

“D”

Revised Initial Study/Mitigated
Negative Declaration

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

REVISED
(State CEQA Guidelines Section 15073.5[c][4])
Initial Study Checklist
(form updated February 2015)

1. **Project Title:** Raymond – Ticen Ranch Winery, Major Modification to Use Permit, Application #P15-00307
2. **Property Owner:** Raymond Vineyard and Cellar, Inc., an affiliate of Boisset Family Estates
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and Email Address:** Dana Ayers, Planner III, (707) 253-4388, dana.ayers@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):** Two parcels in unincorporated Napa County, just south of the City of St. Helena municipal boundary: a) 849 Zinfandel Lane, APN 030-270-013, nearest cross street State Route 29/St. Helena Highway; and b) 1584 St. Helena Highway, APN 030-270-012, nearest cross street Whitehall Lane
5. **Project Proponent's Name and Address:** Tom Blackwood on behalf of Raymond Vineyards, 849 Zinfandel Lane, St. Helena, California 94574
6. **Project Proponent's Representative:** Donna Oldford, Plans4Wine, 2620 Pinot Way, St. Helena, California 94574
7. **General Plan Land Use Designation:** Agricultural Resource
8. **Zoning District:** AP (Agricultural Preserve) District
9. **Background/Project History:**

Raymond Winery (849 Zinfandel Lane) – The 60.72-acre Raymond Winery site is located in the central part of the Napa Valley, just under one mile south of the municipal boundary of the City of St. Helena, on the south side of Zinfandel Lane. The site is accessed via a private road called Wheeler Lane that connects to Zinfandel Lane, a County-maintained, two-lane rural collector street. Zinfandel Lane is a valley crossroad trending from east to west that connects on either end with the two north/south running arterial roads within Napa Valley (State Route 29 on the western side of Napa Valley and Silverado Trail on the eastern side of Napa Valley), and it provides through access between the two arterials.

Historic aerial photographs reflect that the Raymond Winery property and an adjacent, 27.68-acre parcel (APN 030-050-031, also owned by the project proponent) have been in agricultural use as orchards or vineyard since at least the mid-20th century. In 1973, Roy Raymond, then owner of the property, requested a building permit from Napa County's Building Division to construct a winery on the 60.72-acre parcel. Zoning at the time allowed wineries as permitted uses of property in agricultural zoning districts. After the County prepared and certified an environmental impact report for the proposed winery in 1974, the property owner obtained permits for grading and construction of the development in 1978.

In 1984, the property owner at the time obtained County approval (Use Permit #U-498384) to expand the existing winery by increasing production capacity from 50,000 gallons to 250,000 gallons of wine per year; adding 27,750 square feet of hospitality, aging and administrative space; and adding public tours and tastings to the operation of the facility. In April 1990, the Planning Director administratively approved an amendment to that approval that resulted in separation of the approved building into two isolated structures, with wine production areas retained in a reduced, 20,000 square foot building and hospitality areas separated off into an approximately 4,350 square foot building. The two standalone buildings authorized by that amendment were not subsequently built.

Later, in 1991, the same property owner again sought and obtained County approval (Use Permit No. U-89-46) to increase annual wine production from 250,000 gallons to 750,000 gallons per year averaged over any consecutive three-year period, and with production in any year not to exceed 900,000 gallons; construct a 67,800 square foot wine production facility with press, fermentation, aging and storage, office, laboratory, and shipping areas; modify the previously-approved 20,000 square foot aging facility building to include a 4,000 square foot banquet room and kitchen; and add visitor parking spaces, for a total of 75 on-site stalls for guests and employees, and additional service driveways on the property. The action associated with Use Permit No. U-89-46 included approval of an additional 200 visitors to the winery's recognized 200 public visitors per day, for a total of 400 daily visitors (of which 200 were to be on-site by appointment); and a marketing plan for the winery, consisting of daily events for up to 10 people, twice weekly events for 10 to 30 people, and twice monthly events for 30 to 100 people, with any event having an attendance of more than 80 people scheduled so as not to occur concurrently with the hours of operation of the tour and visitors' center.

Ownership of the vineyard and winery on the 60.72- and 27.68-acre parcels transferred to the current owner and project proponent in 2009. Today, the property is developed with a single-family residence, as well as wine production, administrative and winery hospitality buildings, winery process wastewater treatment ponds, a domestic water supply well, surface parking lots, and other small, accessory structures. There are approximately 40 acres of grape vines planted on the property, along with approximately three acres of edible and ornamental landscape plantings that include a 0.6-acre biodynamic garden and scattered areas of lawn and shade trees around winery building A and the on-site residence.

Following the initial approval of construction of the winery in 1974 and subsequent use permits and modifications thereto in the 1980s and early 1990s, the County approved other minor and very minor modifications to the use permit between 1996 and 2010. These minor and very minor modifications are summarized below:

- a. Minor Modification to Use Permit, #95257 – Allowed up to three custom production operations consisting of crush, fermentation, barrel aging, bottling and case goods storage within the existing winery facility. Total annual custom production was not to exceed 37,500 gallons (five percent) of the existing 750,000 gallon per year production capacity. No separate marketing, shipping, office or employees were included in the action. (Approved by Zoning Administrator, March 8, 1996.)
- b. Very Minor Modification to Use Permit, #P07-00829 – Removed custom crush component approved with permit #95257 – MM. (Approved by Director of Conservation, Development and Planning, December 13, 2007.)
- c. Very Minor Modification to Use Permit, #P10-00093 – Permitted tenant improvements to construct 8,129 square feet of office space, consisting of the following: 1) addition of a 2,178 square foot interior mezzanine office space within winery building B, to house 26 existing employees; 2) conversion of 1,677 square feet of existing mezzanine storage area to office space within winery building B; and 3) conversion of 2,673 square feet of warehouse storage space to office, winemaking laboratory, storage and corridor areas on the ground floor of building B. The remaining 1,601 square feet of existing lobby, restroom and break room space on the ground floor of building B was to remain in place and be encompassed within the new office, laboratory and storage areas. The project scope included removal of illegally constructed office improvements within the residential pool house. No changes to production, marketing, visitation or increase in the existing approved 26 employees were included in the action. (Approved by Director of Conservation, Development and Planning, July 29, 2010.)

The most recent request for modification of existing entitlements was submitted to County staff in 2011, at which time the winery operator requested changes to the winery's approved marketing plan, hours of and program for tours and wine tastings, inclusion of on-site wine consumption in accordance with Business & Professions Code Sections 23358, 23390 and 23396.5, and other changes inside and outside of the various buildings on the property. After several Planning Commission public hearings on the request, the applicant withdrew that request on February 2, 2015.

Ticen Ranch (1584 St. Helena Highway) – The 25.48-acre property located at 1584 St. Helena Highway is located on the east side of State Route 29/St. Helena Highway, approximately 200 feet south of the highway's intersection with Whitehall Lane and just under 1.5 miles south of the municipal boundary of the City of St. Helena. The property fronts on and has its driveway access from St. Helena Highway.

The property is currently developed with a single-family residence, a barn, and an accessory structure that incorporates a garage and second dwelling unit. There are approximately 23 acres of wine grape vines planted on the property. Basic analysis of the existing residence suggests that it was built in the late 19th century, though there are no County permits that would have been required at the time and that would have indicated a more precise date of construction. Historic reports suggest that agricultural activity on the property (initially 23 acres of orchards and ornamental landscaping, later replaced with an approximately equivalent acreage of wine grape vines) commenced around the same time as construction of the main residence. The residence was subsequently modified to add rooms and change fenestration, though this work also appears to have been done before permits would have been required, so the precise date of these changes is also unknown. Likewise, the guest house/garage and barn were built before permits would have been required, but based on review of aerial photography, were built some time before 1948.

The property changed ownership several times between the late 19th century and mid-20th century. Prior to purchase by the project proponent, the property was owned by Orville and Theresa Ticen, a local carpenter and a junior high school teacher, between 1956 and 2014. While under the ownership of and residence by the Ticen family, Theresa Ticen operated a three-room bed and breakfast inn in the main residence on the property from 1985 until 1991 (County Use Permit #BB448485). After closing the inn, she continued to live in the house until she moved to a retirement home in 2001.

Currently, both residences on the property are unoccupied. The property owner and project proponent is undergoing an effort to replant the existing, approximately 23 acres of grape vines on the site.

10. **Description of Project:** The proposed Major Modification to Use Permit, Application #P15-00307 – MOD, is a request for amendment to the existing entitlements that allow the operation of Raymond Vineyard and Cellars' winery with visitation and marketing events at 849 Zinfandel Lane. As explained further below, the application, if approved as proposed, would allow operational changes and modifications to the development of the Raymond and Ticen Ranch parcels and would legitimize noncompliant operations and site modifications already in place but that were completed without benefit of County permit approvals.

Changes and modifications previously implemented on the property without County permit, and for which the current application includes a request for after the fact approval, include:

- a. Recognition of the winery's increase in its number of employees, from its permitted number of 26 to its existing number of 70 full-time staff members, plus 10 part-time and 10 part-time harvest employees, for a total of 90;
- b. Recognition of the winery's increase in its number of on-site parking spaces, from its permitted number of 75 stalls (47 stalls for visitors and 28 stalls for employees, as approved under U-89-46, condition 5) to its existing number of ~~89~~ 102 stalls (42 45 stalls for visitors and 47 57 stalls for employees);
- c. Legitimization of prior conversion of the 875 square foot residential pool house to winery visitor and tasting space;
- d. Legitimization of prior conversion of approximately 7,300 square feet of winery visitor and tasting areas established without permits inside of building A (which was originally approved for administrative offices, laboratory, fermenting and warehouse space, as reflected in approval documents for U-89-46); and
- e. Legitimization of unpermitted installation of a standalone modular kitchen unit (for cooking demonstration purposes only, not for preparation of food for public consumption), an herbarium, and a pet dog comfort station for winery visitors on the Raymond parcel.

Proposed operational changes and site modifications for which the current application includes a request for approval include:

- f. Inclusion of the Ticen Ranch parcel (1584 St. Helena Highway, APN 030-270-012) into the Raymond winery operation, with eventual merger of the two lots and establishment of primary visitor vehicular access to the merged parcels from State Route 29 at an improved driveway at the Ticen Ranch property frontage;
- g. An increase in the number of on-site automobile parking spaces by 50 new visitor vehicle stalls on the Raymond parcel and 11 new stalls on the Ticen Ranch parcel, for a site total of ~~450~~ 158 stalls between both sites (**five existing stalls removed for new private access road**);
- h. A change in the hours of winery operation and visitation as a transportation system management measure and to

- facilitate wine production processes, with winery operation hours proposed to change from 6:00 a.m. until 6:00 p.m., to 6:00 a.m. until 11:00 p.m. during the months of August through November, and visitation hours proposed to change from 10:00 a.m. until 4:00 p.m., to 10:00 a.m. until 6:30 p.m. year-round;
- i. Addition of approximately 4,635 square feet to building A, with the additions to house offices, restrooms, storage and utility areas, a staging kitchen and retail wine shop;
 - j. Conversion of approximately 4,775 square feet of area within building A from production to accessory (hospitality) use, including installation of a commercial kitchen allowing on-site preparation of food to be served to the public;
 - k. Inclusion of food with tours and wine tastings;
 - l. Removal of an existing, unfenced swimming pool that was originally built as an accessory to the on-site residence but that is now within areas accessible to winery guests and public, and replacement of the swimming pool with a shallower, maximum seven-inch deep reflecting pool to be incorporated into the winery's outdoor marketing event space (remediates a situation of noncompliance with Building Code);
 - m. Conversion of the existing 2,517 square foot Ticen Ranch residence to winery accessory use (792 square feet dedicated to tasting rooms, the remainder used for administration and employee break areas), with the residential building located 333 feet from the edge of the State Route 29 right-of-way and within the 600-foot winery setback, as allowed for historic structures (County Code Section 18.104.230);
 - n. Conversion of the Ticen Ranch barn to an agricultural education space for winery visitors;
 - o. Construction of an approximately 1,910 square foot, uncovered, vineyard viewing platform (830 square foot platform deck, plus 1,080 square foot of stairs and accessible ramp) adjacent to the existing visitor parking lot on the Raymond parcel, with a platform deck height of four feet above grade and a three-foot tall railing;
 - p. Installation of various utility improvements, including two additional, 10,000-gallon water tanks for storage of water for fire suppression purposes, upgrades to the existing sanitary wastewater treatment system and installation of a new, 12,000-gallon septic tank;
 - q. Allowance for up to half of marketing events to occur outdoors, in the existing lawn and pool areas near the residence on the Raymond parcel, in the existing biodynamic garden area on the Raymond parcel, and in the proposed landscaped picnic area on the east side of the residence on the Ticen Ranch parcel (rescinds condition 12 of Use Permit U-89-46). Duration of each event would span three- to four-hour increments, with no event beginning before 10:00 a.m. or ending later than 10:00 p.m. (current entitlement under U-89-46 allows events to begin as early as 11:00 a.m. and end as late as 11:00 p.m., except that events may not start or end between 4:00 and 6:30 p.m.);
 - r. Establishment of areas for proposed art installations, at the existing Zinfandel Lane and proposed State Route 29 entrances to the winery, and in the lawn and biodynamic garden areas where outdoor marketing events are proposed to occur; and
 - s. Allowance for visitors to consume wine purchased at the winery, in the existing lawn and pool areas near the existing residence on the Raymond parcel, in the existing biodynamic garden area on the Raymond parcel, and in the proposed landscaped picnic area on the east side of the residential building on the Ticen Ranch parcel.

The proposed project includes construction of a left turn lane on Zinfandel Lane at Wheeler Lane, and merger of the Raymond Winery and Ticen Ranch parcels into a single parcel should the requested major modification to use permit be approved.

11. **Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses:** The Raymond and Ticen Ranch properties are predominantly flat, with slopes of fewer than five percent. The soil type on both properties is Pleasanton loam, 0-2 percent, a mixture of roughly equivalent parts of coarse sand, silt and fine clay alluvial soils derived from sedimentary rock. Neither property is located within any Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone designated by the State Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology.

Raymond Winery (849 Zinfandel Lane) – The existing Raymond Winery parcel is surrounded by a combination of residential and agricultural land uses. The parcel's western property line adjoins six parcels, four of which are developed exclusively with vineyards, one of which is developed with a combination of single-family residence and vineyard, and the last (southernmost) of which is the Ticen Ranch parcel that is also included in this use permit modification request. Similarly, the parcel's eastern property line abuts several parcels, most of which are developed with single-family residences (with and without vineyards), and one of which is a 27.68-acre parcel that is exclusively planted with grapevines and that is also owned by Raymond Vineyard and Cellars. This 27.68-acre parcel contains a well that provides irrigation water to both parcels owned by Raymond. Zinfandel Lane, to which the property has its vehicular access, is north of the parcel, and on the

opposite side of Zinfandel Lane is a subdivision of single-family residences on lots generally ranging in size from 0.2 to two acres. South of the Raymond Winery parcel is the Sullivan Family Estate Winery and vineyards.

Ticen Ranch (1584 St. Helena Highway) – A 10.5-acre parcel with a single-family residence and vineyard adjoins the northern lot line of the Ticen Ranch parcel at 1584 State Route 29. Wineries with vineyards, including Franciscan Winery, Sullivan Family Estate Winery, and a portion of the Raymond Winery, adjoin the southern and eastern property lines of the site. The western parcel line adjoins the right-of-way of State Route 29, and on the opposite side of the highway are several parcels developed with single-family residences (with and without vineyards) and a bed and breakfast inn (The Ink House). All of the properties to the north, south, east and west of the Ticen Ranch property share the same zoning (AP District) and General Plan land use designation (Agricultural Resource) as the Ticen Ranch parcel.

12. **Other agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) – Encroachment permit for new access driveway from State Route 29
13. **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, has consultation begun?** [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 21083.3.2.) 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.]

In accordance with Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1, on June 15, 2016, invitation to consult was mailed via certified mail to Native American tribes who requested such invitation in writing. Representatives of the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation submitted a written response requesting consultation, which County staff received on July 5, 2016. Staff, the project proponent and agent, and a tribal representative met to visit the site and discuss potential impacts to Native American resources, as well as potential mitigation measures, in November 2016. See section XVII of this initial study.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



Signature

March 7, 2017

Date

Name: Dana Ayers, Planner III, Napa County Planning, Building & Environmental Services Department

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

Discussion:

The winery buildings, hospitality and residential buildings on the Raymond parcel are existing structures. On the Raymond parcel, the proposed project includes legitimization of small accessory structures (demonstration kitchen, farm animal and horticultural sheds, pet comfort station, with approximately 1,500 square feet of combined floor area); proposed future construction of additions to the existing, approximately 27,500 square foot building A, in order to house a staging kitchen and spaces for retail sales, offices, restrooms, storage, utilities, and maintenance services (approximately 4,500 square feet of combined floor area); installation of two, 10,000-gallon water storage tanks; and proposed future construction of an uncovered, approximately 1,900 square foot vineyard viewing platform. No structures are proposed for demolition on the parcel, although interior building modifications would be done to accommodate the proposed additions to building A and conversion of use of the residential pool house to winery hospitality area. At-grade improvements proposed on the parcel include expansion of the visitor parking lot by 50 stalls.

On the Ticen Ranch parcel, the existing structures include a single-family residence, a garage with apartment unit, and a barn. The residence and barn would be retained, restored, and re-utilized with the proposed project, while the garage and apartment building, located behind (east of) the main residence, lacks any historic significance and would be demolished. Site modifications on the Ticen Ranch parcel would be predominantly at-grade, consisting of a new, 18-foot wide, paved access road extending lengthwise on the property between the western and eastern property lines; a new, 11-stall vehicle parking lot on the south side of the residence; and new landscaping and gardens alongside the new access road and behind the main residence. A 300 square foot trellis would also be built on the south side of the residence, and a similar, trellis-roofed gazebo would be built behind the main residence.

a-c. The proposed project would maintain the majority of the acreage on both parcels as vineyard, would not add a large amount of new building area to either site, and thus, would not substantially alter the appearance of the properties as viewed from adjoining public rights-of-way on Zinfandel Lane and State Route 29. The segment of State Route 29 onto which the Ticen Ranch property fronts is a State-designated scenic highway.

On the Raymond parcel, the proposed additions to winery building A would increase the floor area of the building by just over 16 percent, and the rooflines of all additions would be below the roofline of the existing structure and thus, would not increase the height of the building so as to add significantly to its visual massing. Other accessory structures (domestic animal shelters, viewing platform, demonstration kitchen) on the parcel would also be shorter than the building and would be integrated into the existing landscaping and agricultural plantings on the property, so as to appear complementary to those plantings. The two, 10,000-gallon water storage tanks would be installed to the north of the winery's mechanical building and would be screened from view from Zinfandel Lane and State Route 29 by mature trees and the existing wine production buildings (buildings B and C). Other changes to interior spaces, including use of the pool house as hospitality area, would not affect the exterior appearance of the property. Existing and proposed structures are over 1,300 feet away from the rights-of-way of Zinfandel Lane and State Route 29, with both setback areas planted with grape vines. The depth of the planted setback for the winery diminishes the visibility of the existing winery building structures and would similarly diminish the visibility of the proposed additions and utility installations.

The appearance of the Ticen Ranch parcel as seen from State Route 29 would change primarily due to the proposed addition of the newly-aligned access road, which would be an at-grade modification. The most visually prominent feature on the property, as seen from that right-of-way, is the existing main residence built in the late 1800's. An evaluation by the applicant's architect suggests that the main residence is historically significant due to "its association with Napa Valley's early wine industry and as a good example of a Folk Victorian residence in a rural setting" (ARG, 21). This structure would be restored to remove alterations built outside of the structure's period of significance and to re-introduce architectural features that mimic the building's original characteristics. The existing barn, though not historic, would also be improved from its current condition, although it is noted that the barn is approximately 275 feet further from the State Route 29 right-of-way than is the existing residence and is outside of the minimum 600-foot winery building setback (County Code section 18.104.230). Thus, with the inclusion of restoration efforts into the project scope, the proposed project would be considered to be an enhancement to the aesthetics of the property and would not have a significant negative visual impact. Small, above-grade landscaping enhancements, consisting of installation of a trellis and gazebo on the property, would either be behind or alongside the existing main residence and would have no greater visual impact on the public right-of-way than does the existing main residence.

Both parcels are located on the Napa Valley floor and are predominantly flat, with slopes on both properties generally not exceeding five percent. There are no rock outcroppings on the parcel, and no existing, native trees would be removed as part of the request. Additionally, not being located atop a ridgeline, and with no construction proposed on slopes in excess of 15 percent, the proposed project is not subject to the County's Viewshed Protection Program (Napa County Code Chapter 18.106), which was adopted in order to preserve the County's most prominent visual resources.

- d. The proposed project would result in increases in nighttime lighting due to: increased visitation hours from 4:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.; changes to the marketing plan to allow events to occur outdoors within requested hours (10:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.); and extension of the winery hours of operation to 11:00 p.m. during the harvest and crush seasons. Extension of visitation hours would only affect lighting levels during winter months when the sun sets before 6:00 p.m.; however, hospitality areas are proposed indoors, such that nighttime lighting associated with visitation would not be significant. Hours of operation until 11:00 p.m. only pertains to the production areas of the winery, most of which are completely enclosed within existing buildings, and which enclosure prevents light from spilling off of the property. Occurrence of nighttime outdoor marketing events has the greatest potential to result in off-site glare or light spillage.

The County's standard condition of approval for wineries limits the amount of outdoor lighting to the minimum necessary for operational and security needs. Up-lighting of buildings and landscaping is prohibited. The winery operators must keep lighting as low to the ground as possible and include shields to deflect the light downward. Avoidance of highly reflective surfaces would be required, as well, by the standard County condition. This condition would apply to all winery activities (excluding harvest), including any events that would occur outdoors:

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, shall be on timers, and shall incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. No flood-lighting or sodium lighting of the building is permitted, including architectural highlighting and spotting. Low-level lighting shall be utilized in parking areas as opposed to elevated high-intensity light standards. Lighting utilized during harvest activities is not subject to this requirement.

Prior to issuance of any building permit pursuant to this approval, 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 California Building Code.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a/e. The California Department of Conservation maps both the Raymond and Ticen Ranch parcels as Prime Farmland, a designation that identifies those lands with an optimal combination of physical and chemical features, micro-climate and water supply to produce high crop yields. Currently, 59 acres of the 86 acres on both parcels are in agricultural use, planted with vineyards, and including an approximately 0.6-acre, biodynamic, edible and ornamental plant garden. Construction of the proposed winery site modifications would reduce the on-site vineyard acreage by less than a half an acre compared to the existing condition, as a result of construction of the requested new winery access road and expanded visitor parking lot. Proposed modifications would also remove an existing gravel parking area on the Ticen Ranch parcel, replacing it with an additional, approximately 2,000 square foot garden. Consistent with the General Plan definition of "agriculture" (policy AG/LU-2), processing of agricultural products (in this case, grapes into wine) and related, accessory uses (such as sales and marketing of agricultural products) are agricultural uses of land. With the requested modification, the primary use of both parcels would continue to be agricultural and related accessory uses (vineyard and winery with visitation and marketing). Thus, loss of existing vineyard to accommodate winery facilities, as is the case with the proposed project, would not result in a significant impact with respect to conversion of farmland.
- b. The County's zoning of the property is AP (Agricultural Preserve) District, and the General Plan land use designation is Agricultural Resource. The existing winery on the Raymond parcel and proposed expansion of winery accessory use onto the Ticen Ranch parcel are consistent with the property's zoning, as Napa County Code section 18.16.030 lists wineries and related, accessory uses (hospitality and marketing) as conditionally permitted in the AP District. General Plan Policy AG/LU-21 also identifies processing of agricultural products (grape crushing/winemaking) as a use that is consistent with the Agricultural Resource designation. There is no Williamson Act contract applicable to either property.
- c/d. As previously noted, the site has been in agricultural use for several decades and is currently planted with vineyards. There are no forest resources on the site.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) Board of Directors adopted updated thresholds of significance to assist local agencies in the nine-county Bay Area in the review of projects' potential environmental impacts pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The thresholds were designed to establish the level at which the BAAQMD believed air pollution emissions would cause significant air quality and climate impacts in the region; were posted on the BAAQMD website; and were incorporated into the BAAQMD's updated 2011 CEQA Guidelines. The thresholds were subsequently challenged, and in March 2012, the Alameda County Superior Court issued a judgment finding that the BAAQMD had failed to comply with CEQA when it adopted the thresholds. The court did not determine whether the thresholds were valid on their merits but instead found that the adoption of the thresholds was a project under CEQA. The BAAQMD subsequently appealed the Alameda County Superior Court's decision, and the matter is currently pending final decision by the California Supreme Court. **The Court of Appeal of the State of California, First Appellate District, reversed the trial court's decision. The Court of Appeal's decision was appealed to the California Supreme Court, which granted limited review, and the matter is currently pending there.** ~~Based on the Court's direction~~ **In view of the trial court's order, which remains in place pending final resolution of the case,** the BAAQMD cannot recommend that local agencies use the 2010 thresholds to analyze the potential environmental impacts of proposed projects, and thus, the BAAQMD has removed the 2010 thresholds from their most current CEQA guidelines (2012). **Lead agencies will need to determine appropriate air quality thresholds of significance based on substantial evidence in the record. Although lead agencies may rely on the BAAQMD's updated CEQA Guidelines (2012) for assistance in calculating air pollution emissions, obtaining information regarding the health impacts of air pollutants, and identifying potential mitigation measures, the BAAQMD has been ordered to set aside the Thresholds and is no longer recommending that these Thresholds be used as a general measure of a project's significant air quality impacts.** However, agencies may choose to use the thresholds identified in the BAAQMD's ~~2011~~ **1999** CEQA Guidelines, or other data sources available through the BAAQMD, **and they may continue to make determinations regarding the significance of an individual project's air quality impacts based on substantial evidence in the record for that project.** ~~in order to analyze the potential environmental impacts of projects;~~ **therefore, as the best available information, the BAAQMD's 2011 CEQA Guidelines are applicable for evaluating projects in Napa County.**

The requested entitlement consists of various physical changes to the site and a request to recognize 64 employees currently working on the site, above permitted levels of employment for the winery. (See Description of Project, section 10 above, for a more detailed description of the requested approvals.) As described in the Project Description section of this initial study, the structures for which use permits are being requested are existing buildings, with new construction limited to a 4,635 square foot winery building addition. Other site changes, also described in further detail in Project Description, are proposed to include a 1,910 square foot viewing platform (unenclosed), new vehicle parking areas, driveway improvements and utility installations. Approval of the requested entitlement would

maintain the current number of customer and employee vehicle trips to the property, as the winery is currently operating with 64 additional employees that are requested to be legitimized rather than newly-hired. No changes to the numbers of visitors or gallons of wine production are included with this request.

a-d. Over the long term, sources of emissions from the winery consist primarily of mobile sources, including customer vehicles, employee vehicles, vineyard equipment and delivery vehicles, with secondary stationary sources that include emissions from energy use, well pumping and wastewater treatment. As the vineyard and winemaking operations currently exist, this initial study considers the requested changes to the currently permitted condition, with consideration limited to the proposed new 4,635 square foot building addition to house offices, restrooms, storage and utility areas, a staging kitchen and retail wine shop, and the building modifications to create office and visitor spaces in the 3,800 square feet of the Ticen Ranch house and barn. The BAAQMD's screening criteria (2012) includes a variety of land uses and corresponding square footages for which a project would be anticipated to have a significant impact, based on the BAAQMD's 2012 thresholds. There is not a land use in the BAAQMD's guidance that directly correlates to the combination of new accessory uses programmed for the winery's proposed building addition, ranch house and barn; similar land use categories to the wine retail, office, and food preparation components of the addition include "drugstore," "general office building" and "quality restaurant," respectively. Of these three similar land use categories, "quality restaurant" has the lowest screening criteria of 47,000 square feet, and so it is applied as a conservative a guideline for determining potential air quality impacts of the proposed project. Applying this criterion, the guidelines suggest that a potentially significant air quality impact would occur if the addition was 47,000 or more square feet (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2011, pages 3-2 & 3-3). Given the size of the requested building addition and expansion of use to Ticen Ranch (approximately 8,440 square feet compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 47,000 square feet), the requested use permit modification, as well as its associated construction and ongoing operations and vehicle trips, would not contribute a significant amount of air pollution to the region and thus, would not have a significant air quality impact.

(Note: Approximately 8,200 square feet of winery and residential areas have previously been converted to hospitality uses without benefit of permit, and another, approximately 4,775 square feet are proposed to be converted from winery use to hospitality spaces in winery building A. However, this initial study does not include the approximately 13,000 square feet in these converted areas as new sources of emissions, as these new hospitality areas have been and would be established in existing conditioned spaces inside of existing, previously entitled buildings that have continuously been in winery and related uses since their construction. Tenant modifications inside of these existing buildings would not cause significant construction emissions, as might occur with projects that would require new grading prior to commencement of vertical construction. Additionally, post-construction, customer trips associated with use of these new hospitality spaces would be the same as the existing condition, as the applicant does not propose to increase daily visitation numbers with this modification request. However, potential GHG emissions from the 3,800 square feet in the Ticen Ranch house and barn are included in the discussion because those spaces are currently vacant, and new occupancy of those buildings would result in new energy usage that is not a part of the current condition.)

It is noted that the screening criteria in the BAAQMD's Guidelines correlate to a lower threshold of 54 pounds per day of emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), compared to the significance criterion of 80 pounds per day of NO_x that was identified in the BAAQMD's 1999 Guidelines. Thus, because the project falls within screening criteria applicable to a lower threshold, it is consequently presumed to also fall within the higher thresholds established in the 1999 Guidelines.

In 2010, the BAAQMD adopted an updated Clean Air Plan that outlines a regional program and a set of measures to reduce ozone, ozone precursors, particulate matter, greenhouse gas emissions, and other sources of air pollution. As noted in the Clean Air Plan, the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area as a region is in non-attainment status for achievement of federal standards for emissions of ozone and particulate matter (PM). Sources of ozone and PM include combustion (e.g., burning of fossil fuels or vegetation), fugitive dust from earth-moving activities, and vehicle use (including engine combustion and tire and brake pad wear).

The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Wineries in general are not producers of air pollution in quantities substantial enough to result in an air quality plan conflict. The project site lies within the Napa Valley, which forms one of the climatologically distinct sub-regions (Napa County Sub region) within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The topographical and meteorological features of the Valley create a relatively high potential for air pollution. Over the long term, emissions resulting from the proposed use permit modification would consist primarily of mobile sources, including emissions associated with vehicle trips to and from the site.

As noted above, the combustion process of engines in passenger and heavy duty vehicles is a source of air pollutants, including particulate matter as well as carbon dioxide and nitrogen dioxide, two precursors to formulation of ozone. Post-construction,

emissions from heavy duty on-road vehicles (freight trucks) would not increase as a result of the requested entitlement, as the request includes no changes to currently permitted wine production levels. In general, existing truck trip emissions would decrease over time due to tighter regulations. More specifically, the 2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan notes that emissions from heavy duty vehicles are regulated by standards of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and California Air Resources Board, and that as those standards have intensified, emissions (particularly nitrogen oxides and particulate matter) from these types of vehicles have and will continue to decrease (3-29, 3-30). U.S. Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics data demonstrates this downward trend in heavy duty vehicle emissions since 1990.

In addition to an electric vehicle (EV) charging station and an existing system of roof-mounted photovoltaic panels installed on the winery building roof in 2013, the project proponent identified in the use permit application other measures listed in the 2010 Clean Air Plan with which the existing and proposed winery operations are consistent. The existing EV station in the parking lot and system of photovoltaic panels on the building roof for on-site generation of power to the winery (Napa County Greenhouse Gas [GHG] checklist, Best Management Practice [BMP] 1 and 21) and intent to install a solar water heating system (Napa County GHG checklist, BMP 8) are consistent with the Clean Air Plan's Stationary Source Measure (SSM) 15, Energy and Climate Measure (ECM) 2, and Mobile Source Measures (MSM) A-1 and A-2. In addition, the applicant's GHG checklist indicates willingness not to burn agricultural material pruned on-site (BMP 32), consistent with the Clean Air Plan's SSM-7. While certain components of the requested use permit would implement elements of the Clean Air Plan, other measures would not be implemented as they are more generally applicable to heavy industrial rather than winery and hospitality uses. As such, the proposed modification would not obstruct implementation of the applicable Clean Air Plan for the San Francisco region.

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 exhaust emissions from construction-related equipment and vehicles. The proposed use permit would require ground disturbance for installation of the new roadway, building addition foundation and parking lot, which ground disturbance would result in fugitive dust in the immediate vicinity of the worksite. The area of disturbance for these site improvements would be smaller than three acres and would be temporary, lasting for approximately two to three months. The short duration of the work and compliance with standard conditions would not cause a substantial increase in particulate matter and would therefore result in a less than significant construction impact related to the region's current non-attainment status for particulate matter.

The BAAQMD recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction-related air quality impacts. These measures are incorporated into the County's standard conditions of project approval and include the following:

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

- A. *Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible.*
- B. *All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.*
- C. *All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.*
- D. *All visible mud or dirt tracked out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.*
- E. *All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour.*
- F. *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.*
- G. *Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 14, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.*
- H. *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.*

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

Water and/or dust palliatives shall be applied in sufficient quantities during grading and other ground disturbing

activities on-site to minimize the amount of dust produced. Outdoor construction activities shall not occur when average wind speeds exceed 20 miles per hour.

With the project proponent's adherence to these relevant best management practices identified by the BAAQMD and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts are considered to be less than significant.

- e. The BAAQMD defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact. However, land uses that are more commonly known generators of offensive odors typically include landfills and transfer stations, wastewater treatment plants, refineries, and heavy industrial and manufacturing plants. Production of wine and storage of wine barrels are not land uses that are typically associated with generation of offensive odors comparable to these types of industrial uses. As prescribed in General Plan policy AG/LU-15 odors that are associated with production of wine and other food and beverage production facilities are considered acceptable elements of the County and its agricultural development goals.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a-e. Both the Raymond and Ticen Ranch properties are predominantly flat, with slopes no greater than five percent except along the borders of the biodynamic garden and the banks of existing, on-site wastewater and frost protection ponds; in these graded areas, slopes do not exceed 15 percent. There are no natural wetlands on either property, and the properties' underlying soil type (Pleasanton loam) generally provides poor potential for establishment of wetland plants and wildlife. The Napa River is over one-half mile east of the Raymond parcel and over three-quarter mile east of the Ticen Ranch parcel, with an unnamed, intermediate tributary to the river located just over one-third mile east of the Raymond parcel and two-thirds mile east of Ticen Ranch. The existing and proposed winery buildings and improvements are and would be well outside of the required 45-foot minimum setback established under the water quality and riparian area Conservation Regulations identified in County Code Chapter 18.108, and the proposed improvements on-site include construction of bioretention facilities to receive and treat stormwater runoff from new paved parking lots. (See additional discussion under Hydrology and Water Quality section of this Initial Study.)

Both properties have been in agricultural and residential use for several decades, and with the exception of scattered stands of native oaks to be retained, the properties' native habitat has long been removed to accommodate ornamental landscaping (particularly near the residences on both parcels), introduced wine grape vines and previously, orchards. Construction of

proposed, new site amenities, such as tasting areas, gardens and parking stalls, would occur either within existing buildings or in areas on both parcels that have previously been planted in vines or developed with residential or winery buildings. County geographic information system (GIS) data indicate no presence of sensitive plant or animal species on or in the vicinity of either parcels; however, it is possible that, given the length of vacancy of the structure, colonies of pallid bats or Townsend's big-eared bats, two California bat species of concern, could have established in the garage building proposed to be demolished on the Ticen Ranch parcel. If bat species of concern have established residence in the garage building, demolition of the building would affect the bat population in residence.

Mitigation Measure:

MM BIO-1 ***Mitigation Measure BIO-1:** A qualified wildlife biologist knowledgeable in bat biology and behavior shall conduct a survey in order to determine presence or absence of bats and bat roosts in the garage building proposed to be demolished on the Ticen Ranch parcel. The survey shall include both day and night monitoring within a minimum, 24-hour period and shall be conducted in summer, during months of peak bat activity (June 1 through August 31).*

The biologist shall compile his or her findings, along with his or her resume or statement of qualifications, into a report that shall be submitted to the Napa County Planning Division for the Planning Division's review and approval. If the biologist finds that bats or roosts are present in the garage building and determines that the roosts support special-status bat species, then the biologist's report shall include a program for removal of the bat population from the structure. The program shall, at a minimum, identify: a) installation of artificial roosts on the property, of adequate number and size to support the estimated population of the roosts as observed by the biologist, with the artificial roosts installed no fewer than 15 days prior to commencement of the eviction process; b) location(s) for placement of artificial roosts on the property, with consideration given to identifying locations proximate to the garage building and that would minimize potential impacts of construction noise on any relocated bat populations; and c) a method to progressively secure the garage building as a means to humanely evict the bat population from the structure, with the eviction process to be completed no more than 30 days prior to demolition of the structure

Eviction of the bats shall be scheduled so as not to occur during bat breeding/maternity roosting (approximately April 15 through August 31) or when bats are in torpor (approximately October 15 through March 1) of any year. The process of humane eviction and installation of the artificial roosts shall be overseen by the biologist.

The biologist's survey shall remain valid for up to one year from the last date of the survey. If the garage building is not demolished within one year of the latest date of survey of the structure, then the biologist shall conduct a new survey prior to demolition of the structure, following the procedure outlined in the above paragraphs.

Monitoring: *The biologist conducting the bat survey shall compile the findings of the survey into a written report. The biologist or the permittee shall, immediately upon completion of the report, transmit the report to the Napa County Planning Division for the Planning Division's review and approval. No permit to demolish the garage building on the Ticen Ranch parcel shall be issued to the permittee until the Planning Division has approved of the report and either: a) the results of the survey are negative with respect to presence of special-status bat species, and the report confirms that no further action is required; or b) the results of the survey are positive, and the permittee has submitted evidence satisfactory to the Planning Division that the permittee has completed the process of humane eviction and installation of artificial roosts for the observed bat population.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would reduce to a less-than-significant level the potential impacts to the two California species of concern referenced above, by requiring humane eviction rather than take of the animals, and it would provide an opportunity by which any potentially-present bat populations could relocate within their existing area of residence.

- f. There is no habitat conservation plan (HCP) or natural community conservation plan (NCCP) that has been adopted or is being implemented in unincorporated Napa County.

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

Discussion:

- a. None of the existing structures on either parcel is listed in a local, state or federal register of historic resources. Aerial photographs of the Raymond parcel indicate that it was solely planted with orchards as late as 1968. The 1973 environmental impact report prepared for the initial winery request notes that the property was developed with a single-family residence. Thus, the residence, a ranch-style building, was constructed sometime in the early 1970s, and is not of an age to be considered historically significant. The winery buildings were subsequently built in the late 1970s/1980s and are also not old enough to be considered historical resources. It is lastly noted that the residence, the oldest building on the property, is not proposed to have any physical or functional changes as a result of this application.

As discussed in the Aesthetics section of this initial study, an evaluation by the applicant's architect suggests that the main residence on the Ticen Ranch parcel was built in the late 1800's and is historically significant due to "its association with Napa Valley's early wine industry and as a good example of a Folk Victorian residence in a rural setting" (ARG, 21). This structure would be restored to remove alterations built outside of the structure's period of significance, and to re-introduce architectural features that mimic the building's original characteristics. The ARG report does not suggest that either of the other structures on the property, including the garage/apartment structure proposed for demolition, is historic, though the proposed project does include retention of the existing barn and improvement of the barn to current building standards allowing public occupancy of the structure as an agricultural experience facility. Thus, with the inclusion of efforts to restore the potentially historically significant main residence on the Ticen Ranch parcel, and consistent with General Plan Policy CC-26, the proposed project would be considered to be an enhancement to the historic value of the property and would not have a significant negative impact on a local historical resource.

- b/d. Although there are no known archaeological or paleontological resources on either property, the low (valley floor) elevation and general proximity of the properties to the Napa River would suggest that the properties' general vicinity might have attracted people and animals to the site or its surrounding areas.

The County's 1940 aerial photographs indicate that the project site and surrounding areas were planted with orchards and vineyards, with few structures in the vicinity. Today, the subject properties are developed with residences, a winery (on the Raymond parcel) and vineyards. As discussed in the Background section of this initial study, both parcels have a long history of agricultural development and previous ground disturbance, as has occurred to remove native vegetation and grade the site to accommodate installation of the existing winery, residences, vineyard and previously, orchard. If the project is approved and any resources not previously uncovered during this prior disturbance are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval:

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

determine if additional measures are required.

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

Proposed site modifications to the Raymond and Ticen Ranch parcels would involve ground disturbance to approximately three acres between both parcels, as necessary to remove existing grape vines, demolish and remove the existing Ticen Ranch garage and foundation, and grade the site for new parking stalls, a new access driveway, and new landscaping. Other proposed modifications would be internal to existing structures. The property is predominantly flat and developed with vineyard. During a February 2016 visit to the proposed project site, staff observed no unique geological features such as rock outcroppings, mounds or other landforms on either parcel.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-d. The Raymond and Ticen Ranch properties are not located within any Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone designated by the State Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. Although no fault zone underlies the property, the site is generally located within a region of active fault zones, including those of the Berryessa, Calaveras, Concord, Great Valley, Hayward, Mayacama, Rodgers Creek, San Andreas, San Gregorio and West Napa faults. Movement along any of these faults is anticipated to result in intensities of VI and VII on the Modified Mercalli Scale at the project site; these “moderate” to “strong” intensities would be felt by most people and are likely to result in some damage to well-built structures. Due to the requirement for new and renovated structures to comply with the seismic standards of the 2016 California Building Code (or subsequent, applicable update thereto) and Occupational Health and Safety Administration regulations (i.e., bracing of barrel storage racks), damage to structures on the property is anticipated to be minor and would not expose people to substantial hazards related to ground shaking during an earthquake. Of the structures to be retained on-site (residences, wine production and hospitality buildings), the property owner reports that damage to the existing buildings was limited to unreinforced masonry chimneys, which were subsequently repaired; otherwise, none of the structures experienced structural damage during the recent 2014 West Napa earthquake.

Both properties are predominantly flat, with slopes of fewer than five percent, and the soil type on both properties is Pleasanton loam, 0-2 percent, a mixture of roughly equivalent parts of coarse sand, silt and fine clay alluvial soils derived from sedimentary rock. Given that the site is predominantly flat, underlain with a loam soil mixture, and located on the valley floor, soil movement and landslide potential on both parcels is anticipated to be low. The U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for Napa County describes Pleasanton loam, 0-2 percent slopes, as having a “slight” erosion hazard, consistent with its description as a soil of mixed composition and shallow grade (by contrast, higher erosion potential is anticipated in areas of steep slopes or more moderate slopes with loose, sandy soils). The soil survey also indicates that Pleasanton loam generally has a low to moderate shrink-swell potential (expansion potential increases to moderate, generally at a depth of one foot below ground surface), and regional maps of liquefaction risk indicate that the properties are within an area of moderate liquefaction potential. If the use permit is approved, and concurrently with issuance of an application for a building permit to construct the winery building additions, the permittee will be required to submit a geotechnical report with recommendations for design of the building foundation that minimizes the potential for such damage from the expansive nature of the underlying soil.

e. The Pleasanton loam that underlays the both parcels generally has severe limitations in use for septic system absorption fields; these soil limitations, however, can be overcome with proper design such as expansion of the leachfield or pre-treatment of wastewater. The proposed project plans and wastewater feasibility study indicate that planned improvements to the septic system include a pre-treatment system and an expanded, primary on-site leachfield of 8,000 square feet in the vineyard area to the south of the existing winery building, with a 16,000 square foot reserve area in the same general location on the Raymond parcel. This proposed new system would treat sanitary wastewater generated from both the Raymond Winery and Ticen Ranch parcel buildings. The sizes of these distribution areas are based on a percolation rate of 0.6 gallons per square foot per day, with a peak demand of 150-person events held during harvest (when employment is at proposed 90-person maximum), and are planned to be installed in the large, four-acre vineyard area that is uninterrupted by any winery or accessory structures. (Note that the largest marketing event currently permitted to occur at the winery is 100 persons; however, the applicant can and has obtained permits for temporary events as allowed under County Code Chapter 5.36, with anticipated attendance of over 150 people. In the event such larger events are permitted through the temporary event permit process in the future, the applicant would use portable toilets.)

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

GHGs are the atmospheric gases, including carbon dioxide, methane, nitrogen dioxide, and synthetic fluorinated gases, whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for global warming and that contribute to climate change, a widely accepted theory/science explaining human effects on the atmosphere. Carbon dioxide (CO₂) is the principal GHG being emitted by human activities, and whose concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity. Agricultural sources of carbon emissions include forest clearing, land use changes, and burning of fossil fuels related to goods movement and gas and diesel-powered vehicles and farm equipment (<https://www3.epa.gov/climatechange/science/causes.html>). CO₂ also serves as the reference gas to which to compare other greenhouse gases. The effect that each unit of the other GHGs (methane, nitrogen dioxide and synthetic fluorinated gases) has on causing the global warming effect is exponentially greater than the impact of a unit of CO₂, to the degrees of tens to tens of thousands times. Thus, GHG emissions are measured in “carbon dioxide equivalents.” Carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e) is a unit of measurement of GHG emissions that uses carbon dioxide as a common denominator, and is a way to get one number that approximates total emissions from all the different gases that contribute to GHG emissions (BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2012). CO₂e are measured in units of metric tons, equal to approximately 2,204 pounds.

Napa County has been working to develop a Climate Action Plan (CAP) for several years. In 2012, a Draft CAP² (March 2012) was recommended using the emissions checklist in the Draft CAP, on a trial basis, to determine potential 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 GHG, to acknowledge and credit past accomplishments and voluntary efforts, and to allow more time for establishment of a cost-effective local offset program. The Board also requested that best management practices be applied and considered when reviewing projects until a revised CAP is adopted to ensure that projects address the County's policy goal related to reducing GHG emissions.

In July 2015, the County re-commenced preparation of the CAP to: 1) account for present day conditions and modeling assumptions (such as but not limited to methods, emission factors, and data sources); 2) address the concerns with the previous CAP effort as outlined above; 3) meet applicable State requirements; and 4) 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 No. 1: *2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016*³. This initial phase included updating the unincorporated County's community-wide GHG emissions inventory to 2014 and preparing new GHG emissions forecasts for the 2020, 2030, and 2050 horizon years. Table 1 of the Technical Memorandum indicates that two percent of the County's GHG emissions in 2014 were a result of land use change.

Additional information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or online at <http://www.countyofnapa.org/CAP/>.

- a. Overall increases in GHG emissions in Napa County were assessed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the Napa County General Plan Update and certified by the Napa County Board of Supervisors in June 2008. GHG emissions were found in that document to be significant and unavoidable, 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.

As discussed in the Air Quality section of this Initial Study, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors & GHG Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, including GHG emissions. The BAAQMD's threshold of significance for proposed projects' potential GHG emissions was set at 1,100 metric tons of CO₂e (MTCO₂e) per year. Though the BAAQMD cannot endorse the use of the 1,100 MTCO₂e threshold due to court decision, agencies may choose to use the threshold or other available data source as best available information.; thus, the 1,100 MTCO₂e threshold is appropriate for evaluating projects in Napa County. For

² County of Napa, March 2012, Napa County Draft Climate Action Plan, Prepared by ICF International. Sacramento, CA

³ Supersedes February 2, 2016, version.

this analysis, the GHG threshold of 1,100 MTCO_{2e}, based on the analysis in the BAAQMD's "Threshold Options and Justifications Report," is considered the best available information and is considered an appropriate threshold against which to measure the potential GHG impacts of the proposed project.

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

For the purposes of this analysis, potential GHG emissions associated with winery "construction" and with "operational" winery operations are discussed. One-time construction emissions associated with the winery development project include: i) the carbon stocks that are lost (or released) when existing vegetation is removed and soil is disturbed in preparation for the new winery structure and associated infrastructure; and ii) emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area and construct the winery, including construction equipment and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as "equipment emissions"). These emissions also include underground carbon stocks (or soil carbon) associated with existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed. In addition to the one-time construction emissions, operational emissions of the winery are also considered and include ongoing emissions from the energy used to maintain and operate the winery, including vehicle trips associated with employee and visitor trips. (See Section XVI, Transportation/Traffic, for anticipated number of operational trips.) Operational emissions from the proposed winery would be the primary source of emissions over the long-term when compared to one-time construction emissions.

Air quality and greenhouse gas emission impacts of the requested use permit modification, in general, would not be significant because emissions associated with the vineyard maintenance and winery operation is an existing condition that would continue, regardless of whether the current request is approved. The proposal includes removal of approximately less than a half-acre of vineyard for construction of an expanded visitor parking lot and vineyard viewing platform. While removal of the vegetation would release sequestered carbon, the reduction in vineyard area would correspondingly reduce emissions generated from vineyard management, particularly emissions from agricultural equipment currently used to maintain this same area. The proposed project would recognize an increase in the winery's permitted number of employees, from 26 to 90 staff members, of which 10 are employed only during the harvest season. No increases in the quantity of wine currently permitted to be produced, nor in the number of annual visitors to the property, are requested with the modification. Minimal new construction, consisting of approximately 1,300 square feet of office and utility areas plus 3,300 square feet of hospitality space (guest restrooms, kitchen and retail areas) attached to building A, is proposed outside of existing structures. Other new hospitality areas proposed to be added to the winery's accessory use spaces on the Raymond parcel would be inside of existing buildings on that site. The proposed, expanded parking lot and 1,910 square foot vineyard viewing platform would be unconditioned space without energy demands that generate GHG from heating or cooling. Thus, the primary sources of operational GHG emissions that would result from approval of the request are primarily attributed to: 1) energy demands, such as lighting and conditioning of space within the proposed, 4,635 square foot addition to building A; 2) increase in energy demands for use of the currently vacant, approximately 3,800 square feet within the barn and residence on the Ticen Ranch parcel; and 3) vehicle trips and sanitary wastewater treatment demands generated by the 64-person increase in winery employment.

Applying the "quality restaurant" land use as a best fit category, as explained in additional detail in the Air Quality discussion of this initial study, a project with 9,000 square feet of hospitality area would potentially generate more than 1,100 MTCO_{2e} annually and would be considered to have a potentially significant impact on the environment. The proposed, 4,635 square foot addition to Raymond building "A," plus the approximately 3,800 square feet of hospitality building area to be repurposed from residential use on the Ticen Ranch parcel, falls below both of this threshold.

(Note: Approximately 8,200 square feet of winery and residential areas have previously been converted to hospitality uses without benefit of permit, and another, approximately 4,775 square feet are proposed to be converted from winery use to hospitality spaces in winery building A. However, this initial study does not include the approximately 13,000 square feet in these converted areas as new sources of emissions, as these new hospitality areas would be established in existing conditioned spaces inside of existing buildings; tenant modifications inside of these existing buildings would not cause significant construction emissions, as might occur on properties that would require new grading prior to commencement of vertical construction. Additionally, post-construction, customer trips associated with use of these new hospitality spaces would be the same as existing condition, as the applicant does not propose to increase daily visitation numbers with this modification request. Similar to the Air Quality section of this initial study,

however, potential GHG emissions from the Ticen Ranch house and barn are included because those spaces are currently vacant, and new occupancy of those buildings would result in new energy usage that is not a part of the current condition. Conservatively, including this 3,800 square feet as "new" hospitality and office areas would still not result in an exceedance of the 9,000 square foot screening criterion referenced above.)

It is noted that in 2013, the winery operators obtained permits from Napa County's Building Division to install a system of 750 kilowatt (kW) photovoltaic panels on the roofs of both buildings A and B on the Raymond parcel (Building Permit B13-00273). Assuming five hours of sunlight per day for the state and 240 days of sunshine in the Napa Valley (roughly two-thirds of the calendar year), the recent installation of the renewable energy source generates an estimated 900,000 kilowatt hours (kWh) per year, which according to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency GHG equivalencies calculator is roughly equivalent to a savings of 600 MTCO_{2e} generated annually from non-renewable energy resources. The applicant has reported that the existing photovoltaic system provides approximately 70 percent of the approximately 100,000 square foot winery facility's energy needs.

The winery's installation of solar power generating equipment offsets an excess of the vehicle and wastewater treatment needs generated by its recent and requested increase in employment. More specifically, emissions generated from treatment of wastewater generated by the 64 additional employees are estimated at less than one MTCO_{2e} per year. Vehicle emissions from the daily trips of the additional employees are estimated at just over 300 MTCO_{2e} per year. (This is an estimate using the U.S.E.P.A's estimate of 4.73 MTCO_{2e} of GHG emissions per automobile per year but is conservative because not every trip taken in an employee's personal vehicle over the course of a year would be work-related.) Based on the energy demands of the existing winery buildings, energy needs for the winery building addition, Ticen residence and barn conversion, are estimated at 13 kWh per square foot per year, which would generate fewer than 90 MTCO_{2e} per year. The application includes no request to increase daily visitation or marketing event attendance numbers, and thus, GHG emissions associated with hospitality at the winery would not change from existing, permitted conditions. The sum of the estimated emissions from the requested modification would be below the BAAQMD threshold of 1,100 MTCO_{2e} per year.

It is noted that both the 90-person employee count and photovoltaic installation are existing conditions, though only the former is part of this discretionary approval request, and the latter was a ministerial action. Should the discretionary request be denied by the County, the winery would continue to utilize solar power to reduce its energy needs and consequently, its annual emissions of GHG associated with winery and marketing operations. GHG emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the Cal Green Building Code, vehicle fuel efficiency standards, and the project-specific on-site programs identified above would combine to further reduce emissions below BAAQMD thresholds of significance.

- b. The County of Napa does not have an adopted climate action plan, though the applicant's recent installation of an electric vehicle charging station in its visitor parking lot (Building Permit B13-00305) and roof-mounted photovoltaic array, as described above, is consistent with adopted General Plan goals (CON-68, CON-70) that encourage the County and permittees to pursue use of renewable energy sources. Other measures that the applicant has expressed intent to implement, and that would reduce the winery's emissions of GHGs, include exclusion of burning pruned materials; education to staff and visitors on sustainable practices; limiting grading and existing tree removal; and installation of water-efficient plumbing and landscaping and energy-efficient lighting fixtures.

The increase in emissions anticipated as a result of approval of the project are estimated to be less than significant, and the project is consistent with the County's efforts to reduce GHG emissions, further as described above. Accordingly, the proposed project's GHG impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. The proposed project involves the use and transport of those hazardous materials typically used in agricultural maintenance and winery operations. The project proponent and winery operator is required to file a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) with the Napa County Environmental Health Division and is subject to periodic inspection by County staff every three years or more frequently as needed to confirm ongoing compliance with State regulations for management of hazardous materials. The Raymond Winery facility was most recently inspected in July 2012 and July 2015. The property has no outstanding violations of its HMBP permit. During construction of the project, some hazardous materials (such as building coatings and adhesives would be utilized); however, given that use of these types of substances on the property would be limited to the 15- to 18-month total duration of construction, they would not create significant environmental impact.
- c. The winery and proposed modifications thereto would not affect schools within one-quarter mile. The school closest to the northern boundary of the Raymond parcel is St. Helena High School, which is approximately 1.4 miles northwest of the Raymond parcel and 1.9 miles northwest of the Ticen Ranch parcel.
- d. Neither property is on the California Environmental Protection Agency's list of hazardous sites (Government Code Section 65962.5).
- e/f. The winery and proposed modifications thereto would not cause an unsafe condition within two miles of an airport or airstrip, as neither the Raymond nor Ticen Ranch parcels is within two miles of any public or private airport or airstrip. The closest, operating, private landing facility is an emergency use helipad on-site of St. Helena Hospital, located at 10 Woodland Drive, over four miles northwest of the northernmost boundary of the Raymond parcel. Angwin Airport/Parrett Field, a public use airport owned by Pacific Union College, is over 5.5 miles north the proposed project site, and both the Raymond and Ticen Ranch parcels are outside of the boundaries of the land use compatibility plan for that airport.
- g. 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. Although the applicant would need to obtain a permit from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to encroach into the State Route 29 shoulder to construct the proposed new Ticen Ranch driveway, no component of the winery operational changes would result in

permanent closure or obstruction of adjacent public rights-of-way, and no component of the implementation of the EOP would otherwise be impaired by the proposed modification of the winery use permit.

- h. With the exception of small areas of ornamental landscaping around existing buildings on both sides, both the Raymond and Ticen Ranch parcels are substantially landscaped with vineyards and surrounded by other properties also planted with vineyards. The Napa County General Plan (Figure SAF-2) and regional hazard mapping by the Association of Bay Area Governments indicate that both properties are considered to have low risk for damage from wildland fires due to distance of both parcels from natural forested or grassland areas.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

The applicant's engineer prepared a stormwater control plan (SCP), in accordance with the Napa County / Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies (BASMAA) stormwater quality permit. The SCP describes the proposed measures for preservation of stormwater quality on the Raymond and Ticen Ranch parcels, and includes: 1) use of the adjacent soil in the vineyards, as self-treating receiving areas for runoff from the impervious surface of the proposed new access driveway; and 2) use of bioretention facilities, sized in accordance with BASMAA permit criteria at four percent of the corresponding conveying drainage management area, as a means to

capture and treat and allow soil infiltration of stormwater runoff from proposed new parking areas on both parcels. Runoff from the vineyard rows on the Ticen Ranch parcel currently sheet flows to the southwest, ultimately draining to the Napa River. Installation of the new driveway would interrupt the existing sheet flow pattern, and so proposed road improvements also include installation of a landscaped swale on the north and west sides of the access road as a means to receive and treat runoff sheet flowing from the vineyard rows on the Ticen Ranch parcel.

The existing storm drainage pattern of the site—which includes large, pervious, self-treating areas in the existing vineyard rows, on-site detention ponds for reuse of water for irrigation, and ultimate discharge of any excess runoff into the Napa River—is proposed to be kept with the proposed project. Runoff from the roof of the proposed additions to building A on the Raymond parcel would be conveyed using the existing stormwater system for the winery building and would discharge into an existing irrigation pond on the adjacent parcel. New storm drainage improvements include installation of bioretention areas adjacent proposed vehicle accessible areas (parking lot expansions and access driveway from State Route 29) and grass-lined swales sized to accommodate runoff from the 100-year storm event. Additionally, some proposed new pathways (excluding those needed in order to meet accessibility requirements) would be constructed of pervious surfaces. These measures collectively would serve to enhance stormwater quality by providing a means for direct absorption of stormwater into the on-site soils (as in pervious pathways) and treatment of / filtration of pollutants from runoff from impervious surfaces into pervious areas (bioretention areas, swales and vineyard rows) prior to discharge of any remaining runoff into the larger area storm drainage system. However, as the parcels are relatively flat with differences of fewer than 10 feet across them, much of the runoff from new impervious surfaces would infiltrate into existing on-site soils alongside paved areas or within the vineyard rows. The various opportunities for on-site infiltration would reduce the potential for stormwater contaminants to sheet flow off of the parcels.

The requested modification does not include an increase in the quantity of wine currently permitted to be produced at the site, and thus, would not result in a corresponding increase in the quantity of process-related wastewater generated at the winery nor an increase in potential for stormwater contamination from product spillage compared to existing, permitted conditions. Because the applicant has not requested any change to the winery's permitted quantities of wine production, no changes to existing outdoor production areas are proposed. To comply fully with current regulations for stormwater quality preservation, the winery operator is required to maintain its Industrial General Permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board in order to ensure that winery operations meet minimum water quality standards at all times.

- b. On January 14, 2014, Governor Jerry Brown declared a drought emergency in the state of California. The declaration stopped short of imposing mandatory conservation measures statewide. Mandatory water restrictions are being left to individual jurisdictions. On April 1, 2015, Governor Brown issued Executive Order B-29-15 imposing restrictions to achieve a statewide 25 percent reduction in potable urban water usage through February 28, 2016. However, such restrictions were not placed on private well users in rural areas. At this time, Napa County has not adopted or implemented mandatory water use restrictions. The County requires all Use Permit applicants to complete necessary water analyses in order to document that sufficient water supplies are available for their proposed projects.

To better understand groundwater resources, on June 28, 2011, the Napa County Board of Supervisors approved creation of a Groundwater Resources Advisory Committee (GRAC). The GRAC's purpose was to assist County staff and technical consultants with recommendations regarding groundwater, including data collection, monitoring, well pump test protocols, management objectives, and community support. The County retained Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE), who completed a County-wide assessment of groundwater resources (Napa County Groundwater Conditions and Groundwater Monitoring Recommendations Report, February 2011); developed a groundwater monitoring program (Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2013, January 2013) and also completed a 2013 Updated Hydrogeologic Conceptualization and Characterization of Groundwater Conditions (January 2013).

Groundwater Sustainability Objectives were recommended by the GRAC and adopted by the Board of Supervisors. These objectives acknowledged the important role of monitoring as a means to achieving groundwater sustainability and the principles underlying the sustainability objectives. In 2009, Napa County began a comprehensive study of its groundwater resources to meet identified action items in the County's 2008 General Plan update. The study, conducted by LSCE, emphasized developing a sound understanding of groundwater conditions and implementing an expanded groundwater monitoring and data management program as a foundation for integrated water resources planning and dissemination of water resources information. The 2011 baseline study by LSCE, which included over 600 wells and data going back over 50 years, concluded that the groundwater levels in Napa County are stable, except for portions of the MST (Milliken Sarco Tulocay) district. Most wells elsewhere within the Napa Valley Floor with a sufficient record indicate that groundwater levels are more affected by climatic conditions, are within historical levels, and seem to

recover from dry periods during subsequent wet or normal periods. The LSCE study also concluded that, on a regional scale, there appear to be no current groundwater quality issues except north of Calistoga (mostly naturally occurring boron and trace metals) and in the Carneros region (mostly salinity). LSCE prepared the 2014 Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report, presented to the Napa County Board of Supervisors on March 3, 2015.

Thresholds for water use have been established by the Napa County Department of Public Works, using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS), the GRAC recommendations, and the LSCE reports. These reports are the result of water resources investigations performed by the USGS in cooperation with the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District and LSCE. The County has concluded that the annual one acre-foot of water per parcel acre criteria on the Valley Floor has proven to be both scientifically and operationally adequate. Any project that reduces water usage or any water usage that is at or below the established threshold is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels.

Concurrently with the submittal of the use permit modification application, the applicant's engineer submitted an estimate of water use associated with the requested use permit modification. As noted in the project description, above, no increases in wine production are proposed. Existing vineyard on both parcels would be substantially maintained, with the exclusion of a small amount of vineyard acreage (less than a half-acre) to be removed for parking and driveway installations; this elimination of vineyard acreage would have the effect of reducing water use associated with vineyard irrigation, albeit marginally. Thus, additional landscaping on the Ticen Ranch parcel and approval of the requested recognition of increase in employment have the effect of increasing the winery's water use by an estimated 0.9 acre-feet of water per year over existing entitlements.

Comparison Estimated Water Use of Requested Use Permit Modification vs. Existing Entitlement

	Existing Entitlement (acre-feet / year)	Current Use (acre-feet / year)	Proposed Modification (acre-feet / year)
Production/Winery Processing	13.8	13.8	13.8
Employees	0.6	1.4	1.4
Tasting Room Visitors	1.4	1.4	1.4
Marketing Event Attendees	0.4	0.4	0.4
Landscaping	15.6	15.6	15.7
Vineyard	42.2	42.2	42.2
Frost Protection	15.9	15.9	15.9
TOTAL	89.9	90.7	90.8

Accounting for all existing **permitted** and requested uses and operations on the 60.2-acre Raymond Winery parcel, the 25.48-acre Ticen Ranch parcel, and the 27.68-acre Raymond vineyard parcel (APN 030-050-031) east of the winery, water usage under the requested use permit modification is conservatively estimated at approximately 90.8 acre-feet per year, before including any reduction in water demand as a result of the winery's reuse of process wastewater for vineyard irrigation **or accounting for any year in which the winery does not produce its maximum permitted quantity of wine.** (Although no discretionary approval is requested for the 27.68-acre Raymond vineyard parcel, the well located on the parcel provides irrigation water to the Raymond Winery parcel, and so it is included in this discussion. **Additionally, while the winery is permitted to produce 750,000 gallons of wine per year, and this production level was analyzed in the decision-making process associated with Use Permit U-89-46, the winery's actual production in calendar year 2016 was approximately 450,000 gallons, so that actual water use is less than the estimated water use reflected in the table, above.**) With a combined acreage of 113.4 acres between the three parcels, the conservatively estimated 90.8 acre-feet per year of water usage for the winery and accessory uses is below the one acre-foot per acre of property that the County has established as a sustainable level of groundwater extraction for properties located on the valley floor.

- c-f. Both the Raymond and Ticen Ranch parcels are generally flat, having slopes of less than five percent, and as noted in the Geology and Soils discussion of this initial study, the soil type on the properties (Pleasanton loam, 0-2 percent slopes) has low erosion potential. Grading on the property in order to construct new parking stalls, the proposed driveway and additions to building A would not substantially alter the currently flat characteristics of the parcels, though as noted below, they would reduce the pervious surface area on both properties. There are no streams or rivers on or immediately adjacent to either property that would be modified as a result of construction on either parcel; thus, no physical changes or new development would occur within any stream river setback areas required by County Code Chapter 18.108.

New impervious surfaces proposed with the modification include the asphaltic surfaces in the proposed parking lot expansion and new access driveway from State Route 29. These additions would reduce the pervious area on the properties and would increase the volume of stormwater runoff from the site. During installation of parking lot and driveway modifications, the applicant's contractors must comply with the County's stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) requirements to ensure that best management practices (BMPs) are adopted in order to minimize the amount of sediment and other pollutants leaving the site during construction activities. The following condition regarding stormwater control, which will require the incorporation of BMPs during development, is a standard site improvement and engineering services-specific condition that would apply to the project, if approved:

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

During construction, the project would have a less than significant impact on water quality with the implementation of Best Management Practices required by the standard conditions of approval. Post-construction, the stormwater quality preservation measures described in subsection a, above, would facilitate on-site treatment and infiltration of stormwater runoff from proposed new impervious surfaces on both properties.

- g-i. No new residences are proposed with this modification. According to Napa County's environmental resource mapping (Floodplain and Dam Levee Inundation layers), existing winery buildings, proposed expansions thereto, and existing and proposed hospitality buildings are outside of the 100-year as well as the 500-year floodplains, as well as, dam failure inundation areas. Approximately two acres in the southeastern corner of the Raymond parcel are within the 100-year floodplain; the 500-year floodplain encompasses a larger area of the Raymond parcel, approximately five acres also in the southeastern corner, extending toward the existing process wastewater treatment ponds. No portion of the Ticen Ranch parcel is within an identified floodplain.

While planted grapevines on the Raymond parcel might incur damage as a result of flooding of the Napa River, as might occur with extended duration rainstorms, the residence on-site and the winery's occupied structures (such as offices, employee work and break rooms and hospitality areas within the existing buildings and proposed additions) would be outside of 100- and 500-year floodplains, would not be damaged, and would not, therefore, have the potential to impede, redirect or otherwise alter flooding potential in the general vicinity. Both properties are also outside of the boundaries of the areas of potential inundation from failure of the Bell Canyon and Conn Creek dams, the two closest dams located approximately five miles northwest and three miles east of the Raymond and Ticen Ranch parcels

- j. In coming years, higher global temperatures are purported to raise sea level by expanding ocean water, melting mountain glaciers and small ice caps, and causing portions of Greenland and the Antarctic ice sheets to melt. The National Research Council and California Coastal Commission estimate that the sea level along the central and southern California coast will rise between 17 and 66 inches between the year 2000 and 2100.

Both the Raymond and Ticen Ranch parcels are located well inland of the Pacific Ocean coast and the shores of the San Pablo Bay where risk of inundation by seiche or tsunami tends to occur, and both parcels are located approximately 175 to 195 feet above mean sea level and are not anticipated to be affected by projected rises in sea level. Thus, both parcels have minimal risk for damages or injuries related to seiches or tsunamis. Both parcels are also predominantly flat, with slopes of zero to five percent; therefore, the proposed project is not likely to subject persons or structures to risk of damage as a result of landslide or mudflow.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Discussion:

- a. Both the Raymond and Ticen Ranch parcels are developed with winery and/or residential structures, with the majority of both parcels planted with grape vines. Land uses on surrounding parcels in the vicinity of both parcels are also predominantly agricultural and rural residential and include wineries, such as Del Dotto Family Winery, Franciscan Winery, Sullivan Family Estates and Whitehall Lane, with grape processing and accessory uses. None of the surrounding uses off-site would be physically modified (as by demolition of an existing structure or division of land), and as such, the existing vineyard, residential and winery uses, and proposed addition of winery accessory use to the Ticen Ranch parcel, would integrate with the property's surroundings rather than divide an existing, established community.
- b. By continuing to facilitate use of the property for agricultural use, inclusive of agricultural product processing (winemaking from grapes) and related, accessory uses, the requested use permit modification is generally consistent with the uses envisioned and as described in General Plan Goal AG/LU-1 and Policies AG/LU-1, AG/LU-2. The proposed project is also consistent with General Plan Policy AG/LU-9, which was specifically adopted by the Board of Supervisors as a mitigation measure of the General Plan environmental impact report (EIR), and is intended to prioritize preservation of farmland in the County. Napa County Code Section 18.16.030 also identifies wineries as conditionally permitted uses within the AP District where the site is located.

Water demand generated by the proposed winery would be in line with General Plan goals supporting prioritization of groundwater for agricultural purposes (Goal CON-11). Without taking deductions for vineyard irrigation using process water that currently occurs on the Raymond-owned parcels, both existing and projected water use would serve an agricultural use on the property and would be below the one acre-foot per parcel-acre per year threshold identified in the County's Water Availability Analysis Guidelines as a sustainable water use level in non-deficient groundwater areas on the Valley Floor. (Also see discussion under Hydrology and Water Quality section of this Initial Study.)

Restoration of the Ticen Ranch residence, estimated to be over 120 years old, and removal of its non-original additions, would be consistent with General Plan Policies CC-19 and CC-26.5, which support evaluation and preservation of resources from the County's history (Community Character Policy CC-26.5 was also adopted as a General Plan EIR mitigation measure). Lastly, it is noted that the existing roof-mounted photovoltaic array, installed in 2013 by the current winery owner, is consistent with adopted General Plan goals (CON-68, CON-70) that encourage the County and permittees to pursue use of renewable energy sources as a means to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

As indicated in previous sections of this document, the proposed site modifications and building remodels and rehabilitations to accommodate winery accessory use on-site would be outside of designated waterway setbacks and include measures for treatment of stormwater runoff from new site improvements. The proposed winery would therefore be consistent with adopted policies and zoning regulations intended to preserve water quality and water resources, such as those contained in Napa County Code Chapter 18.108 and referenced in General Plan Policy CON-19 (which prohibit new development proximate to waterways – also see section IV above), as well as General Plan Policy CON-48. Together, these policies and programs have been adopted by the County as regulations and General Plan EIR mitigation measures in order to preserve the quality of watersheds in support of the County's agricultural goals.

- c. There is no HCP or NCCP that has been adopted or is being implemented in unincorporated Napa County.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. There are no impacts anticipated to occur with respect to mineral resources as a result of the proposed modification of a winery on the subject site. As described in Chapter 2 of the Napa County Baseline Data Report (BDR; 2005), mineral resources mostly occur in the southern and northern areas of the County, generally at higher elevations than the valley floor where the subject site is located. BDR Figure 2.2 identifies no mineral mining resources on or in the vicinity of the winery and vineyard site.

The proposed use permit would continue the agricultural use of the site and would not result in permanent, full conversion of the agricultural property to urban development and land uses. Thus, the amendment would continue to have no impact on known mineral resources.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. The proposed project would cause a temporary increase in noise levels as a result of construction of the building and site modifications. Much of the construction (specifically, that which would convert winery space to hospitality space) would occur inside of the existing winery building on the Raymond parcel and inside of the barn and residence on the Ticen Ranch parcel, with

the walls of the existing structures providing sound attenuation for construction activities. However, other improvements including construction of the parking lot and vineyard viewing platform, construction of winery building additions on the Raymond parcel, demolition of the Ticen Ranch garage, and restoration of the exterior of the Ticen Ranch residence, would occur outside of existing structures. **Examples of construction equipment that would be associated with site improvements include concrete mixing trucks and bulldozers for grading of the new access road, along with handheld tools typically used in wood- or steel-frame building construction including pneumatic tools such as nail guns and sanders.** Noise levels generated from these tools and equipment have been measured as high as 90 decibels at 50 feet from the source (https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/handbook/handbook09.cfm). With a six-decibel reduction in noise levels per doubling of distance from the source, and with the County's noise threshold of 75 dBA during daytime hours for construction noise effects on residential uses (County Code Section 8.16.080), a residence located within 400 feet of the location of construction activities could potentially be affected by construction noise generated by renovation, construction or demolition activities associated with the project. As the closest receptors (off-site residences) to a potential construction location (in this case, demolition of the swimming pool and construction of the driveway at the Ticen Ranch property frontage) are over 400 feet from those potential noise sources, construction-related noise impacts of the project are within County Code limits and considered less than significant. **Nonetheless, the project would be subject to Standard conditions of development in Napa County that are intended to reduce to acceptable levels the potential impacts of construction-related noise on neighboring uses, by requiring mufflers on construction equipment, prohibiting operation of noise-disturbing construction tools or equipment between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., and limiting construction noise levels measured at property lines to 75 A-weighted decibels (dBA, a measurement of sound that mimics human hearing by de-emphasizing low- and very-high frequency sound) between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m.:**

Construction noise shall be minimized to the greatest extent practical and allowable under State and local safety laws. Construction equipment muffling and hours of operation shall be in compliance with County Code Chapter 8.16. Equipment shall be shut down when not in use. Construction equipment shall normally be staged, loaded, and unloaded on the project site. 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 between the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Exterior winery equipment shall be enclosed or muffled and maintained so as not to create a noise disturbance in accordance with the County Code. There shall be no amplified sound system or amplified music utilized outside of approved, enclosed, winery buildings.

- c/d. The application includes a request to modify the marketing program defined under Use Permit No. U-89-46 approved in February 1991. Use Permit No. U-89-46 established a marketing program for the Raymond Winery, with frequency of and attendance at marketing events consistent with the current request; however, the current use permit modification request would specify an allowance for the winery to conduct up to half of its marketing events outdoors, in the existing lawn and pool areas near the existing residence on the Raymond parcel, in the existing biodynamic garden area on the Raymond parcel, and in the proposed landscaped picnic area on the east side of the residential building on the Ticen Ranch parcel. Duration of each event would span three- to four-hour increments, with no event beginning before 10:00 a.m. or ending later than 10:00 p.m. (Note that this is an adjustment to the current entitlement under U-89-46, which allows events to begin as early as 11:00 a.m. and end as late as 11:00 p.m., except that events may not start or end between 4:00 and 6:30 p.m.) The on-site consumption of wine is also requested to be allowed in the same locations as outdoor marketing events.

The proposed project involves changes to the approved marketing program that have the potential to generate higher noise levels, compared to existing conditions, as a result of the proposed occurrence of events outdoors. In December 2012, as a component of the now withdrawn Major Modification to Use Permit, Application P11-00156, the winery operator commissioned an acoustical study that concluded that noise impacts of outdoor events as then-proposed would not have significant impacts on nearby sensitive receptors, provided that monitor speakers are oriented away from residences on Zinfandel Lane and events with amplified sound are required to end no later than 10:00 p.m.

The current Major Modification to Use Permit, Application P15-00307, differs from the previous, withdrawn application in that it includes an exclusion of amplified music and includes a marketing schedule that specifies marketing events concluding at 10:00 p.m. Such elements of the current request are consistent with recommendations of the 2012 acoustical study for reduction of noise impacts. It is also noted that the ending time of events (proposed to be adjusted from 11:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m.) is more consistent with current County Code regulations in chapter 8.16, which establish "quiet hours" as those hours between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.

Additional regulations contained within County Code Chapter 8.16 establish exterior noise criteria for various land uses in the County. As described in Project Setting, above, land uses that surround the Raymond and Ticen Ranch parcels are predominantly agricultural (vineyard) and low-density residential developments. Based on the standards in County Code section 8.16.070, noise levels may not exceed 50 decibels during daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) or 45 decibels during nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) at the exterior of a residential structure or residential use on a portion of a larger property. Given the predominant land uses around both parcels, noise impacts of a proposed project would be considered bothersome and potentially significant if sound generated by it had the effect of creating volume exceedances more than 50 percent of the time (i.e., 30 minutes in any hour).

Wheeler Lane, from which the Raymond parcel has its current vehicular access, is a private road that also provides access to several residentially-developed parcels to the north and east of the Raymond Winery buildings. The nearest residence to the Raymond Winery is approximately 500 feet northeast of the lawn near the proposed reflecting pond, the closest of the winery's three proposed outdoor marketing event areas. Under the proposed project, the largest outdoor event that would occur on the Raymond parcel would have an attendance of no more than 100 people, and all events would end by 10:00 p.m.

Noise sampling performed under County authority, as part of the analysis for the Bell Winery use permit modification (P13-00055), measured sound from an 85-person event using a meter placed 123 feet from the sound source (event). Measurements taken from that sound meter indicated that sound from the event exceeded 56 decibels 50 percent of the time, while equivalent (average) noise level was 60 decibels. Given the comparable size of this observed event to the largest outdoor event requested by the Raymond Winery operators, and a similar distance between event areas and State Route 29 (approximately 1,900 feet in the case of Bell Winery, and 1,750 feet in the case of Raymond) these noise levels are considered similar to what would be observed from an outdoor event at the Raymond parcel; however, these levels are also considered to be conservative given that the Bell Winery event had a live music act, and Raymond Winery proposes no outdoor amplified sound. Thus, using the Bell Winery study as a comparable, and applying a six-decibel reduction per doubling of distance from the noise source, it is anticipated that exterior noise experienced at the nearest residence on Wheeler Lane (estimated 44 decibels for half of the event duration, and an average of 48 decibels for the duration of the event) would not exceed the County Code standard of 50 decibels during 50 percent of daytime hours. Outdoor events are also proposed to occur in the proposed garden area behind (east of) the Ticen Ranch house; however, it is noted that the closest residence to the Ticen Ranch house is approximately 700 feet to the west, on the opposite side of State Route 29, and so would also not experience noise levels in excess of County standards as a result of outdoor events conducted on the Ticen Ranch parcel.

Another potential noise source associated with the proposal is the sound of visitors' dogs barking during their temporary stay at the winery's pet comfort station. Sound generated from the pet comfort station is anticipated to be less than significant, given the structure's small size and limited capacity for sheltering pets, its partial enclosure by building walls, and the location of the pet comfort station on the opposite side of winery building A and 400 feet further from the nearest residence on Wheeler Lane as the lawn near the proposed reflecting pond (referenced above). The additional distance and the walls of the winery building would serve as additional buffers to reduce the sounds generated by pets at the pet comfort station.

The project statement submitted with this major modification application indicates that the requested marketing plan excludes outdoor amplified music at marketing events authorized under the winery's use permit. It is noted, however, that County Code Chapter 5.36 allows amplified music on occasion for licensed temporary events. Consistent with County Code, the winery operator or any owner of a business in unincorporated Napa County areas may file an application for a temporary event that includes outdoor, amplified music. No temporary events are proposed as part of this project, although such events do occur at wineries and have legally occurred at Raymond Winery in the past. Thus, occurrence of future temporary events at the winery on the Raymond parcel would be a continuation of an existing condition on that property; requests for temporary events on the Ticen Ranch parcel would be a change in use, and should the winery operation submit a future request for a temporary event on the Ticen Ranch parcel, that request would be evaluated for compliance with the County's Noise Ordinance (County Code Chapter 8.16) as part of the County staff's review of the temporary event application.

- e/f. The winery and proposed modifications thereto would not expose people to excessive noise levels associated with air traffic, as no private landing facility is proposed with the requested modification, and the neither the Raymond nor Ticen Ranch parcels is within two miles of any public or private airport or airstrip. The closest, operating, private landing facility is a helipad operated by St. Helena Hospital, located at 10 Woodland Drive, over four miles northwest of the northernmost boundary of the Raymond parcel. Angwin Airport/Parrett Field, a public use airport owned by Pacific Union College, is over 5.5 miles north the proposed project site.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. Other than a new on-site access road and on-site wastewater treatment facility improvements to serve exclusively the winery's operations, no new infrastructure is proposed that might induce growth by extending service outside of the boundaries of either property. The proposed modification would facilitate ongoing operation of an existing winery; the proposed merger of the 25.48-acre Ticen Ranch parcel with the Raymond parcel would eliminate the potential for establishment of a separate winery operating as a separate business on the Ticen site.
- b/c. The AP District zoning of the parcel allows one single-family residence per legal lot. Each parcel currently has a single-family residence, with only the residential use on the Raymond parcel proposed to be maintained with the operation of the winery, consistent with the property's zoning. The existing residences on the Ticen Ranch parcel are proposed to be demolished (accessory apartment residence) or converted to winery accessory use (main residence); however, no residents would be displaced by the demolition and conversion of this small quantity of units, as both units are currently unoccupied and have been so for several years. Thus, no residents would be displaced as a result of the proposed use permit modification.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV.	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The property is located within the service areas of both the Napa County Sheriff's Department (Beat 4) as well as the Napa County Fire Department. Throughout the construction process, the proposed winery building and improvements, if approved, would be inspected by County building inspectors and fire officials in order to ensure that the structures and vehicle access ways are built in accordance with current Building and Fire Codes applicable at the time of building permit application. Proposed improvements include installation of two additional, 10,000-gallon water storage tanks for storage of water for fire suppression, to ensure adequate flows during response to a fire emergency.

If approved, the requested use permit would facilitate the continued operation and expansion of an existing winery on-site of an existing vineyard. The proposed project scope does not include construction of any new residential units nor accompanying introduction of new residents that would utilize existing parks or potentially increase student enrollment in schools located in the area of the winery. No new parks or other public recreational amenities or institutions are proposed to be built with the proposed use permit. Also see discussion under Section XV, below.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. The proposed project is a request for amendment to the existing Use Permit that allows the operation of Raymond Vineyard and Cellars' winery with visitation and marketing events, and if approved as proposed, would allow operational changes and modifications to the development of the Raymond and Ticen Ranch parcels and would legitimize noncompliant operations and site modifications already in place but that were completed without benefit of County permit approvals. An existing residence on the Raymond parcel would be retained, while the existing vacant residence on the Ticen Ranch parcel would be converted to winery accessory use. The proposed project includes no new residential units and accompanying introduction of new residents that would utilize existing parks in the area, potentially accelerating those recreational facilities' deterioration. The proposal would not increase the number of visitors to the property, though permitted employment is requested to be recognized at the current count of 90 persons, some of whom might visit recreational facilities in the area during breaks or before or after work. However, given that the purpose of employees' trips are to and from the winery as the primary destination, such visits to area recreational facilities are

anticipated to be infrequent and would not drastically accelerate the deterioration of the park amenities. No new parks or other public recreational amenities are proposed to be built with the proposed winery.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system and/or conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-16, which seeks to maintain an adequate Level of Service (LOS) at signalized and unsignalized intersections, or reduce the effectiveness of existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the Napa Valley Transportation Authority for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-23, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. The existing winery has is sole access to the County road network via Wheeler Lane, a private road that intersects Zinfandel Lane (a Napa County road) to the north of the Raymond property. West of the property, Zinfandel Lane intersects State Route 29, a State-managed, north-south roadway that extends the length of the west side of the Napa Valley. East of the Raymond property, Zinfandel Lane intersects and terminates at Silverado Trail, a County-managed, north-south roadway that extends the length of the east side of the Valley. Zinfandel Lane, State Route 29 and Silverado Trail are all two-lane roadways in the general vicinity of the proposed project site, with State Route 29 widening to four lanes in the Town of Yountville to the south. At the Ticen Ranch parcel frontage, State Route 29 has a center, two-way left turn lane that provides a refuge area for vehicles turning left onto the Ticen Ranch property or merging into southbound traffic after turning left out of the Ticen Ranch property. Off-site improvements proposed with the requested modification include construction of a left turn lane on the westbound Zinfandel Lane approach to the winery driveway at Wheeler Lane.

As noted the Project Description above, approval of the requested modification would entitle an existing but unpermitted increase in the number of winery employees from 26 to 90, with a corresponding increase in the number of daily vehicle trips to and from the winery in association with those employees. The overall number of visitor trips would not change with the requested modification, as the project proponent requests no change to the winery's permitted number of daily and marketing event visitors; however, the number of visitors traveling on Zinfandel Lane would decrease as visitors to the winery would have the ability and be encouraged to use State Route 29 to access both the Ticen Ranch and Raymond properties. Employees, by contrast, would be encouraged to continue to use Zinfandel Lane and Wheeler Lane to access the winery. Applying the trip generation factors in the County's use permit application (page 15), the winery's existing and proposed 400-person daily visitor count generates an

estimated 308 vehicle trips per day. Applying the same trip generation factors from the use permit application, the 64 employees (44 full-time and 20 part-time) requested to be recognized in the proposed modification generate an estimated 172 vehicle trips per day, or just under 60 percent of the trip volume of the winery's entitled daily visitation number.

It is recognized that some visitors might still use Zinfandel Lane to access the winery; likewise, it is noted that some employees would use the proposed driveway from State Route 29, particularly those whose work spaces would be on the Ticen Ranch property. Thus, while it is not possible to control driver behavior and definitively isolate employee trips to Zinfandel Lane and visitor trips to State Route 29, addition of the second access point to the winery from State Route 29 would nonetheless have the effect of reducing vehicle trips on Zinfandel Lane compared to existing conditions. Isolating the "proposed" 64-employee increase as a component of the "project," and even if all 64 employees used Zinfandel Lane to access the winery, as much as 40 percent of the winery visitors could also still use Zinfandel Lane without generating an increase in the approximately 300 daily visitor vehicle trips estimated to exist under current entitlements.

Traffic impact analysis prepared by the applicant's consultant similarly identified the 64-employee increase as a component of the "project," and estimated near-term and long-term impacts to the circulation system in the vicinity of the winery, under scenarios both with and without the "project." The study evaluated potential impacts to three existing intersections (State Route 29/Zinfandel Lane, Wheeler Lane/Zinfandel Lane and Silverado Trail/Zinfandel Lane), as well as the proposed driveway onto the Ticen Ranch parcel from State Route 29. Each intersection is unsignalized, with traffic controlled by a stop sign on the minor approach (Zinfandel Lane, Wheeler Lane and Zinfandel Lane, respectively). Additionally, the study evaluated segments of State Route 29 just north of Zinfandel Lane and south of the proposed driveway onto Ticen Ranch; segments of Silverado Trail just north and south of Zinfandel Lane; and segments of Zinfandel Lane east of State Route 29 and west of Silverado Trail.

Level of service standards for roads in the unincorporated areas have been established by the County in its General Plan (2008). As described on page CIR-15 of the General Plan, "[l]evel of service (LOS) is a measure of how well an intersection or roadway is able to carry traffic. LOS is usually designated with a letter grade A-F, where 'A' is best and 'F' is worst." General Plan policy CIR-16 establishes the County's desired LOS on all County roadways as LOS D, which represents "[t]he level where traffic nears an unstable flow. Intersections still function, but short queues develop and cars may have to wait through one cycle during short peaks" (CIR-15). The submitted traffic study applies this standard for *overall* intersection function, allowing LOS E as the poorest acceptable operation for a stop sign controlled approach to an intersection, noting that overall intersection operation generally remains one or more levels of service better than the stop sign controlled approach.

Trip counts for the analysis were taken on a Friday and Saturday in August 2015 and were adjusted upward one to two percent to extrapolate September harvest conditions. (Friday and Saturday, and the month of September, were selected for the analysis because those days and month historically have had the highest traffic volumes of the week and year.) Volumes taken during this timeframe indicated that the peak hours of traffic were between 8:00 and 9:00 a.m. on Friday ("Friday AM peak hour"), between 3:00 and 4:00 p.m. on Friday ("Friday PM peak hour"), and between 3:15 and 4:15 p.m. on Saturday ("Saturday PM peak hour").

The analysis in the traffic study extrapolated traffic volumes of the 64 employees, and deducting that number, indicates that the following intersections and roadway segments currently function overall at unacceptable LOS E or F without the project (i.e., without the requested 64 employees):

1. State Route 29/Zinfandel Lane: LOS E during Friday and Saturday PM peak hours
2. Silverado Trail/Zinfandel Lane: LOS F during Friday PM peak hour
3. State Route 29 Segment: LOS E southbound during the Friday and Saturday PM peak hours
4. Silverado Trail Segment: LOS E southbound during the Friday PM peak hour

(In the existing scenario, it is noted that the Zinfandel Lane approaches to State Route 29 and Silverado Trail function at LOS F during all but the Friday AM peak hour, during which the approach has an LOS E.)

In the cumulative scenario (2030) of General Plan buildout, without the project, level of service at State Route 29/Zinfandel Lane and Silverado Trail/Zinfandel Lane worsens to LOS F during the Friday and Saturday PM peak hours. Additionally, level of service worsens to unacceptable levels on the following road segments:

1. State Route 29 worsens to LOS E northbound during the Friday and Saturday peak hours (AM and PM) and to LOS F southbound during the Friday and Saturday PM peak hours;

2. Silverado Trail worsens to LOS E northbound and LOS F southbound during the Friday PM peak hour, and to LOS E southbound during the Saturday PM peak hour.

None of the studied intersections are signalized or controlled in all directions by stop signs. Under current County policy, if a road segment is already impacted (LOS E or F) during the peak hour of traffic, a proposed project would be considered to have a significant impact requiring mitigation if the project would, in the peak hour: 1) result in an increase of one or more percent to the existing volumes of an unsignalized intersection or road segment; or 2) result in an increase of 10 or more percent to the stop sign controlled minor approach. For intersections or road segments that operate at acceptable levels (LOS A, B, C or D) during peak hours under existing conditions, a project proponent would be required to mitigate his project's impacts if the project would have the effect of deteriorating the LOS of the intersection or road segment to an unacceptable level (LOS E or F) or would trigger peak hour warrants for installation of a traffic signal. Under cumulative conditions (i.e., General Plan buildout), a project would require traffic mitigation if it would contribute five or more percent of the traffic volumes projected to occur in the long-term horizon.

As previously noted, the proposed project includes recognition of the 64-employee increase. The proposed project also includes construction of a left-hand turn lane on Zinfandel Lane at Wheeler Lane, and improvement to the existing driveway access onto the Ticen Ranch parcel, opposite an existing private drive, to provide a secondary access to the winery and tasting rooms. Operational project changes incorporated into the request include a varying work schedule that includes early scheduled shifts (6:00 a.m. – 2:30 p.m.) for production employees and later scheduled shifts (9:30 a.m. – 6:00 p.m.) for hospitality staff, and extension of the end of winery visitation hours from 4:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. The intent of these operational changes is to reduce employee-generated vehicle trips to or from the winery during peak hours of traffic; and to distribute winery visitor departure trips over a longer day so as to reduce the number of visitors leaving within the PM peak hours of traffic (Friday between 3:00 and 4:00 p.m. and Saturday between 3:15 and 4:15 p.m.) by facilitating later departures after the peak hour.

The requested use permit modification is not anticipated to have a significant impact to the transportation network in the vicinity of the site. The traffic analysis suggests that the proposed project would have the effect of reducing (by 0.1 to 0.55 percent) existing traffic volumes at the State Route 29/Zinfandel Lane intersection and the southbound lanes of Silverado Trail south of Zinfandel Lane, and it would have a negligible effect on the Zinfandel Lane stop-controlled minor approach to Silverado Trail. While traffic volumes on Zinfandel Lane would decrease as a result of the secondary access driveway on the Ticen Ranch parcel, volumes on State Route 29 would generally remain static with the project in both near-term and long-term horizons. With-project traffic contributions to other studied intersections and road segments would not exceed 0.6 percent of existing volumes or 0.5 percent of projected traffic volumes in the long-term horizon. No mitigation necessary for level of service impacts is therefore required for the proposed project.

- c. The proposed modification includes no tall structures, uplighting, or air travel component that would affect air traffic.
- d/e. In 1971, Napa County adopted its initial iteration of the Napa County Road and Street Standards (RSS). The intent of the RSS was to establish a uniform set of standards for public and private roads that strive to preserve the natural landscape and water quality, minimize impacts to environmentally sensitive areas and native habitats, and provide adequate safety and service in the interest of protecting public health and welfare. As further described in the RSS Objectives, the RSS "attempt to meet the related interests of several other agencies, including the Resource Conservation District, Cal Fire, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department, and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife" (5). The RSS has since been amended to reflect changes in the best practices and regulations of the respective agencies, with the most recent amendment occurring in November 2016.

As referenced in prior sections of this initial study, the proposed project sites currently have direct access to and from Zinfandel Lane (Raymond parcel) and State Route 29 (Ticen Ranch parcel). The proposed project includes both on-site and off-site changes to the existing vehicular circulation pattern, consisting of a new left turn lane on Zinfandel Lane at Wheeler Lane; an improved vehicular driveway at State Route 29 on the Ticen Ranch parcel; and a new, 18-foot wide, asphalt-paved access road with one-foot wide shoulders on both sides, extending from the State Route 29 entrance on Ticen Ranch eastward and northward to connect to the vehicular parking areas on the Raymond Winery parcel.

The parcels would be accessed by garbage collections trucks, emergency response trucks, and delivery and box trucks, as well as passenger vehicles driven by employees and visitors to the winery. In accordance with standard conditions of approval, "All road improvements on private property required per Engineering Services shall be maintained in good working condition and in accordance with the Napa County Roads and Streets Standards." Subsequent to commencement of preparation of this initial

study, the Napa County Board of Supervisors adopted a revision to the RSS that would increase the minimum required paved surface of private roadways from 18 feet to 20 feet wide. As currently proposed in the project scope, the proposed 18-foot wide paved surface complies with the RSS that were in effect at the time of use permit application submittal but, prior to construction, the applicant will need to revise the proposed improvement to meet the recently adopted, 20-foot wide paved surface standard. This change to the site improvement design could successfully be achieved within the design width of the roadway (i.e., by paving the two, one-foot wide shoulders). Stormwater runoff from the additional pavement would sheet flow into the vineyard rows without significant adjustment to the project's stormwater control plan. No changes are proposed to be made to other service and production areas on-site, which can currently accommodate movement of large vehicles around the areas.

The traffic study prepared for the proposed project also evaluated safety of existing and proposed access points from Zinfandel Lane and State Route 29 to the Raymond and Ticen Ranch parcels. Given posted and observed speeds along the relatively flat roadways, the study concluded that there was adequate sight and vehicle stopping distances at both access points, and the proposed improvement of the existing Ticen Ranch driveway in its same location opposite another existing, private residential driveway would avoid the risk of creating movement conflicts between vehicles entering or exiting either driveway.

- f. The major modification request includes a request for the County to: 1) recognize an increase in the number of permitted parking stalls on-site, from 75 permitted parking stalls to 89 existing stalls; and 2) allow an additional increase of 61 parking stalls, with 50 stalls to be added to the Raymond parcel's guest parking lot and 11 stalls to be added next to the Ticen Ranch residence. It is noted that the 75 parking stalls (of which 47 were guests stalls) was a mitigation measure of the 1991 use permit modification entitlement and was adopted as a transportation demand management measure.

The requested increase in parking would not result in additional visitors to the winery, as the winery operators are not proposing to change the existing number of permitted guests for tastings and marketing events at the winery. The requested parking increases would provide on-site parking for the employment increase now requested to be recognized. However, as further detailed in subsection a/b above, the addition of a second driveway from State Route 29 would minimize the impacts of the proposed project on the convenient circulation of traffic in the vicinity of the site. Thus, while the proposed parking lot expansion conflicts with the mitigation measure adopted by the county in 1991, the addition of the second driveway as an element of the currently-proposed project would have the same intent of the 1991 mitigation measure to manage winery traffic, particularly on Zinfandel Lane, which was the winery's sole means of connection to the greater roadway network in 1991.

The requested increase in the number of parking stalls would not have environmental impacts to water or water quality. The additional employee stalls requested to be recognized have been striped on existing, entitled impervious surfaces near the crush pad and press areas of the Raymond Winery parcel. The proposed, 50-stall expansion of the parking lot on the Raymond parcel would have the effect of reducing water demand from vineyard irrigation, and runoff from the new impervious surface would drain to bioretention areas for treatment. The proposed new parking stalls on the Ticen Ranch parcel would not reduce water demands, as the location of the new parking lot would not replace existing vineyards, but the new impervious area of the parking lot would have adjacent bioretention areas for treatment of runoff from the asphalt concrete surface.

Although the proposed parking additions would not have significant environmental effects, the Planning Commission will be asked to determine whether the increase requested with the modification is consistent with General Plan policy CIR-23, which discourages permit applicants from providing unnecessary or excessive quantities of parking stalls for their uses, as part of the Commission's evaluation of the merits of the proposed use permit modification.

- g. The properties are currently accessible by public transit. Bus service is currently provided in the vicinity of the winery, via a VINE Route 10 transit stop located near the intersection of Zinfandel Lane and State Route 29, approximately one-third mile from the existing Wheeler Lane entrance to the winery, and approximately two-thirds mile from the proposed entrance to the winery property from State Route 29. There are no public bus routes that travel along the Zinfandel Lane frontage of the property.

The Napa Countywide Bicycle Plan, adopted by the Board of Supervisors in June 2012, identifies Zinfandel Lane for a proposed Class II bicycle facility (on-street bike lane); currently the road includes striped and paved shoulders. The Bicycle Plan also identifies a Class I bicycle facility (off-street bike path) parallel to State Route 29 and the Wine Train railroad line, on the opposite side of the highway from the proposed project (Napa Valley Vine Trail). As the proposed project would decrease automobile traffic on Zinfandel Lane and lacks frontage on the proposed Vine Trail alignment, no mitigation associated with provision of bicycle facilities would be required for the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII.	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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. As discussed in section V of this initial study, none of the existing structures on either parcel are listed in a local, state or federal register of historic resources, although an evaluation by the applicant's architect suggests that the main residence on the Ticen Ranch parcel was built in the late 1800's and is historically significant and eligible for listing on a register. As proposed with this request, the ranch residence would be restored to remove alterations built outside of the structure's period of significance, and to re-introduce architectural features that mimic the building's original characteristics. With the inclusion of efforts to restore the potentially historically significant main residence on the Ticen Ranch parcel, and consistent with General Plan Policy CC-26, the proposed project would be considered to be an enhancement to the historic value of the property and would not have a significant negative impact on a local historical resource.

- b. In consultation with tribal representatives pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 (Assembly Bill 52 [Gatto]), potential Native American cultural resources identified in previous archeological surveys were determined to exist within the general vicinity of the Ticen Ranch parcel. As discussed in the Background section of this initial study, both the Raymond and Ticen Ranch parcels have a long history of agricultural development and previous ground disturbance, as has occurred to remove native vegetation and grade the site to accommodate installation of the existing winery, residences, vineyard and previously, orchard. If the project is approved and any resources not previously uncovered during this prior disturbance 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 County's standard condition of approval referenced in section V, above. In addition to the County's standard condition, and in an effort to further protect potential Native American heritage resources that might be discovered during grading of the Ticen Ranch parcel for the new driveway and parking lot, the following measures, developed in consultation with Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation representatives during a site visit and discussions in November 2016, are recommended for inclusion as conditions of project approval.

Mitigation Measure:

MM TCR-1 Mitigation Measure TCR-1: Prior to commencement of construction of project improvements on the Ticen Ranch parcel, the permittee shall coordinate with one or more representatives of a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1. Pre-construction coordination shall, at a minimum, include the following:

- a. Submittal of copies of grading plans to the tribal representative, concurrently with submittal of the grading permit application to the Napa County Planning, Building & Environmental Services Department (PBES).*
- b. Training of construction field crews, by a tribal representative, of the potential for presence of Native*

American resources on the property, the potential types of resources that could be found on-site, and the procedures to follow in the event of discovery of such resources.

- c. Presence of a tribal representative on-site during survey/marketing and initial rough grading of improvements (vehicular access roads and parking stalls) on the Ticen Ranch parcel.

Monitoring: Prior to submittal of the first grading or building permit application, the permittee shall contact Planning staff of PBES to obtain contact information for the California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1, and whose agents requested consultation with the County during the process of review of the requested use permit modification. Concurrently with submittal of the grading application for Ticen Ranch parcel improvements to Engineering and Building staff of PBES, the permittee shall submit confirmation of submittal of the grading plans to the tribal representative previously identified. If the permittee neglects to submit such confirmation to PBES, then Planning staff of PBES will convey a copy of the plans to the tribal representative upon receipt of the grading permit application.

Prior to issuance of the grading permit, the permittee shall submit to Planning staff of PBES confirmation of pre-construction training of construction field crews about potential presence of Native American resources on the project site and the correct procedures to follow in the event of discovery of such resources. Confirmation shall be in the form of a written letter or certification from the tribal representative conducting the training.

No fewer than 10 days prior to commencement of grading, the permittee shall concurrently contact the tribal representative and Planning staff of PBES in writing, receipt confirmed, to advise of the start date of project grading and to invite the representative and staff member to be present during survey of and initial rough grading of the site improvements.

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

Discussion:

- a/e. Because the property utilizes existing on-site septic systems for wastewater treatment, and would continue to treat wastewater on-site, no determination of service or will-serve letters from the wastewater treatment provider is necessary for the proposed project. Permitting of any modifications to the on-site septic system would be conducted by the County Environmental Health Division. The volume of wastewater generated by the requested uses would not exceed limits that would trigger permitting of the wastewater treatment system by the State Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- b/c. As described in the Hydrology and Water Quality section of this initial study, the existing storm drainage pattern of the site—which includes large, pervious, self-treating areas in the existing vineyard rows, on-site detention ponds for reuse of water for irrigation, and ultimate discharge of any excess runoff into the Napa River—is proposed to be kept with the proposed project. New storm drainage improvements include installation of small bioretention areas adjacent proposed vehicle accessible areas (parking lot expansions and access driveway from State Route 29) and grass-lined swales sized to accommodate runoff from the 100-year storm event. Additionally, some proposed new pathways (excluding those needed in order to meet accessibility requirements) would be constructed of pervious surfaces. These measures collectively would serve to enhance stormwater quality by providing a means for direct absorption of stormwater into the on-site soils (as in pervious pathways) and treatment of / filtration of pollutants from runoff from impervious surfaces prior to discharge of the runoff into the larger area storm drainage system. However, as the parcels are relatively flat with differences of fewer than 10 feet across them, much of the runoff from new impervious surfaces would infiltrate into existing on-site soils alongside paved areas or within the vineyard rows. The opportunity for on-site infiltration would reduce the potential for stormwater contaminants to sheet flow off of the parcels. Because new storm drain facilities would occur within disturbed areas on the parcels and would ultimately preserve stormwater quality during ongoing operation of the uses, the installation of the facilities would not have significant negative environmental effects.
- Similarly, proposed wastewater treatment site improvements include installation of a new system for treatment of sanitary wastewater from both the Raymond and Ticen Ranch parcels but are not anticipated to have significant negative environmental effects. The system would consist of a combination of septic tanks, new piping and pumps, a subsurface drip field and pretreatment system. Improvements would occur on-site, with primary and 200 percent reserve subsurface dripfields located within the existing vineyard rows and outside required setbacks from wells so as to prevent contamination of groundwater and surface water. See section III for discussion of potential environmental impacts and standard conditions related to project construction.
- d. As discussed in additional detail in section IX.b of this initial study, water usage under the requested use permit modification is estimated at approximately 90.8 acre-feet per year, before including any reduction in water demand as a result of the winery's reuse of process wastewater for vineyard irrigation. Accounting for all existing and requested uses and operations on the 60.2-acre Raymond Winery parcel, the 25.48-acre Ticen Ranch parcel, and the 27.68-acre Raymond vineyard parcel (APN 030-050-031) east of the winery, which parcels together encompass 113.4 acres, the estimated 90.8 acre-feet per year of water usage for the winery and accessory uses is below the one-acre foot per acre of property per year that the County has established as a sustainable level of groundwater extraction for properties located on the valley floor. The winery, as proposed with this modification request, would utilize existing wells for potable and irrigation water; no new wells would be drilled in association with this use permit modification request.
- f/g. Non-recyclable and non-organic waste generated by winery operations is and will continue to be collected by the Upper Valley Disposal Service and ultimately deposited at the Clover Flat Landfill located in Calistoga. According to information on the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (www.calrecycle.ca.gov), Clover Flat has adequate capacity remaining to accommodate any non-recyclable and non-organic waste generated from the businesses. More specifically, the landfill has a permitted capacity of 4.9 million cubic yards, and as of 2014, had over 40 percent of its permitted capacity remaining with an anticipated closure date in 2047. The Greenhouse Gas Best Management Practices checklist that the applicant submitted with the use permit modification indicated that the winery operator intends to reduce its waste stream from typical operations by striving to recycle 75 percent of all waste and to compost 75 percent of food and garden material (Napa County GHG Checklist BMP-17 and BMP 18).

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. Both the Raymond and Ticen Ranch properties have been previously developed and disturbed with winery buildings, residential and accessory structures, and vineyards. The currently-proposed project generally consists of recognition of an existing, noncompliant, winery employee count; recognition of prior conversion of wine production spaces to accessory uses; and re-purposing of existing residential and agricultural buildings for winery accessory uses. Other site improvements include utility enhancements and installations and vehicle access drives and parking spaces. Proposed site improvements would also include stormwater bioretention areas that would serve to treat and improve quality of water runoff from proposed new impervious surfaces, including the proposed new parking stalls and driveways. None of the proposed site modifications would occur within immediate vicinity of any water body nor within any sensitive riparian setbacks; however, the Ticen Ranch site could potentially host special-status bat species in the garage building to be demolished with the project, and the parcel is within the general vicinity of previously-identified Native American resources. Recommended mitigation measures addressing each of these potential environmental impacts are spelled out in sections IV and XVIII of this initial study.
- b. The proposed project would have the effect of increasing water usage of the winery, although estimated water usage would continue to support winemaking activities and the overall continued use of the property for agricultural purposes, and estimated water use would not exceed one acre-foot per acre of property per year, which the County has determined to be a sustainable level of groundwater extraction for properties located on the valley floor. Likewise, the approval of the requested modification would permit continuation of existing traffic generation from the winery's current, though unpermitted 90-person employee count. However, while traffic volumes on State Route 29 would generally remain unchanged in the long-term, the requested modification and additional driveway at the Ticen Ranch parcel would have the effect of reducing (by 0.1 to 0.55 percent) existing traffic volumes at the State Route 29/Zinfandel Lane intersection and the southbound lanes of Silverado Trail south of Zinfandel Lane. The project's traffic contributions to other studied intersections and road segments would not exceed 0.6 percent of existing volumes or 0.5 percent of projected traffic volumes in the long-term horizon and so, would be cumulatively less than significant. Noise and air quality impacts associated with construction of building and site improvements would be temporary in nature, and so would also be less than significant. Operational noise and air quality impacts are also anticipated to be less than significant due to the limited scope of new on-site construction and distance to the closest sensitive receptors (off-site single-family residence). Emissions from space conditioning and "new" employee vehicle trips associated with the winery are offset and reduced by the winery's existing photovoltaic array, which serves to reduce the winery's demand for energy generated from non-renewable resources.
- c. There are no schools or hospitals housing sensitive receptors within a quarter-mile of the winery site. Noise from construction that would occur with installation of the proposed site improvements would be temporary, lasting approximately 18 months in total (including interior building improvements in the later months) and would be limited to day time hours, and construction would be subject to best management practices intended to limit fugitive dust and protect stormwater quality. Ongoing operations of the winery and its events are also anticipated to have less than significant noise impacts on nearby residences, due to distance between those residences and the proposed tasting room and with project-specific and standard County conditions of approval imposing restrictions on design and utilization of exterior lighting. (See sections I and VII of this initial study.) Vehicle trips associated with the requested modification would not increase over the existing condition, as the increase in employment is a noncompliant matter for

which the project proponent is requesting recognition. Nonetheless, the traffic analysis of the proposal conservatively evaluated the employment increase as if it were "proposed," and concluded that the increase in vehicle trips would not have a cumulatively significant impact on traffic, due to shift scheduling and addition of a new, second winery access driveway from State Route 29 that would have the effect of reducing winery visitor traffic on Zinfandel Lane.

Mitigation Measures: See mitigation measures in sections IV and XVIII of this initial study.
