Notice of Determination

TO:  □ Office of Planning and Research
     P.O. Box 3044
     Sacramento, CA 95812-3044
     ☑ County Clerk, County of Amador
     810 Court St.
     Jackson, CA 95642-2132

FROM: Amador County
      Planning Commission
      810 Court St.
      Jackson, CA 95642-2132
      planning@amadorgov.org
      Phone: (209) 223-6380

SUBJECT: Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21108 or 21152 of the Public Resources Code.

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER (if submitted to State Clearinghouse):

PROJECT TITLE: Use Permit UP-19;12-1 La Mesa Tasting Room in R1A

Applicant: Côme Lagüe

Address: 13200 Shenandoah Rd., Plymouth, CA 95669

Phone: (650)218-5207  Email: come@lamesavineyards.com

PROJECT LOCATION (Amador County): 13200 Shenandoah Rd., Plymouth, CA 95669

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Use Permit (UP-19;12-1) proposing the conversion of an existing utility building into a tasting room for La Mesa Winery and Vineyards in the “R1A,” Single-family Residential/Agricultural zoning district. The tasting room will be located in a 2,250 sq. ft. structure with 912 sq. ft. of the interior square footage to be allocated to the tasting area. The applicant proposes to host a maximum of 350 customers per day and 6 events annually with up to 100 guests. Regular business hours will be Friday through Monday from 11:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. (APN: 014-140-054)

This is to advise that the Amador County Planning Commission [☑ Lead Agency or □ Responsible Agency] approved the above described project on May 12, 2020 and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project:

1. The project [☑ will ☑ will not] have a significant effect on the environment.
2. ☑ An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
   ☑ A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigation measures [☐ were ☑ were not] made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A mitigation reporting or monitoring plan [☐ was ☑ was not] adopted for this project.
5. A statement of Overriding Considerations [☐ was ☑ was not] adopted for this project.
6. Findings [☐ were ☑ were not] made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

This is to certify that the final environmental document, with comments and responses and record of project approval, or the Mitigated Negative Declaration, is available to the General Public at: Amador County Planning Dept., 810 Court St., Jackson, CA 95642.

Signature (Public Agency) __________________________ Title: Planner
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Date Received for Filing at O.P.R.: __________________

Authority cited: Sections 21083, Public Resources Code.
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MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

PROJECT: UP-19;12-1 La Mesa Tasting Room in R1A Zoning District
LEAD AGENCY: Amador County Planning Department
PROJECT LOCATION: 13200 Shenandoah Rd., Plymouth, CA

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Request for a Use Permit (UP-19;12-1) proposing the conversion of an existing utility building into a tasting room for La Mesa Winery and Vineyards in the “R1A,” Single-family Residential/Agricultural zoning district. The tasting room will be located in a 2,250 sq. ft. structure with 912 sq. ft. of the interior square footage to be allocated to the tasting area. The applicant proposes to host a maximum of 350 customers per day and 6 events annually with up to 100 guests. Regular business hours will be Friday through Monday from 11:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. (APN: 014-140-054).

PUBLIC HEARING: The Amador County Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on the matter on May 12, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. in the Board Chambers of the County Administration Center, 810 Court Street, Jackson, CA, 95642.

PROJECT FINDINGS:

1. There is no substantial evidence that the approval of the Use Permit subject to implementation of the proposed Conditions of Approval and Mitigation measures, will have a significant adverse effect on the physical environment.
2. The project is consistent with the Amador County General Plan and zoning district at this location, subject to a Use Permit issued by the Planning Commission;
3. The approval of the Use Permit by the Planning Commission is sanctioned by County Code Section 19.19.24.045 R1A District Regulations allowed uses with a Use Permit issued by the Planning Commission, and is consistent with County Code Section 19.56.040 (Use Permit findings) in that the establishment, maintenance or operation of the use applied for will not under any circumstances be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, morals, comfort, and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use or be detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the County, due to the implementation of proposed Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures;
4. A review of the Use Permit request was conducted by the Technical Advisory Committee who, through their own research and the CEQA Initial Study, found this project will not have a significant effect on the environment due to the mitigation measures and conditions incorporated and a Mitigated Negative Declaration will be adopted and filed with the County Recorder.

PREPARATION OF STUDY: Information on file with the Amador County Planning Department, 810 Court Street, Jackson, CA 95642; (209)223-6380; File No. UP-19;12-1 La Mesa Tasting Room in R1A Zoning District.

Krista Ruesel, Planner

Date: 5/15/2020
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PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This project proposes the addition of a tasting room and winery building (2,250 sq. ft.) with 912 sq. ft. to be allocated to the tasting area. Additionally, there will be small-scale on-site retail and events. Proposed hours of operation for the tasting room will be Friday through Monday (4 days a week) from 11:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. with up to 350 customers per day. The facility will host up to six (6) events annually with up to 100 guests. The maximum proposed occupancy of the tasting room will be determined by the building department at the time of permits and Chapter 15.30 of County Code (Fire and Life Safety) and the terms of the Use Permit.

Project Location

The UP-19;2-1 La Mesa Tasting Room Project is located entirely in the unincorporated area of Amador County, California in District 5. The nearest incorporated city is Plymouth located to the southwest, and the nearest unincorporated community is River Pines, approximately 3 miles northeast of the property. The tasting room will be located on the east end of the property.

Site Characteristics

The property is 24.83 acres with agricultural uses including ten (10) acres of grapes. The project site occupies one (1) acre; the Tasting Room building will be approximately 2,250 sq. ft. with 912 sq. ft. allocated to the tasting area. Sewage disposal will be through a new septic system, and water will be supplied by well. The site is approximately at 1,839 ft. above sea level on the eastern portion of the property between two blocks of grapevines. There is an existing gravel driveway. Soil is composed of decomposed granite and clay loam intermixed with granite rocks. There is a large rocky
outcrop on the northeast part of the site which will be preserved. Mature walnut trees will also be persistent landscape features. The project site includes views of the surrounding vineyards on the property, neighboring vineyards, and forest as well as a view of Shenandoah Rd. There are no pre-existing structures, and appear to be no historical aspects of the site which is consistent with the findings included in the Cultural Resources Report conducted for this project.

**Land Use**

The existing zoning is “R1A,” or Single-Family Residential-Agriculture. The General Plan designation of the project is AG-Agricultural General. The site is currently occupied by one single-family residence and an existing winery with cattle grazing, and a 15 year-old olive orchard and vineyard. There is a pond near the rear (west) end of the property.

**Surrounding Land Uses**

The surrounding properties uses are agriculture, residential, and commercial-agricultural with access off of Shenandoah Rd. (county-maintained). Most of the development in the nearby vicinity is commercial agriculture buildings and wineries, and single-family residences. To the east of the project, is a single family residence and farm. The neighboring farm will be adjacent to the La Mesa Tasting Room and the residence further north. The property to the south of the project is largely undeveloped with a single family residence 0.2 miles and south of the project. Across Shenandoah Rd., the neighboring property includes an existing single family residence approximately 0.35 miles from the project site, vineyards, and a winery and tasting room.

**Access and Transport**

The project site is directly south of the county-maintained major collector Shenandoah Rd., with access onto the north end of the property through an existing encroachment onto Shenandoah. The existing driveway onto the site is gravel and currently utilized to load grapes at harvest into trucks. This project is anticipated to be relatively small-scale and introduce a small increase in traffic and will require a commercial encroachment onto Shenandoah Rd.

**PROBABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND SCOPE MND/MMRP**

The Initial Study will analyze a broad range of potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed project. Information will be drawn from the Amador County General Plan, technical information provided by the applicant to date, and any other reputable information pertinent to the project area.

In the case that through the initial study, it is determined that there will be significant, immunitable impacts, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) may be required prior to project approval. Consistent with CEQA and the requirements of Amador County, each environmental chapter will include an introduction, technical approach, environmental setting, regulatory setting, standards of significance, identification of environmental impacts, the development of mitigation measures and monitoring strategies, cumulative impacts and mitigation measures, and level of significance after mitigation measures.
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Figure C: General Plan Designation
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use / Planning
- Population / Housing
- Transportation / Traffic
- Wildfire
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services
- Utilities / Service Systems
- Air Quality
- Geology / Soils
- Hydrology / Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
- Tribal Cultural Resources

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of the initial evaluation:

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

Krista Ruesel, Planner
Amador County Planning Department

5/14/2020

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c) (3) (D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
   a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.
## Chapter 1. AESTHETICS - Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). Would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:**

A. **Scenic Vistas:** For the purposes of determining significance under CEQA, a scenic vista is defined as a viewpoint that provides expansive views of a highly valued landscape for the benefit of the general public. A substantial adverse impact to a scenic vista would be one that degrades the view from such a designated location. No governmentally designated scenic vista has been identified within the project area. In addition, no specific scenic view spot has been identified in the project area. Therefore, there is no impact.

B. **Scenic Highways:** The nearest scenic highway is Highway 88 east of the Dew Drop Ranger Station to the Alpine County Line as designated by Caltrans and the Amador County General Plan. The project is not located within the section of Highway 88 designated as a scenic highway or affected by the County's scenic highway overlay district. There is no impact.

C. **There are no officially designated scenic vistas in the project area, and it is unlikely that short-range views would be significantly affected by this project. This project is not foreseen to cause any significant change in the aesthetic quality of the property. The conversion of a utility building to a tasting room is not a major change in use, and the hours of operation will be Friday, Saturday, Sunday, and Monday from 11:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. with the maximum of 6 events per year with up to 100 guests. The proposed tasting room structure is 2,250 sq. ft. on a 24.83 acre lot, and is therefore relatively small. The tasting is expected to occupy 9.12 sq. ft. of the building's interior space. The additional uses proposed will not introduce any significant changes or additions to the physical landscape, therefore there is a less than significant impact.**

D. **Existing sources of light and glare are produced by the commercial agriculture uses of the property and along the roadways in the project vicinity. Additionally light would be also produced from the sparse residential properties. Current use of the property consists of commercial agriculture (vineyard and winery); the proposed project does not propose any additional lighting sources or change of existing fixtures beyond what is allowed by State Building Code and Amador County Code. Any future installed lighting would comply with any County Regulations for commercial lighting. There is a less than significant impact.**

**Mitigation Measure**

**AES-1** Any installed lighting accompanying the proposed use and development must comply with General Plan Mitigation Measure 4.1-4:

"To reduce impacts associated with light and glare, the County will require that new projects be conditioned to incorporate measures to reduce light and reflectance to the maximum extent practicable. Conditions may include, but are not limited to, the following:
• Exterior building materials on nonresidential structures shall be composed of a minimum 50% low reflectance, non-polished finishes.
• Bare metallic surfaces (e.g., pipes, vents, light fixtures) shall be painted or etched to minimize reflectance.
• Require public lighting in commercial, industrial, and residential areas to be of a type(s) that are shielded and downward directed, utilizing light sources that are the best available technology for eliminating light bleed and reflectance into surrounding areas to the maximum extent possible.
• Prohibit light fixtures that are of unusually high intensity or brightness or that blink or flash.
• Use automatic shutoffs or motion sensors for lighting features to further reduce excess nighttime light.

Source: Amador County Planning Department, Amador County General Plan and Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR).
## Chapter 2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 CA Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezing of, forest land (as defined in PRC §12220(g)), timberland (as defined in PRC §4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code § 51104(g))?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

**A. Farmland Conversion:** The project site is located in close proximity to areas classified as Grazing Land, Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Unique Farmland as determined by the USDA Department of Conservation (2016) and shown in Figure 4. The project site contains areas of Unique Farmland and Grazing Land. The existing winery buildings are located in the western half of the property, with the proposed tasting room to be located on the eastern end. The proposed project site is within a designated area of Unique Farmland. Wine tasting encourages agrotourism and is thus a complementary use of the existing winery. As the proposed uses included in this project do not detract from any agricultural uses of the property or of nearby properties, nor convert any agricultural areas to non-agricultural uses, there is a **less than significant impact**.

**B. Williamson Act Contract:** The project is not enrolled in any Williamson Act Contract under the California Land Conservation Act of 1965 nor are any adjacent properties. This property is not eligible for inclusion into a Williamson Act contract. There is **no impact** to agricultural uses or Williamson Act contracts.

**C. Zoning:** The area is not zoned for forest land or timberland nor utilized for forest land or timber production, therefore there is **no impact**.

**D. Zoning Classification:** The area is not considered forest land, or zoned as forest land or timberland, therefore there is **no impact**.

**E. Additional Use:** This project does not introduce any additional use or impact that would introduce significant changes to nearby property uses. The increase in commercial aspects of the existing agricultural use is secondary to the current uses. There is no significant impact to farmland or forest land through this project, therefore there is a **less than significant impact**.
Figure 2a: Important Farmland Map (2016)

Source: California Important Farmland: 1984-2016 Map, California Department of Conservation; Amador County General Plan; Amador County Planning Department; CA Public Resources Code, Amador County Agriculture Advisory Committee 2019.
Chapter 3. AIR QUALITY - Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard, result in substantial increase of any criteria pollutant, or substantially contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation under an applicable local, federal, or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in other emissions (example: Odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

A. There would be minimal increase in construction and emissions due to the proposed use of the utility building as a tasting room. Any construction or emissions would be in excess of existing standards established through the County’s air quality guidelines consistent with General Plan Mitigation Measure 4.3: Air Quality Standards, and any applicable state-established standards. The emissions due to the minor traffic to and from the property by visitors would not cause substantial increase over current traffic. Regarding emissions, there is a less than significant impact.

B. The proposed project would not generate an increase in operational or long-term emissions. The existing development climate of the area presents agritourism and commercial agricultural contexts, which are not substantially impacted by the addition of this tasting room. The project will not introduce any high-intensity uses or uses beyond what is allowed by the zoning designation of the parcel. Due to the relative small-scale and low-intensity of the project, it would not violate any air quality standards and or contribute to the net increase of PM10 or ozone in the region. The impacts are less than significant impact.

C. Sensitive receptors are uses that have an increased sensitivity to air pollution or environmental contaminants. Sensitive receptor locations include schools, parks and playgrounds, day care centers, nursing homes, hospitals, and residential dwelling units. The subject property is located approximately 3 miles from the unincorporated community of River Pines (to the northeast). The nearest incorporated city is Plymouth, located approximately five (5) miles to the southwest. Both River Pines and Plymouth, as well as the subject property, are located along Shenandoah Rd (E16) which is classified as a major collector. The project is 14.83 acres with no changes of use or uses-by-right presented through the project other than the tasting room additions and accompanying uses, as specified in the project application. Therefore, there would be no significant increase in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. There is a less than significant impact.

D. The proposed project consists of the use of an existing utility building (under construction as of January 2020) for wine tasting. This would not generate any significantly objectionable odors beyond that which is permitted under the existing zoning districts and due to the relatively large size of the parcel would not be discernable at property boundaries. There is a less than significant impact.

Source: Amador Air District, Amador County Planning Department, Amador County General Plan Mitigation Measure 4.3.
### Chapter 4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CA Dept. of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the CA Dept. of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:**

A. The Information for Planning and Consultation (IPAC) database provided through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service was reviewed to determine if any special status animal species or habitats occur on the project site or in the project area. The report generated specific to this project site is included as Appendix B. The National Marine Fisheries Service Habitat Conservation Map from NOAA did not identify any Habitat Areas of Particular Concern (HAPC) nor EFH Protected Areas within the project area. The Marine Fish and Wildlife Bios did not identify any State Marine Projected Areas (MPAs) Areas of Special Biological Significance. CDFW identified California Essential Habitat Connectivity (CEHC) areas of Natural Landscape and Natural Areas (small), NSNF(Northern Sierra Nevada Foothills region) Wildlife Linkages, and areas of "Irreplaceable and Essential Corridors" of Terrestrial Connectivity (ACE) in the project area. However, this due to the small scale of the project, there would be little impact to these areas. CDFW IPAC database identified potential habitat area for two listed threatened species, the California Red-legged Frog (*Rana draytonii*) and Delta Smelt (*Hypomesus transpacificus*) both of which have identified critical habitats according to the Federal Register (*r. draytonii*: March, 2010 and *h. transpacificus*: December, 1994). No endangered species were determined to be present in the project site and due to the existing level of development of the site, there are is a less than significant impact.

The California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants identified two plants found in Quad 038120e7(381257, Fiddletown) where the property is located, Brandegee's Clarkia (*Clarkia biloba ssp. brandgeae*) and Streambank Spring Beauty (*Claytonia parvifolia ssp. grandiflora*) and depicted in Figure 4a, below. CNDDDB Bios- NLCD Land
Cover (2011) identified areas of Developed Open Space, Deciduous Forest, Mixed Forest, Shrub/Scrub, and Herbaceous land cover classifications within the project area. Additionally, CNDDB Bios identified additional possible species in the quad where the project is located, referenced by Figure 5b. As the change in use and construction of the tasting room would not significantly impact these species due to the existing levels of site disturbance due to the ongoing agricultural activities, there is a less than significant impact.

B. Riverine Community: No riverine habitat or communities were identified by CDFW IPAC in the project site (Figure 4b), therefore the project does not require any 404 Streambed Alteration Permit or any other regulation pursuant to the Clean Water Act or other State/Federal statutes. There is a less than significant impact.

C. Federally Protected Wetlands: The project site includes no Federally Protected Wetlands subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act or other State/Federal statutes, according to the US Fish and Wildlife Service (See Figure 4b)(IPAC, BIOS). Therefore, there is no impact to federally protected wetlands.

D. Movement of Fish and Wildlife: The following migratory bird species could have potential habitat areas in the project site as identified by the US Fish and Wildlife Service (IPAC): California Spotted Owl (Strix occidentalis occidentalis), Common Yellowthroat (Geothlypis trichas sinuosa), Nuttall’s Woodpecker (Picoides nuttallii), Oak Titmouse (Baeolophus inornatus), Song Sparrow (Melospiza melodia), Spotted Towhee (Pipilo maculatus clementae), Wrentit (Chamaea fasciata), Yellow-billed Magpie (Pica nuttalli). All of these species are also listed on the USFWS Birds of Conservation Concern (BCC) list with the California Sotted Owl, Oak Titmouse, Wrentit, and Yellow-billed Magpie having ranges across of the Continental US. Delta Smelt (Hypomesus transpacificus) is an anadromous pelagic fish which migrates from the San Joaquin Delta and Suisun Bay estuaries upstream to spawn seasonally. As the project site is already developed for agricultural uses, there is a less than significant impact.

E. The proposed project would not conflict with local policies adopted for the protection biological resources. No impact would occur.

F. Amador County does not have an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans. No impact would result.

**Figure 4a: California Native Plant Society Database Query**

**Plant List**

2 matches found. Click on scientific name for details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Lifeform</th>
<th>Blooming Period</th>
<th>CA Rare Plant Rank</th>
<th>State Rank</th>
<th>Global Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarkia biloba ssp. brandegeae</td>
<td>Brandegee's clarkia</td>
<td>Onagraceae</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>May-Jul</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>G4G5T4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claytonia clarkica ssp. g ramiflora</td>
<td>streambank spring beauty</td>
<td>Montiaceae</td>
<td>annual herb</td>
<td>Feb-May</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>G5T3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested Citation

### Figure 4b: US Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wetlands Inventory

![Image of US Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wetlands Inventory]

La Mesa - National Wetlands Inventory

January 29, 2020

- **Wellness:**
  - Estuarine and Marine Deepwater
  - Estuarine and Marine Wetland
  - Freshwater Emergent Wetland
  - Freshwater Forested/Shrub Wetland
  - Freshwater Pond
  - Other
  - Riverine
  - Lake

The map is for general reference only. The US Fish and Wildlife Service is not responsible for the accuracy of the information. The data is shown in the map. All wetlands mapped data should be validated on the Wetlands Mapper web site.

### Figure 4c: CNDDDB BIOS Species List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNDDDB Quad Species List</th>
<th>9 records.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Element Code</th>
<th>Federal Status</th>
<th>State Status</th>
<th>bist 3612057</th>
<th>bist 3612057</th>
<th>bist 3612057</th>
<th>bist 3612057</th>
<th>bist 3612057</th>
<th>bist 3612057</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rana bergeri</td>
<td>American bullfrog</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rana catesbeiana</td>
<td>Eastern box turtle</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enys mazonica</td>
<td>Western pond turtle</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrocerca elegans</td>
<td>Central Valley Drainage: Mainstem</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clatonia paivai</td>
<td>Vernal pool plantain</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clatonia paivai</td>
<td>Vernal pool plantain</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enisearia bipinnata</td>
<td>Yellow-crowned night heron</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phlox paivai</td>
<td>Vernal pool phlox</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jepsonia helenae</td>
<td>Jepson's helenae</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td>3612057</td>
<td>Mapped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Source:
California Department of Fish and Wildlife BIOS, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service IPAC, California Native Plant Society (CNPS), California Department of Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Planning, Migratory Bird Treaty Act, NOAA, National Wetlands Inventory, Amador County Planning Department.
## Chapter 5. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

(A) (B) (C) (D)

Cultural resources include prehistoric and historic period archaeological sites; historical features, such as rock walls, water ditches and flumes, and cemeteries; and architectural features. Cultural resources consist of any human-made site, object (i.e., artifact), or feature that defines and illuminates our past. Prehistoric resources sites are found in foothill areas, areas with high bluffs, rock outcroppings, areas overlooking deer migratory corridors, or above bodies of water. Grading and other soil disturbance activities on the project site have the potential to uncover historic or prehistoric cultural resources. There is no ground disturbing or construction activity presented through this project. In the case that any ground disturbing or construction activity is proposed in the future, additional environmental review would be necessary including but not limited to requiring the developer to halt construction upon the discovery of as-yet undiscovered significant prehistoric sites, documenting and/or avoiding these resources, informing the County Planning Department, and consultation with a professional archeologist.

Discretionary permits for projects “that could have significant adverse impacts to prehistoric or historic-era archeological resources” in areas designated by the Amador County General Plan as being moderate-to-high cultural resource sensitivity are required to have a Cultural Resource Study prepared prior to project approval, per Mitigation Measures 4.5-1a, 4.5-1b, and 4.5-2 of the Amador County Implementation Plan. The Cultural Resource Study conducted for this project did not identify any cultural resources significantly affected by this project. This study included review of historical maps, aerial imagery, record search of the Northern California Information Center (NCIC) of the California Historic Resource Inventory System (CHRIS), and a pedestrian survey. If any cultural resources are identified over the course of this project, project applicant and/or property owner must contact the applicable authority and additional mitigations maybe required. There is a less than significant impact to cultural resources.

### Mitigation Measures

**CULTR-1**

During ground-disturbing activity, if paleontological, historic or pre-historic resources such as chipped or ground stone, fossil-bearing rock, large quantities of shell, historic debris, building foundations, or human bone are inadvertently discovered, the operator/permittee shall immediately cease all such activities within 100 feet of the find and notify the applicable agency. A qualified archaeologist shall be contracted by the operator/permittee to assess the significance of the find and prepare an evaluation, avoidance or mitigation plan, as appropriate, which shall be implemented before resuming ground disturbing activities.
CULTR-2

Immediately cease any disturbance of the area where such suspected remains are discovered and any nearby areas reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the Amador County Coroner is Amador County General Plan FEIR AECOM County of Amador 4.5-15 Cultural Resources contacted, per Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. The coroner shall, within two working days:

Determine if an investigation of cause of death is required;

1. Determine if the remains are most likely that of Native American origin, and if so suspected, the coroner shall notify the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours of making his or her determination.

2. The descendants of the deceased Native Americans shall make a recommendation to the operator/permittee for the means of handling the remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.98.

3. The NAHC shall immediately notify those persons it believes to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American.

4. The descendants may, with the permission of the landowner or their representative, inspect the site of the discovered Native American remains and may recommend possible treatment or disposition within 24 hours of their notification.

5. Whenever the NAHC is unable to identify a descendent, or the descendent identified fails to make a recommendation, or the landowner or his or her authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendent and the mediators provided for in subdivision (k) of PRC Section 5097.94 fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner, the landowner or his or her authorized representative shall reinter the human remains and items associated with Native American burials with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.

### Chapter 6. ENERGY – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:**

A. Any related construction and operation of the project would follow industry standard best management practices to reduce impact of energy waste. The project is relatively small and would not result in significant environmental impact due to energy resource management. There is no project construction or operational changes, therefore there is **no impact**.

B. The only local energy plan is the Energy Action Plan which provides incentives for homeowners and business owners to invest in higher-efficiency energy services. The project would not conflict with or obstruct any state or local plan for energy management, therefore there is **no impact**.

**Sources:** Amador County Planning Department.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geological 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geological site or feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:**

**Ai.** The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and no active faults are located on or adjacent to the property, as identified by the U.S. Geologic Survey mapping system. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

**Ai-iv** The State Geologist has determined there are no known sufficiently active or well-defined faults or areas subject to strong ground shaking, liquefaction, landslides, or other ground failure in Amador County as to constitute a potential hazard to structures from surface faulting or fault creep. The project location has not been evaluated for liquefaction hazards or seismic landslide hazards by the California Geological Survey. There is **no impact**.

**B.** Grading Permits are required for any earthmoving of 50 or more cubic yards, and are reviewed and approved by the County in accordance with Ordinance 1619 (County Code 15.40) with conditions/requirements applied to minimize potential erosion. As the grading and construction with this project is according to development standards as determined by the Amador County Community Development Agency and Building Department, there is a **less than significant impact**.

**C.** This project will not impact the stability of existing geological units or soil, nor impact potential landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. The required issuance of a grading permit and small-scale of the project supports **no impact** of this project on the aforementioned conditions.

**D.** According to the project location as mapped in *Figure 8* by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS, 2017), the project site is located on a two different soil types including Rock land, Sierra Coarse Sandy Loam, moderately deep, 9-16%
slopes, eroded, and Sierra very rocky coarse sandy loam, 16-31% slopes. None of these soil types have a high clay content, therefore, the proposed project would not be located on expansive soil, and there is no impact.

E. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 addresses certification of existing wastewater services in the context of operational use and peak events. The impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

G. The proposed project and its operation would not destroy or greatly impact any known unique geological site or feature. The project site is previously disturbed with the majority of the site occupied by agricultural land (vineyards) or developed. There is no impact.

Mitigation Measure:

GEO-1 Prior to activation of the Use Permit the applicant must submit a certification by a qualified consultant stating that the on-site sewage system has been completed and is sufficient to serve the intended use. The certification may include recommendations for provision of chemical toilets to accommodate peak events.

Figure 7a: Soil Map Legend

MAP INFORMATION

The soil surveys that comprise your AOI were mapped at 1:20,000.

Warning: Soil Map may not be valid at this scale. Enlargement of maps beyond the scale of mapping can cause misunderstanding of the detail of mapping and accuracy of soil type placement. The maps do not show the small areas of contrasting soils that could have been shown at a more detailed scale.

Please rely on the bar scale on each map sheet for map measurements.

Source of Map: Natural Resources Conservation Service
Web Soil Survey URL: Coordinate System: Web Mercator (EPSG:3857)
Maps from the Web Soil Survey are based on the Web Mercator projection, which preserves direction and shape but distorts distance and area. A projection that preserves area, such as the Albers equal-area conic projection, should be used if more accurate calculations of distance or area are required.
This product is generated from the USDA-NRCS certified data as of the version date(s) listed below:
Soil Survey Area: Amador Area, California
Survey Area Data: Version 12, Sep 15, 2019
Soil map units are labeled (as space allows) for map scales 1:50,000 or larger.
Date(s) aerial images were photographed: Dec 31, 2009—Nov 6, 2017.
The orthophoto or other base map on which the soil lines were compiled and digitized probably differs from the background imagery displayed on these maps. As a result, some minor shifting of map unit boundaries may be evident.
Figure 7b: Soil Map

Figure 7c: Soil Map Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Unit Symbol</th>
<th>Map Unit Name</th>
<th>Acres in AOI</th>
<th>Percent of AOI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ro</td>
<td>Rock land</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHC2</td>
<td>Sierra coarse sandy loam, moderately deep, 9 to 10 percent slopes, eroded</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SkD</td>
<td>Sierra very rocky coarse sandy loam, 10 to 31 percent slopes</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals for Area of Interest: 24.5 | 100.0%

Sources: Soil Survey-Amador County; Amador County Planning Department, Environmental Health Department, National Cooperative Soil Survey, Amador County General Plan EIR, California Geologic Survey: Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones Maps.
## Chapter 8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

A. This project is not expected to generate substantial increase in emissions. Construction activities would cause a temporary increase in emissions but no other emissions would be associated with the operation of the proposed project. Therefore, the project would not generate significant greenhouse gas emissions or result in significant global climate change impacts. There is a **less than significant impact**.

B. There is no applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Therefore there is **no impact**.

### Sources:
Amador County General Plan, Amador County Municipal Codes, Assembly Bill 32 Scoping Plan- California Air Resources Board (ARB).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

A. **Hazardous Materials Transport and Handling**: The project does not significantly increase risk to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. **The impact is less than significant.**

B. **Hazardous Materials Upset and Release**: The project will enable winetasting and associated uses which would increase the numbers of persons in proximity to agricultural and processing operations. **Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 addresses potential for significant public or environmental hazards due to upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment is mitigated by oversight of the use of herbicides or pesticides and handling of hazardous materials and wastes by the Amador County Agricultural Commissioner and the Amador County Environmental Health department pursuant to state law. The impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.**

C. Schools would not be exposed to hazardous materials, substances, or waste due to the project, and there would be no impact.

D. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, the project site was queried for past-to-current records regarding information collected, compiled, and updated by the Department of Toxic Substances Control and Secretary for Environmental Protection (EPA) evaluating sites meeting the "Cortese List" requirements. Neither the project site nor the surrounding area (4 mile radius) appears on the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) GeoTracker for potential
contamination therefore there is no indication that there is any outstanding violation regarding the permitted underground fuel storage tanks. Neither the project site nor nearby locations appeared on the California EPA’s Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS) database, the US EPA Facility Registry Service (FRS), or the Department of Toxic Substances Control’s EnviroStor database for cleanup sites and hazardous waste permitted facilities. As the project does not propose any significant changes in use, intensity, or major construction, there is no impact regarding hazardous materials on or near the project site.

E No public use airports have been identified to be located within the vicinity of the project site. The nearest public use airport is Westover Field Airport, located in Martell and more than 15 miles from the project site. The proposed project is located outside the safety compatibility zones for the area airports, and therefore, would have no impact to people working on the project site.

F No known private airstrips have been identified near to the project site. As a result, no impact to safety hazards associated with airport operations are anticipated to affect people working or residing within the project site.

G The proposed project is located directly off of Shenandoah Rd. Amador County has an adopted Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP), Updated in January of 2014. The proposed project does not include any actions that physically interfere with any emergency response or emergency evacuation plans. Development of the proposed project would add a small amount of trips onto the area roadways; however, area roadways and intersections would continue to operate at an acceptable level of service so there would be a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measure:

HAZ-1 Hazardous Materials Upset and Release: Prior to activation of the use permit, the applicant shall provide documentation to the Amador County Environmental Health Department that the site is in full compliance with the requirements of the Unified Program regarding hazardous materials business plan requirements, hazardous waste generation, treatment or storage, aboveground petroleum storage, and underground tanks. If a hazardous materials business plan is required, the emergency response portion shall include a plan for the evacuation of visitors in the event of a hazardous materials incident. The applicant shall substantially comply with all requirements of the Unified Program throughout the life of the Use Permit.

Sources: Amador County Planning Department, Superfund Enterprise Management System database (SEMS), Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor database, Geotracker, California State Water Control Board (CA SWRBC), California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA), Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 or 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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Impede or redirect flood flows or place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) In a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation or increase risk of such inundation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

A The proposed project would not significantly increase the impermeable surfaces on-site, nor result in an increase in urban storm water runoff. There are no additional uses of the property introduced through this project that would violate water quality standards. There is a less than significant impact.
The proposed project would not significantly require the use of, or otherwise interfere with, available groundwater supplies. Future development would be subject to review by applicable county agencies to verify capacity and potential environmental effects. There is a less than significant impact.

The proposed project is not projected to significantly contribute to any increase in erosion, siltation, surface runoff, or redirection of flood flows. Future development could have potential impacts which would be reviewed at time of application to the County, which would consider specific parameters with regards to the project scope. The project site is located in a Flood Zone X meaning that the site is outside of the Standard Flood Height Elevation and of minimal flood hazard. Future development in this zone would not necessitate a Flood Plain Study to be conducted by a licensed professional prior to project development. There will be no significant site disturbance, and alteration of absorption rates or drainage patterns introduced through this project. There is a less than significant impact.

The project would not contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. There is no impact.

The proposed project does not involve the construction of housing on the property. The project site falls within Zone X flood map as mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (2010). No impact would result with respect to placing housing within a 100-year flood hazard area for this project.

The project site has an approximate elevation of approximately 2,000 ft. above sea level. The site is not in close proximity to any large bodies of water or significant drainage paths therefore not be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. There is no known risk mapped on the California Department of Conservation CGS Information Warehouse regarding landslides. Therefore no impact to flood flows would occur.

The project would not substantially degrade water quality through its operation. Conditions of additional project approval include submission of plans to the Amador County Environmental Health Department, therefore there are no impacts on water quality.

The project will not expose significant risk of loss, injury, or death to people or structures through placement or location near a levee or dam. There is a small body of water to the north (not on the subject property), though it is not large enough to constitute substantial risk for property or people through the failure of levees or dams, therefore there is no impact regarding risk or loss.

There is no existing water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan in the vicinity of this project. No impact would result.

Sources: Amador County Planning Department, California State Water Resources Control Board (CSWRCB), California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA). CA Department of Conservation, USGS-USDA Forest Service Quad Map, USGS Landslide Hazards Program, CA Department of Conservation CGS Information Warehouse.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 11. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

A  The project site is located along Shenandoah Rd. with road frontage on the northern property border. The unincorporated community of River Pines is located approximately three miles northeast of the project site. The subject parcel is currently utilized for agricultural uses. Surrounding land uses consist of agricultural uses and residential properties, with Shenandoah Rd. a dominant feature of the landscape and community. The proposed project would not divide an established community and is consistent with the General Plan's General Agricultural (AG) land use designation of the Shenandoah Valley. There is **no impact**.

B  The project presents the additional use of a tasting room in a "R1A" zoned property. This does not divide the property or change the residential density classifications of the parcel, nor does the presented project change the uses allowed by right or conditional uses, product of the zoning designation of the property. Section 19.24.045 of Amador County Code lists a wine-tasting room as an allowed conditional use of an "R1A" property, subject to a use permit. The General Plan designation of the property is AG - Agricultural General, which is consistent with the existing and proposed uses of the property. The project proposes one additional building for the tasting room, and all other structures on site are preexisting and will not observe any significant change of use through this project, therefore there is a **less than significant impact**.

C  The project site is not included in any adopted habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any such plans and **no impact** would result.

**Sources:** Amador County General Plan, Amador County Municipal Codes, Amador County Planning Department.
**Chapter 12. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:**

A & B According to the California Division of Mines and Geology Mineral Land Classification Map, this project is located in the Placerville 15-Minute Quadrangle. The proposed project would not use or extract any mineral or energy resources and would not restrict access to known mineral resource areas. There is no impact.

Source: Amador County Planning Department, California Geological Survey, USGS.
# Chapter 13. NOISE - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Contribute to substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Contribute to substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:**

A Uses associated with this project would not create a significant increase in ambient noise levels within or in proximity to the project site. There are commercial operations which take place on this property and produced a low-level of operational noise. Consistent with County Code Section 19.24.045(D)(4b) and consequently 19.24.040(A)(27e)(viii) any indoor or outdoor amplified music will be shut off at or before 10:00 p.m. and also be limited to the hours of operation specified in the Use Permit and described in Mitigation Measure NOI-2. Due to the preexisting conditions and uses-by-right permitted through the site’s existing zoning designation, there would be no additional noise produced which would significantly affect surrounding properties. There is a less than significant impact with mitigations incorporated.

B The proposed project would not include the development of land uses that would generate substantial ground-borne vibration, noise, or use construction activities that would have such effects for any extended period of time. There are no proposed structures whose construction necessitate the use of heavy equipment for an extended period of time. Any additional small-scale construction would be regulated by Mitigation Measure NOI-1. The existing site-conditions of the parcel, zoning setbacks, and surrounding context of the site ensure that there is a less than significant impact with mitigations incorporated.

C & D The presented project will not introduce significant increased noise in addition to current operational noise with the implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1 and NOI-2. Noise levels generated would not exceed applicable noise standards established in the General Plan. Noise activities related to the project would not introduce significant increase and shall not significantly affect offsite residences. Any amplified music or sounds product of the limited events on the property would be shut off at or before 10:00 p.m. as designated by County Code, and consistent with the General Plan Noise Element and Mitigation Measure NOI-2. There is a less than significant impact with mitigations incorporated.

E & F The nearest airport is over 15.8 miles away (Westover Field Airport, Martell). No impact would result.
Mitigation Measures:

NOI-1 Construction activity and ground borne vibrations: Consistent with General Plan Mitigation Measure 4.11, all construction equipment shall be properly maintained per manufacturers' specifications and fitted with the best available noise suppression devices (e.g., mufflers, silencers, wraps); all impact tools will be shrouded or shielded; and all intake and exhaust ports on power equipment will be muffled or shielded. All equipment employed during the project shall maintain appropriate setback distances from residences to reduce vibration levels below the recommended FTA and Caltrans guidelines. Noise levels generated by the project shall not exceed 65 decibels at the nearest property line.

NOI-2 Amplified Music: Consistent with County Code Section 19.24.045(D) (4b) and 19.24.040(A) (27e) (viii), any indoor or outdoor amplified music will be shut off at or before 10:00 p.m. and also be limited to the hours of operation specified in the Use Permit.

Sources: Amador County Planning Department, Amador County General Plan: Noise Element, General Plan Mitigation Measure 4.11.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 14. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:**

A  The proposed project site is currently occupied by vineyards and a winery. The proposed tasting room would increase visitation to the property however, there is no housing displaced through this project. The introduced use would not remove the capability of the lot to support the single-family dwellings as allowed by the property's zoning classification of "R1A," Single-family Residential-agriculture. There is **no impact**.

B & C  The existing uses of the property would not be negatively affected in any measurable way and no resident housing stock would be depleted through this project. There is **no impact** to available resident housing.

**Sources:** Amador County Planning Department.
Chapter 15. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) 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:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Fire protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Police protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Parks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

A The project site is currently served by the Amador Fire Protection District. The nearest fire station belongs to CalFire and is located in River Pines, approximately 2.8 miles east of the project site. Mutual aid agreements coordinate protection service between AFPD, Community Fire Protection Jurisdictions, and CalFire. Per County Code Section 17.14.020 the project is required to be annexed into Community Facilities No. 2006-1, but this would not result in the provision of or need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. The condition of Mitigation Measure PUB-1 ensures that a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated related to fire protection services would occur.

B The project site is currently served by the Amador County Sheriff's Department. The nearest Sheriff station is located at 700 Court St., Jackson, which serves the unincorporated area of the County. Proposed improvements would not result in additional demand for sheriff protection services. As such, this project would not result in the provision of or need for new or physically altered sheriff protection facilities. There is a less than significant impact to police protection services.

C&D This project does not include any construction of additional residential units. Because the demand for schools, parks, and other public facilities is driven by population, the proposed wine tasting room would not increase demand for those services at this time as the property is not going to experience any change in zoning or general plan designation. As such, the proposed project would result in no impact on these public services.

E Potential future development of residences could increase impacts on public facilities, which would be addressed through the project application process through the County Community Development Agency. There is a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

PUB-1 AFPD requires that this project annex into the County's Community Facilities District No. 2006-1 as a condition of this Use Permit.

Sources: Amador County Planning Department, AFPD.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 16. RECREATION – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:**

A&B The proposed project would not increase opportunity for residential development. The addition of a tasting room would not generate population that would increase demand for parks or recreational facilities. The proposed project would not affect use of existing facilities, nor would it require the construction or expansion of existing recreational facilities at this time. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on recreational facilities.

**Source:** Amador County Planning Department.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 17. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC - Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measure 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines §15064.3, subdivision (b)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:**

**A & B** The proposed project would not cause a substantial increase in traffic, reduce the existing level of service, or create any significant congestion at any intersections. The proposed project would require periodic maintenance that is not likely to exceed current demand. Existing level of service standards would not be exceeded and the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. Caltrans, Amador County Department of Transportation and Public Works, and other applicable transportation agencies have been included in circulation of this project. There would be **less than significant impact**.

**C** The proposed project would not be located within any Westover Airport safety zones (Westover Field Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Draft 2017). Therefore, the project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that would result in a safety risk. **No impact** would result.

**D** The proposed project would potentially result in minor increases to the current level of traffic traveling into and out from the existing driveway however the impact shall not be significant enough to necessitate additional mitigation other than Mitigation Measure TRA-1. There would be **less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated**.

**E** The proposed project must comply with the Fire and Life Safety Ordinance (Chapter 15.30) with mitigation measure TRA-1. There is **less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated**.
The project would not affect alternative transportation. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with the policies, plans, and programs supporting alternative transportation, and there would be less than significant impact.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.3, subdivision (b) the County’s qualitative analysis of this project establishes the impacts to traffic less than significant. There is a less than significant impact to the implementation of this project with respects to CEQA Guidelines §15064.3(b).

Mitigation Measures:

TRA-1 The proposed project must comply with the Fire and Life Safety Ordinance (Chapter 15.30).

Sources: Amador County Planning, California Fire and Life Safety (Chapter 15.30), California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines 2019.
### Chapter 18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|
| a) | | | | | Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: |
| i. | | | | | Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)? |
| ii. | | | | | A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe? |

**Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:**

Tribal cultural resources” are defined as (1) Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:

(A) Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources.
(B) Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1.

These may include non-unique archaeological resources previously subject to limited review under CEQA. Assembly Bill 52, which became effective in July 2015, requires the lead agency (in this case, Amador County) to begin consultation with any California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report if: (1) the California Native American tribe requested to the lead agency, in writing, to be informed by the lead agency through formal notification of proposed projects in the geographic area that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the tribe, and (2) the California Native American tribe responds, in writing, within 30 days of receipt of the formal notification and requests the consultation (Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1[b]).

A As defined by Public Resources Code section 21074 (a) there were no tribal cultural resources identified in the project area therefore the project would not cause a substantial adverse change in any identified tribal cultural resources. Additionally, the Ione Band of Miwok Indians, the Buena Vista Band of Me-Wuk Indians, the Shingle Springs Band of Miwuk Indians, and the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California were notified of this project proposal and did not submit materials referencing tribal cultural resources affected by this project. Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources on this site are less than significant.

**Sources:** Amador County Planning Department, California Public Resources Code; National Park Service National Register of Historic Places.
### Chapter 19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentialy Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded systems (causing significant environmental effects):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Water or wastewater treatment facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Stormwater drainage facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Electric power facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Natural gas facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Telecommunications facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources (for the reasonably foreseeable future during normal, dry, or multiple dry years), or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs while not otherwise impairing the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

A i. The project does not demand substantially more water than uses allowed by right. Construction of onsite wastewater and water supply systems will occur on a scale comparable to those serving a single family dwelling. There is no substantial construction or operational changes through this project therefore there is no requirement of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Permit (SWPPP) from State Water Resources Control Board. The impacts are **less than significant**.

A ii. With the addition of the structure for the tasting room, it is unlikely that the stormwater drainage on site will need to be redirected or expanded however, any changes to grading or drainage necessitating a grading plan will require submission to the Amador County Building Department. There is a **less than significant impact**.

Aiii-v. No new or expanded stormwater or drainage facility, electric power facility, natural gas facility, or telecommunications facility would be necessary over the course of this project and therefore would not cause any environmental effects as a result. There is a **less than significant impact**.
B. The proposed project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board or result in the expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, no impact related to these utilities and service systems would occur.

C. The project is not located within the service area of an existing public water system. The project will make water available to at least 25 persons, 60 days per year, therefor constituting a public water system, requiring a permit. As Public Water Systems shall be permitted and regulated by the Environmental Department, therefore the impact is less than significant.

D. The project is not located within the service area of a wastewater treatment provider. Therefor there is no impact.

E-G The project will not introduce an increase in solid waste disposal needs beyond what would be addressed by County Code requirements therefore, there is a less than significant impact, on landfills and solid waste disposal or solid waste reduction goals.

Sources: Amador County Planning Department, Amador County Environmental Health Department.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 20. WILDFIRE</th>
<th>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:**

A The project shall not impair any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. There is **no significant impact**.

B The project does not exacerbate wildfire risks through change in slope, prevailing winds, or other major factors. There is no projected significant increase in project occupants over what accompanies the use-by-right of the residential and agricultural uses and zoning of the site, nor would the project require the installation of emergency services and infrastructure that may result in temporary or ongoing environmental risks or increase in fire risk. There is a **less than significant impact**.

C The project shall not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or impact the environment. Therefore there is a **less than significant impact**.

D&E The project will not expose people or structure to any new significant risks regarding flooding, landslides, or wildland fire risk. The project is located in a Moderate Fire Risk Zone (**Figure 7: Calfire Fire Hazard Severity Zones**) and therefore, shall conform to all standard Fire Safety Regulations as determined by Amador County Fire Department and California Building Code. The project is located approximately 2.8 miles from the Calfire Station in River Pines, and therefore will not require any increased fire protection due to this project. There is **no impact**.
Figure 20a: Calfire Fire Hazard Severity Zones
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La Mesa Vineyards Tasting Room in R1A

Source: Amador County Planning, Amador County Office of Emergency Services, Calfire Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively are considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; 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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:**

The project will not degrade the quality of the environment and no habitat, wildlife populations, and plant and animal communities would be significantly impacted by this project. All environmental topics are either considered to have "No Impact," "Less Than Significant Impact," or "Less than Significant Impacts with Mitigation Incorporated."

Mitigation measures include:

**AES-1** Any lighting installations must be compliant with County regulation, and be conditioned to incorporate measures to reduce light and reflectance pursuant to Amador County General Plan Mitigation Measure 4.1-4 (Aesthetics);

**CULTR-1** During ground-disturbing activity, if paleontological, historic or pre-historic resources are identified, the applicant/permittee shall notify the applicable agency. A qualified archaeologist shall be contracted by the operator/permittee to assess the significance of the find and prepare an evaluation, avoidance or mitigation plan, as appropriate, which shall be implemented before resuming ground disturbing activities.

**CULTR-2** During ground-disturbing activity, if human remains are found/identified, the applicant/permittee shall notify the applicable agency. This may require that a qualified archaeologist shall be contracted by the operator/permittee to assess the significance of the find and prepare an evaluation, avoidance or mitigation plan, as appropriate, which shall be implemented before resuming ground disturbing activities.

**GEO-1** Prior to activation of the Use Permit the applicant must submit a certification by a qualified consultant stating that the on-site sewage system has been completed and is sufficient to serve the intended use. The certification may include recommendations for provision of chemical toilets to accommodate peak events (Geology and Soils);
HAZ-1  Prior to activation of the use permit, the applicant shall provide documentation to the Amador County Environmental Health Department that the site is in full compliance with the requirements of the Unified Program regarding hazardous materials business plan requirements, hazardous waste generation, treatment or storage, aboveground petroleum storage, and underground tanks. If a hazardous materials business plan is required, the emergency response portion shall include a plan for the evacuation of visitors in the event of a hazardous materials incident. The applicant shall substantially comply with all requirements of the Unified Program throughout the life of the Use Permit (Hazardous Materials);

NOI-1  Construction activity and groundborne vibrations will be maintained and operated per manufacturers' specifications and industry-standard Best Management Practices pursuant to General Plan Mitigation Measure 4.11 (Noise);

NOI-2  Amplified Music: Consistent with County Code Section 19.24.045(D)(4b) and 19.24.040(A)(27e)(viii), any indoor or outdoor amplified music will be shut off at or before 10:00 p.m. and also be limited to the hours of operation specified in the Use Permit (Noise);

PUB-1  AFPD Fire Services requires that this project annex into the County's Community Facilities District No. 2006-1 as a condition of approval for the final map (Fire Protection, Public Services);

TRA-1  The proposed project must comply with Fire and Life Safety Ordinance (Chapter 15.30 of Amador County Code) (Transportation and Traffic);  

B  No past, current, or probable future projects were identified in the project vicinity that, when added to project-related impacts, would result in cumulatively considerable impacts. No cumulatively considerable impacts would occur with development of the proposed project. As discussed in the analyses provided in this Initial Study, project impacts were found to be less than significant with mitigations incorporated. The effects of the proposed project are not cumulatively significant when viewed in context of the past, current, and or probable future projects. No cumulative impacts would be occur. The intent of the project to expand the allowable uses of the property to include a Tasting Room. The proposed project is not inconsistent with the Amador County General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

C  There have been no impacts discovered through the review of this application demonstrating that there would be substantial adverse effects on human beings directly or indirectly relating the project. Additionally due to the low-intensity nature of the project, relative small-scale impacts of construction, grading, or changes in use, existing and future conditions of the site and surrounding area, and traffic along State Shenandoah Rd., there is a less than significant impact with mitigation.

Sources: Chapters 1 through 21 of this Initial Study.

References: Amador County General Plan; Amador County General Plan EIR; Amador Air District; Amador County Municipal Codes; Fish & Wildlife's IPAC and BIOS databases; Migratory Bird Treaty Act; California Native Plant Society; California Air Resources Board; California Department of Conservation; Migratory Bird Treaty Act; California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection; California Geologic Survey: Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones; State Department of Mines & Geology; Superfund Enterprise Management System Database (SEMS); Department of Toxic Substances Control Envirostor Database; Geotracker; Amador County GIS; Amador County Zoning Map; Amador County Municipal Codes; Amador County Soil Survey; California Native American Heritage Commission; Amador Fire Protection District; California Air Resources Board (ARB); California State Water Resources Control Board (CSWRCB); California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA); California Environmental Quality Act 2019 Guidelines (CEQA); California Public Resources Board; Caltrans District 10 Office of Rural Planning; Amador County Important Farmland Map, 2016; Commenting Department and Agencies; Beckett Archeological Consulting - La Mesa Cultural Resources Report (2020); Amador County Community Development Agency and Departments. All sources cited herein are available in the public domain, and are hereby incorporated by reference.