

# COUNTY OF SONOMA

## PERMIT AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403  
(707) 565-1900 FAX (707) 565-1103

---

### ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

**FILE #:** PLP02-0085 **PLANNER:** Steve Padovan  
**PROJECT:** Carneros View Vineyards **DATE:** January 16, 2007

**LEAD AGENCY:** Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department

**PROJECT LOCATION:** 4202 Stage Gulch Road, Sonoma, APN 142-051-024

**APPLICANT NAME:** Carneros View Vineyards, LLC c/o Jim Verhey

**APPLICANT ADDRESS:** 855 Bordeaux Way, Suite 100, Napa, CA 94558

**GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** Land Extensive Agriculture, 100 Acre Density

**SPECIFIC/AREA PLAN:** N/A

**ZONING:** LEA (Land Extensive Agriculture) B6 100 Acre Density ; MR (Mineral Resource); Z (Second Unit Exclusion); G (Geologic Hazard); SR (Scenic Resource)

**DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT:** The applicant is requesting (1) a Zone Change to remove the MR zoning overlay from a proposed 25.27 acre parcel that is being created through a separate Lot Line Adjustment process, and; (2) a Use Permit with Design Review for a new winery on the proposed 25.27 acre parcel to be implemented in two phases: Phase I consists of all aspects of wine production only (crushing, fermenting, barrel storage, bottling, case goods storage and administrative/operational support requirements) and includes construction of a new  $\pm 52,000$  square foot production building, grape crush and receiving area, wastewater treatment ponds, septic system, parking area, and paved driveway access improvements to provide for an annual production capacity of up to 250,000 cases; Phase II will add tasting and hospitality uses housed in two separate existing structures ( $\pm 1,260$  square foot house and  $\pm 4,200$  square foot barn) with a new access road and parking area to serve them. The winery will be served by a new on-site septic system, waste water treatment ponds and private wells.

The new winery building will be constructed in a topographic "bowl" created by the quarry excavation. The area was the site of a soil mixing operation that has since moved to a bench above the proposed winery site and the old quarry has been graded and contoured to accommodate this project. A revised reclamation plan for the former quarry site was recently approved by the California Department of Conservation and the County of Sonoma which amended the previous plan by incorporating the new winery into the plan. The new winery structure is a "tilt-up" concrete building with a galvanized metal roof that will be 46 feet high at the topmost portion of its roof. Exterior colors consist of brown stained walls, a galvanized metal roof and white board and batten siding on the administrative offices, the case goods storage and the clerestory windows. The existing barn and dwelling will go through a significant interior remodeling but will retain a significant majority of their exterior facades.

The winery will be served by a new on-site septic system for domestic waste (restrooms, sinks, etc.), two processed wastewater treatment ponds proposed behind the building (for the wine making operations) and a private well. The processed wastewater ponds are designed to hold water for a temporary time period and then to discharge the water into the irrigation system for the vineyards. During the rainy season, the ponds will have the ability to store the water until needed for irrigation. The wine tasting and hospitality buildings will occupy two existing buildings that are located adjacent to Champlin Creek near Stage Gulch Road. Access to the site will be from the existing private road named County Dump Road off Stage Gulch Road (Highway 116) which serves the relocated soil amendment operation on the shelf above the winery

site and the County transfer station which is to the northwest. Drainage from the site is southeast into Champlin Creek thence to Fowler Creek which flows into Sonoma Creek which flows into San Pablo Bay.

**SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:** The site is surrounded by pasture land, vineyards, and the Sonoma County waste transfer facility at the end of County Dump Road. The soil amendment operation, which relocated in 2005, is situated on the same property as the winery but will be on a separate property once the Lot Line Adjustment is approved. Surrounding zoning is Land Intensive Agriculture 100 Acre Density, Public Facilities and Diverse Agriculture 20 Acre Density. Elevations on the site range from 20 to 200 feet.

**Other Public Agencies whose approval is required (e.g. responsible/trustee agencies issuing permits):**

- Army Corps of Engineers/404 Permit
- Regional Water Quality Control Board/401 Certification
- California Department of Fish and Game 1600 Permit
- California Coastal Commission
- Department of Emergency Services Hazardous Materials Plan
- Caltrans Encroachment Permit
- State Lands Commission
- US Fish and Wildlife Consultation
- NOAA Fisheries Consultation

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics           | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources      | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials   | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality            | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning             |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources    | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems       | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> None with Mitigation            |   |  |

**DETERMINATION**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- 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 by 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.

Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, all potentially significant effects were previously analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable standards and potential impacts 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. There are no changes in the project, no new information related to potential impacts, and no changes in circumstances that would require further analysis pursuant to Section 15162 of CEQA Guidelines, therefore no further environmental review is required.

The checklist below is taken from Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. For each item, one of four responses is given:

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

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

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated: The project would have the impact described, and the impact could be significant. One or more mitigation measures have been identified that will reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

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

#### Incorporated Source Documents

The checklist includes a discussion of the impacts and mitigation measures that have been identified. Sources used in this Initial Study are numbered and listed below. Following each checklist question one or more sources used are cited in parentheses.

In preparation of the Initial Study checklist, the following documents were referenced/developed, and are hereby incorporated as part of the Initial Study. All documents are available in the project file or for reference at the Permit and Resource Management Department.

1. Initial Data Sheet
2. County Planning Department's Sources and Criteria Manual
3. Sonoma County Rare Plant Site Identification Study
4. Project Referrals from Responsible Agencies
5. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
6. Full record of previous hearings on project in file
7. Correspondence received on project.
8. Sonoma County CEQA Implementing Ordinance 1985, 1991
9. Coastal Zone Visual Analysis
10. PRMD staff evaluation based on review of the project site, project application and project description.
11. PRMD staff evaluation of impact based on past experience with construction projects.
12. *Sonoma County General Plan* (as amended) and Environmental Impact Report, Sonoma County Board of Supervisors, March 23, 1989 - Revised December 1998.

13. California Department of Transportation Scenic Highways website.  
[www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic\\_highways/](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/) accessed 6/23/05.
14. *Sonoma County Important Farmland Map* California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, 2000.
15. Assessor's Parcel Maps
16. *Ozone Implementation Plan*, California Air Resources Board, 2002.<http://www.arb.ca.gov/> accessed 6/23/05
17. *BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans*; Bay Area Air Quality Management District; April 1999;
18. *California Natural Diversity Database*, California Department of Fish & Game 2000.
19. Sonoma County Zoning Ordinance (as amended), May 2004.
20. Guidelines for California Environmental Quality Act Section 15064.5
21. *Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones*; State of California Division of Mines and Geology; 1983.
22. *Seismic Shaking and Tsunami Plates 1A and 1B, Geology for Planning in Sonoma County Special Report 120*, California Division of Mines and Geology; 1980.
23. *Slope Stability Plates 2A and 2B, Geology for Planning in Sonoma County Special Report 120*, California Division of Mines and Geology; 1980
24. *Manual of Standards for Erosion and Sediment Control Measures*, Association of Bay Area Governments; May, 1995.
25. *Soil Survey of Sonoma County, California*, Sonoma County, Vernon C. Miller, U.S. Department of Agriculture; 1972.
26. California Regional Water Quality Control Board <http://geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov/> ; accessed 6/23/05
27. California Dept of Toxic Substances Control [www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/calsites/cortese\\_list.cfm](http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/calsites/cortese_list.cfm) accessed 6/23/05
28. Integrated Waste Management Board [www.ciwmb.ca.gov/SWIS/Search.asp](http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/SWIS/Search.asp) accessed 6/23/05
29. *The Thomas Guide Napa and Sonoma Counties*, Rand McNally, 2000.
30. *Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan for Sonoma County*, Coffman Associates for Sonoma County Airport Land Use Commission, January 2001.
31. *Evaluation of Groundwater Resources*, California Department of Water Resources; 1975.
32. *Flood Insurance Rate Maps*, Federal Emergency Management Agency.
33. *Sonoma County Aggregate Resources Management Plan and Program EIR*, 1994.
34. *County of Sonoma Guidelines for Traffic Studies*, 2004.
35. *Sonoma County Congestion Management Program*, Sonoma County Transportation Authority; December 18, 1995.
36. *Sonoma County Bikeways Plan*, Sonoma County Department of Transportation and Public Works April, 1997.
37. *General Plan Consistency Determination*, Sonoma County Permit & Resource Management Department. *Fundamentals of Tree Pruning*, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, 1999.
38. *Tree Protection and Replacement Ordinance* (Ordinance No. 4014); Sonoma County, 1989.
39. *Valley Oak Protection Ordinance* (Ordinance No. 4991); Sonoma County, December 1996.
40. *Heritage or Landmark Tree Ordinance* (Ordinance No. 3651); Sonoma County, December, 1986.

#### NOTICE OF ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I, Jim Verhey, am the project applicant and have reviewed the Initial Study and agreed to accept all mitigation measures and monitoring programs listed in this checklist as conditions of approval of the proposed project and to obtain all necessary permits. I agree to notify all employees, contractors and agents involved in project implementation, and any new owners should the property be transferred, about the required mitigation measures and conditions, and I agree to ensure compliance with such measures and conditions.

---

Jim Verhey

---

Date

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 17 at the end of the checklist, “Earlier Analysis” may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - B) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - C) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated”, describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

**1. AESTHETICS** Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

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

_____	<u>  X  </u>	_____	_____
-------	--------------	-------	-------

**Less than Significant with Mitigation.** The project is located on a site that fronts along a designated Scenic Corridor as indicated in the Sonoma County General Plan (Highway 116, Stage Gulch Road). The project involves the remodel or construction of buildings within the scenic corridor and portions of the site would be visible from the highway. In order to limit visual impacts to a less than significant level, the following mitigation measure shall apply:

**Mitigation Measure 1.a:** All new construction or existing building renovation shall require Administrative Design Review (ADR). Buildings and access roads shall be placed below ridgelines and should utilize existing topography and vegetation for screening. In addition, the maximum building height for all new construction within 200 feet of Stage Gulch Road shall be 24 feet as measured from the natural grade. Renovation of the existing barn shall require ADR, but is not considered new construction subject to the 24 foot height limit.

**Mitigation Monitoring:** No building permits shall be issued on any structures prior to Administrative Design Review approval by Project Review staff. Subsequently, all grading permits shall be reviewed for visual impacts from Highway 116.

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

_____	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>
-------	-------	-------	--------------

**No Impact.** Stage Gulch Road is not a state designated scenic highway.

- c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

_____	<u>  X  </u>	_____	_____
-------	--------------	-------	-------

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation.** The proposed winery would be located approximately 600 feet from Stage Gulch Road at an existing quarry site and portions of the project involve the renovation of existing structures and some new construction within the SR Zoning overlay (200 foot Scenic Corridor setback). In addition, the larger winery building would be visible for brief moments while driving along Stage Gulch Road and to those going to the quarry or to the transfer station on County Dump Road.

Plans for remodeling the building should be reviewed by the Design Review Committee to ensure that the existing aesthetics remain substantially the same and that similar architectural styles are maintained when viewed from Stage Gulch Road.

**Mitigation Measure 1.c:** Prior to issuance of the Building Permit, plans for remodeling the barn for tasting/hospitality shall be submitted to the Design Review Committee for review and approval to ensure that the building would be shielded from view from Stage Gulch Road.

**Mitigation Monitoring:** The Permit and Resource Management Department shall not issue the Building Permit for the barn until plans have been submitted that are consistent with the approved use permit and County standards. The Permit and Resource Management Department shall not sign off final occupancy on the barn until a site inspection of the property has been conducted that indicates the remodeling has been conducted and landscaping installed according to the approved plans and conditions. If complaints

are received, the Permit and Resource Management Department shall conduct a site inspection and require the property be brought into compliance or initiate procedures to revoke the permit. (Ongoing)

- d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? \_\_\_\_\_  X  \_\_\_\_\_

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation.** New structures will introduce new sources of light and glare. Lighting of the facility, especially lighting of the parking lot, security and safety lighting, may affect nighttime views.

**Mitigation Measure 1.d:** Prior to issuance of the Building Permit, an exterior lighting plan shall be submitted to the Design Review Committee for review and approval. Exterior lighting is required to be fully shielded, and directed downward to prevent "wash out" onto adjacent properties. Generally fixtures should accept sodium vapor lamps and not be located at the periphery of the property. Flood lights are not allowed. The lighting shall be installed in accordance with the approved lighting plan during the construction phase.

**Mitigation Monitoring:** The Permit and Resource Management Department shall not issue the Building Permit until an exterior night lighting plan has been submitted that is consistent with the approved plans and County standards. The Permit and Resource Management Department shall not sign off final occupancy on the Building Permit until a site inspection of the property has been conducted that indicates all lighting improvements have been installed according to the approved plans and conditions. If light and glare complaints are received, the Permit and Resource Management Department shall conduct a site inspection and require the property be brought into compliance or initiate procedures to revoke the permit. (Ongoing)

## 2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. Of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would not convert a significant amount of important farmland to non-agricultural use and therefore potential impacts are less than significant. The parcel is not designated as Prime or Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance on the Important Farmland maps. It is designated as Grazing Lands reflecting the surrounding uses.

In accordance with County Code 26A-09-010, the quarry site should be reclaimed to an agricultural use as soon as mining has ceased, and ancillary uses, other than agriculture, could not continue beyond the mining phase on-site. The project would not conflict with the purpose of the Williamson Act contract. The primary use of the property will remain agriculture (vineyard and pasture), no vineyards or grazing lands will be removed as a result of the project, agricultural processing (the construction of a winery on the reclaimed land) is included as a permitted use on contract lands, and a winery is a higher intensity agricultural use of the land in comparison to grazing.

- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? \_\_\_\_\_

  X  

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is in Land Extensive Agriculture zoning district which allows wineries with a conditional use permit. The subject parcel is also located within an Agricultural Preserve/ Williamson Act contract. The proposed winery would occupy only 25 acres of a 193 acre site and would be an agricultural processing facility for grapes grown primarily on the site or in the local area. Furthermore, the winery will occupy a previous quarry site and no removal of vineyards or other agricultural uses will occur. As for the tasting and hospitality structures, these constitute less than 10 percent of the building area of the winery and are located within existing structures. This would be considered incidental to agricultural processing and would thereby meet the requirements of the Williamson Act contract.

The Sonoma County Rules and Regulations for Administration of Williamson Act Contracts state that the primary rule is to protect the land for agricultural purposes and compatible uses shall be incidental to such agricultural use. The Rules include the following pertinent permitted agricultural uses:

- The processing, packing, selling and shipping of agricultural and treating products grown or raised on the premises other than commercial packing or processing plants.
- Commercial packing and processing plants of agricultural products
- Recreational uses if maintained secondarily to a principal agricultural use.

The County has also recently been audited to assess if the Williamson Act program in Sonoma County is in compliance with State Law and the Department of Conservation (DOC) requirements. Section 51201 (e) of the Williamson Act defines "Compatible Use" as any use determined by the county or city administering the preserve pursuant to sections 51231, 51238 or 51238.1 or by this act to be compatible with the agricultural, recreational, or open space use of land within the preserve and subject to contract. In addition, Section 51220.5 states that "*cities and counties shall determine the types of uses to be deemed compatible in a manner which recognizes that a permanent or temporary population increase hinders or impairs agricultural operations.*"

In addition, Section 51238.1 of the Williamson Act states, "*Uses approved on contracted lands shall be consistent with all of the following principles of compatibility:*"

- (1) The use will not significantly compromise the long-term productive agricultural capability of the subject contracted parcel or parcels or on other contracted lands in agricultural preserves.*
- (2) The use will not significantly displace or impair current or reasonably foreseeable agricultural operations on the subject contracted parcel or parcels or on other contracted land in agricultural preserves.*
- (3) The use will not result in the significant removal of adjacent contracted land from agricultural or open-space use."*

Upon evaluation of the findings listed above, it appears that a winery is a compatible use on this site and that the selling and promotion of the agricultural product produced on-site is a permitted use. As stated above, the winery will occupy land that was previously a quarry with no agricultural uses, no agricultural



producing land will be displaced, and the development of a winery further promotes agricultural products and the agricultural use of the land.

- c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?

**No Impact.** The project does not involve other changes in the environment that could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. See 2(a,b).

### 3. AIR QUALITY

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

- |   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact                           |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>              | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**No Impact.** The project is within the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The District does not meet federal or state standards for ozone precursors, and has adopted an ozone Attainment Plan and a Clean Air Plan describing steps that will be taken to bring air quality in the district into compliance with federal and state Clean Air Acts' ozone standards. The plans deal primarily with emissions of ozone precursors (nitrogen oxides and volatile organic compounds(hydrocarbons)). The project will not conflict with the District's air quality plans to reduce emissions from new uses. (1,5)

- b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** State and federal standards have been established for "criteria pollutants": ozone precursors, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide and particulates (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>). The pollutants NOx (nitrogen oxides) and hydrocarbons form ozone in the atmosphere in the presence of sunlight. Significance thresholds for ozone precursors, carbon monoxide and particulates have been established by BAAQMD. The principal source of ozone precursors is vehicle emissions, although stationary internal combustion engines must also be considered. BAAQMD generally does not recommend detailed NOx and hydrocarbon air quality analysis for projects generating less than 2,000 vehicle trips per day. Given the low traffic generation of the project relative to the screening criteria, ozone precursor emissions would be less than significant.

Detailed air quality analysis for carbon monoxide is generally not recommended unless a project would generate 10,000 or more vehicle trips a day, or contribute more than 100 vehicles per hour to intersections operating at LOS D, E or F with project traffic. Given the low traffic generation of the project relative to the screening criteria, carbon monoxide emissions would be less than significant.

- 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)? \_\_\_\_\_  X  \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation.** The BAAQMD is a non-attainment area for ozone precursors and PM<sub>10</sub> (fine particulate matter) See 3c for a discussion of ozone emissions. The project will not have a significant long-term effect on PM<sub>10</sub>, because all disturbed surfaces will be paved or landscaped, and dust generation will be insignificant. (See 3b for a discussion of ozone)

PM<sub>10</sub> is a criteria pollutant that is closely monitored in the BAAQMD. Readings in the district have exceeded state standards on several occasions in the last several years. The high PM<sub>10</sub> readings occurred in the winter and are attributed to the seasonal use of wood burning stoves. The project will not have a significant long-term effect on PM<sub>10</sub>, because all surfaces will be paved or landscaped, and dust generation will be insignificant.

However, there could be a significant short-term emission of dust (which would include PM<sub>10</sub>) during construction. These emissions could be significant at the project level, and would also contribute to a cumulative impact.

The impact could be reduced to less than significant by including dust control as described in the following mitigation measure:

**Mitigation Measure 3.c:** The following dust control measures will be included in the project:

- A. Water or other dust palliative will be applied to unpaved portions of the construction site, unpaved roads, parking areas, staging areas and stockpiles of soil daily as needed to control dust.
- B. Trucks hauling soil, sand and other loose materials over public roads will cover the loads, or will keep the loads at least two feet below the level of the sides of the container, or will wet the load sufficiently to prevent dust emissions.
- C. Paved roads will be swept as needed to remove any visible soil that has been carried onto them from the project site.

**Mitigation Monitoring:** Building/grading permits for ground disturbing activities shall not be approved for issuance by Project Review staff until the above notes are printed on the building, grading and improvement plans. The applicant shall be responsible for notifying construction contractors about the requirement for dust control measures to be implemented during construction. If dust complaints are received, PRMD staff shall conduct an on-site investigation. If it is determined by PRMD staff that complaints are warranted, the permit holder shall implement additional dust control measures as determined by PRMD or PRMD may issue a stop work order. (Ongoing during construction)

- d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_  X  \_\_\_\_\_

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Sensitive receptors are facilities or locations where people may be particularly sensitive to air pollutants such as children, the elderly or people with illnesses. These uses include schools, playgrounds, hospitals, convalescent facilities and residential areas. There are no sensitive receptors in the project vicinity. There will be no significant, long term increase in emissions, but during construction there could be significant dust emissions that would affect nearby residents. Dust emissions can be reduced to less than significant levels by the mitigation measure described in item 3c above.

The California Air Resources Board has determined that diesel emissions contain toxic air contaminants. Exposure of people to these emissions over a long period of time is considered to increase the risk of cancer.

The exhaust emissions from trucks associated with this project will increase localized concentrations of toxic air contaminants. The winery (where most of the diesel emissions will occur) is over 1000 feet from the nearest residence. Given the low volume of truck traffic, and the distance from the receptors, the emissions of toxic air contaminants would not be substantial.

Local jurisdictions do not have the authority to regulate emissions from diesel trucks or other vehicles. The Environmental Protection Agency and the California Air Resources Board have this authority. In September 2000 the California Air Resources Board adopted a comprehensive plan to reduce diesel emissions. The plan will require the use of low-sulfur fuel, retrofitting diesel engines with particulate filters, and reducing particulate emissions from new engines by 90 per cent. The Board expects the plan to reduce emissions by 75% by the year 2010. In December 2000 the EPA approved similar rules on fuel and new emissions. Implementation of the plan and rules would significantly reduce the effect of diesel emissions in the future.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

\_\_\_\_\_   X   \_\_\_\_\_

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation.** Wineries seasonally generate odors associated with the crushing and fermenting of fruit. These odors are relatively short-lived and mild. The BAAQMD has no record of complaints related to grape pomace in Sonoma Valley, except when burned. The project site is located in an agricultural area and is surrounded by other wineries, vineyards, and livestock ranches. Odors from these agricultural uses occur in the area. The winery project does not include the use of a wastewater pond. Winery and domestic wastewater would be diverted to a subsurface septic tank and leachfield on-site system.

However, the processing of grapes requires the long-term management of grape residue (aka grape pomace). To reduce potential odor impacts caused by grape residue to a less than significant level, the Mitigation Measure has been incorporated into the project to require that grape residue (pomace) be managed as follows:

**Mitigation Measure 3.e:** To ensure that odors caused by grape crush residue are minimized, all residues must be removed from the site or spread in vineyards within two days of processing.

**Mitigation Monitoring:** If PRMD receives complaints regarding objectionable odors, staff will investigate the complaint. If its determined by PRMD staff that complaints are warranted, the permit holder shall implement additional odor control measures as determined by PRMD. (Ongoing)

Construction equipment may generate odors during project construction. The impact would be less than significant and it would be a short-term impact that ceases upon completion of the project.

**4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

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

_____	<u>  X  </u>	_____	_____
-------	--------------	-------	-------

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation.** The California Department of Fish and Game Natural Diversity Database indicates certain special status species that may be present and warrant investigation of the site. There are two reported sightings of the California red-legged frog directly adjacent to the property; one on Champlin Creek and the other on a drainage channel along the east side of County Dump Road. PRMD staff inspected the site and found that all of the areas proposed for development have been recently disturbed by grading operations for the reclamation of the quarry area or are already developed with vineyards, structures or roads. The seasonal wetlands that do occur on the property are located in the vineyards and are not affected by the proposed winery. However, the renovation and reconstruction of the barn is within 30 feet of Champlin Creek. In order to mitigate any impacts to the riparian corridor, the following mitigation measures shall apply:

**Mitigation Measure 4.a.1:** No new grading or construction shall be permitted within 50 feet of the top of the bank of Champlin Creek to ensure that any potential California red-legged frog habitat within the creek remain undisturbed. The existing barn may be rehabilitated, but any new structure or expansion of the barn shall be placed a minimum of 50 feet from the top of the bank of Champlin Creek.

**Mitigation Monitoring:** PRMD shall verify that construction plans for the Phase II tasting and hospitality buildings do not include encroachment into the 50 foot setback for new grading or construction prior to issuance of Grading or Building permits.

**Mitigation Measure 4.b.2:** All drainage from the roads, parking areas and buildings shall be directed into vegetative swales, ponds, etc. and allowed to infiltrate into native soils prior to draining into Champlin Creek.

**Mitigation Monitoring:** PRMD shall verify that grading and construction plans show drainage swales and other infiltration devices prior to issuance of Grading or Building permits.

**Mitigation Measure 4.b.3:** The riparian corridor along Champlin Creek shall be replanted with native vegetation and all debris, equipment and storage uses shall be removed from within 50 feet of the top of the bank.

**Mitigation Monitoring:** PRMD shall verify that all equipment, materials, storage, etc. has been removed from the riparian corridor prior to issuance of Grading or Building permits. The landscape plans for the Phase II tasting room/hospitality areas shall include the replanting of native vegetation along the creek. This plan shall be submitted prior to issuance of Phase II building permits.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

_____	<u>  X  </u>	_____	_____
-------	--------------	-------	-------

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation.** See Comments and Mitigation Measures listed under 4.b.

- 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? \_\_\_\_\_  X  \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation.** A wetland delineation report was prepared by Kjeldsen Biological Consulting for the project site in the spring of 2000. The biologist determined that there are seasonal wetlands located in pockets throughout the vineyards in the northwest and northeast edges of the property. In addition, Champlin Creek traverses the site near the proposed hospitality building and generally follows along the southern border of the proposed winery site.

The proposed project has been designed to avoid all wetlands, and no fill will occur in the seasonal wetlands. Mitigation measures as listed in Section 4.a should mitigate all impacts to a less than significant level.

- 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? \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_  X

**No Impact.** Migratory wildlife corridors generally include riparian areas and connected open space areas adjacent to urban centers. The project would not remove vegetation or place barriers in fish or wildlife migration corridors.

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

**No Impact.** The project site is not designated by any local policy or ordinance that protect biological resources.

- 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? \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_  X

**No Impact.** Habitat conservation plans and natural community conservation plans are site-specific plans to address take of listed species of plants and animals. The project site is not located in an area subject to a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

**5. CULTURAL RESOURCES** Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	_____	_____	<u>  X  </u>	_____

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A cultural resources records search for the entire 193 acre site and a site survey of the portion of the project site where project construction will occur was conducted and documented in a report by ASI Archaeology dated May 21, 2002. It was determined that the existing structures on site were over 50 years old but that they had no significant historical significance nor were they representative of any unique architectural style. The house and barn are proposed to be converted to tasting and hospitality facilities and the exterior will be renovated.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	_____	<u>  X  </u>	_____	_____
--	-------	--------------	-------	-------

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation.** A cultural resources records search for the entire 193 acre site and a site survey of the project site where project construction will occur was conducted and documented in a report by ASI Archaeology dated May 21, 2002. No known archaeological resources were found on the site, but the project could uncover such materials during grading and construction.

The following measure will reduce the impact to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure 5.b:** The following notes shall be included on building or grading plans for ground disturbing activities:

"If archaeological materials such as pottery, arrowheads or midden are found, all work shall cease and PRMD staff shall be notified so that the find can be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist (i.e., an archaeologist registered with the Society of Professional Archaeologists). The developer shall designate a Project Manager with authority to implement the mitigation prior to issuance of a building/grading permit. When contacted, a member of PRMD Project Review staff and the archaeologist shall visit the site to determine the extent of the resources and to develop proper procedures required for the discovery. No work shall commence until a protection plan is completed and implemented subject to the review and approval of the archaeologist and Project Review staff. Mitigation may include avoidance, removal, preservation and/or recordation in accordance with accepted professional archaeological practice.

"If human remains are encountered, all work must stop in the immediate vicinity of the discovered remains and PRMD staff, County Coroner and a qualified archaeologist must be notified immediately so that an evaluation can be performed. If the remains are deemed to be Native American and prehistoric, the Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted by the Coroner so that a "Most Likely Descendant" can be designated."

**Mitigation Monitoring:** Building/grading permits for ground disturbing activities shall not be approved for issuance by Project Review staff until the above notes are printed on the building, grading and improvement plans. The applicant shall be responsible for notifying construction contractors about the requirement to cease construction if archaeological materials are found during ground disturbing activities. The project planner shall work with the applicant in reviewing and revising construction plans if archaeological materials are found. (Ongoing during construction)

- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? \_\_\_\_\_  X  \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation.** See Comment and mitigation under 5.b.

- d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? \_\_\_\_\_  X  \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation.** See Comment and mitigation under 5.b.

**6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS** Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

- 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. \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_  X  \_\_\_\_\_

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo fault zone, although the site is approximately one quarter mile east of an active fault, the Roger's Creek Fault. The Uniform Building Code as been developed to address seismic events in Sonoma County. The fact that the site is not located directly on a fault zone indicates that the impact from a seismic event will be less severe than for sites located in the fault zone. Geotechnical/soils reports are required for all new commercial structures and development which complies with the Uniform Building Code will result in buildings which should withstand the most severe reasonably anticipated seismic event.

- ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? \_\_\_\_\_  X  \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation.** All of Sonoma County is subject to seismic shaking that would result from earthquakes along the San Andreas, Healdsburg-Rodgers Creek, and other faults. Predicting seismic events is not possible, nor is providing mitigation that can entirely reduce the potential for injury and damage that can occur during a seismic event. However, using accepted geotechnical evaluation techniques and appropriate engineering practices, potential injury and damage can be diminished, thereby exposing fewer people and less property to the effects of a major damaging earthquake. The design and construction of future structures and remodeling existing structures are subject to load and strength standards of the Uniform Building Code (UBC), which take seismic shaking into account. Project conditions of approval require that building permits be obtained for all construction and that the project meet all standard seismic and soil test/compaction requirements. The project would therefore not expose people to substantial risk of injury from seismic shaking. The following mitigation measures will ensure that potential impacts are reduced to less than significant levels.

**Mitigation Measure 6.a.1:** All earthwork, grading, trenching, backfilling and compaction operations shall be conducted in accordance with the Sonoma County Code and Building Ordinance (Chapter 7, Sonoma County Code) and the Uniform Building Code (UBC). All construction activities shall meet the Uniform





**Mitigation Monitoring:** Building/grading permits for ground disturbing activities shall not be approved for issuance by Project Review staff until the above notes are printed on applicable building, grading and improvement plans. The applicant shall be responsible for notifying construction contractors about erosion control requirement.

- 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?          X

**Less than Significant with Mitigation.** The project site is subject to seismic shaking as described in item 6.a.ii. above. No further mitigation is required.

- d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?                 X

**Less than Significant Impact.** Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code is an index of the relative expansive characteristics of soil as determined through laboratory testing. For the proposed project, soils at the site were not tested for their expansive characteristics. No substantial risks to life or property are expected if the project is located on expansive soil. Soil testing may be required for building or grading permits.

- 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?                        X

**No Impact.** The project site is not in an area served by public sewer. Preliminary documentation provided by the applicant and reviewed by the PRMD Project Review Health Specialist indicates that the soils on site would support the proposed process and wastewater treatment system.

**7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

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

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation.** The proposed project will not create a significant hazard from the routine use of hazardous materials. However, during construction, improper handling or storage could result in spills of hazardous materials such as fuel or paint. The impact can be reduced to less than significant levels by requiring approved methods for handling hazardous materials.

**Mitigation Measure 7.a:** During construction, hazardous materials shall be stored away from drainage or environmentally sensitive areas, on non-porous surfaces. Storage of flammable liquids shall be in accordance with Sonoma County Fire Code.

A concrete washout area such as a temporary pit, shall be designated to clean concrete trucks and tools. At no time shall concrete waste be allowed to enter waterways, including creeks and storm drains.

Vehicle storage, fueling and maintenance areas shall be designated and maintained to prevent the discharge of pollutants to the environment. Spill cleanup materials shall be kept on site at all times during construction, and spills shall be cleaned up immediately. In the event of a spill of hazardous materials, the applicant will call 911 to report the spill and take appropriate action to contain and clean up the spill.

During construction, portable toilets shall be located and maintained to prevent the discharge of pollutants to the environment.

**Mitigation Monitoring:** Building/grading permits shall not be approved for issuance by Project Review staff until the above notes are printed on the building, grading and improvement plans. The applicant shall be responsible for notifying construction contractors about the requirement for responsible storage and spill cleanup of hazardous materials.

- b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? \_\_\_\_\_  X

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment from upset or accident involving hazardous materials.

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

**No Impact.** The project is not located within one quarter mile of any existing or proposed school.

- d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? \_\_\_\_\_  X

**No Impact.** The project site is not included on lists of sites containing hazardous materials that are maintained by the California Water Resources Control Board and California Department of Toxic Substances Control.

- 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? (21) \_\_\_\_\_  X

**No Impact.** The site is not within an airport land use plan as designated by Sonoma County.

- f) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?(1) \_\_\_\_\_  X

**No Impact.** There are no known private airstrips within the vicinity of the proposed project.

- g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? \_\_\_\_\_  X

**No Impact.** The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the County's adopted Emergency Operations Plan. There is no separate emergency evacuation plan for the County. In any case, the project would not change existing circulation patterns and would have no effect on emergency response routes. See item 15(e) for discussion of emergency access.

- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (3) \_\_\_\_\_  X

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project is not in an area with high or very high potential for large wildland fires. All project construction will be required to conform to Fire Safe Standards related to fire sprinklers, emergency vehicle access and water supply.

**8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation.** Drainage from the site is southeast into Champlin Creek thence to Fowler Creek which flows into Sonoma Creek which flows into San Pablo Bay. A small seasonal creek along the south side of the winery site has been delineated as waters of the US in a report prepared by Kjeldsen Biological Consulting in spring 2000. Sonoma Creek and its tributaries are 303d listed for sediment, nutrients and pathogens. Refer to construction site erosion/sediment control methods in 6(b) to address sediment control.

Construction of the project is subject to the requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board General Permit for Construction Projects.

**Mitigation Measure 8.a:** The project is subject to the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements and coverage under the General Construction Stormwater Permit, as set by the State Water Resources Control Board. A copy of the Notice Of Intent (NOI) filed with the SWRCB, as well as the Waste Discharge Identification Number (WDID) issued by that agency; must be submitted to the Drainage Review Section of the Permit and Resource Management Department.

**Mitigation Monitoring:** PRMD shall not issue any grading and/or building permits, until the applicant has submitted a copy of the filed NOI and WDID forms to the Drainage Review Section of PRMD.

Also refer to Mitigation Measure 4c for discussion of Clean Water Act 401 certification requirement.

- 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?

\_\_\_\_\_   X   \_\_\_\_\_

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is located on the border of a Zone 1 area (major groundwater recharge basin) and a Zone 3 area (marginal groundwater availability). The existing water supply well is located in the Zone 1 area. The project also includes a processed wastewater treatment system with ponds which would partially recharge groundwater on the site by funneling the treated water into the irrigation system for the vineyards. Therefore, based on the location of the well in a Zone 1 area, the limited size of the project, and the potential recharge capability from the processed wastewater ponds, it is not expected that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level resulting from the project.

- 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?

\_\_\_\_\_   X   \_\_\_\_\_

**Less than Significant with Mitigation.** A seasonal creek traverses the site near the proposed hospitality building and generally follows the south side of the proposed winery site. The project was reviewed by the Sonoma County PRMD Drainage Review Section and a condition of approval requires that grading and drainage improvement plans be reviewed and approved by PRMD prior to the issuance of any development permits. Erosion and sediment control measures are required to be included in the plans. The project does not include any work or alteration of the course of a stream or river. However, the design of the winery building would require grading and fill for the building pad, parking areas, driveway, and landscaping. The proposed project could potentially alter existing drainage patterns and re-direct existing flow, and the impervious surfaces and building could cause an increase in the rate and amount of runoff. Therefore, engineered drainage improvement plans are required to be approved by the Drainage Review Section of PRMD prior to any grading work.

**Mitigation Measure 8.c:** Drainage improvements shall be designed by a civil engineer in accordance with the Water Agency Flood Control Design Criteria for approval by the Drainage Review Section of the Permit and Resource Management Department, and shall be shown on the improvement drawings. The engineer shall include a grading plan as part of the required improvement drawings. The grading plan shall include all pertinent details. An erosion control plan is also required, and shall include all pertinent details, notes, and specifications to minimize project's impact to the environment.

**Mitigation Monitoring:** PRMD shall not issue any grading permits until the drainage improvements designed by a civil engineer in accordance with the Water Agency Flood Control Design Criteria, and shown on the improvement drawings, have been approved by the drainage review specialist.

- 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?      \_\_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_\_        X        \_\_\_\_\_

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Grading, as well as the introduction of impervious surfaces, may increase the rate and the amount of the runoff. However, the proposed design will not substantially alter drainage patterns on the site as the existing topography will not be significantly altered and minimal cuts and fills are proposed. Drainage improvements shall be designed by a civil engineer in accordance with the Water Agency Flood Control Design Criteria, for approval by the Drainage Review Section, and shall be shown on the improvement drawings. Concentrated flows shall be converted to sheet flows to the maximum extent possible.

- 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?      \_\_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_\_        X        \_\_\_\_\_

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Runoff from developed areas could contribute pollutants to wetlands or waterways. In order to reduce these pollutant levels to a less than significant level during construction and after the project is completed, the plans are required to include BMP's for stormwater controls which will include permanent stormwater controls such as swales and detention basins. Grading plans will include measures to trap potential contaminated runoff from parking areas, buildings and roadways to prevent pollutants and silt from entering waterways. Roads are designed to slope away from the creek to allow water to drain into a swale and be filtered before draining to the creek.

- f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?      \_\_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_\_        X        \_\_\_\_\_

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to comments under 8.e.

- g) Place housing within a 100-year hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?      \_\_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_\_        X

**No Impact.** The project site is not located in a flood hazard area.

- h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?      \_\_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_\_        X

**No Impact.** The project site is not located in a flood hazard area.

- 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?      \_\_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_\_        X

**No Impact.** The project site is not located in an area subject to flooding as a result of dam failure.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? \_\_\_\_\_ X

**No Impact.** The project site is not located in an area subject to seiche or tsunami. Mudflow can be triggered by heavy rainfall, earthquakes or volcanic eruption. See discussion of landslide in 6 (a) (iv) above.

**9. LAND USE AND PLANNING** Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

a) Physically divide an established community? \_\_\_\_\_ X

**No Impact.** The project would not divide an established community. The area is a rural agricultural area and the proposed use is compatible with this type of area.

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? \_\_\_\_\_ X

**No Impact.** The project site is designated Land Extensive Agriculture 100 Acre Density by the Sonoma County General Plan. The proposed project is consistent with general plan goals, policies and objectives related to the construction of wineries in agricultural land use categories.

The General Plan policy for Land Extensive Agriculture allows for wineries to be approved with a conditional use permit, defining them as “Agricultural Processing: Facilities for the processing of any agricultural product grown or produced primarily on site or in the local area, storage of agricultural products grown or processed on site, and bottling or canning of any agricultural product grown or processed on site.” The site contains some vineyards, and there are extensive vineyards planted on many surrounding properties.

The proposal is consistent with the General Plan’s Agricultural Element Goals, Objectives and Policies, which include the following:

**AR-4a:** *The primary use of any parcel within the three agricultural land use categories shall be agricultural production and related processing, support services, and visitor serving uses. Residential uses in these areas shall recognize that the primary use of the land may create agricultural “nuisance” situations, such as flies, noise, odors, and spraying of chemicals.*

The project site is within the Land Extensive Agriculture land use designation, which is one of the three Agricultural Land Use categories, and the proposed use is an agricultural processing facility.

**Goal AR 5:** *Facilitate County agricultural production by allowing certain agricultural support services to be conveniently and accessibly located in agricultural production areas when related to the primary agricultural activity in the area.*

The proposed location is related to and serves primarily the agricultural activity of vineyards, which are prevalent in the surrounding area.

**Objective AR-5.1** *Facilitate County agricultural production by allowing agricultural processing facilities and uses in all Agricultural Land Use categories.*

The request is for a winery facility which is defined as an agricultural processing facility.

**Policy AR-5f** states; "Permit storage facilities for agricultural products either grown or processed on the site. Size the facilities according to the processing operation." The size of the storage facilities is within the range of other wineries in Sonoma County. This policy appears to be met. The General Plan also includes Policy AR-5a, which states, "Provide for facilities that process agricultural commodities in all three Agricultural Land Use categories. Establish standards and procedures in the Zoning Ordinance for permitting those facilities." The LEA zoning allows agricultural processing plants with a Use Permit under Section 26-06-020 (g).

Overall, the winery use is consistent with applicable land use and agriculture policies and regulations set forth in the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. The vineyard operation is a permitted use and is not subject to CEQA requirements. Chemicals used for the vineyard operation require a Pesticide Identification report with the Sonoma County Agricultural Commissioners office.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? \_\_\_\_\_  X

**No Impact.** See 4(f) above. Habitat conservation plans and natural community conservation plans are site-specific plans to address effects on sensitive species of plants and animals. The project site is not located in an area subject to a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

**10. MINERAL RESOURCES** Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The State Geologist has designated the site as a "Mineral Bearing Area of Regional Significance" in its North San Francisco Bay Mineral Land Classification Report. The winery will be constructed on the Phase I reclamation area as indicated in the revised reclamation plan that was recently approved for the existing permitted quarry. It is not expected to affect the availability of mineral resources on the site because all resources have already been fully mined from the area where the winery will be located. Furthermore, winery activities are not expected to have any impact on the adjacent mining operations and State and local mining regulations require that the site be reclaimed to a condition acceptable for agricultural use.

As of December 20, 2006, the Phase I area of the Revised Reclamation Plan, which contains the winery site, has been fully reclaimed and financial assurances for Phase I released.

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? \_\_\_\_\_  X

**No Impact.** The project site is locally designated as a mineral resource and mining at the winery site has been completed. See comments under 10.a.

<b>11. NOISE</b> Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?(3)	_____	_X_	_____	_____

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation.** Exterior noise from the winery would primarily be generated from crush activities, traffic and operation of the wastewater treatment facility. Ambient noise levels at the site currently are very noisy and include noise from the transfer station, the soil amendment operation and high volumes of traffic on Stage Gulch Road. The nearest sensitive receptors are the turkey farms located approximately one mile northwest of the site, and residential senior housing developments located in Sonoma Valley approximately 1.5 miles northeast of the site. Both these uses are buffered by the existing hillside topography and there should be no noise impacts from the winery use.

The Noise Element of the Sonoma County General Plan establishes goals, objectives and policies including performance standards to regulate noise affecting residential and other sensitive receptors. The general plan sets separate standards for transportation noise and for noise from non-transportation land uses. The following mitigation measure will ensure that the completed project will not result in excessive noise generation or expose persons to noise levels in excess of County standards.

**Mitigation Measure 11.a:** Noise shall be controlled in accordance with Table NE-2 of the Noise Element of the Sonoma County General Plan as measured at the exterior property line of any affected residential or sensitive land use:

Maximum Exterior Noise Level Standards, dBA

Cumulative Duration of Noise Event in any one-hour Period	Daytime (7 a.m. to 10 p.m.)	Nighttime (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.)
30-60 Minutes	50	45
15-30 Minutes	55	50
5-15 Minutes	60	55
1-5 Minutes	65	60
0-1 Minutes	70	65

- A. If the ambient noise level exceeds the standard, adjust the standard to equal the ambient level.
- B. The applicable standards shall be reduced by five dBA for simple tone noises, noises consisting primarily of speech or music, or for recurring impulsive noises.
- C. The applicable standards shall be reduced by 5 decibels if they exceed the ambient level by 10 or more decibels.

**Mitigation Monitoring:** Any noise complaints will be investigated by PRMD staff. If such investigation indicates that the appropriate noise standards have been or may have been exceeded, the permit holders shall be required to install, at their expense, additional professionally designed noise control measures. Failure to install the additional noise control measure(s) will be considered a violation of the use permit conditions. If noise complaints continue, PRMD shall investigate complaints. If violations are found,



PRMD shall seek voluntary compliance from the permit holder and thereafter may initiate an enforcement action and/or revocation or modification proceedings, as appropriate. (Ongoing)

- b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or ground borne noise levels? \_\_\_\_\_  X  \_\_\_\_\_

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project includes construction activities that may generate ground borne vibration and noise. These levels would not be significant because they would be short-term and temporary, and would be limited to daytime hours. In addition, there are no noise sensitive uses within 1000 feet of the project site. There are no other activities or uses associated with the project that would expose persons to or generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels. Also see 11a.

- c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? \_\_\_\_\_  X  \_\_\_\_\_

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation.** See 11a.

- d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? \_\_\_\_\_  X  \_\_\_\_\_

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation.** See 11a.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such 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? \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_  X

**No Impact.** The site is not within an airport land use plan as designated by Sonoma County.

- 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? \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_  X

**No Impact.** There are no known private airstrips within the vicinity of the proposed project.

**12. POPULATION AND HOUSING** Would the project:

- |   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact        |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|
| 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)? | _____                          | _____                                 | _____                        | _____ <u> X </u> |

**No Impact.** The project would not include construction of a substantial number of homes, businesses or infrastructure and therefore would not induce substantial population growth.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? \_\_\_\_\_  X

**No Impact.** The project would not displace any existing housing.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? \_\_\_\_\_  X

**No Impact.** The project would not displace any people.

**13. PUBLIC SERVICES**

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection? \_\_\_\_\_  X

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Construction of the project would not involve substantial adverse physical impacts associated with provision of government facilities and the impact would be less than significant. No housing is included in the project, and it is expected to have 17 employees on a typical day with 24 employees during crush season.

The County Fire Marshal reviewed the project description and required that the expansion comply with Fire Safe Standards, including fire protection methods such as sprinklers in buildings, alarm systems, extinguishers, vegetation management, hazardous materials management and management of flammable or combustible liquids and gases.

Police protection? \_\_\_\_\_  X

**No Impact.** The Sonoma County Sheriff and the California Highway Patrol will continue to provide law enforcement in the area.

Schools? \_\_\_\_\_  X

**No Impact.** Development fees to offset potential impacts to public services include school and park mitigation fees.

Parks? \_\_\_\_\_  X

**No Impact.** Development fees to offset potential impacts to public services include school and park mitigation fees.

Other public facilities? \_\_\_\_\_  X

**No Impact.** Development fees to offset potential impacts to public services include school and park mitigation fees.

**14. RECREATION**

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

a) Would the project 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? \_\_\_\_\_  X

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not involve activities that would cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of parks or recreational facilities. No new housing units are planned.

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? \_\_\_\_\_  X

**No Impact.** The proposed project does not involve construction of recreational facilities.

**15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC** Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? (25) \_\_\_\_\_  X  \_\_\_\_\_

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation.** The proposed project involves construction and operation of a winery to be implemented in two phases: Phase I consists of all aspects of wine production only (crushing, fermenting, barrel storage, bottling, case goods storage and administrative/operational support requirements) and includes construction of a new ±52,000 square foot production building, grape crush and receiving area, wastewater treatment ponds, septic system, parking area, and paved driveway access improvements to provide for an annual production capacity of up to 250,000 cases; Phase II will add tasting and hospitality uses housed in two separate existing structures (±1,260 square foot house and ±4,200 square foot barn) with a new access road and parking area to serve them. PRMD and the Department of

Transportation and Public Works recently instituted "Traffic Impact Thresholds of Significance Criteria" to define a consistent methodology and provide consistency in the analysis of traffic impacts throughout Sonoma County. These criteria also provide for a more complete analysis of cumulative traffic impacts. A traffic impact study was completed by W-Trans on July 23, 2004 and revised on December 2, 2004 based on comments in a peer review by Crane Transportation Group. Additional traffic counts were taken November 15, 2005 and analysis reported in an additional report by W-Trans dated February 23, 2006..

The study evaluated the Dump Road/Stage Gulch Road intersection and Stage Gulch Road in the vicinity of the proposed project under four scenarios: Existing Conditions, Existing plus Project Conditions, Future Conditions and Future plus Project Conditions. Traffic conditions were analyzed during the weekday AM peak hours, MIDDAY and PM peak hours. Trip generation rates for the winery and tasting room were based on a total of 17 employees and 90 visitors per day for the public tasting which would yield an average daily trip generation rate of 139 trips per day.

The key assumption made in the original traffic study is that a left turn lane would be installed in 2006 by the Sonoma County Transportation and Public Works Department on Stage Gulch Road at the intersection with County Dump Road prior to the commencement of winery operations. This new left turn lane (originally scheduled for completion in 2006) was designed to handle the increased truck traffic related to the County's waste transfer facility and was designed to improve safety at the intersection. Upon analysis by the proponent's engineer and Caltrans, it was determined that it could also accommodate the future increased traffic from the proposed winery project. It was further determined that the left turn lane must be installed prior to the occupancy of any new buildings or uses which would add traffic to the intersection of Stage Gulch and County Dump Roads.

In the meantime, due to past safety issues on this section of Stage Gulch Road, Caltrans initiated the Highway 116 Realignment Project to realign the road to smooth out the winding road alignment. A new left turn lane at County Dump Road was incorporated into the Caltrans project, thereby transferring the construction of the left turn lane over to Caltrans, with the County of Sonoma paying for the added cost of the turn lane. Caltrans completed the environmental document and roadway design plans and is now in the process of securing the necessary easements. It is anticipated that construction will begin within two to three years which should resolve most of the safety issues.

The following is a summary of the various road conditions listed in the report:

**Existing Conditions:** Stage Gulch Road currently operates at LOS D from Adobe Road to Donnell Road during the critical p.m. peak hour with an average travel speed of 26.6 mph. In addition, the Dump Road intersection has at least one turning movement operating at LOS D or worse during the p.m. peak hour (the primary being the left turn movement from County Dump Road to eastbound Highway 116).

**Existing Plus Project Conditions:** Based on the analysis provided in the traffic study, the additional daily traffic from the winery will result in a less than five second delay at the Dump Road intersection and less than one mile per hour decrease in average travel speed on Stage Gulch Road. This is not considered a significant impact under the County criteria.

**Future Conditions:** Future traffic volumes were based on a historical growth factor of 4.6 percent per year on Highway 12 resulting in a growth factor of 1.794 for the ten year horizon (2015). Using these figures, Stage Gulch Road would operate at LOS E during the P.M. peak hour without the project.

**Future plus Project Conditions:** Delay at the Dump Road intersection would increase by less than five seconds and LOS would not change during P.M. peak hours with the winery project.

As stated above, the future conditions assume that a left turn is constructed and operational. In general, this section of Stage Gulch Road has had a higher percentage of accidents due to the narrow twisting

nature of the road and higher average speeds. Two fatal accidents have occurred near the project site within the last 2 years and there have been two other accidents at the intersection over the last four years. In addition, a peer review conducted by Crane Transportation Group stated that allowing the project to begin operations without the turn lane in place would be a significant impact.

Caltrans currently has a project in the design phase which will realign Stage Gulch Road in this area. A new left turn lane will be constructed as part of this alignment which will provide the necessary access to the site and accommodate traffic from the existing soils amendment operations, the transfer station and the proposed winery. The County of Sonoma will contribute their fair share to the cost of the turn lane as will the applicant.

Therefore, based on the increased truck and vehicle traffic from the winery operations, the existing road conditions, and the conclusions in the traffic study, the need to construct the left turn lane prior to commencement of operations is warranted. Occupancy shall not be granted until the left turn lane is installed and operational to Caltrans satisfaction. Once operational, wine tasting traffic will be limited to off-peak hours to maintain LOS levels within current General Plan objectives and policies.

In order to mitigate the traffic impacts to a less than significant level and be consistent with Caltrans standards for state highways, the following measures shall be implemented:

**Mitigation Measure 15.a.1:** The left turn lane on Stage Gulch Road at the intersection of County Dump Road is considered a part of the project and shall be installed prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for any wine production buildings/operations at the winery.

**Mitigation Monitoring:** No occupancy of any structures shall be granted until the left turn lane has been installed and is operational to Caltrans satisfaction.

**Mitigation Measure 15.a.2:** Public wine tasting shall not be permitted nor shall building permits be issued for the construction or renovation of wine tasting/hospitality buildings prior to the installation of the left turn lane on Stage Gulch Road.

**Mitigation Monitoring:** Construction and installation of the left turn lane on Stage Gulch Road shall be completed and operational prior to issuance of any building permits for wine tasting/hospitality uses or for any public wine tasting on the site.

**Mitigation Measure 15.a.3:** The applicant/developer shall contribute a "fair share" toward the County of Sonoma's financial obligation to Caltrans for the future left turn lane on Stage Gulch Road (Highway 116). The left turn lane and access road improvements shall be constructed by Caltrans. The "fair share" amount shall be considered a percentage of the Sonoma County contribution as required by Caltrans solely for the construction of the left turn lane. Additionally, the "fair share" contribution is based only on the cost of design and construction of the left turn lane and based upon the project's use of the access road. The Department of Transportation and Public Works shall determine the actual cost from a study performed by the Department of Transportation and Public Works. The developer shall enter into a written agreement with the County for payment of the developer's share of the County's obligation of the deferred left turn/access road costs. The County will deposit these funds into an account to pay for construction of the left turn improvements on Stage Gulch Road (Hwy 116) in the future.

**Mitigation Monitoring:** The fair share shall be determined by the Department of Transportation and Public Works based upon the project's "fair share" and shall be paid prior to issuance of building permits.

**Mitigation Measure 15.a.4:** Prior to the completion of the left turn lane on Stage Gulch Road, all winery related construction traffic shall be limited to right-turn-in and right-turn-out movements. Signage shall be

placed at the intersection of the project driveway and County Dump Road and at the corner of County Dump Road and Stage Gulch Road indicating that all winery traffic be restricted to right turns only.

**Mitigation Monitoring:** Prior to issuance of grading or building permits for construction of the winery and associated improvements, the right turn only signs shall be installed subject to the review and approval of PRMD. Said signage shall be removed once the left turn lane on Stage Gulch Road is completed and operational.

**Mitigation Measure 15.a.5:** Public wine tasting shall be restricted to between the hours of 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday to avoid the PM peak hours on the highway.

**Mitigation Monitoring:** Any reported violation of the time restrictions for the tasting room shall open up the use permit for review by PRMD and possible revocation hearings on the winery.

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? \_\_\_\_\_   X   \_\_\_\_\_

**Less than Significant Impact.** The project would not result in a decreased level of service (LOS) standard on the roadway. Sonoma County General Plan Circulation and Transit Objective CT-2.1 is to maintain a LOS C or better on arterial and collector roadways. See 15a above for a discussion of traffic resulting from project construction and operation. The new left turn lane will create a safety area for vehicles wishing to turn onto County Dump Road allowing for other vehicles to pass easily on the main highway. In addition, this section of roadway will be realigned in the near future which will increase line of sight distances and improve safety.

- 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? \_\_\_\_\_   X   \_\_\_\_\_

**No Impact.** The project does not include air traffic or result in any changes to air traffic patterns.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? \_\_\_\_\_   X   \_\_\_\_\_

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation.** The project would not include any hazardous design features or uses that would obstruct roadways or compromise sight distances. See comments and mitigation under 15.a.

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access? \_\_\_\_\_   X   \_\_\_\_\_

**No Impact.** The project will be required to comply with all emergency access requirements of the Sonoma County Fire and Life Safety Code, including emergency vehicle access requirements. Project development plans are routinely reviewed by a Department of Emergency services Fire Inspector during the building permit process to ensure compliance with emergency access issues.

- f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? \_\_\_\_\_   X   \_\_\_\_\_

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation.** The project will provide 24 employee parking spaces and 8 tasting room spaces. The traffic study determined that the employee parking is adequate and that the

tasting room parking would need to be increased to 11 spaces to accommodate approximately 56 vehicles per day, assuming that the traffic would not be evenly distributed throughout the day.

**Mitigation Measure 15.f:** A minimum of eleven parking spaces shall be provided for the tasting room.

**Mitigation Monitoring:** PRMD shall not issue building permits for the tasting room until a revised site plan has been provided with adequate parking and found consistent with the approved use permit and County Design Standards. PRMD shall not sign off the building permit for occupancy of the tasting room until a site inspection of the property has been conducted to determine that all site improvements have been installed according to the approved plans and conditions.

- g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? \_\_\_\_\_  X

**No Impact.** Sonoma County Transit serves the site with a bus stop on Stage Gulch Road near the entrance to Dump Road. Bicycle travel is not safe on Stage Gulch Road and is not encouraged.

**16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? \_\_\_\_\_  X

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project is within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. Wastewater treatment will be provided by a new on-site septic treatment system and processed wastewater ponds for all wine making waste. The septic system will require a permit from the RWQCB.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? \_\_\_\_\_  X

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project will not contribute to the need for construction of new public water or wastewater treatment facilities. All systems will be privately owned and operated and will only serve the winery itself. Impacts of septic system construction are addressed throughout the Initial Study with other impacts of ground disturbance such as biology, cultural resources, geology, hazards, hydrology, etc.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? \_\_\_\_\_  X

**No Impact.** Grading and paving of the site will alter the natural topography and may alter the drainage pattern and increase storm water runoff. See 8d for analysis of construction of storm drainage facilities.

Impacts of storm water drainage facilities construction are addressed throughout the Initial Study with other impacts of ground disturbance such as biology, cultural resources, geology, hazards, hydrology, etc.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? \_\_\_\_\_ X

**No Impact.** Water for the project will be provided by construction of a new well located in a Zone 1 area. Available water supply/groundwater is adequate to serve the project. No new or expanded water entitlements are needed for the project.

- 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? \_\_\_\_\_ X

**No Impact.** A new sewage treatment system will be constructed for the project. There will be no sewage treatment by an off-site provider.

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? \_\_\_\_\_ X

**No Impact.** Sonoma County has access to adequate permitted landfill capacity to serve the proposed project.

- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? \_\_\_\_\_ X

**No Impact.** There are no federal, state or local solid waste regulations that would significantly affect the project.

**17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Yes No

- 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? \_\_\_\_\_ X

**No.** Mitigations are proposed to reduce impacts to the environment, fish and wildlife and cultural resources.

- 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)?

\_\_\_\_\_   X  

**No.** Potential impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable were identified in the area of construction site air quality and traffic. Mitigation is proposed that would reduce impacts to less than significant levels. The project will not have a significant impact after mitigation is implemented.

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

\_\_\_\_\_   X  

**No.** Potential substantial adverse effects on human beings were identified in the areas of aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise and transportation/traffic. Mitigation is proposed that would reduce impacts to less than significant levels. The project will not have a significant impact after mitigation is implemented.



# Mitigated Negative Declaration

## Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department

2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403

(707) 565-1900 FAX (707) 565-1103

---

Publication Date: January 16, 2007  
Adoption Date:  
State Clearinghouse#: 2005102082

This statement and attachments constitute the **Mitigated Negative Declaration** as proposed for or adopted by the Sonoma County decision-making body for the project described below.

**File No.:** PLP02-0085 **Planner:** Steve Padovan

**Project Name:** Carneros View Winery

### Project Description:

Request for (1) a Zone Change to remove the MR zoning overlay from a proposed 25.27 acre parcel that is being created through a separate Lot Line Adjustment process, and; (2) a Use Permit with Design Review for a new winery on the proposed 25.27 acre parcel to be implemented in two phases: Phase I consists of all aspects of wine production only (crushing, fermenting, barrel storage, bottling, case goods storage and administrative/operational support requirements) and includes construction of a new  $\pm 52,000$  square foot production building, grape crush and receiving area, wastewater treatment ponds, septic system, parking area, and paved driveway access improvements to provide for an annual production capacity of up to 250,000 cases; Phase II will add tasting and hospitality uses housed in two separate existing structures ( $\pm 1,260$  square foot house and  $\pm 4,200$  square foot barn) with a new access road and parking area to serve them. The winery will be served by a new on-site septic system, waste water treatment ponds and private wells.

**Project Location:** 4202 Stage Gulch Road

### Environmental Finding:

Based upon the information contained in the Initial Study included in the project file, it has been determined that there will be no significant environmental impacts resulting from this project, provided that mitigation measures are incorporated into the project. The Mitigated Negative Declaration has been completed in compliance with CEQA State and County guidelines and the information contained therein has been reviewed and considered.

**Initial Study:** Attached

**Other Attachments:** None

**Decision-making Body:** Sonoma County Board of Supervisors

**Lead Agency:** Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department