

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 #: UPE09-0027 **PLANNER:** Cynthia Demidovich
PROJECT: Fort Ross Vineyard Tasting Room **DATE:** February 26, 2010

LEAD AGENCY: Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department

PROJECT LOCATION: 15001 Meyers Grade Road, Jenner

APPLICANT NAME: Lester Schwartz

APPLICANT ADDRESS: 1212 Oakland Ave., Piedmont, CA 94611

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: RRD (Resources and Rural Development), 160 acre density

SPECIFIC/AREA PLAN: None

ZONING: RRD (Resources and Rural Development), B7 / TP (Timber Production) B7

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT:

The proposed project is a request for a Use Permit for a new retail tasting room open to the public with 18 special events with a maximum of 200 people per event. The tasting room will be available to rent for eight of the 18 special events to various organization for fund raising, private and public events. The remaining ten special event will be promotional events sponsored by the vineyard. All of the special events will be by invitation only. The new 4,991 square foot tasting room facility will include an 800 square foot tasting room area, 180 square foot office, 261 square foot kitchen, and 840 square foot deck, 1,600 square foot attic that will be converted to an office in the future, and a 2,640 square foot basement which will be used for storage. The site will be improved with 31 new parking spaces. The cultivation of approximately 8 acres of vineyard is currently present on the project site and this yields approximately 2,656 cases of Sonoma County wine. There is no on-site winery facilities all of the grapes are taken off-site for processing.

It is anticipated one full time employee and one part-time will be required for the retail tasting room. The proposed hours of operations for the tasting room during the winter months between December 1 and March 31 would be from 10 a.m. and 5 p.m. and special events would conclude by 5 p.m. During spring, summer, and fall between April 1 and November 30 the tasting room would be open 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. and special events would conclude one-half hour before sunset. The proposed tasting room will be served by an on-site septic system and water will be supplied by an existing on-site well. The large special events will be required to use portable toilets.

SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

The parcels located to the north, south and east are zoned RRD (Resources and Rural Development), and TP (Timber production. The parcels located to the west are zoned RRD (Resource and Rural Development, LEA (Land Extensive Agriculture), TP (Timber Production), and CC (Coastal Combining District). The surrounding uses in the area are residential, the cultivation of vinyards and the grazing of cattle.

Other Public Agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

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 type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input 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 type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |
| <input checked="" 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.

The environmental documents which constitute the Initial Study and provide the basis and reasons for this determination are attached or referenced herein, and hereby made a part of this document.

- Project Application and Description
- Initial Data Sheet
- County Planning Department's Sources and Criteria Manual
- Sonoma County General Plan and Associated EIR
- Specific or Area Plan ___
- Sonoma County Zoning Ordinance
- Sonoma County Rare Plant Site Identification Study
- Project Referrals from Responsible Agencies
- State and Local Environmental Quality Acts (CEQA)
- Full record of previous hearings on project in File
- Correspondence received on project.
- Other technical reports: (List attachments and include author, title, date)

1) Habitat Assessment, Fawcett Environmental Consulting, Michael H. Fawcett, Ph.D., October 30, 2009.

2) Cultural Resources Survey, Rene Peron, August 3, 2009, (confidential on file at the Permit and Resource Management Department).

3) Geology & Ground Water Study, E.H. Boudreau, Registered Geologist #3000, December, 2009.

4) Focused Traffic Study, W-Trans, Mary Jo Yung, P.E., PTOE, October 15, 2009.

5) Outdoor Events Location Map, prepared by Ray Carlson and Associates, dated October 2, 2009.

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 Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

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

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

Comment:

1.a. Less than Significant Impact - The subdivision is not located in a SR (Scenic Resource Combining District) and will not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista. In addition, the proposed tasting room and parking lot will be screened as viewed from Meyers Grade road.

No Mitigation Required.

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

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

Comment:

1.b. Less than Significant Impact - The project will not damage any scenic resources including trees, rock outcroppings, historic buildings, and is not within a state scenic highway.

No Mitigation Required.

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

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

Comment:

1.c. No Impact - The project will not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings as the surrounding area is residential and agricultural in nature. The site is not located in a SR (Scenic Resource Combining District).

No Mitigation Required.

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

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

Comment:

1.d Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation - The proposal includes construction of a new building and a parking lot which could have exterior lighting. New exterior lighting could create a new source of light and glare in the area. To ensure new sources of light do not adversely the area the following mitigation measure has been incorporated into the project:

Mitigation Measure 1.d:

Prior to issuance of building permits, an exterior lighting plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the Design Review Committee. Exterior lighting shall be low mounted, downward casting and fully shielded to prevent glare. Lighting shall not wash out structures or any portions of the site. Light fixtures shall not be located at the periphery of the property and shall not spill over onto adjacent properties or into the sky. Flood lights are not permitted. All parking lot shall be full cut-off fixtures and shall not exceed 4

feet in height. Lighting shall shut of automatically after closing and security lighting shall be motion-sensor activated.

Mitigation Monitoring 1.d:

The Permit and Resource Management Department shall not issue the building permit until an exterior night lighting plan has been reviewed and approved by the Design Review Committee and is consistent with the approved plans and County Design Standards. The Permit and Resource Management Department shall not sign off the Building Permit for occupancy 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 procedures to revoke the permit and terminate the use shall be initiated.

2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

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

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:

- | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| 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? | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
|--|-------|-------|-------|--------------|

Comment:

2.a No Impact - The project does not result the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use. According to the Sonoma County Important Farmlands Map -2000 (database), the project site is designated as lands for grazing. The parcel is approximately 248 acres in size, and approximately 10 acres of vineyard exist on the project site. The construction of a tasting room will not will not result in the removal of any vines. Approximately 30,185 square feet of the project site will be developed with the tasting room, and parking lot.

No Mitigation Required.

- | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |
|--|-------|-------|-------|--------------|

Comment:

2.b No Impact - The portion of the project site where the tasting room is to be constructed is zoned RRD (Resources and Rural Development) a zoning district which allows the use of a tasting room for agricultural products which are grown or processed on-site. The subject parcel is not in a Williamson Act contract. This project is a tasting room for agricultural products which are grown on-site and off-site.

No Mitigation Required.

- 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?

_____ _____ _____ X

Comment:

2.c No Impact - There are no aspects of this project which will result in the conversion of land to non-agricultural uses.

No Mitigation Required.

3. AIR QUALITY

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

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

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

_____ _____ _____ X

Comment:

3.a. No Impact. The project is within the jurisdiction of the Northern Sonoma County Air Pollution Control District (NSCAPCD). The NSCAPCD does not have an adopted air quality plan. The project would not create any conflicts. The project would not generate any mobile source emissions beyond that which is generated from trucks/vehicles along the roadways.

No Mitigation Required.

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

_____ X _____ _____

Comment:

3.b Less than Significant Impact with Mitigaion- The Sonoma County General Plan Open Space and Resource Conservation Element addresses pollutants from mobile sources (e.g. transportation sources). The following goal and policy would be relevant to the proposed project:

Goal OSRC-16:

Preserve and maintain good air quality and provide for an air quality standard that will protect human health and preclude crop, plant and property damage in accordance with the requirements of the Federal and State Clean Air Acts.

State and Federal standards have been established for the "criteria pollutants": ozone, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulphur dioxide, and particulate (PM10 and PM2.5). To determine whether standards for any of these pollutants would be violated, the emissions from both stationary and mobile sources must be considered.

The proposed project will not emit significant amounts of criteria pollutants. The project will not add any new equipment or processes that would have significant emissions or require permits from the air district.

Mobile sources include vehicle traffic. This traffic will emit carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides (NOX), particulates, and Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC). Vehicles do not emit ozone directly, but ozone will form in the atmosphere from NOX and hydrocarbons in the exhaust gasses.

The NSCAPCD has established significance thresholds for the following criteria pollutants:

Carbon monoxide	100 tons/year
VOC	40 tons/year
NOX	40 tons/year
Total Suspended Particulates	25 tons/year

The Bay Area Air Pollution Control District developed simple screening methods to determine whether project traffic would generate sufficient emissions to warrant more detailed computer modeling (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, 1996). These screening methods may also be used in the NSCAPCD. Based on these screening methods, the emission of criteria pollutants would be less than significant.

The first screening method involves a comparison of the proposed project to a list of other projects that are considered to generate enough traffic to warrant further analysis. All of the examples in the list generate at least 3000 trips per day. This is far more traffic than would result from the proposed project as the tasting room will generate 29 trips per day.

The BAAQMD recommends computer modeling for carbon monoxide emissions when a project would generate 10,000 trips per day. Since the NSCAPCD has the same threshold of significance for carbon monoxide (100 tons/year), the same screening level is valid. Given the low traffic generation of this project relative to that screening level the emission of carbon monoxide would be less than significant.

Comment: Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) - Greenhouse gases trap heat in the atmosphere. Increases in greenhouse gases due to human activity are associated with Global Climate Change (aka "Global Warming"), that is, the change in the average weather on earth, as measured by wind patterns, storms, precipitation and temperature. The primary greenhouse gases are CO₂, methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), and water vapor (H₂O). Considered the most important greenhouse gas, CO₂ is the reference gas for climate change and emissions of greenhouse gases in general are often reported as CO₂ equivalents (CO₂e).

The California Air Resources Board ("CARB") is required by the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 to design and implement emissions limits, regulations, and other statewide measures to reduce statewide greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. The Act does not indicate what role local land use planning should play in the statewide strategy or how environmental review under CEQA is implicated. In October, 2007, CARB published the Expanded List of Early Action Measures to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions in California Recommended for Board Consideration. None of the early action measures address how local agencies should address greenhouse gas emissions associated with land use applications.

The State Office of Planning and Research is required to provide thresholds of significance for GHGs and transmit them to the Resources Agency for adoption-. As indicated by the Governor's letter to the Senate on signing the Act, the development of CEQA significance thresholds should be guided by the appropriate responsible agencies to achieve a standardized approach consistent with the state law. This is critical given the complexity of global climate change and the State's role in directing Californians' response to this environmental issue. Therefore it is speculative at this time to generate a local threshold of significance before such levels are determined on a statewide basis.

Regarding local efforts on GHG reductions, the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors recently adopted the Sonoma County Climate Protection Campaign which sets a target to reduce GHG emissions to 25% below 1990 levels by the year 2015. The County has completed the first two of five steps in the campaign. The next step is to complete the Community Climate Action Plan (the blueprint to help Sonoma County achieve this emissions target) and then implement the actions in the Plan and develop an on-going monitoring process to ensure that the County meets its reduction target.

For purposes of the Mitigated Negative Declaration, the project would be considered to have a significant impact on greenhouse gases if it would conflict with the state goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions in California to 1990 levels by 2020, as set forth by the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. There is currently no indication that the project would conflict with the Act's timeline. In addition, the County's Climate Protection Campaign has yet to establish emissions targets to reduce GHG in Sonoma County. However, the Climate Protection Campaign has provided a list of projects that are effective and

under local control that will reduce Greenhouse Gases if they are implemented. The Plan's solutions involve four major categories: 1. Improve efficiency in energy and water use; 2. Shift transportation from fossil fuel vehicles to transit, walking, bicycling, etc.; 3. Invest in local renewable energy sources; 4. Protect forests and farmlands, sequester carbon, and convert waste into energy. The inclusion of these types of activities in this project will ensure that there is not a cumulative contribution to Greenhouse Gas emissions as a result of this project.

On November 4, 2008 the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution selecting the Build it Green (BIG) New Home Construction, Home Remodeling and Multifamily Green Building Guidelines for Residential Construction, and Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED®) Commercial Green Building System for Commercial Construction guidelines, along with their respective Green Points Checklists, set compliance thresholds, and directed staff to develop a green building ordinance based on these guidelines.

The development of tasting room to meet the Sonoma County Green Building Standards will provide for the reduction of a portion of the CO₂ generated each year. Requiring low water use fixtures and low water use landscaping will also help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions as this reduces the amount of energy used to bring water up from wells, heat water, etc.

3.b. Mitigation Measure (1): Prior to issuance of temporary or final occupancy on the tasting room and/or winery production building , the applicant/developer shall submit to the Project Planner a plan to eliminate or substantially reduce the increase in greenhouse gas emissions on-site through all feasible strategies of carbon off-sets such as the use of more fuel efficient trucks, the use of alternative energy resources to offset increased demand, reduced truck idling times and/or off-site mitigation. The plan shall quantify the project's annual emissions and expected reductions and be verified and certified by an independent entity.

3.b. Mitigation Monitoring (1): PRMD shall not issue temporary or final occupancy on the tasting room and/or winery production building until the applicant has submitted to the Project Planner a plan to eliminate or substantially reduce the increase in greenhouse gas emissions for the project which has been verified and certified by an independent entity.

3.b. Mitigation (2): "The new tasting room built on the project site shall be built to using the Sonoma County Green Building Program standards or most current standards. These standards are based on LEED® rating systems and result in buildings that are more energy efficient and reduce Greenhouse Gas emissions. At the time of building documentation information must be provided that the new tasting room meet the current standard under the LEED® rating system or earn at least a 20 point rating under the LEED® rating system."

3.b. Mitigation Monitoring(2):

The Permit and Resource Management Department shall not issue a grading or building permit until project meets the Sonoma County Green Building Program standards or most current standards.

3. b. Mitigation (3):"Ultra low flow water usage appliances and fixtures shall be installed in new tasting room constructed on the project site."

3.b. Mitigation Monitoring (3): The project planner shall ensure that the ultra low flow usage appliances and fixtures appear on the building permit.

3. b. Mitigation (4): The applicant shall prepare an idle time reduction plan to reduce the time that trucks making deliveries or picking up products spend with engines idling. For diesel engines idle times shall be no longer than 5 minutes.

3.b. Mitigation Monitoring (4): The idle time reduction plan shall be submitted to the project planner who will verify that it meets the minimum standards established by State of California Rules.

3. b. Mitigation (5): Prior to building permit issuance a Water Conservation Plan shall be submitted for all landscaping, subject to PRMD review and approval. The Water Conservation Plan shall comply with all provisions of the County Low Water Use Landscaping Ordinance and the State or County Model Efficiency Ordinance as applicable.

3.b. Mitigation Monitoring (5): Verification, from a qualified irrigation specialist, that landscaping complies with the Model Water Efficiency Ordinance shall be provided prior to Building Permit issuance. The measures in the Plan shall be implemented and verified by PRMD staff prior to Certificate of Occupancy.

- 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

Comment:

3.c No Impact - The NSCAPCD is a non-attainment area for Particulate Matter - 10 microns or less (PM10). Based on the relatively low traffic volumes expected with this project and lower air emissions factors for newer vehicles, the emissions of ozone precursors (hydrocarbons and NOX) and particulates would not be cumulatively considerable.

No Mitigation Required.

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

Comment:

3.d No Impact - Using the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines since none are available from the (NSCAPCD), the district defines sensitive receptors as facilities where sensitive receptor groups (i.e children, the elderly, the acutely ill, and the chronically ill) are likely to be located. Such uses are typically schools, playgrounds, child care centers, retirement homes, convalescent homes, hospitals, and medical clinics. None of these types of uses are in the near vicinity of the project site.

No Mitigation Required.

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

Comment:

3.e No Impact - The proposed project is a tasting room and all processing of the grapes grown on-site will be conducted off-site. There are no known sources associated with the proposed tasting room that would create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people.

No Mitigation Required.

4. **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES** Would the project:

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

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies,

or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? _____ _____ _____ X

Comment:

4.a. No Impact - A Wildlife Habitat Assessment with a special reference to the California red-legged frog (CRF) was prepared by Fawcett Environmental Consulting, dated October 30, 2009. The assessment identified a reservoir located on the project site which is approximately 250 feet long and 120 feet wide when filled, and 20 feet deep in the center and holds water year round. Wetland plants are located along the shoreline of the reservoir. The reservoir is surrounded by forest and a gravel access road is located to the west of the reservoir. A culvert lies beneath the gravel road and collects water from a short segment of an ephemeral stream located to the west of the reservoir. This culvert is the main source of inflow to the reservoir. The reservoir drains to an unnamed ephemeral stream flowing east-northeast to the West Branch of Russian Gulch Creek. Riparian habitat is associated with both of the ephemeral streams.

The proposed project is within the range of the California red-legged frog however according to the assessment there are no known records of the CRF within one mile of the project site. The proposed tasting room is to be located approximately 680 feet to the south west of the existing reservoir. The main driveway and parking area is located approximately 400 feet to the south west of the existing reservoir. If the CRF was to occupy the reservoir there would be no incentive for the CRF to migrate away from the pond and riparian area toward the tasting area. The assessment indicates that all new construction is located several hundred feet to the south west of the reservoir and the operation of the tasting room and associated facilities will have no significant impact on California red-legged frogs or their habitat.

The habitat assessment indicated that establishment of buffers around the reservoir, adjacent riparian areas and wetlands would not be necessary since the tasting room access roads and parking areas are confined to the south west portion of the project site. No special-status plant or animal species were observed or associated with the project site.

No Mitigation Required.

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

Comment:

See response to 4.a listed above.

No Mitigation Required.

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

Comment:

See response to 4.a listed above.

No Mitigation Required.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory

wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? _____ X

Comment:

See response to 4.a listed above.

No Mitigation Required.

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

Comment:

4.e. No Impact - The Sonoma County Zoning regulation includes two ordinances that regulate tree removal on private land: the Tree Protection and Replacement Ordinance (Section 26C-88-010 (m)), and the Heritage or Landmark Trees Ordinance (Section 26D-1). The Tree Protection and Replacement Ordinance provides protection to only certain trees greater than 9-inches in diameter. Valley Oaks (*Quercus lobata*) are given special protection because they contribute to Sonoma County's visual character and landscape. If removal of these trees cannot be avoided, the ordinance requires tree replacement or an in-lieu fee, based on the number and size of the removed trees. The Heritage or Landmark Trees Ordinance applies to any tree designated a Heritage or Landmark tree because of its historical significant or interest or because of its size, age, rarity, shape or location. No trees will be removed for the proposed project.

No Mitigation Required.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat conservation plan? _____ X

Comment:

4.f. No Impact - The project site is not within an area that contains a Conservation Plan within the General Plan. No conflicts with regional or State Conservation Plans were identified.

No Mitigation Required.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	_____	_____	_____	X

Comment:

5.a No Impact - A Cultural Resources Survey (dated August 3, 2009) was prepared for the project by Rene Peron, Consulting Archaeologist. No prehistoric or historic cultural resources were found. Although unlikely, there is always the potential for buried or otherwise obscured resources. Therefore, a standard condition would be placed on the project to require that, if archaeological artifacts such as pottery, arrowheads, midden are found, all earthwork in the vicinity of the find 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). 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 mitigation measures required for the discovery. No earthwork in the vicinity of the find shall commence until a mitigation plan is approved and completed subject to the review and approval of the archaeologist and Project Review staff. This condition shall be noted on all grading and construction plans and provided to all contractors and superintendents on the job site.

No Mitigation Required.

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

Comment:

5.b - No Impact - See Response to 5.a listed above.

No Mitigation Required.

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

Comment:

5.c - No Impact - The project site has been disturbed and used as a residence and the cultivation of vineyard. The proposed project will not destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature.

No Mitigation Required.

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

Comment:

5.d - No Impact - No burial sites are known in the vicinity of the project. In the event that human remains are unearthed during construction, state law requires that the County Coroner be contacted in accordance with Section 7050.5 of the State Health and Safety Code to investigate the nature and circumstances of the discovery. If the remains were determined to be native American interment, the Coroner will follow the procedure outlined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15065.5(e).

No Mitigation Required.

- | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| <p>6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project:</p> <p>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>Potentially Significant Impact</p> | <p>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</p> | <p>Less than Significant Impact</p> | <p>No Impact</p> |
| <p>_____</p> | <p>_____</p> | <p>_____</p> | <p><u> X </u></p> | <p>_____</p> |

- 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

Comment:

6.c. No Impact - There is no indication that the development of the site will result in increased instability of the site resulting in landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. These issues are addressed in the mitigation measures above in 6.a. & 6.b.

No Mitigation 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

Comment:

6.d. Less than Significant Impact - Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code is an index of the relative expansive characteristics of soil as determined through laboratory testing. 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.

No Mitigation Required.

- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? _____ X

Comment:

6.e. No Impact - Soils on the project site appear capable of supporting use of a septic tank for wastewater disposal. The PRMD Project Review Section (Health) has commented on the proposed project, listing a wide range of standard County conditions of project approval for use of an on-site septic system. The conditions include submittal of additional soils testing information, design of a private sewage disposal system by a registered civil engineer or registered environmental health specialist, and provision of adequate area for use of a private septic system and domestic well.

No Mitigation Required.

7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

- | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | _____ | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> |

Comment:

7.a - No Impact - The use and disposal of hazardous materials is not generally associated with the use of a tasting room. Any hazardous material used at the inn (disinfectants, gasoline, etc.) would most likely be of a quantity too small to pose any significant hazard to the public.

No Mitigation Required.

- 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

Comment:

7.b - No Impact - See response to 7.a listed above.

No Mitigation Required.

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

Comment:

7.c No Impact - The project site is not within one-quarter mile of a school.

No Mitigation Required.

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

Comment:

7.d No Impact - A referral was sent to the Project Review Environmental Health Specialist and the Department of Emergency Services, in which neither agencies commented in their response that the project site is located on a hazardous materials site.

No Mitigation Required.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? _____ X

Comment:

7.e No Impact - The project site is not located within 2 miles of a public airport.

No Mitigation Required.

- 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? _____ X

Comment:

7.e No Impact - The project site is not located within 2 miles of a private airport.

No Mitigation Required.

- | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|----------------------|
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ <u>X</u> _____ |
|---|-------|-------|-------|----------------------|

Comment:

7.g No Impact - The project will not interfere with an emergency response plan or evacuation plan. The tasting room will access directly off of Meyers Grade Road. There are no known adopted emergency response plans for this area. The tasting room will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

No Mitigation Required.

- | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|----------------------|-------|
| 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? | _____ | _____ | _____ <u>X</u> _____ | _____ |
|--|-------|-------|----------------------|-------|

Comment:

7.h Less than Significant Impact -The project must conform to Fire Safe Standard requirements for commercial uses related to fire sprinklers, emergency vehicle access, and water supply. This will bring the potential exposure to people or structures to a less than significant impact.

No Mitigation Required.

8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

- | Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | _____ | _____ | _____ <u>X</u> _____ | _____ |

Comment:

8.a Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation- The project will not result in any impact to water quality. Construction of the new tasting room will require all waste water to be disposed of in private septic systems which must meet County standards for their construction and operation.

- | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|----------------------|-------|
| 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? | _____ | _____ | _____ <u>X</u> _____ | _____ |
|--|-------|-------|----------------------|-------|

Comment:

8.a Less than Significant Impact - The proposed project is located in a groundwater zone 4 which is a water scarce area. A Geology & Ground water Study was prepared by E.H. Boudreau a Registered Geologist, and the study is dated December, 2009. The study states that the tasting room would use a maximum of 750 gallons pe day and 18,000 gallons per year. The tasting room well taps fractured sandstone that yields 3.5 gallons per minute (gpm) which is 5,000 gallons per day. The water storage available to the well is approximate l 2 million gallons. The ground water recharge is approximately 1.3 million gallons per year.

According to the ground water study the parcel to the north and adjacent to the proposed project site is served by a spring. The spring is located approximately 800 feet to the north of the well that will serve the tasting room. The study indicates there is no connection between the well that will serve the proposed tasting room and the spring located 800 feet to the north. The study also indicates that wells on other properties are at least 1200 feet away. The study states that the tasting room well will support the proposed project without interfering with wells and springs on neighboring properties. The study was reviewed by the Project Review Health Specialist, who was satisfied by the conclusions reached in the study.

No Mitigation Required.

- c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? _____ X _____

Comment:

8.c. Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation - The project has been conditioned in that erosion control plans and all pertinent details are required as part of the improvement drawings. The erosion control plans will include storm drain outfall erosion control and will meet the requirements prescribed by the Sonoma County Water Agency.

8.c. Mitigation Measure (1):

Prior to issuance of a grading or building permit, the applicant shall submit for review and approval the grading and drainage improvement plans necessary for the proposed project. Drainage improvements shall be designed in accordance with the Sonoma County Water Agency Flood Control Design Criteria And shall maintain sheet flow or existing drainage patterns to the maximum extent practicable. The improvement plans shall also include erosion prevention/sediment control measures, details, notes, and specifications to prevent damages and minimize adverse impacts to the environment."

8.c. Mitigation Monitoring (1):

The issuance of grading or building permit for the project will not be approved by the Project Review Division until the required drainage improvement, grading, and erosion control plans have been reviewed and approved by the Drainage Review Division of the Permit and Resource Management Department.

- 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 _____

Comment:

8.b. Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation - The project will not substantially alter existing drainage patterns. The project does not include the alteration of a course of a stream or river. The impact of the project would be less than significant.

No Mitigation Required.

- 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

Comment:

8.b. Less than Significant Impact - The development of the site will result in soil disturbance, either as a result of grading or fill work. Standard review and permitting processes for Sonoma County include erosion and sediment control measures which are enforced by the Storm Water and Grading Section of the Permit and Resource Management Department.

No Mitigation Required.

- f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? _____ X

Comment:

8.b. Less than Significant Impact - The project will not result in any impact to water quality. New construction will require all waste water to be disposed of in private septic systems which must meet County standards for their construction and operation.

No Mitigation Required.

- 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

Comment:

8.b. No Impact - The project site is not located within a flood hazard boundary.

No Mitigation Required.

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

Comment:

8.b. No Impact - The project site is not located within a flood hazard boundary.

No Mitigation Required.

- 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

Comment:

- 4) Protect natural resource lands including, but not limited to watershed, fish and wildlife habitat and biotic areas,
- (5) Protect against intensive development of lands constrained by geologic hazards, steep slopes, poor soils or water, fire and flood prone areas, biotic and scenic areas, and other constraints,
- (6) Accommodate agricultural production activities but limit such activities on timberland, or
- (7) Protection of county residents from proliferation of growth in areas where there are inadequate public services and infrastructure, including water supply and safe wastewater disposal.

Of the above listed General Plan Policies only the bolded policies which are number one, four, five, six, and seven apply to the proposed tasting room. The proposed tasting room will not interfere with the portion of the site that is designated as Timberland Production as the tasting room will be located outside of that designated portion of the site. A habitat assessment was prepared for the project site and indicated that the proposed tasting room will not impact any biotic resources located on the project site (see issue #5 listed below). The proposed tasting room will be constructed on a portion of the site that is relatively flat and not subject to a geological hazard. The site is served by a private well and septic system that meets County standards. A Geology & Ground Water Study was prepared for the proposed project and the study indicated that there is adequate ground water to support the project (see issue # 3 listed below). Access to the site is directly off of Meyers Grade Road which is a County maintained road. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan designation of Resources and Rural Development, which allows tasting room facilities related to agriculture activities.

The Land Use Element balances the various goals and objectives of the other elements of GP 2020. Policies in the Land Use Element support and are supported by policies stated in the other elements. The following goals and policy's from the Agricultural Resources Element apply to the proposed project because the proposed tasting room promotes an on-site agricultural use:

Policy AR-1a: Permit a wide variety of promotional and marketing activities of County grown and processed products.

The tasting room will promote wine from grapes that are grown and processed in Sonoma County.

GOAL AR-5: Facilitate agricultural production by allowing agriculture-related support uses, such as processing, storage, bottling, canning and packaging, and agricultural support services, to be conveniently and accessibly located in agricultural production areas when related to the primary agricultural production in the area.

The majority of finished case goods will not be stored on site, only the amount necessary for the tasting room use. The processing and bottling will be done at a private off-site facility located in Sonoma County. The tasting room facility is not an excessive use for the cultivation of vineyard located on the project site as approximately 2,656 cases of wine will be produced.

Policy AR-5g: Local concentrations of any separate agricultural support uses, including processing, storage, bottling, canning and packaging, agricultural support services, and visitor-serving and recreational uses as provided in Policy AR-6f, even if related to surrounding agricultural activities, are detrimental to the primary use of the land for the production of food, fiber and plant materials and shall be avoided. In determining whether or not the approval of such uses would constitute a detrimental concentration of such uses, consider all the following factors:

- (1) Whether the above uses would result in joint road access conflicts, or in traffic levels that exceed the Circulation and Transit Element's objectives for level of service on a site specific and cumulative basis.

(2)Whether the above uses would draw water from the same aquifer and be located within the zone of influence of area wells.

(3)Whether the above uses would be detrimental to the rural character of the area.

In cases where the proposed processing use would process only products grown on site, such use would not be subject to this concentration policy.

There are currently no tasting rooms in the immediate area or near vicinity. Traffic impacts are addressed in Issue #2 below, but staff believes that the proposed tasting room will have an insignificant impact on the existing traffic conditions and the exiting road will adequately support additional trips associated with the proposed project. Ground water impacts are addressed in Issue #3 listed below, and staff believes that the wells on the neighboring properties will not be influenced by the proposed tasting room. The proposed tasting room will not be detrimental to the rural character of the area as it supports an existing agricultural use on the project site.

Policy AR-6a: Permit visitor serving uses in agricultural categories that promote agricultural production in the County, such as tasting rooms, sales and promotion of products grown or processed in the County, educational activities and tours, incidental sales of items related to local area agricultural products, and promotional events that support and are secondary and incidental to local agricultural production. Limit recreational uses to the "Land Extensive Agriculture" and "Diverse Agriculture" categories, specifically to bed and breakfast inns and campgrounds of 30 or fewer sites.

Policy AR-6d: Follow these guidelines for approval of visitor serving uses in agricultural areas:

(1)The use promotes and markets only agricultural products grown or processed in the local area.

(2)The use is compatible with and secondary and incidental to agricultural production activities in the area.

3)The use will not require the extension of sewer and water.

(4)The use is compatible with existing uses in the area.

(5)Hotels, motels, resorts, and similar lodging are not allowed.

(6)Activities that promote and market agricultural products such as tasting rooms, sales and promotional activities and tours, incidental sales of items related to local area agricultural products grown or processed in the County, educational activities and tours, incidental sales of items related to local area agricultural

ural
product
s are
allowed

Policy AR-6a and AR-6d permits tasting rooms and events that are secondary and incidental to the local agricultural production. The applicant has eight acres of vineyard on site and uses grapes grown in the near vicinity to produce wine. The eight acres of vineyard will yield approximately 2,656 cases wine. The intent of the on-site tasting room and special events is to promote the wine produced by these products. Previous approvals by the Board of Zoning Adjustments have demonstrated that such promotional events are in keeping with the intent of Policy AR-6a. The proposed use is secondary to the eight acres of vineyard. The proposed tasting room is compatible with and secondary to other agricultural production activities in the area. The use will be served by a private, on-site well and septic system and the request does not involve any type of lodging.

Zoning Consistency:

The project site has split zoning of RRD (Resources and Rural Development), B7 (Frozen Density) and TP (Timber Land Production), B7 (Frozen Density). The proposed tasting room will be constructed on a portion of the site that is zoned RRD. Section 26-10-020(e) of the RRD zoning district allows tasting rooms subject to Use Permit approval for agricultural products which are grown or processed on site. The current cultivation of approximately 8 acres of vineyard on site yields approximately 2,656 cases of wine. The portion of the site that is zoned TP will remain in timber production and the new tasting room will not interfere with the portion of the site that is designated as Timberland Production. The proposal is consistent with the Resource and Rural Development zoning, which allows tasting rooms for agricultural products grown on site, if a Use Permit is obtained.

No Mitigation Required.

- c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? _____ _____ _____ X

Comment: 9.c No Impact - Habitat conservation plans and natural community conservation plans are area-specific plans that 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. The property is also located outside of the adopted Santa Rosa Plain Conservation Strategy Area.

No Mitigation Required.

10. MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>

Comment:

10.a. No Impact - The project is not locate in a MR (Mineral Resource) zoning district. The project would nor result in a loss of its availability.

No Mitigation Required.

- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? _____ _____ _____ X

Comment:

10.b. No Impact - The project is not locate in a MR (Mineral Resource) zoning district. The project would nor result in a loss of its availability.

No Mitigation Required.

11. **NOISE** Would the project result in:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
_____	_____X_____	_____	_____

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?

Comment:

11. a - Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation -The Sonoma County Noise Element of the General Plan establishes objectives, policies and performance standards for noise producing land uses which may affect noise sensitive land uses and vice versa. Tasting rooms with special events are recognized as a source of community noise because they are typically located in quiet rural areas. Exterior noise primarily occurs during special events and is usually less than 60 dBA at distances greater than 300 feet. The closest neighboring residence is over 1,063 feet from the outdoor events location.

The Project Review Health Specialist reviewed the project and determined that no noise study was necessary based on the distance to the nearest residence to the outdoor events location. The location of the outdoor events is located on the "Outdoor Events Location Map", dated October 2, 2009, and prepared by Ray Carlson and Associates. The following mitigations will insure that potential noise impacts are less than significant:

Mitigation 11.a (1):

Noise shall be controlled in accordance with the standards set in the Noise Element of the Sonoma County General Plan.

Mitigation 11.a (2):

If noise complaints are received from nearby residents, and they appear to be valid complaints in PRMD's opinion, then the applicant shall conduct a noise study to determine if the current operations meet noise standards and identify any additional noise mitigation measures if necessary. A copy of the noise study shall be submitted to the Project Review Health Specialist within sixty days of notification from PRMD that a noise complaint has been received. The owner/operator shall implement any additional mitigation measures needed to meet noise standards.

Mitigation Monitoring 11.a (1& 2):

All noise complaints will be investigated by PRMD staff. If such investigation reveals that noise standards have been or may be exceeded, the permit holders shall be required to install, at their expense, additional professionally designed noise control measure(s). Failure to install the additional noise control measure(s) will be considered a violation of the use permit conditions. If violations continue, PRMD shall seek voluntary compliance from the permit holder and thereafter may initiate an enforcement action and/or revocation or modification proceedings, as appropriate.

Mitigation 11.a (3):

Amplified sound and very loud musical instruments (such as horns, drums and cymbals) are not permitted outdoors except at the Outdoor Events Location when in compliance with the Noise Element of the Sonoma County General Plan. The location of the outdoor events that involve amplified sound or very loud

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

Comment:

11.e No Impact - The project is not located within an airport land use planning area or two miles of an airport.

No Mitigation Required.

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

Comment:

11.f No Impact - The project is not located near a private airstrip.

No Mitigation Required.

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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)?

_____ _____ _____ X

Comment:

12.a. No Impact - The project includes construction of a new tasting room. The project would not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth in the area because it would not add to local housing and would not provide infrastructure needed to support the development of new housing.

No Mitigation Required.

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

_____ _____ _____ X

Comment:

12.b. No Impact - The project would not displace existing housing or necessitate the construction of housing elsewhere.

No Mitigation Required.

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

_____ _____ _____ X

Comment:

12.b. No Impact - See response to 12.b listed above.

No Mitigation Required.

13. PUBLIC SERVICES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
Police protection?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
Schools?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
Parks?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
Other public facilities?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>

Comment:

12.a No Impact - The proposed improvements would not require additional public services or new or physically altered governmental facilities. The project must comply with all applicable fire codes including emergency access, water supply and appliances, building sprinklers, alarm systems, and extinguishers. All applicable fire protection measures would be required with any new construction. The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on associated governmental facilities, therefore potential impacts to these agencies is considered less than significant.

No Mitigation Required.

14. RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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?				
	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>

Comment:

14 a. No Impact -Typically, residential uses are associated with increased demands on recreational facilities. The proposed project is a tasting room and not residential or recreational use. The proposed tasting room would not cause an increase in the use of parks in the area. In addition, the project does not include recreational facilities and does not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

No Mitigation Required.

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? _____ X

Comment:

14 a. No Impact - No recreational facilities are required or proposed.

No Mitigation Required.

- | 15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (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? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> | _____ |

Comment:

15 a. Less than Significant Impact - A Focused Traffic Study dated October 15, 2009, was prepared for the proposed tasting room by W-Trans. The current traffic volumes were measured near the existing south driveway for seven days, between September 4, and 11, 2009, and the average daily volume (ADT) was approximately 400 vehicles per day. The study indicates that the proposed project will generate approximately an average of 23 vehicle trips per day on Meyers Grade Road. The analysis states that the proposed tasting room will have an insignificant impact on the existing traffic conditions and the exiting road will adequately support additional trips associated with the proposed project.

No Mitigation Required.

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

Comment:

15 a. Less than Significant Impact - A Focused Traffic Study dated October 15, 2009, was prepared for the proposed tasting room by W-Trans. The current traffic volumes were measured near the existing south driveway for seven days, between September 4, and 11, 2009, and the average daily volume (ADT) was approximately 400 vehicles per day. The proposed project will generate approximately 23 vehicle trips per day. The study indicated that the proposed project will have an insignificant impact on the existing traffic conditions and the road will adequately support additional trips associated with the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project will not have an individual or cumulative impact on the roads or highways.

No Mitigation Required.

- 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

Comment:

15.c. No Impact - The project does not include air traffic. There will be no change in air traffic patterns that would result in substantial safety risks.

No Mitigation Required.

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

Comment:

15 d. Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation - A Focused Traffic Study dated October 15, 2009, was prepared for the proposed tasting room by W-Trans. The 248.38 acre parcel is located approximately 2.5 miles northeast of Highway 1 on Meyers Grade Road. The paved width of Meyers Grade Road is 24 feet at the frontage of the project site and between the site and the intersection of Highway 1. The average traffic speed is approximately 38 mph. The current traffic volumes on Meyers Grade Road were measured near the existing south driveway for seven days, between September 4, and 11, 2009, and the average daily volume (ADT) was approximately 400 vehicles per day. This traffic volume is significantly less than the roadway capacity. The study indicates that the proposed project will generate on average approximately 23 vehicle trips per day on Meyers Grade Road. The analysis states that the proposed tasting room will have an insignificant impact on the existing traffic conditions and the exiting road will adequately support additional trips associated with the proposed project.

The traffic study reviewed the collision history for Meyers Grade Road and determined that between October 2005 and September 2008 there was one collision within a half-mile segment of Meyers Grade Road near the proposed project site. The collision involved a single vehicle driving on the wrong side of the road. The study indicated the collision rate on Meyers Grade Road is slightly lower than the average rate for similar roads statewide and the road is operating within acceptable safety standards.

There are two existing driveways located on the project site and are identified as Entry 1 and Entry 2 in the traffic study. Entry 1 is located on the south portion of the site and Entry 2 is located on the north portion of the project site. The site distance along Meyers Grade road was evaluated at both driveways using the criteria contained in "A Policy on Geometric Designs on Highways and Streets," published by American association of State Highway and Transportation Official (AASHTO). The measured site distance at Entry 1 for southbound drivers approaching the driveway was less than 180 feet, which is less than the required stopping sight distance. Northbound drivers approaching Entry 1 have a sight distance of approximately 360 feet, which is meets the AASHTO standards. The measured site distance for Entry 2 was over 360 feet in both the northbound and southbound directions which meets the AASHTO standards. In order to meet the site distance standards the study recommends outbound traffic use Entry 1 located on the south portion of the site and inbound traffic use Entry 2 located north portion of the site. In addition the study recommend that a "STOP" legend should be marked on the driveway at Entry 1 to ensure that exiting motorists stop where the best visibility can be achieved.

The study recommends restricting hours of operation as a precautionary measure in consideration of traffic operational efficiency. During the winter months as between December 1 and March 31 the tasting room would be open from 10 a.m. and 5 p.m. and special events would conclude by 5 p.m. During spring, summer, and fall between April 1 and November 30 the tasting room would be open 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. and special events would conclude one-half hour before sunset.

The traffic study states that the proposed tasting room will have an insignificant impact on the existing traffic conditions and the exiting road will adequately support additional trips associated with the proposed project.

Mitigation 15.d (1):

All outbound traffic shall exit the project site from Entry 1 and all inbound traffic shall access the project site from Entry 2 as identified on the Driveway Plan prepared by Bartholow Engineering, dated April 2009.

programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? _____ X

Comment:

15.g. No Impact - The proposed project does not conflict with alternative transportation plans or policies.

No Mitigation Required.

16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>

Comment:

16.a. No Impact - The proposed project is located in a rural, unincorporated area of the County where the parcels are served by private on site well and sub-surface septic systems. Therefore, the proposed project would not require or result in the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities.

No Mitigation Required.

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

Comment:

16.b. No Impact - The proposed project does not involve wastewater treatment or the review by the Regional Water Quality Control Board as the waste water will be treated in an approved septic system.

No Mitigation Required.

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

Comment:

16.c. Less than Significant Impact - The project would require the construction of storm water drainage facilities for all new structures. This will not require the expansion of any public stormwater system or cause significant environmental effects. Conditions will require that drainage improvements be designed by a civil engineer in accordance with the Water Agency Flood Control Design Criteria for approval by the Director of the Permit and Resource Management and be shown on the improvement drawings.

No Mitigation Required.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
--	-------	-------	------------	-------

Comment:

16.d. Less than Significant Impact - The proposed project will be served by a private on-site well. Water supply from subsurface wells do not require water entitlement approvals. According to the ground water study required by PRMD's Environmental Health Specialist there is sufficient water supplies available to serve the project.

No Mitigation Required.

- 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

Comment:

16.e. No Impact - The project is served by a private, on-site septic system. The project is not served by a wastewater treatment provider.

No Mitigation Required.

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

Comment:

16.f. No Impact - Sonoma County has a solid waste management program in place that provides solid waste collection and disposal services for the entire County. The program can accommodate the permitted collection and disposal of the waste that will result from the proposed project.

No Mitigation Required.

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

Comment:

16.g. No Impact - The proposed project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

No Mitigation Required.

17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to 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? | _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> | _____ |

Comment:

17.a . Less than Significant Impact - This initial study determined that this project will not result in degrading the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

No Mitigation Required.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? _____ X _____ _____
- c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? _____ X _____ _____

Comment:

17. b&c - Less than Significant with Mitigation - It is the conclusion of this initial study that the proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impact with the incorporation of mitigation measures. This determination was reached through examination of the project description and plans, project site evaluation, and the following documents:

- 1) Habitat Assessment, Fawcett Environmental Consulting, Michael H. Fawcett, Ph.D., October 30, 2009.
- 2) Cultural Resources Survey, Rene Peron, August 3, 2009, (confidential on file a the Permit and Resource Management Department).
- 3) Geology & Ground Water Study, E.H. Boudreau, Registered Geologist #3000, December, 2009.
- 4) Focused Traffic Study, W-Trans, Mary Jo Yung, P.E., PTOE, October 15, 2009.

Mitigation:

See mitigation measures list above, 1d, 3b, 8c, 11a, 11b.

Many of the proposed project's potential environmental affects are addressed through the Sonoma County project review process. The Environmental Health Specialist of the Project Review Division has reviewed the proposal and imposed conditions designed to protect water quality and supply. Emergency Services requires compliance with fire safe standards in order to ensure that the exposure of people and property to hazards is minimized.



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:
Adoption Date:
State Clearinghouse:

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.: UPE09-0027 **Planner:** Cynthia Demidovich

Project Name: Fort Ross Vineyard Tasting Room

Project Description:

The proposed project is a request for a Use Permit for a new retail tasting room open to the public with 18 special events with a maximum of 200 people per event. The tasting room will be available to rent for eight of the 18 special events to various organization for fund raising, private and public events. The remaining ten special event will be promotional events sponsored by the vineyard. All of the special events will be by invitation only. The new 4,991 square foot tasting room facility will include an 800 square foot tasting room area, 180 square foot office, 261 square foot kitchen, and 840 square foot deck, 1,600 square foot attic that will be converted to an office in the future, and a 2,640 square foot basement which will be used for storage. The site will be improved with 31 new parking spaces. The cultivation of approximately 8 acres of vineyard is currently present on the project site and this yields approximately 2,656 cases of Sonoma County wine. There is no on-site winery facilities all of the grapes are taken off-site for processing.

It is anticipated one full time employee and one part-time will be required for the retail tasting room. The proposed hours of operations for the tasting room during the winter months between December 1 and March 31 would be from 10:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. and special events would conclude by 5:00 p.m. During spring, summer, and fall between April 1 and November 30 the tasting room would be open 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. and special events would conclude one-half hour before sunset. The proposed tasting room will be served by an on-site septic system and water will be supplied by an existing on-site well. The large special events will be required to use portable toilets.

Project Location: 15001 Meyers Grade Road, Jenner
See Location Map - Attached

Environmental Finding:

The proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment, and the adoption of a Negative Declaration is appropriate.

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 effect resulting from this project, provided that mitigation measures are incorporated into the project. The Negative Declaration has been completed in compliance with CEQA State and County guidelines and the information contained therein has been reviewed and considered.

There (will) (will not) be a potential impact on biotic habitat of concern to Fish & Game.

Initial Study:

Attached

Other Attachments:

1) Habitat Assessment, Fawcett Environmental Consulting, Michael H. Fawcett, Ph.D., October 30, 2009.

2) Cultural Resources Survey, Rene Peron, August 3, 2009, (confidential on file a the Permit and Resource Management Department).

3) Geology & Ground Water Study, E.H. Boudreau, Registered Geologist #3000, December, 2009.

4) Focused Traffic Study, W-Trans, Mary Jo Yung, P.E., PTOE, October 15, 2009.

5) Outdoor Events Location Map, prepared by Ray Carlson and Associates, dated October 2, 2009.

Decision-making Body:

Sonoma County Board of Zoning Adjustments

Lead Agency:

Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department