed utility improvements will be undergrounded, and the winery building will contain fire suppression infrastructure, including fire sprinklers and dedicated water storage. During

construction, the risk of igniting a fire would be low because vegetation would be cleared prior to development, and the risk would be temporary due to the limited duration of construction. Operation and maintenance activities would be similar to activities already occurring onsite and properties in the area. This development is not considered a type of improvement that exacerbates wildfire risk or significant environmental risk. Impacts will be less than significant.

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: The physical improvements are located on a flat area that is already graded or paved. The proposed project would not physically alter the site in a way which would expose people or structures to risks such as downstream or downslope flooding or landslides resulting from runoff, post-fire instability or drainage changes. Impacts would be less than significant.

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 project does not 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 or substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal species. The project site is fully developed, currently occupied by a winery and its associated infrastructure. While the site lacks documented sensitive habitats or special-status species, the existing landscaping includes more than 20 trees. Because the project involves tree removal, Mitigation Measures **BIO-1** and **BIO-2** have been incorporated to ensure preconstruction surveys are conducted. These surveys will

protect nesting birds, raptors, and roosting bats before any tree removal or construction begins. Through implementation of Mitigation Measures **BIO-1** and **BIO-2**, the project is anticipated to result in less than significant impacts to nesting birds and raptors and bats. Additionally, the project does not have the potential to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California's history or prehistory. As discussed in Section 5 (Cultural Resources) and Section 18 (Tribal Cultural Resources), the project has the possibility of unearthing cultural resources during ground disturbance activities. The County's standard Archeological Finding Condition of Approval has been incorporated into the Project to protect inadvertently discovered resources and reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level

Significance Level: Less than significant with mitigation incorporation.

Mitigation Measures: See Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2.

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 emissions, hydrology, traffic, and noise are discussed in the respective sections above and were determined to have a less than significant impact. Implementing Mitigation Measure **NOISE-1** will reduce noise from future mechanical equipment to a less-than-significant level. Potential impacts to air pollution and GHG emissions are being addressed through meeting BAAD recommended design elements, with the addition of Greenhouse Gas Voluntary Best Management Practices, VMT/Transportation Demand Reduction strategies, and standard Conditions of Approval. The applicant intends to implement a number of greenhouse gas reduction strategies, including but not limited to, installing roof-mounted photovoltaic panels, implementing a transportation demand management plan, installing water efficient fixtures and energy conserving lighting, employing low-impact development practices, providing bicycle incentives, and installing an electric vehicle charging station. Section 10 (Hydrology and Water Quality) includes details on the Water Availability Analysis which demonstrates that the project well, as conditioned, will be limited to 2.03 AFY to ensure there are no impacts to groundwater availability. For these reasons, potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Significance Level: Less than significant with mitigation incorporation.

Mitigation Measures: See Mitigation Measure NOISE-1.

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 Mitigated Negative Declaration are less than significant with the exception of Biological Resources and Noise, for which Mitigation measures are proposed. 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 with mitigation incorporations.

Mitigation Measures: See Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2 and NOISE-1.