

**Project Title:** Kenwood Vineyards Tasting Room Relocation and Expansion

**PRMD File No.:** PLP15-0067

**Project Location Address:** 9592 Highway 12, Kenwood (APN 051-160-033)

**Lead Agency:** Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department  
("Permit Sonoma")

**Decision Making Body:** Board of Zoning Adjustments

**Project Applicant:** Pernod Ricard Kenwood Holding LLC (Jo-Anna Partridge) (dba Kenwood Vineyards)

Note to the Mitigated Negative Declaration posted on the County of Sonoma's website:

Please note that all of the studies referenced at the end of this document are not included in this version. If you would like to see additional studies not included please contact the Permit and Resource Management Department's Planning Division at (707) 565-1900



# **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: 11/21/2017  
Adoption Date:  
State Clearinghouse: 11/21/2017

Pursuant to Section 15071 of the State CEQA Guidelines, this summary of findings and the attached Initial Study and mitigations constitute the Mitigated Negative Declaration as proposed for or adopted by the County of Sonoma for the project described below:

**Project Title:** Kenwood Vineyards Tasting Room Relocation and Expansion  
**PRMD File No.:** PLP15-0067  
**Project Location Address:** 9592 Highway 12, Kenwood (APN 051-160-033)  
**Lead Agency:** Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department ("Permit Sonoma")  
**Decision Making Body:** Board of Zoning Adjustments  
**Project Applicant:** Pernod Ricard Kenwood Holding LLC (Jo-Anna Partridge) (dba Kenwood Vineyards)

**Project Description:** Request for a use permit to construct a new 4,232 square foot tasting room and retail sales building, a new access driveway and parking area with 42 new vehicle parking spaces in a new parking lot for the tasting room; new subsurface sanitary sewer treatment system leachfield for the winery tasting room; relocation of water tanks and a pump shed closer to the winery to allow construction of the new tasting room; relocation of a pomace storage area; demolition of an existing agricultural garage and storage building which are in the area where the new tasting room will be constructed; and related site improvements. The new tasting facility would replace the existing 2,100 square foot tasting room located in an historic barn on the project site. The barn would continue to be used as an entrance to one of the large processing buildings and for storage. A total of 1.36 acres of existing vineyard would be removed to accommodate the new facility and related improvements.

The project proposes a total of 33 events (22 promotional marketing events and 11 industry wide event days) per year at the new tasting/retail facility. No increase to winery production is proposed with this application.

**Environmental Finding:** Based on the attached Initial Study, the project described above will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, provided that the mitigation measures identified in the Initial Study are incorporated into the project.

**Initial Study:** See attached.

**Mitigation Measures:** Included in attached Initial Study. The project applicant agreed to implement all mitigation measures.

This report is the Initial Study required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The report was prepared by Brian Millar, AICP, Contract Review Planner with the Sonoma County

Permit and Resource Management Department (“Permit Sonoma”), Project Review Division. Information on the project was provided by the applicant. Additional information was provided by various consultants as identified in this Initial Study. Technical studies referred to in this document are available for review at Permit Sonoma.

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

### *Existing Winery Operations*

The applicant indicates that the project site has been in winery use since 1906, and was acquired by Kenwood Winery in 1970. The facility currently operates under use permit UPE 01-0135 (superseding several older use permits) which allows production of 500,000 cases of wine. None of the use permits specifically discusses tasting or public tours but those activities are obliquely referred to in the older permits issued during a period of time when events were not specifically discussed or considered as a separate function of a winery.

The project site is developed with production, bottling and storage buildings, retail sales and tasting room, office building, driveway and parking areas, truck scale, pond, water storage tanks, well, wastewater disposal/leachfield system, related production equipment, and approximately 25 acres of planted vineyard. The facility has an existing food facility permit for a kitchen located in the administrative offices building, which is used to provide food for hospitality events at the existing tasting room and onsite administrative activities. The existing use permit identifies up to 60 employees, though there are currently approximately 35 employees. There are no residential units on the project site. The site is not subject to a Land Conservation (Williamson) Act Contract.

Most recently, the applicant obtained approval of PLP15-0011, which proposed to add an approximately 3,800 square foot tank building to an existing building, relocate existing receiving areas, complete a loop road around the facility, construct a new fire protection tank and fire pump and associated above-ground and underground piping. This construction work has been completed.

The retail sales and tasting room hours are currently 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M., seven days a week.

### *Project Overview*

The applicant proposes to relocate an existing winery tasting room/retail sales area of 2,100 square feet currently located in a barn that has been designated as an historic resource. A new 4,232 square foot tasting room/retail sales building will be constructed in a new location further east on the property. The historic barn will remain and continue to be used as an entrance to one of the existing processing buildings and as storage. The project would also include a new access driveway; new subsurface sanitary sewer treatment system leachfield for the winery tasting room; relocation of water tanks and a pump shed closer to the winery to allow construction of the new tasting room; relocation of a pomace storage area from its location near the proposed tasting room parking lot to a location near the existing central parking park and leachfield area; and demolition of an existing agricultural garage and storage building which are in the area where the new tasting room will be constructed. The project proposes 42 new vehicle parking spaces for the new tasting room plus 5 bicycle parking spaces and one space for a bus. This is in addition to 55 parking spaces existing on-site. Proposed events are further discussed, below. The new tasting room operation is expected to result in ten new employees.

### *New Construction and Improvements*

The new 4,232 sq. ft. wine tasting room and retail sales building would be located on the eastern portion of the site atop an existing knoll. The new building would be 19-feet, 8-inches high, and be of a modern design, incorporating use of steel, glass, and concrete along with a green “living” roof. The building would be oriented to the south to take advantage of views of the project site and towards the Valley of the Moon, with a continuous terrace wrapping around to the south and

east sides of the building. The building would include a public tasting room (occupying approximately 1,150 sq ft), VIP tasting room (675 sq ft), retail sales space (500 sq ft), along with restrooms, kitchen, storage, and related space. Additionally, outdoor tasting and events would occur on the proposed terraces (occupying approximately 3,000 square feet), including an outdoor bar and fireplace, and would be used as weather conditions allow. Tasting Room hours in the new facility would continue unchanged from the current operation of 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., seven days per week..

The relocated water tank and related pump and treatment shed would be located north from its current location, allowing for parking lot construction, northwest approximately 100 feet. The water tank would be approximately 24 feet high with a 24-foot diameter. Construction materials are expected to consist of galvanized steel or similar materials.

The existing use permit identifies up to 60 employees, which is consistent with the 2001 conditions of approval for the existing project, though no changes in the current number of employees (35) is anticipated by the applicant.

The existing 2,100 sq. ft. tasting room, located in an historic barn onsite, would no longer be used as a tasting room or for events once the new tasting room is constructed. Instead, the barn would be used as an entrance to one of the existing processing buildings and for storage.

Landscaping, including non-native and native species, would be utilized around the winery building and parking areas. Native grasses would be planted around the proposed wine tasting room building. A Valley Oak tree adjacent to the southeast corner of the tasting terrace would be preserved. The landscape design would preserve existing site features, topography, and large oak trees and landscaping has been selected to complement the existing surroundings. Additional olive trees are proposed along the new entrance drive as it would lead upslope to the tasting room. The parking area would be graded to match the existing terrain, and landscaping trees would be planted at the perimeter to minimize its visibility from neighboring properties.

Exterior lighting will be low mounted, downward casting and shielded to prevent glare. Light fixtures will not be located at the periphery of the property and would be designed to reduce potential for light spillage onto adjacent properties or into the night sky. Lighting will shut off automatically after closing and security lighting will be motion sensor activated.

Project construction would include both cut and fill, associated with the new tasting room, parking area and access driveway improvements, resulting in off-haul of approximately 8,00000 cubic yards of soil. This would result in off-haul of material using slightly fewer than 500 truck-trips; the soil would taken to a location to be determined. The site work would impact approximately four acres, which would include removal of 1.36 acres of existing vineyard.

The following table provides a comparison of existing and proposed uses, by area, of the project site:

<b>Area Type/Use</b>	<b>Existing Conditions</b>	<b>Project Proposal</b>
Vineyard	1,048,750 sf (24.08 ac)	989,718 sf (22.72 ac)
Winery production	145,941 sf (3.36 ac)	141,311 sf (3.25 ac)
Supporting areas	120,827 sf (2.77 ac)	167,719 sf (3.85 ac)
Vegetated Areas (non-Vineyard)	121,532 sf (2.79 ac)	138,520 sf (3.18 ac)
<b>TOTAL:</b>	33.0 acres	33.0 acres

*Utilities, Access and Parking*

Water is currently provided by an existing well, which would continue to serve the winery operations and supply the new tasting room. The increased water use anticipated as a result of this project is approximately 3.3 acre-feet per year. The Groundwater Availability Study prepared

by EBA Engineering determined that the well, with a production of 200 gallons per minute (gpm), would be sufficient to meet new facility demands.

Access to the site would continue to occur through the signalized intersection at Highway 12/Helmick Road, which includes a dedicated left-turn lane onto Highway 12 from Helmick Road. (Helmick Road becomes Warm Springs Road across Highway 12, to the south.) A private paved driveway leads into the winery from Helmick Road, while Kinnybrook Drive leads from Helmick Road upslope and behind the project site to the Kinnybrook Subdivision, which contains residences on large lots.

The application proposes 42 new vehicle parking spaces for the new tasting room, plus 5 bicycle parking spaces and 1 space for a bus. This is in addition to the 55 parking spaces existing on-site. The Event Parking Plan submitted with the traffic analysis (dated October 7, 2015; revised October 4, 2016) identifies a total of 183 spaces on-site that could be used during events (42 spaces by the new tasting room, plus an additional 141 existing paved and unpaved spaces located near the main parking lot and entry driveway shoulder). The Event Parking Plan is attached to the Initial Study.

#### *Uses and Events*

There are 35 full time employees currently, with ultimate plans for 60 full time employees under the most recent use permit, UP01-0135 (2001). Wine production, up to 500,000 cases per year, would remain unchanged. The existing 2,100 square foot tasting room is located in an historic barn that is attached to one of the main processing buildings. Once the tasting room has been relocated the barn will be used for storage and as an entrance to the existing winery processing building.

Grapes for the existing winery will continue to come from a combination of sources including: grapes grown on site, grapes from other Sonoma County vineyards owned by Pernod Ricard, and grapes sourced from Sonoma and other surrounding counties. Pernod Ricard owns approximately 211 acres of vineyard (planted) in Sonoma County, which represents approximately 960 tons of grapes or approximately 13 percent of the total production approved in the existing use permit. Thus, there will be no change in grape hauling from the present.

With the current proposal, Kenwood Vineyards requests approval of a total of 33 events per year, consisting of 22 specific marketing events and an additional 11 industry events. The applicant submitted that the winery has historically held up to 8 agricultural promotional events per year, with up to 50 guests attending events. However, it has requested approval for all 33 proposed events as if the winery use has never included events. The events will focus on promotion of the agricultural products grown and produced onsite. No weddings or rental of the facility for events are proposed. Food for events and visitors will either be prepared offsite by caterers or prepared on site in the existing kitchen (located in the administration building) and proposed kitchen to be located in the new tasting room building. Event functions would occur between the hours of 7 a.m. and 9:30 p.m. (with all staff leaving by 10:00 p.m.) The applicant proposes the use of amplified sound during events, though there will be no use of amplified outdoor sound during regular tasting room hours.

The following summary details the proposed events and anticipated attendees:

- Marketing/Promotional Events – 18 events per year, 150 attendees maximum with average of 50 guests, meals prepared on- or off-site. Proposed to be held between 10:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m.
- Promotional Events – 2 events per year, 500 attendees maximum (anticipated to be rotating throughout the event), proposed to be held between 11:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., meals prepared on- or off-site.
- Charitable Event – 2 events per year, 200 attendees maximum, proposed to be held between 4:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m., meals prepared on- or off-site.

- Industry Event – up to 8 events per year, 500 attendees maximum – anticipated to be rotating through the event (Savor Sonoma Valley, Heart of Sonoma Valley, etc.), with food prepared by local restaurants and chefs
- Wine Trade Open House – 2 events per year, 150 attendees maximum, to be held between 10:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m., and food prepared on- or off-site.
- Annual Grower's Breakfast – 1 event per year, 100 attendees maximum, meals prepared on site, proposed to be held between 7:00 a.m. and Noon.

Kenwood Vineyards proposes the following food service, focused on promotion of the agricultural products grown and produced onsite, as follows:

1. Samples or tastes of pre-prepared packaged food, such as crackers, nuts or other palate cleansers, featuring local foods and food products, offered in conjunction with wine tasting.
2. Prepared meals or appetizers featuring local foods and food products, offered in conjunction with agricultural promotional events (such as wine club parties and winemaker dinners) and with food and wine pairings.
3. Retail sales of pre-packaged food, not associated with the activities described in items 1 and 2 above, in conjunction with wine tasting.
4. Food and wine pairing, limited to the area identified as the VIP tasting room. Seating in the VIP tasting room is proposed to be limited to 20 seats serving up to 20 persons, 3 times per day. Food and wine pairings would be selected by the winery, with no menu options allowed. Such pairings would be limited to small appetizer-like portions, at specified times avoiding the lunch hour and not be open to drop-in guests.
5. Food for the events would be either prepared off-site and delivered to the winery, or prepared in the new tasting room kitchen.

## **SITE CHARACTERISTICS**

The approximately 33-acre project site (APN 051-160-033) extends upslope and north at approximately a five percent grade from its frontage along Highway 12, at the northwest intersection of Highway 12/Helmick Road. The applicant indicates that the project site has been in winery use since 1906, and acquired by Kenwood Winery in 1970. The project site is developed with production, bottling and storage buildings, tasting room, office building, driveway and parking areas, truck scale, pond, water storage tanks, well, wastewater disposal/leachfield system, related production equipment, and approximately 24 acres of planted vineyard. The site also includes a barn and former house (since converted to use as an administration building for winery operations) related to the original winery development, though these structures were found through an assessment by a historian as not having integrity of design, setting, materials, workmanship, and feeling to qualify as historically significant, and do not retain sufficient integrity to be eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources. There are no residential units on the project site. The site is not in a Land Conservation (Williamson) Act Contract.

## **SETTING**

Land use in the project vicinity is primarily vineyard development and rural residential uses. There are several wineries, vineyards, and tasting rooms within approximately one mile of the project site, including the Kunde Family Winery to the east and Chateau St. Jean Winery to the west along the north side of Highway 12, and several tasting rooms in and adjacent to the Kenwood town center on the south side of Highway 12. Lands to the north are in rural residential use. Access to the residences is provided via Kinnybrook Drive, which connects to Helmick Road north of Highway 12. Lands to the west and east are in agricultural use. An unnamed blue-line creek lies along the south edge of the project site. The closest off-site residence is approximately 444 feet northwest of the proposed tasting room parking lot and 594 feet from the proposed tasting room. Lands to the south, across Highway 12, are primarily in commercial and residential use by the Kenwood town center.

## RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES

The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) must approve a Construction General Permit before PRMD can issue a permit to construct the winery expansion improvements. The California Department of Transportation would be responsible for any work in the Highway 12 right-of-way, while the California Department of Fish and Wildlife would regulate any work within stream corridors.

## INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

This checklist 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.

Each question on the checklist was answered by evaluating the project as proposed, that is, without considering the effect of any added mitigation measures. 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 at the end of this report.

The applicant has agreed to accept all mitigation measures listed in this checklist as conditions of approval of the proposed project and to obtain all necessary permits.

## 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.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural & Forest Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils
<input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emission	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance		

### 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 Permit Sonoma.

- Project Application and Description
- Initial Data Sheet
- County Planning Department's Sources and Criteria Manual
- Sonoma County General Plan 2020 and associated EIR
- Specific or Area Plan:
- Sonoma County Zoning Ordinance
- Project Referrals from Responsible Agencies
- State and Local Environmental Quality Acts (CEQA)
- Correspondence received on project
- Other technical reports:
  1. Applicant's Preliminary Engineering and Planning Information packet, July 2014 and updated August 2017.
  2. Noise Analysis, Illingworth & Rodkin, May 2016, and update letter of August 11, 2017.
  3. Preliminary Geotechnical Report, Kenwood Vineyards Use Permit, Bauer Associates, August 25, 2015.
  4. Stormwater Control Plan, Kenwood Vineyards, Summit Engineering, August 2015.
  5. Traffic Analysis for Kenwood Vineyards Tasting Room Project, Transpedia Consulting Engineers, October 2016, and Final Addendum report dated July 17, 2017.
  6. Sonoma County Important Farmland Map 2014. California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.
  7. Assessor's Parcel Maps.
  8. BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines; Bay Area Air Quality Management District; April 1999; California Air Resources Board (CARB) <http://www.arb.ca.gov/>.
  9. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emission modeling, De Novo Consulting, October 2017.
  10. California Environmental Protection Agency - <http://www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/corteseList/default.htm>; California Regional Water Quality Control Board - <http://geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov/>; California Dept of Toxic Substances Control [http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/calsites/cortese\\_list.cfm](http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/calsites/cortese_list.cfm), and Integrated Waste Management Board - <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/SWIS/Search.asp>.
  11. Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones; State of California; 1983.
  12. Flood Insurance Rate Maps, Federal Emergency Management Agency.
  13. Special Report 120, California Division of Mines and Geology; 1980.
  14. Tree Protection and Replacement Ordinance (Ordinance No. 4014); Sonoma County.
  15. Heritage or Landmark Tree Ordinance (Ordinance No. 3651); Sonoma County.
  16. Sonoma County Aggregate Resources Management Plan and Program EIR, 1994.
  17. Sonoma County Bikeways Plan, Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department, August 24, 2010.
  18. North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast/water\\_issues/programs/non\\_chapter\\_15\\_permitting.shtml](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast/water_issues/programs/non_chapter_15_permitting.shtml).



**1. AESTHETICS – Would the project:**

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	

The frontage road to the project site, Highway 12, is designated as a Scenic Resource (Scenic Corridor) by the Sonoma County General Plan. The General Plan Objective OSRC-3.1, for scenic corridors reads "...roadways that cross highly scenic areas, provide visual links to major recreation areas, give access to historic areas, or serve as scenic entranceways to cities." Highway 12 is also a State Designated Scenic Highway through Kenwood and the Valley of the Moon. All new development is subject to Design Review to ensure that it is compatible with the scenic nature of the area and screened as much as possible from views from designated Scenic Corridors.

The site is also designated as a Scenic Landscape Unit and subject to Local Area Development Guidelines for the mountain regions.

The proposed tasting room building would be located on the eastern portion of the site atop an existing knoll. The new tasting room building would be 1-story, and 19-feet, 8-inches tall at its peak. The applicant indicated that the site and design were selected to take advantage of the views of the valley and to be unobtrusive to adjacent properties. The approach to the building steps down approximately eight feet below the parking area to an entry court. The building will have a partial green roof, which would help blend the building into the surrounding landscape. Building materials include concrete and weathering steel walls. The south side of the tasting room is proposed to be primarily glass while the opposite side is cut in to the hillside. The building is oriented towards the south. A continuous outdoor tasting terrace wraps the west, south and east perimeter of the building, occupying approximately 3,000 square feet. The parking area near the tasting room would be screened with trees and landscape plantings.

The proposed location of the new winery tasting building is over 1,000 feet from centerline of Highway 12 to the south, and approximately 500 feet from the closest neighboring offsite residence to the north. Additionally, the single-story design of the building will be in keeping with the agricultural theme of the existing structures on the property, and the building height, with a roof peak of 19-feet, 8-inches along with use of a green "living" roof, will also reduce its visibility from passersby on the Highway and from adjoining properties. Additionally, any exposed slopes would be graded to blend with the topography of the project site, and any disturbed areas will be required to be revegetated, pursuant to standard County conditions of project approval.

The application proposes 42 new parking spaces by the new tasting room, with overflow parking to be provided per an Event Parking Plan. The parking spaces by the new tasting room would be substantially screened from Highway 12 by both distance (approximately 1,000-foot separation), existing and proposed landscaping. Additional parking is provided at the Winery in existing lots southwest of the main winery buildings. The proposed relocation of the water tank and related shed would result in placement of these improvements closer to the rear property line (approximately 160 feet from the northern boundary). However, the tank would be located downslope, adjacent to and substantially behind the water tank and pump house built in the previous phase of winery construction. The new, relocated tank would be smaller than the adjoining, upslope tank, and substantially screened from upslope (offsite) views, while also being generally consistent in its design with the agricultural-based structures at the site.

Additional discussion of building design is provided in Section 1.c, below.

Based on building and project design, combined with separation from the Highway 12 corridor and the existing level of development in the adjoining Kenwood area, the project will not result in a significant impact to a scenic vista.

See 1.c for additional discussion of Scenic Resources.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	

Highway 12 is a State designated Scenic Highway through the Valley of the Moon. The proposed tasting room will be located so that trees, rock outcroppings, historic structures or other distinctive features will be damaged. The project has been designed and located to minimize its visibility from Highway 12, as discussed in Section 1.a, above, and to preserve trees and other vegetation.

A historic resources study prepared for the project site found that a barn and house (the latter was converted into an administration building for winery operations), built as part of the original winery operation, lacked integrity of design, setting, materials, workmanship, and feeling to qualify as historically significant, and, overall, buildings associated with the 1906 Pagani Brothers Winery do not retain sufficient integrity to be eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources. The proposed winery tasting room project would not involve or alter these structures.

The project would therefore have less than significant impacts upon scenic resources, historic buildings, and the Highway 12 corridor.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	

The applicant has designed the project consistent with provisions of the Local Area Development Guidelines for Taylor/Sonoma/Mayacamas Mountains) (LG/MTN). These provisions seek to minimize the visual impact of a project through use of appropriate design and construction materials, building siting, landscaping, and lighting.

The project was considered by the Design Review Committee (DRC) on April 12, 2016. At the time, the DRC evaluated the original plans for the proposed tasting room, which entailed a slightly larger building (5,200 sq. ft.). The DRC found the overall design, including use of exterior glass panels on the south elevation of the new tasting room, watershed block walls, vertical corten (finished steel) cladding and "living roof" generally compatible with the site and its surroundings. Additionally, the DRC provided input to the applicant, focused on:

- Design of the building to help with noise attenuation.
- Provision of exterior lighting details.
- Landscape plan details.

The applicant made subsequent modifications to the building design, and reduced the overall size of the building to 4,232 sq. ft.

The proposed tasting room building would be located on the eastern portion of the site atop an existing knoll. The new tasting room building would be 1-story at 19-feet, 8-inches tall. The applicant indicates that the site and design were selected to take advantage of the views of the valley and to be unobtrusive to adjacent properties. The approach to the building steps down approximately eight feet below the parking area to an entry court. The building will have a partial green roof, which would help blend the building into the surrounding landscape. Building materials include concrete and weathering steel walls. The south side of the tasting room is proposed to be primarily glass while the opposite side is cut in to the hillside. The building is oriented towards the south. A continuous outdoor tasting terrace wraps the south and east perimeter of the building. The parking area near the tasting room would be screened with trees and landscape plantings. Event parking would be located near the new tasting room, winery buildings and along the shoulder of interior driveway areas, and would not present a significant visual impact as seen from offsite locations.

Prior to submitting grading and building permits the project will be brought back to the Design Review Committee for final design review. After completion of the construction project, the site will be inspected by the Project Review planner to ensure that all colors and materials have been used correctly and that landscaping and lighting has been installed per the plans approved by the Design Review Committee.

The project, based on the above analysis, would have less than significant impacts upon the visual quality and character of the site and its surroundings.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime view in the area?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
		X		

The Project will add a new structure to the site and thus introduce new sources of light and glare. Some reflective glare could occur when sunlight is reflected off exterior glass used in the building. However, a six-foot eave overhang above the south-facing elevation where use of glass panels are proposed, building screen and distance to Highway 12 are mitigating design factors that would make this potential impact less than significant.

An impact would occur with vehicles leaving the site after events during evening hours, when headlights are on. However, this would be a short-duration impact and not expected to present a significant impact. The applicant indicates in the revised project plans that exterior lighting will be low mounted, downward casting and fully shielded to prevent glare. Light fixtures will not be located at the periphery of the property and will not spill over onto adjacent properties or into the night sky. Lighting will shut off automatically after closing and security lighting will be motion sensor activated. These provisions will be reviewed again at plan-check to ensure they are included in construction plans.

Lighting for appurtenant signs and structures and parking areas are regulated by the Zoning Code (26-82-030 (g) and (n)) and per the Local Development Guidelines for the mountain areas. Exterior lighting is required to be fully shielded, and directed downward to prevent "wash out" onto adjacent properties. Generally, fixtures should accept sodium vapor lamps and not be located at the periphery of the property. Flood lights are not allowed. Additionally, the following mitigation measure will be added to the project to ensure that lighting is controlled according to Permit Sonoma standards and that impacts will be less than significant:

**Mitigation Measure:**

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

**Mitigation Monitoring:** Permit Sonoma staff shall ensure that the measures are listed on all building plans, prior to issuance of grading or building permits.

**2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES – Would the project:**

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, Sonoma County utilizes information from the California Dept. of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

<p>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?</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>X</p>	
<p>The project site (area of proposed development) is located on lands designated as Farmland of Statewide Importance. However, the project proposal is for an accessory agricultural use related to processing grapes grown on site and in the area, involving construction of a new winery tasting room and parking lot. Only a small portion of the on-site vineyard (approximately 1.36 acres, or 5.6 percent of the vineyard area on the site) would be removed to facilitate placement of the new winery building, access driveway and parking areas. Additionally, the project proposes a visitor-serving use that promotes agricultural products that are grown, in part, on-site and in the local area, involving construction of a new wine tasting room, parking area and related improvements. This will not affect the viability of the existing vineyard operation and will not result in significant conversion of Farmlands of Statewide Importance.</p>				
<p>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or Williamson Act Contract?</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>X</p>
<p>The project is consistent with the DA (Diverse Agriculture) designation and the related agricultural policies of the General Plan. The zoning designation allows for wineries and tasting rooms as conditional uses (Zoning Ordinance Section 26-06-020). The scale and location of the proposed</p>				

winery expansion are consistent with applicable General Plan Agricultural Resource Element objectives and policies, including Objective AR-1.2: Permit marketing of products grown and/or processed in Sonoma County in all areas designated for agricultural use.				
The property is not in a Williamson Act Contract.				
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526) or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g)?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
				X
The project is not located in a zoning district which is intended for forest land protection or timberland production. The project would not cause the rezoning of this or any other property currently in forestland protection or timberland production zoning.				
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
				X
The project will not convert existing forestland to a non-forest use.				
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
				X
The project does not involve other changes in the environment that could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use.				

### 3. AIR QUALITY – Would the project

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.

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	
The project is within the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), which is currently designated as a nonattainment area for state and federal ozone standards, the state PM 10 standard, and the state and federal PM 2.5 standard. The District has adopted an				

Ozone Attainment Plan and a Clean Air Plan in compliance with Federal and State Clean Air Acts. These plans include measures to achieve compliance with both ozone standards. The plans deal primarily with emissions of ozone precursors (nitrogen oxides (NOx) and volatile organic compounds, also referred to as Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)).

Based on the results of air quality modeling, the project will not conflict with the District's air quality plans because the proposed use is well below the emission thresholds for ozone precursors or involve construction of transportation facilities that are not addressed in an adopted transportation plan (see discussion in 1 (b) below).

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	

State and Federal standards have been established for the "criteria pollutants": ozone, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide and particulates (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>). The pollutants NOx (nitrogen oxides) and reactive organic gases (ROG) form ozone in the atmosphere in the presence of sunlight. The principal source of ozone precursors is vehicle emissions, although stationary internal combustion engines are also considered a source.

To assess potential air quality impacts related to the project, air quality modeling was performed using the CalEEMod Version. The results of the analysis, summarized in the below tables, indicate the project would be well below BAAQMD thresholds for potentially significant impact in all measurement categories. The project therefore would not exceed the 1,100 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr GHG threshold of significance.

<b>Criteria Pollutant &amp; GHG Emissions - Construction Phase</b>				
<b>Pollutant</b>				
<b>ROG</b>	<b>NOx</b>	<b>PM<sub>10</sub> (Exhaust)</b>	<b>PM<sub>2.5</sub> (Exhaust)</b>	<b>CO<sub>2e</sub></b>
<b>CalEEMod Modelled Emissions (Average lbs/day)</b>				
0.68	3.64	0.23	0.21	N/A
<b>BAAQMD Thresholds (Average Daily)</b>				
54	54	82	54	N/A
<b>Emissions Exceed BAAQMD Threshold?</b>				
No	No	No	No	N/A
<b>Criteria Pollutant &amp; GHG Emissions - Operational Phase</b>				
<b>Pollutant</b>				
<b>ROG</b>	<b>NOx</b>	<b>PM<sub>10</sub></b>	<b>PM<sub>2.5</sub></b>	<b>CO<sub>2e</sub></b>
<b>Average Daily Emissions</b>				
<b>Unit</b>				
(lbs/day)	(lbs/day)	(lbs/day)	(lbs/day)	(metric tons/year)
<b>CalEEMod Modelled Emissions (Average Daily)</b>				
0.73	2.44	0.71	0.22	N/A
<b>BAAQMD Threshold (Average Daily)</b>				
54	54	82	54	N/A
<b>Emissions Exceed (Average Daily) BAAQMD Threshold?</b>				
No	No	No	No	N/A
<b>Maximum Annual Emissions</b>				
<b>Unit</b>				
(tons/year)	(tons/year)	(tons/year)	(tons/year)	(metric tons/year)
<b>CalEEMod Emissions (Maximum Annual)</b>				
0.13	0.45	0.13	0.04	258.28
<b>BAAQMD Threshold (Maximum Annual)</b>				
10	10	15	10	1,100
<b>Emissions Exceed (Maximum Annual) BAAQMD Threshold?</b>				
No	No	No	No	No

Additionally, emissions of construction-related dust would be less further reduced by including dust control measures as described in the following best management practices (BMPs) which will be applied to the project:

*“The Permit Holder shall be responsible for controlling dust and debris during all construction phases. The following measures shall be implemented by the permit holder on the project site during the construction period:*

- *Water all active construction areas at least twice daily.*
- *Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.*
- *Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.*
- *Sweep daily (preferably with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.*
- *Sweep streets daily (preferably with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.*
- *Hydro-seed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas.*
- *Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles of dirt, sand, etc.*
- *Limit traffic speeds on unpaved access roads to 15 mph.*
- *Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.*
- *Replant vegetation and ground cover in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.”*

**Mitigation Measure 3.b.:**

The Permit Holder shall be responsible for controlling dust and debris during all construction phases. The following measures shall be implemented by the permit holder on the project site during the construction period:

- *Water all active construction areas at least twice daily.*
- *Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.*
- *Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.*
- *Sweep daily (preferably with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.*
- *Sweep streets daily (preferably with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.*
- *Hydro-seed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas.*
- *Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles of dirt, sand, etc.*
- *Limit traffic speeds on unpaved access roads to 15 mph.*
- *Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.*
- *Replant vegetation and ground cover in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.”*

**Mitigation Monitoring:**

Dust control measures shall be included on all grading and construction plans. The Project Review Planner shall verify that these measures are included and the Building Inspector shall note these measures are implemented at the project site.

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)?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	



The project is within the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, which is currently designated as a nonattainment area for state and federal ozone standards

The project will not have a cumulative effect on ozone because it will not generate substantial traffic which would result in substantial emissions of ozone precursors (ROG and NO<sub>x</sub>). The project is expected to generate 239 net trips on a weekday, of which 58 trips (16 inbound and 42 outbound) would occur during a weekday P.M. peak hour; and 376 net trips on a weekend day, of which 81 trips (28 inbound and 53 outbound) would occur during weekend peak hour. The project will have no long-term effect on PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, because all new driveway and parking surfaces will be paved, landscaped or otherwise treated to stabilize bare soils, and dust generation will be insignificant. However, there could be a significant short-term emission of dust (which would include PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>) during construction. These emissions will be less than significant through application of mitigation identified in Section 3(b), above. The project therefore would not result in any cumulatively considerable air quality impact which might violate Federal or State ambient air quality standards.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
		X		

There are no sensitive receptors (including residences) in the immediate vicinity of the project site, and the project will not generate substantial long-term pollutant concentrations. Additionally, mitigation has been included above under Air Quality, item 3.b, to address any short-term potential impacts related to dust generation, ensuring limitation of dust-generating activities which may occur during project development.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	

Construction equipment may generate odors during project construction. The impact would be less than significant as it would be a short-term impact that ceases upon completion of the project. Additionally, the construction site is located approximately 380 feet from dwellings on the adjoining properties, further reducing potential impact from short-term odors. The proposed tasting room would not result in generation of objectionable odors. The proposed relocation of the pomace storage area would place the pomace in a more central location on the site, near existing leachfield areas, compared to its current location on the knoll in the area of the proposed tasting room and parking lot.

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

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies,	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

<p>or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p>			X	
<p>The project site contains a mix of vegetation types, including stands of valley oak trees, small areas of grasslands, and the planted vineyards. The majority of the site is developed with vineyards and related structures, roadways and parking areas. The area of the proposed winery expansion would occur on developed vineyards (to establish the proposed wine tasting building, parking area and access driveway). As a result of this action, approximately 1.36 acres of the existing vineyard area would be removed. There are no known special status species that would be impacted by the project. No such special status species occur on or immediately adjacent to the site, based on the California Natural Diversity Database and Sonoma County biological resource maps. Additionally, the project site has been previously disturbed with the planting of the vineyard and related site improvements, further reducing potential for presence of such species. No trees would be removed in the proposed tasting room or parking areas, and there would be no impact to any nesting birds in the immediate area. This impact would therefore be less than significant.</p>				
<p>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	
<p>The east portion of the project site adjoins a narrow drainage course, an unnamed creek tributary to Sonoma Creek. This drainage course contains some areas of vegetation cover, as well as unvegetated channel. The project property includes a Riparian Corridor 50/50 Combining District, calling for a streamside conservation area 50-feet from the top of the highest bank along with a 50-foot wide minimum setback for cultivation. The project development footprint, including grading, would be at least 150 feet from the edge of the riparian corridor, and no impacts would occur involving grading or development within the required 50-foot setback area. The project is therefore not expected to result in impacts to the creek corridor, wetlands or related riparian habitat, or conflict with any applicable plans, policies or regulations by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</p>				
<p>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?</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	
<p>The project development footprint would be located approximately 150 feet west of the unnamed creek course, and is situated atop a knoll, removed from any water features. The project therefore would not directly or indirectly impact Waters of the U.S.</p>				

<p>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?</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>X</p>	
<p>The proposed project will not interfere 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 as the project development area will not be located in the riparian area of the adjoining unnamed creek, and as any wildlife movement though the vineyard area would continue to be able to occur.</p>				
<p>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance?</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>X</p>
<p>No trees will be removed with the construction of the new winery tasting room or parking/driveway areas.</p>				
<p>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?</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>X</p>
<p>There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans applicable to the project site.</p>				

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

<p>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</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>X</p>	
<p>The project site includes an HD (Historic District) Combining designation. The HD designation is intended to apply to an individual structure or an integrated group of structures on a single lot or lots having a special historical, architectural or aesthetic interest or value as a historic structure may be designated, and an area having special historical, architectural or aesthetic interest or value as a historic district may be designated. This issue therefore is considered for the purposes of historic resource evaluation under CEQA. A house and barn on the site, located near the center of the winery complex, were considered as potentially significant historic structures by the</p>				

County in applying the HD designation.

Tom Origer and Associates previously prepared an evaluation of the barn and house. These buildings were evaluated for inclusion on the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register). Briefly, a resource eligible for the California Register is one that meets one of the following criteria:

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.
2. Is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history.
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.
4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation.

In addition to meeting one or more of the above criteria, eligibility to the California Register requires that a resource retain sufficient integrity to convey a sense of its significance or importance.

The study found that the barn and house lack integrity of design, setting, materials, workmanship, and feeling to qualify as historically significant, and, overall, buildings associated with the 1906 Pagani Brothers Winery do not retain sufficient integrity to be eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources.

Additionally, the HD zoning aspect of the site was previously addressed by Landmarks Commission review and in the applicant's historical technical evaluation of the site. The Landmarks Commission reviewed this project on June 7, 2016, and had the following recommendations for the Board of Zoning Adjustments on this Use Permit/Design Review application for a new tasting room on a site with historic resources (HD zoning and Landmark #78, Kenwood Winery):

*“Supported design concept as proposed, noting that the new development area would have no impact on the historic resources onsite and that the modern design blended well into the site.”*

The project would not demolish, destruct, relocate or alter the house or the barn, and therefore would not be expected to result in any significant impacts to the historical setting or structures on the property.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
		X		

Tom Origer & Associates (February 2016) evaluated the property for potential presence of archaeological resources. This study included archival research at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University (NWIC File No. 15-1035), examination of the library and files of Tom Origer & Associates, field inspection of the project location, and contact with the Native American community. No archaeological sites were discovered within the study area, although one obsidian biface fragment and one obsidian flake were found within the study area. These archaeological materials are considered to be background materials to a previously studied site

which is outside the study area, and do not constitute a site themselves. There was no evidence of the archaeological site extending into the study area.

PRMD referred the project to those Native American tribes who requested such notices pursuant to Assembly Bill 52. The Lytton Rancheria recommended the following, which is incorporated as a mitigation measure for the project:

- 1. A qualified archaeological monitor and/or tribal monitor will be present and monitor all earth-disturbing activities within native soils, and will have the authority to stop and redirect grading activities, to evaluate any tribal cultural resources discovered on the property. Such evaluation will be done in consultation with the appropriate tribe.*
- 2. The appropriate tribe shall make recommendations as to appropriate treatment of such resources and the applicant, tribe and County may meet to discuss further mitigation if necessary.*

As the area of development (new driveways, parking areas and winery building, along with relocated water tanks) will occur in areas previously disturbed with winery and vineyard operations, there are no anticipated impacts to archaeological resources. However, the project could uncover such materials during construction. The following measure will reduce the impacts to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure 5.b.1:**

- A qualified archaeological monitor and/or tribal monitor will be present and monitor all earth-disturbing activities within native soils, and will have the authority to stop and redirect grading activities, to evaluate any tribal cultural resources discovered on the property. Such evaluation will be done in consultation with the appropriate tribe.
- The appropriate tribe shall make recommendations as to appropriate treatment of such resources and the applicant, tribe and County may meet to discuss further mitigation if necessary.

**Mitigation Monitoring:**

The applicant shall utilize a qualified archaeological and/or tribal monitor to monitor earth moving activities, and make appropriate recommendations to Permit Sonoma if any Tribal Cultural Resources are encountered.

**Mitigation Measure 5.b.2:**

All building and/or grading permits shall have the following note printed on plan sheets:

*"In the event that archaeological resources 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 Permit Sonoma Project Review staff shall be notified and a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted immediately to make an evaluation of the find and report to Permit Sonoma. Permit Sonoma staff may consult and/or notify the appropriate tribal representative from tribes known to Permit Sonoma 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 resources include hearths, firepits, or house floor depressions whereas typical mortuary resources 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 Permit Sonoma 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. Permit Sonoma 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 Permit Sonoma Project Review staff. Mitigations may include avoidance, removal, preservation and/or recordation 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 Permit Sonoma 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:** 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?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
		X		

The proposed project will not destroy unique geologic features. However, the project could uncover previously undiscovered paleontological resources during project construction. The following mitigation measure will reduce the impact to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure 5.c:**

All building and/or grading permits shall have the following note printed on plan sheets:

If paleontological resources 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 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 further excavations 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."

**Mitigation Monitoring:** 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?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	

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). See also mitigation measure 5.b.2. above.

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

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X	
The project site is not mapped by the California Geological Survey (CGS) to be underlain by a "Holocene-active" earthquake fault capable of resulting in surface fault rupture.				
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
		X		
<p>All of Sonoma County is subject to seismic shaking that would result from earthquakes along the San Andreas, Healdsburg-Rodgers Creek, and other area faults. Predicting seismic events is not possible, nor is providing mitigation that can entirely reduce the potential for injury and damage that can occur during a seismic event. However, using accepted geotechnical evaluation techniques and appropriate engineering practices, potential injury and damage can be diminished, thereby exposing fewer people and less property to the effects of a major damaging earthquake. The applicant prepared a preliminary geotechnical investigation of the site, which found potential for weak surface soils, and identified that use of a Site Classification "B" would be appropriate for design related to foundations and site preparation. The design and construction of the tasting room and winery structures are subject to load and strength standards of the California Building Code (CBC), which take seismic shaking into account. Appropriate seismic design criteria for the site based on the CBC guidelines will be required. Project conditions of approval require that building permits be obtained for all construction and that the project meet all standard seismic and soil test/compaction requirements. Additionally, the following mitigation measures will ensure the project would not expose people to substantial risk of injury from seismic shaking.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 6.a.ii.1.:</b>  All earthwork, grading, trenching, backfilling and compaction operations shall be conducted in accordance with the County Subdivision Ordinance (Chapter 25, Sonoma County Code) and erosion control provisions of the Drainage and Storm Water Management Ordinance (Chapter 11, Sonoma County Code and Building Ordinance (Chapter 7, Sonoma County Code).</p> <p>All construction activities shall meet the California Building Code regulations for seismic safety (i.e., reinforcing perimeter and/or load bearing walls, bracing parapets, etc.). Construction plans shall be subject to review and approval of PRMD prior to the issuance of a building permit. All work shall be subject to inspection by PRMD and must conform to all applicable code requirements and approved improvement plans prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy.</p>				

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

**Mitigation Measure 6.a.ii.2:**

The design of all earthwork, cuts and fills, drainage, pavements, utilities, foundations, and structural components shall conform with the specifications and criteria contained in the project geotechnical report prepared by Bauer Associates, Inc. (August 25, 2015). The geotechnical engineer shall submit an approval letter for the engineered grading plans prior to issuance of the grading permit. Prior to final of the grading permit the geotechnical engineer shall also inspect the construction work and shall certify to PRMD, prior to the acceptance of the improvements or issuance of a certificate of occupancy that the improvements have been constructed in accordance with the geotechnical specifications.

**Mitigation Monitoring:** PRMD Plan Check staff will ensure plans are in compliance with geotechnical requirements. PRMD inspectors will ensure construction is in compliance with geotechnical requirements.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	

The project site is located within an area subject to limited liquefaction hazards as shown on the Sonoma County Relative Hazard from Seismic Shaking map. Strong ground shaking during an earthquake can result in ground failure and/or settlement such as that associated with soil liquefaction, and can also cause deformation of slopes, particularly fill slopes. Therefore, the property has the potential to experience liquefaction and settlement during a seismic event. All structures will be required to meet building permit requirements, including seismic safety standards and soil test/compaction requirements. Based on standard permitting requirements, the project will have no significant risk of loss, injury or death from seismic ground failure or liquefaction. Also see mitigation measures included in 6.a.ii above.

iv. Landslides?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	

The project site is not located in a landslide prone area as shown on Geology for Planning in Sonoma County Special Report 120 Slope Stability, nor based on site observations.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
		X		



<p>The project includes grading, cuts and fills (with a collective off-haul of 8,0000 cubic yards of earth) which require the issuance of a grading permit. Unregulated grading during construction has the potential to increase soil erosion from the site which could have adverse downstream flooding impacts and further erosion impacts, and which could adversely impact downstream water quality. See discussion and mitigation measures under Hydrology and Water Quality, Questions 9.c. of this checklist.</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?</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
		X		
<p>The risk of impact to the project from the effects of lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse is considered to be less than significant with application of the Mitigation Measures established above in 6.a.ii.</p>				
<p>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?</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	
<p>Highly expansive surface soils, if encountered during construction, will be excavated and replaced with 'select fill', addressed as a condition of approval for the project. The extent of excavation and replacement will be determined in the field on a case-by-case basis.</p>				
<p>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?</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	
<p>The project site is not in an area served by public sewer. The project proposes a new sanitary system leachfield to the south of the main winery buildings, near the location of the existing leachfield system. Preliminary documentation provided by the applicant and reviewed by the PRMD Project Review Health Specialist indicates that the soils on site would support a septic system and the required leachfield area. Conditions of project approval require final permitting for the system, meeting County health standards.</p>				

**7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS - Would the project:**

<p>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	

The project is within the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), and thresholds for air quality and greenhouse gas emission evaluations are based on BAAQMD standards. The County concurs with and utilizes as County thresholds the thresholds that BAAQMD staff have recommended as greenhouse gas significance thresholds. The County concurs that these thresholds are supported by substantial evidence for the reasons stated by BAAQMD staff. For projects other than stationary sources the greenhouse gas significance threshold is 1,100 metric tons per year of CO<sub>2</sub>e or 4.6 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per service population (residents and employees) per year. BAAQMD's staff's analysis is found in the document titled "Revised Draft Options and Justification Report, October, 2009, which are publicly available documents that can be obtained from the BAAQMD website or from the County. Emissions are caused by natural gas

<b>Criteria Pollutant &amp; GHG Emissions - Construction Phase</b>				
<b>Pollutant</b>				
<b>ROG</b>	<b>NOx</b>	<b>PM<sub>10</sub> (Exhaust)</b>	<b>PM<sub>2.5</sub> (Exhaust)</b>	<b>CO<sub>2</sub>e</b>
<b>CalEEMod Modelled Emissions (Average lbs/day)</b>				
0.68	3.64	0.23	0.21	N/A
<b>BAAQMD Thresholds (Average Daily)</b>				
54	54	82	54	N/A
<b>Emissions Exceed BAAQMD Threshold?</b>				
No	No	No	No	N/A
<b>Criteria Pollutant &amp; GHG Emissions - Operational Phase</b>				
<b>Pollutant</b>				
<b>ROG</b>	<b>NOx</b>	<b>PM<sub>10</sub></b>	<b>PM<sub>2.5</sub></b>	<b>CO<sub>2</sub>e</b>
<b>Average Daily Emissions</b>				
<b>Unit</b>				
(lbs/day)	(lbs/day)	(lbs/day)	(lbs/day)	(metric tons/year)
<b>CalEEMod Modelled Emissions (Average Daily)</b>				
0.73	2.44	0.71	0.22	N/A
<b>BAAQMD Threshold (Average Daily)</b>				
54	54	82	54	N/A
<b>Emissions Exceed (Average Daily) BAAQMD Threshold?</b>				
No	No	No	No	N/A
<b>Maximum Annual Emissions</b>				
<b>Unit</b>				
(tons/year)	(tons/year)	(tons/year)	(tons/year)	(metric tons/year)
<b>CalEEMod Emissions (Maximum Annual)</b>				
0.13	0.45	0.13	0.04	258.28
<b>BAAQMD Threshold (Maximum Annual)</b>				
10	10	15	10	1,100
<b>Emissions Exceed (Maximum Annual) BAAQMD Threshold?</b>				
No	No	No	No	No

combustion, electricity use, vehicles, water use, carbon sequestration, and existing emissions.

GHG emissions would be emitted directly and indirectly by the project. Sources of these emissions would include traffic and indirect emissions from electricity usage. Included in the indirect emissions are those associated with the conveyance of water and wastewater, and handling and storage of solid waste. The majority of emissions for the project are expected to come from traffic and energy usage.

To assess potential air quality impacts related to the project, air quality and GHG modeling was performed using the CalEEMod Version. The results of the analysis, summarized in the below tables, indicate the project would be well below BAAQMD thresholds for potentially significant impact in all measurement categories.

The project would have a less than significant impact on GHG emissions because the project would generate an insignificant amount of GHG emissions, and be below the GHG operational threshold of 1,100 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year as recommended by BAAQMD for new projects. The application of CalGreen building and energy efficiency requirements at the time the project is constructed will help to ensure the project's GHG emissions are less than significant.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	

On September 27, 2005, the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors established a county-wide greenhouse gas reduction target. The target is to reduce emissions 25 percent below 1990 levels by 2015, which exceeds the State target under AB 32. Accordingly, General Plan Resource Conservation Element OSRC-14.4 is to "reduce GHG emissions by 25 percent below 1990 levels by 2015." Toward this objective, the County established policies that govern its review of the greenhouse gas emissions of discretionary projects, including the following, as applicable to this project:

- Policy OSRC-14d: Support project applicants in incorporating cost effective energy efficiency that may exceed State standards.
- Policy OSRC-14e: Develop energy conservation and efficiency design standards for new development.
- Policy OSRC-14f: Use the latest green building certification standards, such as the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standards, for new development.

The proposed wine tasting building will be built in compliance with the California Green Building (CALGreen) Standards Code, as adopted by the County, in furtherance of the General Plan policies above.

**8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:**

<p>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No impact</p>
			X	
<p>The project consists of expansion of a winery tasting room. The existing vineyard operation is not part of this review, but requires the use and storage of pesticides and herbicides on the project site. The Sonoma County Agricultural Commissioner's Office regulates the storage and use of herbicides and pesticides by requiring the annual issuance of a Pesticide I.D. and classes be taken by persons applying such hazardous materials for agricultural uses such as vineyard operations.</p> <p>The project is not anticipated to produce or generate hazardous materials. A referral describing the project was sent to the PRMD Project Review Environmental Health Specialist who requires compliance with hazardous waste generator laws and copies of appropriate permit approval. Prior to initiation of the use permit, the winery facility expansion must comply with Code requirements already in place that will ensure the storage and use of any hazardous materials associated with the winery would not create a hazard to the public or the environment. Further, the County Fire Department, as standard practice for vineyard operations, requires the establishment of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan that specifies the use of, storage, quantities, transportation, disposal, and upset conditions for hazardous materials in accordance with County and state regulations. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact.</p>				
<p>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?</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No impact</p>
			X	
<p>The project would not generate or produce hazardous materials. Hazardous materials (diesel fuels, solvents, oils, etc.) are contained in products used on site for use and maintenance of equipment and machinery. The use, storage, and transport of such products are controlled by the local Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA). While the vineyard operation is not part of this review, use of pesticides and herbicides are regulated by the Sonoma County Agricultural Commissioner's Office. Appropriate permit approval must be submitted to the PRMD Project Review Environmental Health Specialist prior to initiation of the use. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact.</p>				
<p>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No impact</p>
			X	

The closest school to the project site is Kenwood Elementary School, located in the Kenwood town center to the southwest, over one-quarter mile from the project site. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact.				
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?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
				X
The project site was not identified on, or in the vicinity of, any parcels on lists compiled by the California Environmental Protection Agency, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Toxic Substances Control, and the California Integrated Waste Management Board.				
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?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
				X
The site is not within an airport land use plan as designated by Sonoma County.				
f) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
				X
The nearest known private airstrip is over 1 ½ miles to the west of the proposed project.				
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
				X
The project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with the County's adopted emergency operations plan. There is no separate emergency evacuation plan for the County. In any case, the project would not change existing circulation patterns significantly, and would have no effect outside the area.				
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact

areas, or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?		Incorporation		
			X	

The project site is located in an area classified as having moderate to high wildland fire hazard based on the County's Wildland Fire Hazard Map. The project proposal statement includes water storage on-site as part of a project fire protection system. Additionally, the County Fire Marshal's Fire Safe Standards require that new structures be installed with fire sprinklers with the intent to contain or prevent fires from spreading from structures to wildlands fires. Fire service features for buildings, structures and premises are required to comply with the Sonoma County Fire Safe Standards and the California Fire Code as adopted and amended by Sonoma County Code; including but not limited to: emergency access; road naming and address numbers; emergency water supply; and defensible space. Compliance with these Fire Safe Standards will ensure that the exposure of people and property to fire hazards would be reduced to a degree that the risk of injury or damage is less than significant.

**9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:**

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	

The project is subject to compliance with water quality discharge requirements of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. Accordingly, following project approval and at the time of proposed construction, the project applicant will be required, as a condition of approval, to prepare a grading and drainage plan in conformance with Chapter 11 Grading and Drainage Ordinance) and Chapter 11a (Storm Water Quality Ordinance) of the Sonoma County Code and the Sonoma County Storm Water Low Impact Development Guide, all of which include performance standards, low impact development (LID) and Best Management Practices (BMPs) for pre-construction, construction, and post-construction to prevent and/or minimize the discharge of pollutants, including sediment, from the project site.

Drainage improvements to the site as well as erosion/sediment control measures will be required during construction to handle any increases in storm runoff. Examples of BMPs that are included in the project grading and design plans include: use of a "living roof" on the new tasting room structure that would filter and collect rain water, use of level spreaders at storm drain outfalls, vegetated drainage swales, and a biofiltration (LID) facility alongside access driveway. Additionally, standard BMPs imposed by the County as part of conditions of approval include the following:

- a. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily.
- b. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
- c. Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.
- d. Sweep daily (preferably with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.
- e. Sweep streets daily (preferably with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.
- f. Hydro-seed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas.
- g. Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed

- stockpiles dirt, sand, etc.
- h. Limit traffic speeds on unpaved access roads to 15 mph.
- i. Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.
- j. Replant vegetation and ground cover in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.

Final drainage improvements will be designed so that the post-development flows do not exceed the pre-development flows. Therefore, with the application of the Low Impact Development (LID) and other BMPs to the project, no significant soil erosion or related soil erosion water quality impacts are expected.

Additionally, the County's grading ordinance and adopted best management practices require that storm water facilities be engineered to treat storm events and associated runoff to the 85 percentile storm event. Adopted flow control best management practices must be designed to treat storm events and associated runoff to the channel forming discharge storm event, which is commonly referred to as the two-year storm event. Required County inspection ensures that all work is constructed according to the approved plans. These ordinance requirements and adopted best management practices are specifically designed to ensure that any potential project water quantity impacts remain less than significant during and post construction.

With respect to waste discharge, the project would utilize an on-site septic system to support the new tasting room development. Application for wastewater discharge requirements will be required to be filed by the applicant with the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, with a copy of the Waste Discharge Permit, when issued, submitted to the Project Review Health Specialist.

<p>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)?</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>X</p>	

Water is provided by an existing well, which will continue to serve the buildings and vineyard operations including the new tasting room building. The applicant prepared a groundwater availability study (EBA Engineering, May 2016), which includes a Groundwater Use Estimate prepared by Summit Engineering, to assess potential impacts to local groundwater supplies. The study considered both the existing and projected groundwater uses associated with the proposed development, as well as estimates of the off-site groundwater use on adjoining and nearby properties located within the cumulative impact area. The scope of the research was developed to comply with General Plan Water Resources Policy WR-2e guidelines:

*Policy WR-2e: Require proof of groundwater with a sufficient yield and quality to support proposed uses in Class 3 and 4 water areas. Require test wells or the establishment of community water systems in Class 4 water areas. Test wells may be required in Class 3 areas. Deny discretionary applications in Class 3 and 4 areas unless a hydrogeologic report establishes that groundwater quality and quantity are adequate and will not be adversely impacted by the cumulative amount of development and uses allowed in the area, so that the proposed use will not cause or exacerbate an overdraft condition in a groundwater basin or subbasin. Procedures for proving adequate groundwater should consider groundwater overdraft, land subsidence, saltwater intrusion, and the expense of*

*such study in relation to the water needs of the project.*

The project site is located within a Zone 3 groundwater availability area as designated in the SCGP Water Resources Element, indicating potential limitations in groundwater availability. The project site is served by an existing 8-inch diameter well, installed in 1993 and drilled to a depth of 400 feet below ground. The well provides domestic water for the winery and for vineyard and landscape irrigation.

The increased water use anticipated as a result of this project is approximately 3.3 acre feet per year. This includes approximately 1.65 acre feet of water for new domestic use (new tasting room visitors, employees and events) and 1.65 acre feet for landscaping purposes. A total of 1.36 acres of vineyards will be removed as part of the tasting room project and its related site improvements, which have historically used approximately 0.5 acre feet of water per year. Therefore, the net increase in water use is anticipated to be 2.8 acre feet per year.

The existing well was found to have been satisfactory for historical demand and the groundwater study concluded it is anticipated to be adequate for the potential increases in water demand as a result of the proposed tasting room. The well has a yield of 200 gpm. The study concluded that, "it does not appear that the proposed project will have a significant impact on current and future groundwater availability at the project site, nor within the cumulative impact area under existing or foreseeable future use conditions." Additionally, the study found the projected estimated annual water supply requirement for the proposed project and existing uses (14.80 AF/yr) equates to less than 0.1 percent of the groundwater in storage within the cumulative impact area and is significantly less than the amount of potential annual groundwater recharge (736 AF/yr). The groundwater study was reviewed and accepted by PRMD – Health.

To ensure that the water use for the project does not exceed what has been projected and analyzed, several standard PRMD conditions of approval would be applied addressing water supply, including monitoring of groundwater levels, water testing and well construction consistent with County PRMD – Health standards.

The project would therefore have a less than significant impact on groundwater supplies in the project area.

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?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	

Storm water runoff generated by the proposed project are proposed to be mitigated with the installation of several bio-retention low impact development (LID) facilities. The LID facilities will infiltrate any additional storm water runoff generated by the project for the design storms specified in the county's LID requirements. The LID facilities are to be located a minimum of 180 ft away from the unnamed creek to the south of the property and overflows from the LID facilities will travel through vegetated vineyards buffers prior to reaching the creek.

The project includes grading, cuts and fills which will require the issuance of a grading permit. Unregulated grading during construction has the potential to increase soil erosion from the site which could have adverse downstream flooding and further erosional impacts, and which could adversely impact downstream water quality.

County grading ordinance and adopted best management practices require grading applications and issued permits to depict and install adequate erosion prevention and sediment control best management practices. Required inspection by County inspectors insures that all work is



constructed according to the approved plans. These ordinance requirements and adopted best management practices are specifically designed to maintain potential project water quantity impacts at a less than significant level during and post construction. These provisions are identified as mitigation measures, below.

The proposed project has been designed and/or conditioned to prevent and/or minimize the discharge of pollutants or waste from the project site during construction. The applicant will use gravel basins for subsurface drainage. Storm water best management practices also include primary and secondary containment for petroleum products, paints, lime and other materials of concern.

The project will not alter the course of a stream or river.

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?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	

With the incorporation of best management practices (BMP's) into the overall project's design and grading plan, the project will not significantly alter drainage patterns on-site or in the general area, nor will it result in on- or off-site flooding. These will include standard BMPs imposed by the County as part of conditions of approval, and include the following:

- a. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily.
- b. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
- c. Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.
- d. Sweep daily (preferably with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.
- e. Sweep streets daily (preferably with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.
- f. Hydro-seed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas.
- g. Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles dirt, sand, etc.
- h. Limit traffic speeds on unpaved access roads to 15 mph.
- i. Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.
- j. Replant vegetation and ground cover in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.

The project does not include any work or alteration of a course of a stream or river.

Project development will require a grading permit, as well as the appropriate building and septic permits. The applicant is required to provide an erosion prevention/sediment control plan which clearly shows best management practices to be implemented, limits of disturbed areas, vegetated areas to be preserved, pertinent details, notes, and specifications to prevent damage and minimize adverse impacts to the environment in the grading and improvement plans. Tracking of soil or construction debris into the public right-of-way, including Highway 12, shall be prohibited. Runoff containing concrete waste or by-products shall not be allowed to drain to the storm drain system, waterways, or adjacent lands. The erosion prevention/sediment control plan shall abide by and contain all applicable items in the Grading Permit.

<p>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No impact</p>
			X	
<p>The area proposed for development would not create a substantial source of polluted run-off. With the incorporation of BMP's into the overall project's design and conditions of approval (see list provided above in section 9.d, the project will not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the storm water drainage system's capacity. The project would not substantially alter drainage patterns or capacities of the project site, or result in substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.</p>				
<p>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No impact</p>
			X	
<p>The project is subject to the County grading ordinance. As part of the required grading plans, the applicant shall include an erosion prevention/sediment control plan which clearly shows best management practices to be implemented, limits of disturbed areas, vegetated areas to be preserved, pertinent details, notes, and specifications to prevent damage and minimize adverse impacts to the environment. Tracking of soil or construction debris into the public right-of-way will be prohibited. Runoff containing concrete waste or by-products will not be allowed to drain to the storm drain system, waterways, or adjacent lands.</p>				
<p>g) Place housing within a 100-year hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood hazard Boundary of Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No impact</p>
			X	
<p>The project property is not located within Flood Zone A as shown on FEMA flood maps and does not include construction of any housing.</p>				
<p>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No impact</p>
			X	
<p>The proposed wine tasting room development area is not located in a 100-year flood hazard area.</p>				
<p>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>Less than Significant with</p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No impact</p>

a result of the failure of a levee or dam?		Mitigation Incorporation		
			X	
The project winery area is not located in an area subject to flooding or inundation as a result of dam failure. There is a man-made pond on the lower portion of the project site, which would not impact the proposed development area, and the proposed development is not expected to expose people or structures to significant flood hazard.				
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
				X
The project site is not subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.				

**10. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:**

a) Physically divide an established community?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
				X
The project site is within an unincorporated area in the eastern portion of Sonoma County, by Kenwood. The project site is located across Highway 12 from Kenwood, and 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?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
				X
<p>The General Plan land use designation for the site is Diverse Agriculture, 20-acre minimum density and the Zoning designation of the property is DA (Diverse Agriculture) 20 acres per dwelling unit density with the HD (Historic Designation), LG/MTN (Local Guidelines / Taylor/Sonoma/Mayacama Mountain Design Guidelines) RC (Riparian Corridor) 50/50 (50 foot building setback/50 foot agricultural setback), and the SR (Scenic Resources) Combining Districts.</p> <p>HD - T</p>				

LG/MTN and SR – The LG/MTN and SR designations are applied to the property to ensure that the scenic values of the Kenwood area and Valley of the Moon are preserved. See Section 1 - Aesthetic Resources (above) for information on compliance with Local Guidelines and Scenic Resources designations.

RC - The RC combining zone is established to protect biotic resource communities, including critical habitat areas within and along riparian corridors, for their habitat and environmental value, and to implement the provisions of the General Plan Open Space and Resource Conservation and Water Resources Elements. The “50/50” under the RC designation references a 50-foot minimum streamside conservation area shown in the zoning database, and a 50-foot minimum setback for agricultural cultivation. See Section 4 – Biological Resources (above) for information on compliance with the Riparian Corridor designation.

This General Plan land use designation and zoning allows agricultural product processing, wineries, tasting rooms, and special events as conditional uses. The existing winery was established over 100 years ago, with incremental improvements and construction of winery buildings since that time.

The proposed winery use expansion is consistent with the DA requirements. It will continue with processing and production of grapes which are grown on site and in the general region, while introducing a new 4,232 sq. ft. tasting room. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan’s Agricultural Element Goals, Objectives and Policies, which include the following:

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

Comment: The project site is within the DA General Plan land use category, and the primary proposed use would remain vineyards with an agricultural processing facility. The potential impacts related to noise, traffic, odor and light have been addressed in specific sections of this Initial Study, and, where appropriate, mitigation measures established to reduce impacts to levels of insignificance. Additionally, project conditions of approval would further regulate the proposed use.

*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.*

Comment: There are multiples wineries, vineyards and tasting rooms within approximately one mile of the project site, including the Kunde Family Winery to the east and Chateau St. Jean Winery to the west along the north side of Highway 12, and several tasting rooms in and adjacent to the Kenwood town center on the south side of Highway 12. The proposed project is not expected to significantly contribute to roadway conflicts or result in traffic levels of service beyond County standards. (See Transportation section, below, for further discussion.)

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

Comment: The applicant's engineer provided information on water usage demand for the proposed project, finding that the project would have adequate water supplies and would not be expected to adversely impact area wells. See additional discussion in Hydrology, above, and Utilities, below.

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

Comment: The area of the proposed wine tasting room is centrally located on a large, existing winery operation. As discussed under the Aesthetics section of this Initial Study, the design impacts from the project are expected to be less than significant, with the inclusion of mitigation for creation of a new source of light. The location and scale of the proposed wine tasting room use is subordinate in size relative to the existing vineyard and winery operation and the property on which it is located. Due to the small scale of the project, there are no significant traffic impacts. Based on the above information the proposed project will not be detrimental to the community character.

*"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.*

Comment: The winery will continue to promote agricultural products grown on the site and in the local area.

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

Comment: The primary agricultural production activity in the project area is wine grape vineyards. Because the proposed wine tasting room would support continued facilitation of the processing of grapes into wine, it is considered incidental and secondary to agricultural activities on site and in the area.

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

Comment: The use will be served by on-site septic system (new leach field system is proposed near the location of the existing system) and existing well.

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

Comment: The tasting room will operate only during normal business hours. Events are proposed at various times during the day and into evening hours. As discussed in this Initial Study, noise, traffic and other land use considerations are addressed and regulated through project design, application of mitigation measures (where appropriate) and conditions of project approval. The wine tasting room therefore is not expected to result in a significant impact or disturbance to residential neighbors to the north and northwest.

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

Comment: The proposed project does not include any overnight marketing accommodations.

6. *Activities that promote and market agricultural products 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 are allowed.*

Comment: The project includes a tasting room proposed for sales and both marketing and agricultural events that promote local wine.

The Project will add a new structure to the site and thus introduce new sources of light and glare. The Sonoma County General Plan Open Space and Resource Conservation Element contains goals and policies to preserve and maintain views of the night time skies and visual character of urban, rural and natural areas, while allowing for nighttime lighting levels appropriate to the use and location. Policies include:

*Policy OSRC-4a: Require that all new development projects, County projects, and signage utilize light fixtures that shield the light source so that light is cast downward and that are no more than the minimum height and power necessary to adequately light the proposed use.*

*Policy OSRC-4b: Prohibit continuous all night exterior lighting in rural areas, unless it is demonstrated to the decision making body that such lighting is necessary for security or operational purposes or that it is necessary for agricultural production or processing on a seasonal basis. Where lighting is necessary for the above purposes, minimize glare onto adjacent properties and into the night sky.*

Mitigation is proposed (see Aesthetics section of this Initial Study) to regulate creation of new sources of light. Design of the building is also addressed in the Aesthetics section, and has been modified by the applicant in response to preliminary Design Review Committee comments to ensure no significant design impacts are created.

With respect to General Plan's Water Resources Element, protection of local groundwater supplies are addressed through the following:

*Objective WR-2.3: Encourage new groundwater recharge opportunities and protect existing groundwater recharge areas.*

Comment: The applicant's project plans include use of LID measures to help ensure on-site capture and infiltration of runoff to storm-drain improvements and channels.

*Policy WR-2e: Require proof of groundwater with a sufficient yield and quality to support proposed uses in Class 3 and 4 water areas. Require test wells or the establishment of community water systems in Class 4 water areas. Test wells may be required in Class 3 areas. Deny discretionary applications in Class 3 and 4 areas unless a hydrogeologic report establishes that groundwater quality and quantity are adequate and will not be adversely impacted by the cumulative amount of development and uses allowed in the area, so that the proposed use will not cause or exacerbate an overdraft condition in a groundwater basin or subbasin. Procedures for proving adequate groundwater should consider groundwater overdraft, land subsidence, saltwater intrusion, and the expense of such study in relation to the water needs of the project.*

Comment: The applicant provided a groundwater availability study which determined that the project would result in an approximate net increase of 2.8 acre feet/year for increased use of groundwater. This increased water demand could be accommodated through continued use of the existing well, and the project would not be expected to result in a significant impact to groundwater levels in the project impact area. See further discussion above in Section 9.b.

Transportation goals related to the County highway system include:

*GOAL CT-4: Provide and maintain a highway system capacity that serves projected highway travel demand at acceptable levels of service in keeping with the character of rural and urban communities.*

*Objective CT-4.1: Maintain LOS C or better on roadway segments unless a lower LOS has been adopted as shown on Figure CT-3.*

*Objective CT-4.2: Maintain LOS D or better at roadway intersections.*

Comment: The project will not exceed County LOS standards. See further discussion in Section 16.1, Transportation/Traffic.

The Sonoma Valley Citizens Advisory Committee considered the application on February 24, 2016, and by a 9-2 vote, recommended approval of the project, subject to “serious consideration” of neighbors’ concerns regarding lighting, amplified music, and noise generated by events. The applicant further addressed these concerns in the project noise analysis, which is discussed in the Noise section of this Initial Study.

The project as proposed is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance policies related to agricultural processing facilities and related visitor serving uses. Mitigation measures and monitoring have been incorporated into this Initial Study to reduce potential environmental impacts; thus potential conflicts with land use and zoning policies are considered less than significant. The existing vineyard operation is a permitted use and is not a part of the project or subject to CEQA requirements.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
				X

Habitat conservation plans and natural community conservation plans are site-specific plans to address effects on sensitive species of plants and animals. The project site is not located in an area subject to a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

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

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
				X

There are no known mineral resources on the project site. The site is not zoned MR (Mineral Resources). The project will not result in the loss of a known 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?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
				X

The project site is not a mineral resource recovery site.

**12. NOISE - Would the project:**

a) Expose 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?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	

The Noise Element of the Sonoma County General Plan establishes goals, objectives and policies including performance standards to regulate noise affecting residential and other sensitive receptors. The General Plan sets separate standards for transportation noise and for noise from non-transportation land uses, listed below.

TABLE NE-2: Maximum Allowable Exterior Noise Exposures

Hourly Noise Metric <sup>1</sup> , dBA	Daytime (7 a.m. to 10 p.m.)	Nighttime (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.)
L50 (30 minutes in any hour)	50	45
L25 (15 minutes in any hour)	55	50
L08 (4 minutes 48 seconds in any hour)	60	55
L02 (72 seconds in any hour)	65	60

<sup>1</sup> The sound level exceeded n% of the time in any hour. For example, the L50 is the value exceeded 50% of the time or 30 minutes in any hour; this is the median noise level. The L02 is the sound level exceeded 1 minute in any hour.

A noise assessment of the project was conducted by the applicant's consultant, Illingworth & Rodkin (May 2016), and further clarified in a letter dated August 11, 2017. The noise assessment considered existing noise conditions at the site, as well as projected noise levels resulting from project construction and new tasting room operations, including use of the outdoor terrace (terrace) area on the south and east sides of the tasting room building, and proposed use of amplified sound during events. *Ambient and Winery Production Noise Levels*

Ambient noise levels were measured at two locations along the property line of the project site and by the along the northwest property line of the project site, approximately 50 feet from the existing bottling building to accurately determine noise levels from existing operations by the winery facility and in assessing noise at the edge of the project site leading to upslope residential properties. Noise levels for average ambient day-night ranged from 51 to 56 dBA Ldn, with no measurement period exceeding County noise standards. The second recording site was similarly situated along the northwest property line of the project site, but nearer to an existing Kinnybrook Drive residence that overlooks the project site. The noise environment at this location results primarily from distant traffic along State Route 12. Existing ambient day-night average noise levels ranged from 50 to 54 dBA Ldn, in compliance with County noise standards.

*Proposed Project – Vehicle-Related Noise*

The additional trips resulting from the proposed project would not measurably increase existing traffic noise levels along Highway 12 as noise levels are calculated to increase by 0.2 dBA or less during the peak hour and by 0.1 dBA or less when averaged over a daily basis. The predicted noise increases due to project generated traffic are not measurable or perceptible. The closest off-site residential receptors are located northwest of the site, approximately 444 feet from the proposed tasting room parking lot, 594 feet from the new tasting room and over 600 feet from its



adjoining outdoor terrace. Approximately 18 to 20 dBA of attenuation would be expected at residential receptors due to distance alone.

Vehicles accessing the parking lot, vehicle engine starts, and doors being closed would be the primary noise sources, and such noise sources typically produce noise levels that range from 53 dBA to 63 dBA at 50 feet. The sounds of human voices are normally less. The noise analysis assumed that the cumulative duration of noise from intermittent sounds occurring at or near the parking lot on a typical day would be more than five minutes, but less than 15 minutes in any hour. Therefore, the L08 would be the regulatory threshold applicable to the assessment of parking lot noise. On a busy day, the noise from intermittent sounds occurring at or near the parking lot could exceed a duration of 15 minutes in an hour, but would not likely exceed 30 minutes in any hour. In such a case, the L25 would be the appropriate regulatory threshold and the noise limit would be 5 dBA more restrictive than the L08 noise level limit. The predicted noise level from activities within the parking lot on a typical tasting room operation day are projected to be 15 to 17 dBA or more below the daytime noise level threshold of 60 dBA, and therefore not significant. Similarly, on a busy day, such as during events, predicted noise level from activities within the parking lot would be 10 to 12 dBA or more below the daytime noise level threshold of 55 dBA and therefore insignificant. Further, the resultant noise levels at the property lines of the closest off-site residences are calculated to range from 33 to 45 dBA L08 on a typical day. Noise resulting from the operation of the tasting room parking lot would therefore be in the range of existing ambient noise levels during the daytime and would not exceed the Table NE-2 noise limits contained in the Sonoma County General Plan.

*Proposed Project – Tasting Room and Event Noise*

The highest noise levels attributable to marketing and agricultural promotional events would result from use of amplified outdoor music (e.g., use of a DJ or small band located on the terrace area of the tasting room building). (Noted is that the applicant modified the initial project proposal to remove plans for use of amplified sound on the terrace during regular tasting room operations in order to reduce overall project noise.)

The cumulative duration of noise from these fairly continuous sounds would be more than 30 minutes in any hour. Therefore, the L50 would be the applicable regulatory threshold. The County's allowable noise limit for the L50 daytime reading is 50 dBA as measured at the nearest off-site residence.

Amplified music events would be expected to generate noise levels of approximately 72 dBA L50 at a distance of 50 feet from the noise source. As noted above, residential receptors north and northwest of the site would be located more than 600 feet from the proposed terrace on the south and east sides of the tasting room. Approximately 22 to 23 dBA of attenuation would be expected due to the distance, including taking into account the difference in elevation between the sites. A minimum of 5 dBA of acoustical shielding would be provided by the intervening tasting room building. The resulting noise level at the property line of the nearest residences is calculated to range from 44 to 45 dBA L50, 5 to 6 dBA below the maximum noise standard.

Events held indoors would produce lower noise levels at off-site receptor locations because of the additional attenuation provided by the building housing the event. Assuming that windows of the building are partially open for ventilation, the building would be expected to provide about 15 dBA of noise reduction from the indoor noise level, resulting in operational noise levels well below the above-referenced Table NE-2 noise standards at the nearest residential receptors.

The noise study concluded that noise associated with regular operations of the production improvements and new tasting room (with outdoor terrace), parking, or agriculture promotional events at Kenwood Vineyards is not expected to exceed the applicable daytime NE-2 noise standards at any residential property line in the site vicinity. As no operations would continue past 10:00 p.m., County nighttime noise standards would not apply.

Further, the project would be subject to several conditions of approval to ensure compliance with County General Plan Table NE-2 noise standards, limitations on event hours (events must conclude no later than 9:30 p.m., with all staff leaving by 10:00 p.m.), prohibition of use of amplified sound on the terrace except during special events permitted under this use permit, and similar controls. Additionally, a standard condition of approval will also be required, indicating that if noise complaints are received from nearby residents, and they appear to be valid complaints in PRMD's opinion, then the applicant will be required to conduct a Noise Study to determine if the operations meet noise standards and identify any additional noise measures necessary to attenuate noise. A copy of the Noise Study would then be submitted to the Project Review Health Specialist within 60 days of notification from PRMD that a noise complaint has been received, and the owner/operator required to implement any additional measures needed to meet noise standards.

b) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	

The project includes construction activities, including use of heavy equipment (such as bulldozers and trucks) and construction tools, that may generate ground-borne vibration and noise. With construction activities (including grading) located a minimum of approximately 444 feet from the nearest off-site residence, and limited to daytime hours, short-term and temporary construction-related noise is not expected to be significant, and construction noise is not anticipated to exceed County noise standards of 65 dBA L02 or 60 dBA L08 at off-site residences. There are no other activities or uses associated with the project that would expose persons to or generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels. This is a less-than-significant impact.

Construction activities are also regulated by County Codes and conditions of the project that would also limit construction hours. See discussion below under item 12.d. There are no other activities or uses associated with the project that would expose persons to or generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels.

c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	

The noise assessment of the project was conducted by the applicant's consultant, Illingworth & Rodkin (May 2016), included assessment of existing (ambient) noise levels, as well noise levels expected to result from the addition of the project to winery operations. Existing ambient day-night average noise levels were found to range from 50 to 54 dBA Ldn. Trucks circulating at the project site would therefore be in compliance with the Table NE-2 standards (see Section 12.a, above) at the nearest residential receivers to the northwest and north. Effects of noise from proposed project vehicle trips and event noise were also assessed relative to ambient noise levels. The additional trips resulting from the proposed project would not measurably increase existing ambient traffic noise levels along Highway 12 as noise levels are calculated to increase by 0.2 dBA or less during the peak hour and by 0.1 dBA or less when averaged over a daily basis. Residential receptors northwest of the site would be located approximately 444 feet from the tasting room parking lot. The resultant noise levels at the property lines of these residences were

calculated to range from 33 to 45 dBA L08 on a typical day. Noise resulting from the operation of the tasting room parking lot would be in the range of existing ambient noise levels during the daytime and would not exceed the Table NE-2 noise limits contained in the Sonoma County General Plan.

For events, the highest noise levels attributable to agricultural promotional events would result from amplified outdoor music (e.g., DJ or small band located in the terrace area east of the tasting room building). Such events would be expected to generate noise levels of approximately 72 dBA L50 at a distance of 50 feet from the noise source. Residential receptors north and northwest of the site would be located more than 600 feet from the proposed terrace southeast of the tasting room. The resulting noise level at the property line of the nearest residences was calculated to range from 44 to 45 dBA L50, which would not represent a significant increase over ambient levels, measured at a low of 44 dBA. The predicted noise level from amplified music on the terrace would not exceed the daytime noise level threshold at the nearest residences due to the distance between the noise source and receptors and the acoustical shielding provided by the new tasting room building.

Events held indoors which may include amplified sound would produce lower noise levels at off-site receptor locations because of the additional attenuation provided by the building housing the event. Assuming that windows of the building are partially open for ventilation, the noise analysis found that the building would be expected to provide about 15 dBA of noise reduction from the indoor noise level, resulting in operational noise levels well below the Table NE-2 noise standards at the nearest residential receptors. This noise reduction, combined with the distance to the nearest off-site residence at nearly 600 feet, will not significantly affect ambient noise levels, estimated at 44 dBA, at off-site residences.

The noise study concluded that noise associated with regular operations of the production improvements and new tasting room, parking, or agriculture promotional events at Kenwood Vineyards is not expected to exceed the applicable daytime NE-2 noise standards at any residential property line in the site vicinity, and would not significantly increase ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	

There will be short-term noise impacts from the construction activities, including use of trucks, graders, bulldozers and similar heavy equipment, as well as noise related to construction of the proposed tasting room and installation (relocation) of the proposed water tank and equipment shed. Construction noise will cease when construction activities are finished.

Reasonable regulation of the hours of construction, as well as regulation of the arrival and operation of heavy equipment and the delivery of construction materials, are necessary to protect the health and safety of persons, promote the general welfare of the community, and maintain the quality of life.

The County will require, as a condition of approval for the project, the construction crews to adhere to the following construction best management practices to reduce temporary construction noise levels emanating from the site and minimize disruption and annoyance at existing noise-sensitive receptors in the project vicinity.

*Construction Best Management Practices:*

*Develop a construction noise control plan, including, but not limited to, the following available controls:*

*Noise-generating construction activities should be restricted to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. No construction activities should occur on weekends or holidays. If work is necessary outside of these hours, the County should require the contractor to implement a construction noise monitoring program and, if feasible, provide additional mitigation as necessary (in the form of noise control blankets or other temporary noise barriers, etc.) for affected receptors.*

*Construct temporary noise barriers, where feasible, to screen stationary noise-generating equipment when located within 200 feet of adjoining sensitive land uses. Temporary noise barrier fences would provide a 5 dBA noise reduction if the noise barrier interrupts the line-of-sight between the noise source and receiver and if the barrier is constructed in a manner that eliminates any cracks or gaps.*

*Equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with intake and exhaust mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.*

*Unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines should be strictly prohibited.*

*Locate stationary noise-generating equipment, such as air compressors or portable power generators, as far as possible from sensitive receptors as feasible. If they must be located near receptors, adequate muffling (with enclosures where feasible and appropriate) shall be used. Any enclosure openings or venting shall face away from sensitive receptors.*

*Utilize "quiet" air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.*

*Construction staging areas shall be established at locations that will create the greatest distance between the construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction.*

*Locate material stockpiles, as well as maintenance/equipment staging and parking areas, as far as feasible from residential receptors.*

*Control noise from construction workers' radios to a point where they are not audible at existing residences bordering the project site.*

*The contractor shall prepare a detailed construction plan identifying the schedule for major noise-generating construction activities. The construction plan shall identify a procedure for coordination with adjacent residential land uses so that construction activities can be scheduled to minimize noise disturbance.*

*Designate a "disturbance coordinator" who would be responsible for responding to any complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator will determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., bad muffler, etc.) and will require that reasonable measures be implemented to correct the problem. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the disturbance coordinator at the construction site and include in it the notice sent to neighbors regarding the construction schedule.*

The implementation of the controls outlined above would be expected to further reduce construction noise levels emanating from the site. With the implementation of these controls, and

<p>considering that construction is temporary and with the nearest off-site residence approximately 444 feet from the area of parking lot construction and further to the construction site for the tasting room, the impact of temporary or periodic noise increases in ambient noise levels, estimated at 44 dBA at the nearest off-site residence, would be less-than-significant level.</p>				
<p>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
				X
<p>The site is not within an airport land use plan as designated by Sonoma County.</p>				
<p>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?</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
				X
<p>The nearest known private airstrip is over 1½ miles to the west of the proposed project. The airstrip is owned and used by a single parcel that is developed with a single-family dwelling. Use is low, estimated not to exceed one plane per day, and the use permit for the airstrip prohibits use by anyone other than the property owner. The flight pattern would be variable since it is not a commercial use, and thus flights over the Kenwood Winery site from this airstrip would be infrequent and cause no more impact than any other small planes that might fly over the Valley from any other airport.</p>				

**13. POPULATION AND HOUSING- Would the project:**

<p>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)?</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
				X
<p>The project would not include construction of homes or infrastructure, and therefore would not induce substantial population growth.</p>				
<p>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
				X

The project site does not contain any housing units, and would not displace any housing units or tenants.				
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
				X
No people will be displaced by the project.				

**14. PUBLIC SERVICES - Would the project:**

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:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
				X
<p>The project will not substantially increase the number of employees (with creation of four to six full-time jobs, and eight full-time seasonal jobs) such that governmental services and/or facilities will have to be expanded. Generally, any potential impact the project may have on the provision of public services and or expansion of governmental facilities will be offset by development fees. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Fire Protection: The County Fire Marshal reviewed the project description and will require that the Project comply with Fire Safe Standards, including fire protection methods such as sprinklers in buildings, alarm systems, extinguishers, vegetation management, hazardous materials management, and management of flammable or combustible liquids and gases.</li> <li>ii. Police: The Sonoma County Sheriff provides police protection services. There will be no anticipated significant increased need for police protection resulting from the project.</li> <li>iii. Schools, parks, or other public facilities: The project will not generate additional students; nor will it significantly increase demand for parks or other public facilities.</li> <li>iv. Parks: The project would not result in an increased demand on public parks in the area.</li> <li>v. Other public facilities: no other public facilities would be adversely impacted by this project.</li> </ul>				

**15. RECREATION - Would the project:**

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?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
				X
The project would not cause nor accelerate substantial physical deterioration of parks or recreational facilities.				
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?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
				X
The project does not include public recreational facilities and does not require construction or expansion of recreational facilities.				

**16. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC - Would the project:**

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	
<p>The <i>Sonoma County General Plan 2020</i> established significance standards for both intersections (LOS D or better) and roadways (LOS C or better). Compliance with these LOS standards ensures County-accepted traffic movement standards will be met with respect to operation of intersections and along roadways.</p> <p><b>2.6 COUNTYWIDE HIGHWAY SYSTEM</b>  <b>GOAL CT-4:</b> <i>Provide and maintain a highway system capacity that serves projected highway travel demand at acceptable levels of service in keeping with the character of rural and urban communities.</i></p> <p><i>Objective CT-4.1: Maintain LOS C or better on roadway segments unless a lower LOS has been adopted as shown on Figure CT-3.</i></p> <p><i>Objective CT-4.2: Maintain LOS D or better at roadway intersections.</i></p>				

Caltrans seeks to maintain a LOS at the transition between C and D on state highways.

- Key local roadways in the project vicinity include: State Route 12 (Highway 12), a two-lane roadway running in a general east-west direction along the south side of the project site. This roadway is posted for a 45 mph speed in this location.
- Helmick Road, a two-way private road that serves the project site and Kinnybrook Subdivision to the north (via a connection of Kinnybrook Drive to Helmick Road).
- Warm Springs Road, located opposite Helmick Road at its intersection with Highway 12. This road is classified as a Rural Major Collector in the General Plan, and is a two-lane road posted for a 25 mph speed limit.

The Highway 12/Helmick Road/Warm Springs Road intersection is signalized. There are left-turn pockets providing for turn movements onto Warm Springs Road from westbound Highway 12 traffic, and onto Helmick Road from eastbound Highway 12 traffic.

#### *Traffic Study*

The proposed project would generate traffic related to the new winery tasting room and events. To address these concerns, a traffic impact study was conducted for the project by Transpedia Consulting Engineers (October 2016). The analysis considered existing and future transportation and circulation conditions at the project site and including the intersection of Highway 12/Helmick Road/Warm Springs Road. The traffic study retained the originally proposed new tasting room size of 5,200 sq ft, while the revised project plans reduced the size of the proposed tasting room to 4,232 sq ft. The results of the traffic study therefore assume a slightly increased degree of parking and trip generation impacts, resulting in a more conservative analysis for the purposes of this environmental assessment.

Under "Existing Plus Production Improvements Scenario," the study Intersection at the project site entry of Highway 12/Helmick Road/Warm Springs Road, operates at the same service levels (LOS A on the weekday peak, and LOS B on the weekend peak) as under "Existing Scenario," with the exception that delays increased slightly on the weekend (by 0.6 seconds). This entry roadway is signalized. Previous analysis indicates that 55 persons visited the existing tasting room during a typical weekday (Monday-Friday) in the peak harvest months (October 2012 and October 2013), and 121 persons during a typical weekend day (Saturday-Sunday). It is estimated that 199 persons would visit the new tasting room during a weekday (Monday-Friday) in the peak harvest months (October), and 438 persons during a weekend day (Saturday-Sunday). In addition to tasting room public visitation, the project plans to have VIP public tours, food and wine pairing daily between 9:00 A.M.-5:00 P.M., 20 seats per seating with three seatings per day. Traffic generation is based on an anticipated 2.5 visitors per vehicle, considered the industry standard for the proposed uses.

The traffic study indicates that the proposed project is expected to generate 239 net trips on a weekday, of which 58 trips (16 inbound and 42 outbound) would occur during a weekday P.M. peak hour; and 376 net trips on a weekend day, of which 81 trips (28 inbound and 53 outbound) would occur during weekend peak hour. Existing peak hour traffic volumes along State Route 12 are approximately 1,450 to 1,500 vehicles per hour, and the Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) is approximately 15,700 to 16,100 vehicles per day in the vicinity of the project site.

Under "Existing Plus Production Improvements Plus Project Scenario," the study intersection is expected to continue to operate at acceptable LOS during weekday P.M. and weekend peak hours, with the exception that delays increased slightly. Turn lane storages are expected to be capable of handling traffic queues at 95% confidence level. Level of service analysis results show that weekday peak hour trips would increase traffic delays by 0.8 seconds, going from an LOS A to an LOS B, while weekend peak hour traffic would increase by 1.3 seconds, remaining at the existing LOS B level.



For the “Cumulative Scenario” analysis, calculations were made using the Countywide traffic forecasting model, maintained by the Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA). The traffic model volumes were obtained from SCTA for both base year (2010) and future (2040) projections, inclusive of existing and planned project area development. Under cumulative conditions, which include the proposed project, the study intersection is expected to continue to operate at acceptable LOS during weekday P.M. and weekend peak hours, at LOS B. Under “Cumulative Plus Project Scenario,” the study intersection is expected to continue to operate at acceptable LOS B during weekday P.M. and weekend peak hours (see Table 13 of the October 2016 traffic study). Turn lane storage is expected to be capable of handling traffic queues.

#### *Proposed Event Traffic*

- Marketing/Promotional Events – 18 events per year, 150 attendees maximum with average of 50 guests, meals prepared on- or off-site. Proposed to be held between 10:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m.
- Promotional Events – 2 events per year, 500 attendees maximum (anticipated to be rotating throughout the event), proposed to be held between 11:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., meals prepared on- or off-site.
- Charitable Event – 2 events per year, 200 attendees maximum, proposed to be held between 4:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m., meals prepared on- or off-site.
- Industry Event – up to 8 events per year, 500 attendees maximum – anticipated to be rotating through the event (Savor Sonoma Valley, Heart of Sonoma Valley, etc.), with food prepared by local restaurants and chefs
- Wine Trade Open House – 2 events per year, 150 attendees maximum, to be held between 10:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m., and food prepared on- or off-site.
- Annual Grower’s Breakfast – 1 event per year, 100 attendees maximum, meals prepared on site, proposed to be held between 7:00 a.m. and Noon.

It was assumed that event attendees would carpool in a similar way to the wine tasting room visitors; i.e., 2.5 attendees per vehicle on weekdays or weekends. Parking for winery operations and events is addressed below. The marketing and events are expected to have a less-than-significant impact on the study intersection operation at Highway 12/Helmick Road/Warm Springs Road, falling within LOS B during weekday and weekend peaks.

#### *On-Site Circulation and Parking*

On-site circulation was analyzed based on existing uses at the project site along with the project’s proposed improvements. The existing interior driveway is proposed to be extended to loop around the existing production facility (approved under separate action by the County). The new tasting room proposes driveway construction from the main entry driveway to a parking area near the proposed tasting room, and separated from primary production traffic. The traffic analysis found the on-site circulation plan and use of internal driveway aisles would be expected to perform adequately.

The winery’s parking supply, including 42 new spaces proposed near the new tasting room parking lot, includes 183 passenger spaces (inclusive of overflow parking spaces at the site), 6 of which are for disabled passengers. A bus parking area will also be provided by the tasting room parking lot. The winery’s parking demand during winery’s regular operations is approximately 92 parking spaces on weekdays and 82 parking spaces on weekends. As a result, the proposed project parking supply of 183 parking spaces would be expected to exceed parking demand during regular operations on weekdays and weekends..

The winery’s parking demand when regular operations and marketing and events occur simultaneously is approximately 172 parking spaces on weekdays and 162 spaces on weekends. The proposed project parking supply (183 parking spaces) would be expected to exceed parking demand during weekday or weekend operations when public visitation and marketing and events would be conducted simultaneously. The winery’s accessible parking supply (6 spaces) meets

California and Federal ADA requirements of 6 spaces.

The application includes an Event Parking Plan exhibit which proposes use of existing and new (tasting room) parking spaces throughout the project site property, including a bus parking area by the tasting room. The Event Parking Plan indicates ability to accommodate the largest of the proposed events (500 attendees), though the traffic study anticipates that vehicle trips, and therefore on-site parking demand, would rotate over the course of an event.

The parking plan does not include on-site bicycle parking, which could allow for reduced vehicle trips. The applicant must provide one bicycle parking space per 5 spaces of automobile parking to meet Sonoma County Zoning Code requirements. (Note: Compliance with the bicycle parking requirements of the Sonoma County Code is required as a condition of project approval. See further discussion under item 16.f, below.)

#### *Traffic Study Findings*

Other key findings and recommendations of the traffic analysis are as follows:

- The proposed project is expected to generate 239 net trips on a weekday, of which 58 trips (16 inbound and 42 outbound) would occur during a weekday P.M. peak hour; and 376 net trips on a weekend day, of which 81 trips (28 inbound and 53 outbound) would occur during weekend peak hour.
- The Transpedia Study found that even with the addition of the proposed project traffic, all intersection/roadways would be expected to operate within County prescribed standards under present and future (including cumulative development) conditions. The study intersection (Highway 12/Warm Springs Road/Helmick Road) is expected to operate at acceptable LOS during weekday P.M. and weekend peak hours under all study scenarios including when winery operations; wine tasting room; VIP tours; and marketing and events occurring simultaneously.
- The project is expected to have less-than-significant impacts on the study intersection operations.
- The collision rate at Highway 12/Warm Springs Road/Helmick Road (0.31 collisions per million vehicle miles, c/mvm) is lower than the statewide average for similar facilities (0.50 c/mvm). This collision rate does not show any trends or patterns that could indicate a safety issue at this location.
- The existing paved shoulders on Highway 12 in the vicinity of the project will continue to adequately accommodate pedestrian and bicyclist activities.
- Sonoma County Transit (SCT) bus routes 30 and 34 will accommodate project's transit demand and provides an alternative transportation option for winery's guests and employees. Transit stops are currently located approximately 750 feet from the Highway 12/HelmickRoad/Warm Springs Road intersection.
- The onsite circulation pattern is adequate. Access into and out of the site would adequately accommodate emergency response vehicles maneuvers. Internal drive aisles and parking spaces are based on County standards and would be expected to perform adequately.
- Sight distance available at the study intersection meets Caltrans standards and requirements.
- No vegetation or building along the project frontage should be located within the minimum sight distance envelope so as to obstruct vehicle or bicycle travel along Highway 12.

The County Transportation and Public Works Department reviewed and accepted the Traffic studies for the project, and Caltrans provided previous comments on the project. A series of project conditions of approval would also be imposed to payment of applicable County Traffic Impact Fees and obtaining an encroachment permit from Caltrans, if required for work in the Highway 12 right-of-way.

<p>Also noted is that on-site grading related to driveway, parking lot and tasting room improvements is estimated to result in a surplus of approximately 8,000 cubic yards of cut (soil) material, resulting in off-haul of fewer than 500 truck trips. The location of the off-haul will be determined in response to demand for the material, expected to be in the local area. The truck trips would be dispersed overall several weeks, and would be a temporary occurrence related to site preparation. The trucks would exit the site using the driveway connection to Helmick Road and would likely proceed east or west along Highway 12, utilizing the signalized intersection of Helmick Road/highway 12. No significant traffic impacts are anticipated to occur related to the truck trips.</p>				
<p>b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	
<p>The proposed project would not significantly impact adjacent intersections, roadways, or highways, given the relatively low number of vehicle trips it would generate. Sonoma County established significance standards for both intersections (LOS D or better) and roadways (LOS C or better). With proposed project traffic, all intersection/roadways would be expected to operate within County prescribed standards. See further discussion under item 16.a, above.</p>				
<p>c) Result in change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
				X
<p>The project would have no significant effect on air traffic patterns. The closest airstrip is a privately-owned facility 1 ½ miles from the project site, and the airstrip is limited in its use to the property owner.</p>				
<p>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	
<p>Sight distance at the study intersection was evaluated based on sight distance criteria contained in the Caltrans Highway Design Manual, March 7, 2014. The speed limit on Highway 12 in the project vicinity is 45 mph. The Manual requires a minimum stopping sight distance of 360 feet for a 45-mph design speed. The sight distance currently provided at the study intersection location is greater than 1,850 feet when looking to the west and is greater than 850 feet when looking to the east, which exceed the Caltrans minimum sight distance requirement of 360 feet. The project would not create a dangerous condition for vehicle movement.</p>				
<p>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact

			X	
<p>The existing main driveway from Highway 12 provides proposed on-site circulation areas for the new winery facility and parking areas, and would meet the Sonoma County Fire Marshall's requirements for access to the site and structures for fire protection.</p>				
<p>f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	
<p>The 2010 Sonoma County Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan encourages new developments to incorporate bicycle friendly design. In the County's Plan, Highway 12 is designated as a proposed Class 1 Bikeway. It is designed as a Class 1 Bikeway in the General Plan. Some visitors may utilize bicycles to access the proposed project site. Bicycle racks are required to be located at the winery site by a condition of project approval; compliance with County bicycle parking standards of 1 space per 5 required vehicle parking spaces will be enforced as part of plan check review.</p>				

**17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:**

<p>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	
<p>The project includes existing and proposed private wastewater disposal systems on-site. The size and design of the wastewater system must be approved by the Well and Septic Section of PRMD, and by the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) through the Waste Discharge Requirement permitting process. These permits will be analyzed to ensure that wastewater treatment requirements will not be exceeded. See question 17(b) for additional information.</p>				
<p>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?</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	
<p>The existing, on-site production well would continue to be used to support the proposed winery expansion for both process and domestic use, as well as for irrigation.</p> <p>The applicant provided a wastewater feasibility study for the project. The peak sanitary sewer system flow of 4,950 gal/day will be used to size the system for the proposed tasting room. The winery flows of 600 gal/day will be disposed of through a new septic system, which is currently under review by Sonoma County PRMD under permit No. SEP16-0047, and is intended to replace the existing leachfield system that was under permit B40299. For the events where meals</p>				

are prepared onsite, a generation rate of 15 gallons of wastewater per tasting or event attendee is assumed. Of the 15 gallons, 5 gallons are assumed to be associated with food preparation and clean-up and 10 gallons are assumed as a contribution from attendee restroom use. Therefore, consistent with County wastewater standards that require the winery wastewater septic system to be sized for 100 percent of the wastewater flows from the fifth largest event, the maximum flow associated with meal preparation is calculated as follows based on the largest 150-person onsite event and the 60 VIP tastings per day:  $(150 + 60) \text{ meals/day} \times 5 \text{ gal wastewater/meal} = 1,050 \text{ gal/day}$ .

Wastewater from the project would be treated in a new sanitary system leachfield to be located on the south portion of the site, near the existing leachfield system. The applicant would also be required to utilize portable toilets during special events, to be determined as part of the County's Environmental Health and Safety Division permitting process. Additionally, discharge of wastewater is regulated by the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act and other provisions of the California Water Code, California Code of Regulations and Chapters 7 and 24 of the Sonoma County Code. The project will be required through conditions of approval to obtain a permit from PRMD and Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) from the Regional Water Board. A copy of the WDRs will be submitted to the Project Review Health Specialist prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy or project operation and vesting the use permit.

All WDRs issued by the Regional Water Board include self-monitoring programs requiring the waste discharger to collect pertinent water quality data and to submit it to the Regional Water Board for evaluation of compliance with waste discharge requirements. In addition, Regional Water Board staff conducts periodic inspections of each regulated discharge to monitor compliance with waste discharge requirements. The Regional Water Board may take enforcement action in response to significant or chronic waste discharge requirement violations under the authority of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (California Water Code).

Compliance with the Sonoma County Code, permit conditions, and WDRs will ensure that the project's wastewater disposal system will not cause significant environmental effects to water quality.

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?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	

Storm water drainage facility construction improvements would consist of installation of subsurface gravel basins to collect runoff from the new roof of the winery building, placement of storm drain outfall improvements, and construction of a low impact development (LID) facility alongside the entry driveway. New parking spaces and driveway areas would be constructed using permeable materials. Drainage improvements will maintain off-site natural drainage patterns and limit post-development storm water levels and pollutant discharges. The construction of these facilities are not anticipated to result in significant environmental effects as all such facilities are required, through conditions of approval, to be installed consistent with County grading and construction standards which will ensure that the project improvement designs will minimize potential for soil disturbance and erosion.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

			X	
<p>Water will be supplied from an existing on-site production well. The existing, on-site production well would continue to be used to support the proposed wine tasting room for both process and domestic use, as well as for irrigation. A net increase in water demand has been calculated to be approximately 2.8 acre feet per year for the new project operations, and a groundwater assessment prepared for the project determined that there will be adequate water supplies to serve the project via the production well. See additional discussion in Section 9.b, Hydrology and Water Quality.</p>				
<p>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?</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
			X	
<p>Private, on-site wastewater disposal systems would be utilized for the project. The applicant provided a wastewater feasibility study for the project. Wastewater from the project would be treated in a new sanitary system leachfield to be located on the south portion of the site, near the existing leachfield system. The applicant would also be required to utilize portable toilets during special events, to be determined as part of the County's Environmental Health and Safety Division permitting process.</p>				
<p>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
				X
<p>Sonoma County has access to adequate permitted landfill capacity to serve the proposed project.</p>				
<p>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No impact
				X
<p>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.</p>				

**18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

<p>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?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No</p>
	<p>X</p>	
<p>There are no known special status species on the project site, and none listed on the State's Diversity Database. The project development does not include any work within a creek or waterway. The project will not cause 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 wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means; the project will not 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; the project site does not contain any unique habitat, or unique plant or animal population; the project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as the County's Tree Protection Ordinance. With implementation of Best Management Practices related to grading and erosion control, the project will not result in any potentially significant adverse biological impacts to the environment on site or off site.</p>		
<p>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)?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No</p>
		<p>X</p>
<p>Cumulative projects include development of residential and commercial uses in the project area, as well as existing and other recently approved improvements to the project site. These projects have not resulted in any significant effects to which the project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution. As noted in this Initial Study, this project will not result in incremental contribution to any cumulatively significant impacts, the design of the project has been found to be consistent with the established character of the project area, which includes both semi-rural residential and agricultural development. For aesthetics, lighting impacts will be reduced to levels of insignificance through application of mitigation measures that will limit use and placement of nighttime lighting, and thereby limit project contribution to cumulative lighting levels in the project area. The project design has been found, by County Design Review, to be appropriate for the site and general area, and would not result in a individually limited but cumulative negative impact on area design. Biological resource impacts are insignificant related to site development, and would not contribute to any incrementally significant cumulative impact to area biological resources, including with respect to protection of the unnamed tributary creek on the south edge of the project site. There would be no use of hazardous materials that would result in individually limited but cumulatively significant impact in the area. Storm drainage controls on-site as part of the project would limit project impacts and any potential contribution to cumulative drainage impacts in the area. The project's traffic study analyzed expected project impacts and cumulative traffic</p>		

conditions in the area, inclusive of existing/project/future cumulative conditions, and found that the project would operate within prescribed County Levels of Service and not significantly impact traffic conditions at the project level nor contribute to a cumulatively significant traffic condition on Highway 12, based on the projected trip generation of 239 net trips on a weekday, of which 58 trips (16 inbound and 42 outbound) would occur during a weekday P.M. peak hour; and 376 net trips on a weekend day, of which 81 trips (28 inbound and 53 outbound) would occur during weekend peak hour. Potential air quality and greenhouse gas impacts of the project were determined to avoid potentially significant cumulative impact based on completion of air quality/GHG modeling (the project was found to be well below all applicable BAAQMD air quality and GHG thresholds), along with application of standard County grading and permitting requirements, and based on the limited size of the proposed tasting room and related vehicle trip generation. Noise impacts were also evaluated and were determined to be insignificant at the project level, and would not, based on noise assessment of project noise-generating activities, result in a cumulatively significant impact when considering current, project and cumulative condition scenarios. A groundwater availability study analyzed potential impacts to area (off-site) wells, and found that the project would not adversely affect area groundwater levels or adversely impact area wells, and therefore would not result in a cumulatively significant impact to local groundwater supplies.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	Yes	No
		X

The project would not result in any significant changes to the existing environment. Based on the discussion and information provided in this initial study, there are no project-related environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Compliance with local area design guidelines ensure that aesthetic impacts are less than significant. Conditions have been incorporated into the project and mitigation measures imposed which reduce traffic and cultural impacts to a less than significant level. Specific conditions are placed on the project to control noise levels and limit hours of operation.



## Sources

- X Project Application and Description
- X County Planning Department's Sources and Criteria Manual
- X Sonoma County General Plan 2020 and associated EIR
- X Sonoma County Zoning Ordinance
- X Project Referrals from Responsible Agencies
- X State and Local Environmental Quality Acts (CEQA)
- X Correspondence received on project
- X Other technical reports:
  1. Applicant's Preliminary Engineering and Planning Information packet, July 2014 and updated August 2017.
  2. Preliminary Geotechnical Report, Kenwood Vineyards Use Permit, Bauer Associates, October 22, 2015.
  3. Noise Analysis, Illingworth & Rodkin, May 2016, and update letter of August 11, 2017.
  4. Stormwater Control Plan, Kenwood Vineyards, Summit Engineering, August 2015.
  5. Traffic Analysis for Kenwood Vineyards Tasting Room Project, Transpedia Consulting Engineers, October 2016 and Final Addendum report dated July 18, 2017.
  6. Sonoma County Important Farmland Map 2014. California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.
  7. Assessor's Parcel Maps.
  8. BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines; Bay Area Air Quality Management District; April 1999; California Air Resources Board (CARB) <http://www.arb.ca.gov/>.
  9. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emission modeling, De Novo Consulting, October 2017.
  10. California Environmental Protection Agency - <http://www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/corteseList/default.htm>; California Regional Water Quality Control Board - <http://geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov/>; California Dept of Toxic Substances Control [http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/calsites/cortese\\_list.cfm](http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/calsites/cortese_list.cfm), and Integrated Waste Management Board - <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/SWIS/Search.asp>.
  11. Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones; State of California; 1983.
  12. Flood Insurance Rate Maps, Federal Emergency Management Agency.
  13. Special Report 120, California Division of Mines and Geology; 1980.
  14. Tree Protection and Replacement Ordinance (Ordinance No. 4014); Sonoma County.
  15. Heritage or Landmark Tree Ordinance (Ordinance No. 3651); Sonoma County.
  16. Sonoma County Aggregate Resources Management Plan and Program EIR, 1994.
  17. Sonoma County Bikeways Plan, Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department, August 24, 2010.
  18. North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast/water\\_issues/programs/non\\_chapter\\_15\\_permitting.shtml](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast/water_issues/programs/non_chapter_15_permitting.shtml).