Mitigated Negative Declaration

Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department
2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403
(707) 565-1900  FAX (707) 565-1103

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.: UPE07-0008  Planners: David Hardy
Project Name: Henry Cornell Winery

Project Description:

The applicant's request is for a winery with a maximum annual production capacity of 10,000 cases. The proposal includes construction of an 18,670 square foot building and a 8,670 square foot cave for barrel storage. The project would require a substantial amount of grading (approx. 3,000 cubic yards) to terrace the site for the proposed buildings. The plans indicate space for approximately 22 parking spaces. A new water tank would be constructed for fire protection and domestic use. The building and caves would contain all winery operations and equipment.

Tasting would be by appointment only. According to the proposal statement, a maximum of 15 visitors at a time would be hosted. There would be three full time employees, with four additional employees to help during harvest and crush. Crushing operations would take place outside on a crush pad. Normal hours of operation (non-crush) would be 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. The process wastewater would be treated using a small patented aerobic treatment system and stored in a water tank for disposal by means of drip irrigation in the vineyard. Domestic wastewater from staff and customers would be processed using a conventional septic system with disposal in a leach field downhill and to the north of the proposed winery. The existing wells on the ridge to the northeast will supply the winery with water. Stems and pomace would be disked back into the vineyard and not burned.

A 540 square foot kitchen is proposed in the 2,640 square foot hospitality area of the winery. The kitchen use will be limited to wine industry sales and marketing representatives for wine and food pairings at a frequency of ten dinners per year with a maximum number of ten dinner guests at one time. No special events are proposed.

Project Location: 245 Wappo Road, Santa Rosa

Environmental Finding:

The proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment and the adoption of a Mitigated 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 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
Decision-making Body: Sonoma County Board of Zoning Adjustments
Lead Agency: Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department
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 #:  PLP07-0008  
PROJECT:  Henry Cornell Winery  
PLANNER:  Dave Hardy  
DATE:  September 2008  

LEAD AGENCY:  Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department  
PROJECT LOCATION:  245 Wappo Rd., Santa Rosa  
APPLICANT NAME:  W. Guy Davis  
APPLICANT ADDRESS:  52 Front St., Healdsburg CA  
GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:  Resource and Rural Development, 100 acre density  
ZONING:  RRD (Resource and Rural Development), B6-100 acre density, BR (Biotic Resources)  

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT:  
The applicant's request is for a winery with a maximum annual production capacity of 10,000 cases. The proposal includes construction of an 18,670 square foot building and a 8,670 square foot cave for barrel storage. The project would require a substantial amount of grading (approx. 3,000 cubic yards) to terrace the site for the proposed buildings. The plans indicate space for approximately 22 parking spaces. A new water tank would be constructed for fire protection and domestic use. The building and caves would contain all winery operations and equipment. 

Tasting would be by appointment only. According to the proposal statement, a maximum of 15 visitors at a time would be hosted. There would be three full time employees, with four additional employees to help during harvest and crush. Crushing operations would take place outside on a crush pad. Normal hours of operation (non-crush) would be 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. The process wastewater would be treated using a small patented aerobic treatment system and stored in a water tank for disposal by means of drip irrigation in the vineyard. Domestic wastewater from staff and customers would be processed using a conventional septic system with disposal in a leach field downhill and to the north of the proposed winery. The existing wells on the ridge to the northeast will supply the winery with water. Stems and pomace would be discd back into the vineyard and not burned.  

A 540 square foot kitchen is proposed in the 2,640 square foot hospitality area of the winery. The kitchen use will be limited to wine industry sales and marketing representatives for wine and food pairings at a frequency of ten dinners per year with a maximum number of ten dinner guests at one time. No special events are proposed.  

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

The project site is largely undeveloped other than the access road, an existing single family residence,
and fencing around the residence, which is several hundred feet southwest of the winery site, which is located on a knoll adjacent to the access road. The knoll has been grubbed and cleared and erosion control measures put in some places at the top of drainages. The only vineyard on the parcel is a small one associated with the residence. Most of the vineyard that will supply the winery is located on abutting land owned by Cornell. The project site is not located in a designated scenic resource area. There is a small area of Biotic Resources/Critical Habitat Areas (reflecting the serpentine soils in the area that support unique plant species) at the southern edge of the site, but it is over 600 feet away from the proposed winery.

Land use in the project vicinity is rural. The south side of Mark West Creek is largely forest land along most of St. Helena Road. The north side of the road is interspersed with forest and chaparral scrub, some of the latter having been cleared for pasture and for vineyards. The nearest off site neighboring dwellings are more than 1,300 feet to the south. There is an old Christmas tree farm on St. Helena Road southwest of the site. A winery with a maximum annual production capacity of 6,000 cases was approved in August of 2002 on Mattei Road, another private road off of St. Helena Road about 2 miles west of the site. Parcels in this area range from over 120 acres to less than 5 acres in size. Zoning is Resource and Rural Development, with 100 acre density.

Other Public Agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): Regional Water Quality Control Board

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" or "Less than Significant with Mitigation" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Agricultural Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

Air Quality
Geology/Soils
Land Use and Planning
Population/Housing
Transportation/Traffic

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 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 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.

Incorporated Source Documents

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.

- Project Application and Description
- Initial Data Sheet
- 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)
- UPE03-0092 File
- Supplemental Groundwater Availability Study, Todd Engineers, August 2006
- Groundwater Letter updates, Todd Engineers, April 27, 2007, and June 12, 2007
- Review of Supplemental Groundwater Studies by Kleinfelder, dated March 8, 2008
- Review of RGH Reports by Kleinfelder, dated July 2, 2008

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

Comment: The area to be developed is not visible from any public view sheds or scenic vistas.

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

Comment: The area to be developed is not visible from any public view sheds or scenic vistas.
Comment: The project is not in a designated scenic resource area, is not visible from public offsite areas, and is not on a state scenic highway.

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

Comment: The new building and cave will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

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

1.d. Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation. The proposal, for a winery, will include new exterior lighting. To ensure that new sources of light do not adversely impact 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 PRMD Project Review staff. 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 night 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 off 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 PRMD Project Review staff 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

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?  

Comment: According to the Sonoma County Important Farmlands Map -2000 (database), the site is designated "Grazing and Other Land". The facility will be used for processing of agricultural products. The project would not convert prime land to a non-agricultural use.

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

Comment: The proposed project would not conflict with the zoning as agricultural processing is an allowed use in the RRD zoning district with use permit approval. The project site is not under a Williamson Act contract.

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?  

Comment: The proposed facility would be used for processing of agricultural products. The project would not convert prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance to a non-agricultural use.

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:

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

Comment: 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.

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

Comment: State and federal standards have been established for "criteria pollutants": ozone precursors, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide and particulates (PM10 and PM2.5). 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 (only 15 guests and seven employees are allowed at one time) 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.

Project architectural drawings dated June 20, 2008, prepared by Backen Gillam Architects show a fireplace between the hospitality area and the fermentation room. Wood smoke from fireplaces and wood stoves are sources of pollutants receiving increasing scrutiny and generating numerous complaints to the BAAQMD. Although constituting a very small percentage of the total PM10 emissions on an annual basis, wood smoke is a major contributor to reduced visibility and reduced air quality on winter evenings in both urban and rural areas. Sonoma County building regulations restrict fireplaces to natural gas fireplace, pellet stoves and EPA-Certified wood burning fireplaces or stoves. With the regulatory restriction on fireplace design, this would be a less than significant impact.

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)?

   _______   _______   _______   _______   _______

Comment: The BAAQMD is a non-attainment area for ozone precursors and PM10 (fine particulate matter) The project will not have a significant long-term effect on PM10, because all disturbed surfaces will be paved or landscaped, and dust generation will be insignificant. See 3b for a discussion of ozone.

PM10 is a criteria pollutant that is closely monitored in the NSCAPCD. Readings in the district have exceeded state standards on several occasions in the last several years. The high PM10 readings occurred in the winter and are attributed to the seasonal use of wood burning stoves. The project will not have a significant operational long-term effect on PM10 because all surfaces will be paved or landscaped, and dust generation will be insignificant when the project is completed.

However, there could be a significant short-term emission of dust (which would include PM10) 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 AIR-1:
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?

Comment: 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 such uses nearby, and the nearest of site residence is more than 1,300 feet away. 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 entrance road to the winery passes 75 to 100 feet from two residences, but the winery itself (where most of the diesel emissions will occur) is over 1,300 feet from the nearest of site residence. Given the low volume of truck traffic, and the distance from the receptors, the emissions of toxic air contaminants would not be substantial.

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

Comment: The project includes crushing grapes, which can cause odors. The BAAQMD has no record of complaints related to grape pomace, except when burned. The applicant proposes to spread the crush residue in the vineyard as a soil amendment, and the nearest off site residence is more than 1,300 feet away from the crush area of the winery.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project: Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant Impact 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? 

**Comment:** A referral was sent to the Department of Fish and Game, which did not respond. The new structures will not impact candidate, sensitive, or special status species because the project does not include modifications to any wetland or special habitat.

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? 

**Comment** The project does not include any disturbance along a riparian habitat or sensitive natural community. The nearest formally designated Biotic Resource area is located over 600 feet from the development site.

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?

**Comment:** See Comment 4.a.

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?

**Comment:** The project parcel is developed with an existing house and fencing structures, although they are several hundred feet southwest of the proposed winery. No fencing is proposed that would obstruct wildlife movement. The project development does not include any work within a creek. The project would not substantially interfere with the movement of migratory fish or wildlife species.

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

**Comment:** The winery site is over 600 feet from any critical habitat area or biotic resource, and the biotic resource designation is related to plant species adapted to serpentine soils. The site has previously been grubbed. The RGH geologic report says that the winery site topsoils consist mainly of a "loam that exhibits moderate plasticity." The site is not in a Valley Oak Preservation area. No significant trees would be removed as a result of the project.

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?

**Comment:** There are no known regional or state habitat conservation plans for this area. The
distance of the development from the biotic resource area as a protection measure is consistent with the Franz Valley Specific Plan and the Sonoma County General Plan.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project: 

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5? 

Comment: A Cultural Resources Survey was done on the site, and no historical resources were found on the site.

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

Comment: No archaeological resources were found on the project site. The following mitigation ensures that should resources be uncovered, they will be appropriately protected. No paleontological resources or unique geologic features are evident on site.

Mitigation Measure 5.b: All building and/or grading permits shall have the following note printed on plan sheets:

"In the event that archaeological features such as pottery, arrowheads, midden or culturally modified soil deposits are discovered at any time during grading, scraping or excavation within the property, all work shall be halted in the vicinity of the find and County PRMD Project Review staff shall be notified and a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted immediately to make an evaluation of the find and report to PRMD. PRMD staff may consult and/or notify the appropriate tribal representative from tribes known to PRMD to have interests in the area. Artifacts associated with prehistoric sites include humanly modified stone, shell, bone or other cultural materials such as charcoal, ash and burned rock indicative of food procurement or processing activities. Prehistoric domestic features include hearths, firepits, or house floor depressions whereas typical mortuary features are represented by human skeletal remains. Historic artifacts potentially include all by-products of human land use greater than 50 years of age including trash pits older than fifty years of age. 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 and coordinate proper protection/mitigation measures required for the discovery. PRMD may refer the mitigation/protection plan to designated tribal representatives for review and comment. No work shall commence until a protection/mitigation plan is reviewed and approved by PRMD - Project Review staff. Mitigations may include avoidance, removal, preservation and/or recording in accordance with California law. Archeological evaluation and mitigation shall be at the applicant's sole expense.

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, the Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted by the Coroner so that a "Most Likely Descendant" can be designated and the appropriate provisions of the California Government Code and California Public Resources Code will be followed."

Mitigation Monitoring 5.b: 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.

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

Comment: The project includes digging a cave. Paleontological resources may be found during this excavation.

Mitigation Measure 5.c: If paleontological artifacts are found during site development, 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 paleontologist. When contacted, a member of PRMD Project Review staff and the paleontologist 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 paleontologist 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 regarding the procedures to follow in the event that artifacts are found including contact information for PRMD.

Mitigation Monitoring 5.c: Staff shall check plans for notation of the condition, prior to issuance of grading permits and shall conduct site inspections as necessary during construction. This condition shall be noted on all grading and construction plans and provided to all contractors and superintendents on the job site.

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

Comment: There was no evidence that the site contains a burial site.

Mitigation Measure 5.d: If human remains are encountered, excavation or disturbance of the location shall be halted immediately in the vicinity of the find, and the County Coroner contacted. If the Coroner determines the remains are Native American, the Coroner will contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will identify the person or persons believed to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American. The NAHC will then work with the applicant on re-intering the remains. The applicant shall be responsible for all costs incurred in the removal, identification and reburial of the remains. This condition shall be noted on all grading and construction plans and provided to all contractors and superintendents on the job site regarding the procedures to follow in the event that human remains are found including contact information for the County Coroner's Office.

Mitigation Monitoring 5.d: Staff shall check plans for notation of the condition, prior to issuance of grading permits and shall conduct site inspections as necessary during construction.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project:

Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation 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.

____  __  ____  ____  ____
Comment: A Preliminary Geotechnical Study Report of the site was prepared by RGH consultants, Inc., dated May 31, 2007, and updated April 22, 2008. The updated RGH report was reviewed on behalf of the County of Sonoma by Kleinfelder in a letter by William McCormick prepared July 2, 2008. RGH conducted numerous excavations at the winery property to evaluate the site's suitability for construction of the proposed project. RGH concludes, “Based upon the results of our geologic data review, site reconnaissances and subsurface explorations, we judge that it is currently geologically and geotechnically feasible to construct a winery and related improvements at the planned site.” RGH notes: “We did not observe landforms at the winery site that would indicate the presence of active faults and the site is not within a current Alquist-Priolo (A-P) Earthquake Fault Zone.” Nevertheless, the site is located approximately seven miles northeast of the Healdsburg-Rodgers Creek Fault Zone, and there are other faults in the vicinity. Therefore, according to RGH, “future seismic shaking should be anticipated at site. It will be necessary to design and construct the proposed winery and related improvements in strict adherence with current standards for earthquake-resistant construction, as will be recommended in a future Geotechnical Study.” Kleinfelder agreed with the revised geologic mapping by RGH, and states: “Based on their supporting data, conclusions and recommendations, it is our opinion that the updated RGH report has adequately identified the existing and potential geologic hazards at the site and that they have demonstrated geotechnical feasibility for a winery project, from a preliminary or planning viewpoint. As stated in their report, a detailed, site-specific Geotechnical Study should be prepared prior to final design and construction of the project.”

Mitigation Measure 6.a.i: The Project shall comply with all recommendations contained in the Preliminary Geologic Study prepared by RGH Consultants, Inc. dated April 22, 2008. Compliance with these recommendations would reduce geology and soils impacts to a less-than-significant level. In addition, a detailed, site-specific Geotechnical Study shall be prepared and submitted with grading and construction plans. Said Study shall address all issues raised in the Preliminary Geologic Study and review by Kleinfelder, and shall insure that the construction of the winery is engineered to eliminate the probability of downward creep, erosion, landslides, and soil/bedrock expansion.

Mitigation Monitoring 6.a.i: Prior to approval of the grading, drainage, and construction plans for the project, PRMD Project Review staff shall ensure that the Geotechnical Study is submitted for Engineering Division Review and Approval.

i) Strong seismic ground shaking? X

Comment: As noted in the RGH report, the site may be subject to strong seismic ground shaking as is all of Sonoma County. The California Building Code and the adopted codes and policies of Sonoma County have been developed to address seismic hazards to the most reasonable extent possible. All new construction must comply with the seismic design requirements of the Building Code. RGH states: “Provided the proposed fills and foundations, as applicable, are adequately keyed into underlying bedrock material, as will be recommended in a future Geotechnical Study report, we judge the potential for impact to the proposed winery from the occurrence of these phenomena (seismic slope failure or lurching) at the winery site is low to moderate.

ii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? X

Comment: The Schematic Map of Areas Subject to Safety Policy Requirements of the Sonoma County General Plan (Figure PS-1e) indicates that the site is outside the area of high to moderate potential for liquefaction. The Preliminary Geologic Study prepared by RGH Consultants, Inc. states “We did not observe subsurface conditions ...that would suggest the presence of materials that may be susceptible to seismically induced densification or liquefaction.” The Study concludes that the probability of liquefaction is low. The applicant must submit a building permit application including construction design plans for Sonoma County's review and approval. This review process ensures the structures would be adequately designed to California Building Code standards.

iii) Landslides? X

Comment: The Schematic Map of Areas Subject to Safety Policy Requirements of the Sonoma County General Plan (Figure PS-1e) indicates that the site is outside the area of high to moderate potential for liquefaction. The Preliminary Geologic Study prepared by RGH Consultants, Inc. states “We did not observe subsurface conditions ...that would suggest the presence of materials that may be susceptible to seismically induced densification or liquefaction.” The Study concludes that the probability of liquefaction is low. The applicant must submit a building permit application including construction design plans for Sonoma County's review and approval. This review process ensures the structures would be adequately designed to California Building Code standards.
Comment: The Schematic Map of Areas Subject to Safety Policy Requirements of the 1989 Sonoma County General Plan (Figure PS-1e) indicates that the site is within the area of high to moderate potential for landslides. The RGH report notes that previous mapping indicates three major landslides in the vicinity. In addition, RGH encountered active, dormant, and ancient landslides on the property. "The dormant landslide on the north-northeast extends onto the northern end of the new proposed winery configuration, a portion of the cave, and roadway...Preliminarily, we estimate the middle and lower portions of this landslide to be in the 15- to 25-foot depth range but will need to be verified during a site specific geotechnical study." The report observes that "Creep and creep prone soils and shallower landslides can be mitigated during the normal course of grading. Avoiding or setting structures back from landslides is also a feasible mitigation. The dormant translational landslide on the north-northeastern portion of the proposed winery will require reconstructing portions of the entire landslide, depending on the planned grading, as drained, buttressed fills bearing below the landslide plane." The use of buttressed fills and reconstructing landslides are to be addressed during a detailed site-specific report.

Mitigation Measure 6.a.iv: The Project shall comply with all recommendations contained in the Preliminary Geologic Study prepared by RGH Consultants, Inc. dated April 22, 2008. Compliance with these recommendations would reduce geology and soils impacts to a less-than-significant level. In addition, a detailed, site-specific Geotechnical Study shall be prepared and submitted with grading and construction plans. Said Study shall address all issues raised in the Preliminary Geologic Study and review by Kleinfelder, and shall insure that the construction of the winery is engineered to eliminate the probability of downward creep, erosion, landslides, and soil/bedrock expansion.

Mitigation Monitoring 6.a.iv: Prior to approval of the grading, drainage, and construction plans for the project, PRMD Project Review staff shall ensure that the Geotechnical Study is submitted for Engineering Division Review and Approval.

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

Comment: The proposed winery construction would require grading and could result in a minor loss of topsoil. The RGH report observes that "the natural drainages of the site trend westerly into a deep ravine that trends southwesterly through the northwestern portion of the subject parcel. The ravine trends off the parcel and into a second south-westerly-flowing intermittent blue-line stream that empties into Mark West Creek off the property. Mark West Creek is a perennial blue-line stream that flows westerly adjacent to St. Helena Road."

The project description estimates approximately 2,500 cubic yards of excavation and approximately 500 cubic yards of fill. The RGH report states that uncontrolled erosion "could induce sloughing, new landsliding or landslide reactivation." The report also states that the "long-term satisfactory performance of winery improvements and roadways constructed on hillsides results primarily from strict control of surface runoff and subsurface seepage. The site's surface soils have a moderate to high erosion potential depending on slope inclination." To avoid these problems, the report recommends that roof downspouts from the winery should discharge into closed glued pipes that empty away from steep and/or potentially unstable areas. Discharge for downspout points, roadway culverts and ditches and storm drain outfalls will need to be protected against erosion and sloughing by installing energy dissipaters and then piping the collected waters downhill to planned discharge facilities.

Mitigation Measure: See 6.a.iv. above

Mitigation Monitoring: See 6.a.iv. above

Comment: Cave construction may generate surplus soils for disposal off-site, and improper disposal of this material could affect off-site wetlands or other sensitive habitats. The impact can be reduced to
less than significant by controlling the disposal of surplus soils, as required in the following mitigation measure.

**Mitigation Measure 6b:** All surplus and excavated soils shall be retained onsite subject to the provisions of 6.a.iv above. All surplus soils that cannot be used on the project site shall be disposed of at an acceptable disposal site. If any areas outside the project site are used for disposal or stockpiling of soil or other materials, the contractor shall be required to demonstrate that the site has all the required permits, including, if applicable, a grading permit.

**Mitigation Monitoring 6b:** The contractor shall be required to provide evidence to the County that the disposal site does not affect wetlands under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers, or that the site has the appropriate permits.

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?  

   

   Comment: See response to 6.a.iv.

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?  

   

   Comment: 6a.iv. above.

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?  

   

   Comment: The domestic wastewater is proposed to be disposed in a new leach field approximately 150 feet north of the proposed winery. The applicant's civil engineer conducted percolation tests at the site of the proposed domestic wastewater leach field pursuant to a PRMD site evaluation permit (SEV06-1209). The test results were reviewed by the environmental health specialist for that area on January 10, 2007, and the proposed location was approved for eventual construction of a system designed by a registered environmental health specialist or civil engineer.

7. **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**
   
   Would the project:  

   

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

   

   Comment: The processing and fermentation of the grapes to wine includes the use and maintenance of machinery and equipment that require the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials (e.g. oils, diesel, solvents, lubricates, etc.) The vineyard was approved and installed several years ago, but pesticides and herbicides are still used and stored on the project site. The Sonoma County Agricultural Commissioners Office regulates the storage and use of herbicides and pesticides by requiring an annual issuance of a Pesticide I.D. and classes be taken by person applying such
hazardous materials for agricultural uses such as the vineyard operation. A referral describing the project was sent to the Department of Emergency Services which required that the project comply with Fire Safe Standards for commercial development. The project itself (the winery) does not produce or generate hazardous materials. A referral describing the project was also sent to the Environmental Health Specialist-Project Review which required compliance with hazardous waste generator laws and submittal of copies of appropriate permits.

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?  

Comment: The use of any hazardous materials by the winery and vineyard will not be of sufficient volatility or quantity to cause a hazard to the public. These materials are commonly used in the wine industry and will be handled according to existing regulations and codes.

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

Comment: The subject property is not within a one-quarter mile of an 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?  

Comment: The site is not identified as a hazardous materials sites under Government Code Section 65962.5.

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?  

Comment: The project is not in close proximity to an airport.

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?  

Comment: The project is not located within the vicinity of a known private airstrip.

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

Comment: There will be no impacts on emergency responses or evacuation plans as a result of the project.
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?

Comment: According to the Safety Element of the General Plan, the project site is located in an area with very high or high potential for large wildland fires. The site is located on a knoll where substantial brush clearing has occurred, providing a significant buffer around the proposed facility. The project must conform to Fire Safe Standard requirements for commercial uses related to fire sprinklers, emergency vehicle access, and water supply. These standard provisions reduce the potential exposure to people or structures to a less than significant impact.

8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project: 

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Comment: The proposed facility would generate wastewater from crushing, fermenting, bottling, and barrel washing. Wastewater is proposed to be irrigated into the vineyard. A referral describing the project was sent to the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board and the Environmental Health Specialist - Project Review, which set conditions for the project’s domestic and industrial wastewater disposal requirements. To ensure the project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements the applicant is required to submit a letter of acceptance of wastewater discharge requirements from the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board prior to obtaining building permits for any new construction. The Permit and Resource Management Department will not issue any permits until the Project Review Health Specialist has received a letter of acceptance of an application for wastewater discharge requirement from the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board.

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?

Comment: A Geologic Report addressing groundwater availability was prepared by Todd Engineers, dated August 2006, along with subsequent update and clarification letters dated April 27, 2007, and June 12, 2007. According to the original report, "Cornell Farms plans to pump approximately between 3.82 and 3.98 acre feet per year (AFY; equivalent to about 2.5 gallons per minute [gpm] year-round) for groundwater from the two existing water supply wells. This usage includes irrigation for the 20-acre vineyard (2.28 gpm or 3.69 AFY) and for crushing and bottling operations, and light industrial requirements (0.18 gpm or 0.29 AFY)." In the April 27, 2007, supplement, Todd concludes:

"There will be no direct and short-term hydraulic impacts to Mark West Creek or its tributaries due to project groundwater pumping. The area of influence of the pumping well could be a radial distance that ranges between 102 and 505 feet from the well after 18 hours of pumping. The distance between the well and Mark West Creek and its tributaries is greater than 500 feet."
Groundwater pumped for the project is derived ultimately from precipitation on the local watershed and percolation of that water through the unsaturated zone to the water table through the pores and fractures of the underlying rock. Groundwater pumped for the project is not derived from surface water of Mark West Creek or its tributaries.

"However, we recognize that long-term and cumulative indirect impacts to Mark West Creek and its tributaries may occur from project groundwater pumpage to surface water courses over tens of decades. This long-term impact results from removing groundwater from the aquifer that would ordinarily and eventually support the base flows of Mark West Creek and its tributaries. The project requires about 4 acre feet per year of water and return flows to the aquifer are about 2 AFY; therefore, the net usage or a loss of base flow contribution is about 2 AFY. Considering that Mark West Creek has an average annual flow of 42,671 AFY and a dry year flow of 17,600 AFY, the net loss of 2 AFY is insignificant."

Todd's June 12, 2007, letter further states: "... the Cornell Farms LLC project will have no significant direct or indirect short- or long-term or cumulative hydrologic or hydraulic impact to groundwater or surface water resources in the Mark West Creek watershed."

These Todd Engineer reports were reviewed by the County's peer reviewer, Kleinfelder, who, in a letter March 5, 2008, stated: "We believe Todd makes a clear and concise description of the relationship between potential groundwater, groundwater conditions and withdrawals, and their interaction with the Mark West Creek. Their approaches are sound are within what would be considered acceptable practice and standard of care.....Our opinion is that the approach, description, calculations, and arguments in the reply Todd makes are well founded. They present a logical argument that the potential quantity of cumulative groundwater usage is a small percentage of the Mark West Creek contribution is a reasonable statement."

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: Construction of the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern on the site. The project is located on a knoll and avoids the drainage courses, which are to be used only as receptacles for water from rooftops and hard surfaces. The RGH Study identifies high erosion potential and recommends engineered site-specific drainage improvements to eliminate erosion and siltation in watercourses. See 6.a.iv above. In addition, standard measures for erosion control and management of the storm water runoff will reduce the level of impact to a less than significant level. Drainage review improvements are required to be designed by a geotechnical or civil engineer in accordance with the Water Agency Flood Control Design Criteria for approval and must be shown on the improvement drawings. The developer's engineer shall include a site grading plan and an erosion control plan as part of the required improvement drawings. The Permit and Resource Management Department will not issue a grading or building permit until evidence is submitted and approved by the Drainage Review section of PRMD that the improvements have been designed by a civil engineer in accordance with the Water Agency Flood Control Design Criteria for approval and are shown on the improvement drawings.

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. See 8c.
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?  

Comment: See 8.a. above.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?  

Comment: Refer to 8.a. and 8.c. above. The project development requires permits to be approved by the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board and the Well and Septic Sections of PRMD for all wastewater disposal. Compliance with State and County Standards will insure that potential impacts to water quality will be avoided.

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?  

Comment: There is no housing associated with the project.

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

Comment: No structures would be placed within any flood plains.

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?  

Comment: The site is not in an area subject to flooding or below a levee or dam.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?  

Comment: The site is not subject to seiche, tsunami or mudflow.

9. LAND USE AND PLANNING Would the project:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Physically divide an established community?  

Comment: The project is located within an established rural vineyard area. The project would not alter the parcel's ownership, nor reconfigure existing parcels or roadways. Therefore, the project would not divide an established community.

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? 

Comment: The request for a winery complies with the Resource and Rural Development General Plan designation and other goals and policies of the County's General Plan and conforms with the RRD zoning. Agricultural Processing is defined as, "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 applicant has stated that grapes grown on-site will be used to make wine. The proposal is also consistent with the General Plan's Agricultural Element Goals, Objectives and Policies which include the following:

**Goal AR 5:** "Facilitate 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 location is related to and serves primarily the agricultural activity of vineyards and the adjacent site is planted in vines.

The following Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Sonoma County General Plan apply to other issues of this project, namely geology, hydrology, and safety:

**Goal LU-7:** Prevent unnecessary exposure of people and property to environmental risks and hazards. Limit development on lands that are especially vulnerable or sensitive to environmental damage.

**Objective LU-7.1:** Restrict development in areas which are constrained by the natural limitations of the land, including by not limited to, flood, fire, geologic hazards, groundwater availability, and septic suitability.

**RC-2b:** Include erosion control measures for any discretionary project involving construction or grading near waterways or on lands with slopes over 10 percent.

**RC-2d:** Require a soil conservation program to reduce soil erosion impacts for discretionary projects which could increase waterway or hillside erosion. Design improvements such as roads and driveways to retain natural vegetation and topography to the extent feasible.

**Objective RC-8.1:** Identify sources of sediment and erosion and minimize their impact on local water courses.

**RC-8c:** Design public and private projects to minimize damage to the stream environment and to maintain instream flows.

**Goal PS-1:** Prevent unnecessary exposure of people and property to risks of damage or injury from earthquakes, landslides and other geologic hazards.

**Objective PS-1.2:** Regulate new development to reduce the risks of damage and injury from known geologic hazards to acceptable levels.

**PS-1f:** Require and review geologic reports prior to decisions on any project which would subject property or persons to significant risks from the geologic hazards shown on Figures PS-1a through PS-1i (pages 257 through 273) and related file maps and source documents. Geologic reports shall describe the hazards and include mitigation measures to reduce risks to acceptable levels. Where appropriate, require an engineer's or geologist's certification that risks have been mitigated to an acceptable level and, if indicated, obtain indemnification or insurance from the engineer, geologist, or
developer to minimize County exposure to liability.

**Comment:** The issues covered by these policies and objectives are addressed elsewhere in this Initial Study in sections relating to Geology and Hydrology and Water Quality. A geotechnical report and a hydrogeological analysis were submitted and reviewed by consulting geologists retained by the County. The following measure addresses the implementation of said reports.

**Mitigation Measure:** See Mitigation Measure 6.a.iv above.

**Mitigation Monitoring:** See Mitigation Measure 6.a.iv above.

**Goal PS-3.1:** Prevent unnecessary exposure of people and property and property to risks of damage or injury from wildland and structural fires.

**Objective PS3.2:** Regulate new development to reduce the risks of damage and injury from known fire hazards to acceptable levels.

**PS-3b:** Consider the severity of natural fire hazards, potential damage from wildland and structural fires, adequacy of fire protection and mitigation measures consistent with this element in the review of projects.

**PS-3d:** Require on-site detection and suppression, including automatic sprinkler systems, where available services do not provide acceptable levels of protection.

**Comment:** The site is located on a knoll where substantial brush clearing has occurred, providing a significant buffer around the proposed facility. The project must conform to Fire Safe Standard requirements for commercial uses related to fire sprinklers, emergency vehicle access, and water supply. These provisions reduce the potential exposure to people or structures to a less than significant level. No mitigation is required.

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

[ ] [ ] [ ] [X] [ ]

**Comment:** The project site is not within the Valley Oak Habitat Combining District. The project is not located within any other habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan area.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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]

**Comment:** The project will not result in the loss of a mineral resource.

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:** The Sonoma County General Plan does not designate the project site as within a known mineral resource deposit area.
11. **NOISE** Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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? ___ ___ X ___

**Comment:** The Sonoma County Noise Element of the General Plan establishes objectives, policies and performance standards for noise producing land uses that may affect noise sensitive land uses and vice versa. Wineries are recognized as a source of community noise because they are typically located in quiet rural areas. Exterior noise primarily occurs during the crush season and is usually less than 60 dBA at distances greater than 300 feet. The Project Review Health Specialist reviewed the project and determined that no noise study was necessary based on the distance to the offsite nearest residence, which is approximately 1,300 feet from the proposed construction of the winery.

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

**Comment:** Construction of the new building and cave may generate ground borne vibration and noise. These levels would not be excessive or significant as they would be limited to the construction period and would occur during normal business hours. In addition, the project site is more than 1,300 feet away from the nearest off site residences. Otherwise there are no other activities or uses associated with the project that would expose persons to or generate any excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels.

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

**Comment:** See 11 a.

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

**Comment:** See 11 a.

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 ___

**Comment:** The project site is not within an adopted airport land use plan.

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:** The project is not located within the vicinity of a known private airstrip.
12. POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:** 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:** The project would not displace existing housing or necessitate the construction of housing elsewhere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:** See Comment 12.b

13. PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:** The project will not require additional public services or new or physically altered governmental facilities. It 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.

14. RECREATION

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?

Comment: The proposed project is considered agricultural processing and is not a residential or recreational use. It would not cause an increase in the use of parks in the area.

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?

Comment: No recreation facilities are proposed.

15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (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)?

Comment: The site is accessed via Wappo Road, a private road off of St. Helena Road northeast of the City of Santa Rosa. The project would result in a negligible increase in daily volumes on the Road. Even with projected increase in traffic volumes, traffic would continue to operate at LOS A overall. The County General Plan requires that a LOS C be maintained as a standard. The project was reviewed by a representative of the Sonoma County Department of Public Works, who made a determination that roads serving the site were adequate. The applicant states that a reduction of agricultural truck traffic will occur because grapes will no longer be shipped off-site for processing.

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

Comment: See Comment 15.a.

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?

Comment: The project would not 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.

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: A determination has been made by the Transportation and Public Works Dept. that the project will not increase hazards.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

   X

Comment: With the review by Dept. of Emergency Services personnel on new construction for compliance with Fire Safe Standards, the project will not result in inadequate emergency access.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

   X

Comment: The design provide approximately 22 parking spaces, which would be adequate to serve the intensity of the requested use.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (E.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

   X

Comment: The proposed project does not conflict with alternative transportation plans or policies.

16. **UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

Would the project:

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

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

   X

Comment: The wastewater disposal system must be reviewed and approved (or the need for a permit waived due to the small size of the proposed facility) by the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB). Through this review and the Well and Septic Section of PRMD permitting process, the project must be designed not to exceed wastewater treatment requirements.

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

Comment: See response to 16.a. above in this initial study. The proposed project is not served by public sewer and all process wastewater will be disposed of in a sub-surface septic system and irrigated on the vines. Permits are required by the NCRWQCB and clearance by the Well and Septic Section of PRMD prior to issuance of building permits.

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

Comment: The project will not require the expansion of any public stormwater system or cause
significant environmental effects. Conditions will require that any 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.

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

Comment: The Groundwater Availability Report prepared by Todd Engineers states, “due to the presence of successful existing wells on the property, which have been used to irrigate the vineyards without reported problems, and our groundwater modeling results, we anticipate the availability of water for the planned increase in winery production is good and should not significantly impact groundwater availability on adjacent residential parcels.” There is no indication that there would be insufficient water to serve 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?

Comment: The project is not served by a wastewater treatment provider. Any expansion to the existing system must be permitted through the Well and Septic Section of PRMD and the NCRWQCB.

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

Comment: Sonoma County has a solid waste management program 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 would result from the proposed project. Grape pomace from the processing of the grapes into wine will be composted and tilled into the vineyard.

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

Comment: A referral describing the project was sent to the Project Review-Health Specialist, who required as a condition of approval that prior to issuance of any related building permit, the applicant shall submit a design for trash enclosures for review and approval to PRMD-Building as a part of the building permit process. This will ensure the winery facility complies with local regulations for solid waste.

17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
Comment: The project site is developed with existing structures, an adjacent vineyard, and fencing. The project development does not include any work within a creek. The project would not substantially interfere with the movement of migratory fish or wildlife species. Based on the above information it is concluded the project site has no habitat for sensitive species that could be affected by the project.

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)?

Comment: Cumulative projects include the past removal of timber, planting of grapes, and construction of structures and other improvements on the site, as well as development of residential, agricultural, and winery uses in the project area. These projects have not resulted in any significant effects to which the project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution. All project impacts would be mitigated to a Less that Significant level on both a project and cumulative level. In particular, the Groundwater Study demonstrates that cumulative impacts would be less than significant. Traffic mitigation fees are required to be paid to assist with the overall County roadways maintenance costs.

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

Comment: The project would result in only minimal changes to the existing environment. All impacts will be mitigated to less than significant. Mitigation Measure 1.d.1 requires that all new exterior lights be shielded, which would ensure that the project would not intensify any environmental effect to the detriment of residents or employees in the area. Geologic issues are mitigated through the implementation of the Geologic Study and the required Geotechnical Study.