DocuSign Envelope ID: 5726D706-711D-43C7-B7C6-6DA3F194FCAA

State of California – Natural Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
North Central Region
1701 Nimbus Road, Suite A
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670-4599
916-358-2900
www.wildlife.ca.gov

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor
CHARLTON H. BONHAM, Director

February 3, 2022

Shirlee Herrington
Environmental Coordination Services
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603
cdraecs@placer.ca.gov

Subject: NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT 8 WINERY
SCH# 2022010188

Dear Ms. Herrington:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) received and reviewed the Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) from the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency for the Project 8 Winery Project (Project) in Placer County pursuant the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) statute and guidelines.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and recommendations regarding those activities involved in the Project that may affect California fish, wildlife, plants, and their habitats. Likewise, we appreciate the opportunity to provide comments regarding those aspects of the Project that CDFW, by law, may need to exercise its own regulatory authority under the Fish and Game Code (Fish & G. Code).

CDFW ROLE

CDFW is California's Trustee Agency for fish and wildlife resources and holds those resources in trust by statute for all the people of the State (Fish & G. Code, §§ 711.7, subd. (a) & 1802; Pub. Resources Code, § 21070; CEQA Guidelines § 15386, subd. (a).). CDFW, in its trustee capacity, has jurisdiction over the conservation, protection, and management of fish, wildlife, native plants, and habitat necessary for biologically sustainable populations of those species (*Id.*, § 1802.). Similarly, for purposes of CEQA, CDFW provides, as available, biological expertise during public agency environmental review efforts, focusing specifically on projects and related activities that have the potential to adversely affect fish and wildlife resources.

CDFW may also act as a Responsible Agency under CEQA. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21069; CEQA Guidelines, § 15381.) CDFW expects that it may need to exercise regulatory authority as provided by the Fish and Game Code. As proposed, for example, the Project may be subject to CDFW's lake and streambed alteration

DocuSign Envelope ID: 5726D706-711D-43C7-B7C6-6DA3F194FCAA

regulatory authority. (Fish & G. Code, § 1600 et seq.) Likewise, to the extent implementation of the Project as proposed may result in "take" as defined by State law of any species protected under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) (Fish & G. Code, § 2050 et seq.), the Project proponent may seek related take authorization as provided by the Fish and Game Code.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

The Project site is located at 7615 Callison Road in the community of Penryn, within unincorporated Placer County. The proposed Project would be located on portions of several parcels consisting of Assessor's Parcel Numbers [APNs] 031-220-061, 032-124-080, and 032-124-044, totaling 44.14 acres. The proposed Project site, or improvement area, consists of approximately 18 acres of the 44.14-acre parcel area.

The proposed Project would develop a full production winery, generally including wine production facilities, a tasting room, an underground wine cave, an accessory restaurant, and associated facilities on approximately 17.96 acres of the 44.14-acre parcel area. Above-ground structures would primarily consist of a 75-foot tall, 29,250-square-foot (sf) octagon building on the northern hillside of the Project site, and a 23,500-sf processing/warehouse building to the south of the octagon building. In addition, a 72-stall minimum parking lot would be developed east of the octagon building, and a 19-stall minimum parking lot would be developed to the west of the processing building. Other on-site development would include a 180-sf guard shack and a 900-sf outdoor utility pad. The proposed Project would include a new driveway encroachment into the site from Callison Road. The new gated, private driveway would begin at Callison Road and wind up the hillside, connecting to the processing building and octagon building, before ending at the parking lot east of the octagon building.

The Project description in the EIR should include the whole action as defined in the CEQA Guidelines § 15378 and should include appropriate detailed exhibits disclosing the Project area including temporary impacted areas such as equipment stage area, spoils areas, adjacent infrastructure development, staging areas and access and haul roads if applicable.

As required by § 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines, the EIR should include an appropriate range of reasonable and feasible alternatives that would attain most of the basic Project objectives and avoid or minimize significant impacts to resources under CDFW's jurisdiction.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CDFW offers the comments and recommendations presented below to assist Placer County in adequately identifying and/or mitigating the Project's significant, or potentially significant, impacts on biological resources. The comments and recommendations are also offered to enable CDFW to adequately review and comment on the proposed Project with respect to impacts on biological resources. CDFW recommends that the forthcoming EIR address the following:

DocuSign Envelope ID: 5726D706-711D-43C7-B7C6-6DA3F194FCAA

Assessment of Biological Resources

Section 15125(c) of the CEQA Guidelines states that knowledge of the regional setting of a project is critical to the assessment of environmental impacts and that special emphasis should be placed on environmental resources that are rare or unique to the region. To enable CDFW staff to adequately review and comment on the Project, the EIR should include a complete assessment of the flora and fauna within and adjacent to the Project footprint, with emphasis on identifying rare, threatened, endangered, and other sensitive species and their associated habitats. CDFW recommends that the EIR specifically include:

1. An assessment of all habitat types located within the Project footprint, and a map that identifies the location of each habitat type. CDFW recommends that floristic, alliance- and/or association-based mapping and assessment be completed following *The Manual of California Vegetation*, second edition (Sawyer 2009). Adjoining habitat areas should also be included in this assessment where site activities could lead to direct or indirect impacts offsite. Habitat mapping at the alliance level will help establish baseline vegetation conditions.

2. A general biological inventory of the fish, amphibian, reptile, bird, and mammal species that are present or have the potential to be present within each habitat type onsite and within adjacent areas that could be affected by the Project. CDFW recommends that the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), as well as previous studies performed in the area, be consulted to assess the potential presence of sensitive species and habitats. A nine United States Geologic Survey 7.5-minute quadrangle search is recommended to determine what may occur in the region, larger if the Project area extends past one quad (see *Data Use Guidelines* on the Department webpage www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB/Maps-and-Data). Please review the webpage for information on how to access the database to obtain current information on any previously reported sensitive species and habitat, including Significant Natural Areas identified under Chapter 12 of the Fish and Game Code, in the vicinity of the Project. CDFW recommends that CNDDB Field Survey Forms be completed and submitted to CNDDB to document survey results. Online forms can be obtained and submitted at: https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB/Submitting-Data.

   Please note that CDFW's CNDDB is not exhaustive in terms of the data it houses, nor is it an absence database. CDFW recommends that it be used as a starting point in gathering information about the *potential presence* of species within the general area of the Project site. Other sources for identification of species and habitats near or adjacent to the Project area should include, but may not be limited to, State and federal resource agency lists, California Wildlife Habitat Relationship System, California Native Plant Society Inventory, agency contacts, environmental documents for other projects in the vicinity, academics, and professional or scientific organizations.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 5726D706-711D-43C7-B7C6-6DA3F194FCAA

3. A complete and recent inventory of rare, threatened, endangered, and other sensitive species located within the Project footprint and within offsite areas with the potential to be affected, including California Species of Special Concern and California Fully Protected Species (Fish & G. Code § 3511). Species to be addressed should include all those which meet the CEQA definition (CEQA Guidelines § 15380). The inventory should address seasonal variations in use of the Project area and should not be limited to resident species. The EIR should include the results of focused species-specific surveys, completed by a qualified biologist and conducted at the appropriate time of year and time of day when the sensitive species are active or otherwise identifiable. Species-specific surveys should be conducted in order to ascertain the presence of species with the potential to be directly, indirectly, on or within a reasonable distance of the Project activities. CDFW recommends the lead agency rely on survey and monitoring protocols and guidelines available at: www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Survey-Protocols. Alternative survey protocols may be warranted; justification should be provided to substantiate why an alternative protocol is necessary. Acceptable species-specific survey procedures should be developed in consultation with CDFW and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, where necessary. Some aspects of the Project may warrant periodic updated surveys for certain sensitive taxa, particularly if the Project is proposed to occur over a protracted time frame, or in phases, or if surveys are completed during periods of drought or deluge.

4. A thorough, recent (within the last two years), floristic-based assessment of special-status plants and natural communities, following CDFW's *Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities* (see www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Plants).

5. Information on the regional setting that is critical to an assessment of environmental impacts, with special emphasis on resources that are rare or unique to the region (CEQA Guidelines § 15125[c]).

Analysis of Direct, Indirect, and Cumulative Impacts to Biological Resources

The EIR should provide a thorough discussion of the Project's potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on biological resources. To ensure that Project impacts on biological resources are fully analyzed, the following information should be included in the EIR:

1. The EIR should define the threshold of significance for each impact and describe the criteria used to determine whether the impacts are significant (CEQA Guidelines, § 15064, subd. (f)). The EIR must demonstrate that the significant environmental impacts of the Project were adequately investigated and discussed and it must permit the significant effects of the Project to be considered in the full environmental context.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 5726D706-711D-43C7-B7C6-6DA3F194FCAA

2. A discussion of potential impacts from lighting, noise, human activity, and wildlife-human interactions created by Project activities especially those adjacent to natural areas, exotic and/or invasive species occurrences, and drainages. The EIR should address Project-related changes to drainage patterns and water quality within, upstream, and downstream of the Project site, including: volume, velocity, and frequency of existing and post-Project surface flows; polluted runoff; soil erosion and/or sedimentation in streams and water bodies; and post-Project fate of runoff from the Project site.

3. A discussion of potential indirect Project impacts on biological resources, including resources in areas adjacent to the Project footprint, such as nearby public lands (e.g. National Forests, State Parks, etc.), open space, adjacent natural habitats, riparian ecosystems, wildlife corridors, and any designated and/or proposed reserve or mitigation lands (e.g., preserved lands associated with a Conservation or Recovery Plan, or other conserved lands).

4. A cumulative effects analysis developed as described under CEQA Guidelines section 15130. The EIR should discuss the Project's cumulative impacts to natural resources and determine if that contribution would result in a significant impact. The EIR should include a list of present, past, and probable future projects producing related impacts to biological resources or shall include a summary of the projections contained in an adopted local, regional, or statewide plan, that consider conditions contributing to a cumulative effect. The cumulative analysis shall include impact analysis of vegetation and habitat reductions within the area and their potential cumulative effects. Please include all potential direct and indirect Project-related impacts to riparian areas, wetlands, wildlife corridors or wildlife movement areas, aquatic habitats, sensitive species and/or special-status species, open space, and adjacent natural habitats in the cumulative effects analysis.

Mitigation Measures for Project Impacts to Biological Resources

The EIR should include appropriate and adequate avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures for all direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts that are expected to occur as a result of the construction and long-term operation and maintenance of the Project. CDFW also recommends that the environmental documentation provide scientifically supported discussion regarding adequate avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures to address the Project's significant impacts upon fish and wildlife and their habitat. For individual projects, mitigation must be roughly proportional to the level of impacts, including cumulative impacts, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA (Guidelines § § 15126.4(a)(4)(B), 15064, 15065, and 16355). In order for mitigation measures to be effective, they must be specific, enforceable, and feasible actions that will improve environmental conditions. When proposing measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts, CDFW recommends consideration of the following:

DocuSign Envelope ID: 5726D706-711D-43C7-B7C6-6DA3F194FCAA

1. *Fully Protected Species*: Several Fully Protected Species (Fish & G. Code § 3511) have the potential to occur within or adjacent to the Project area, including, but not limited to: white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*), American peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus anatum*), bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), golden eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*), and California black rail (*Laterallus jamaicensis coturniculus*). Fully protected species may not be taken or possessed at any time. Project activities described in the EIR should be designed to completely avoid any fully protected species that have the potential to be present within or adjacent to the Project area. CDFW also recommends that the EIR fully analyze potential adverse impacts to fully protected species due to habitat modification, loss of foraging habitat, and/or interruption of migratory and breeding behaviors. CDFW recommends that the Lead Agency include in the analysis how appropriate avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures will reduce indirect impacts to fully protected species.

2. *Sensitive Plant Communities*: CDFW considers sensitive plant communities to be imperiled habitats having both local and regional significance. Plant communities, alliances, and associations with a statewide ranking of S-1, S-2, S-3, and S-4 should be considered sensitive and declining at the local and regional level. These ranks can be obtained by querying the CNDDB and are included in *The Manual of California Vegetation* (Sawyer 2009). The EIR should include measures to fully avoid and otherwise protect sensitive plant communities from Project-related direct and indirect impacts.

3. *Mitigation*: CDFW considers adverse Project-related impacts to sensitive species and habitats to be significant to both local and regional ecosystems, and the EIR should include mitigation measures for adverse Project-related impacts to these resources. Mitigation measures should emphasize avoidance and reduction of Project impacts. For unavoidable impacts, onsite habitat restoration, enhancement, or permanent protection should be evaluated and discussed in detail. If onsite mitigation is not feasible or would not be biologically viable and therefore not adequately mitigate the loss of biological functions and values, offsite mitigation through habitat creation and/or acquisition and preservation in perpetuity should be addressed.

   The EIR should include measures to perpetually protect the targeted habitat values within mitigation areas from direct and indirect adverse impacts in order to meet mitigation objectives to offset Project-induced qualitative and quantitative losses of biological values. Specific issues that should be addressed include restrictions on access, proposed land dedications, long-term monitoring and management programs, control of illegal dumping, water pollution, increased human intrusion, etc.

4. *Habitat Revegetation/Restoration Plans*: Plans for restoration and revegetation should be prepared by persons with expertise in the regional ecosystems and native plant restoration techniques. Plans should identify the assumptions used

DocuSign Envelope ID: 5726D706-711D-43C7-B7C6-6DA3F194FCAA

to develop the proposed restoration strategy. Each plan should include, at a minimum: (a) the location of restoration sites and assessment of appropriate reference sites; (b) the plant species to be used, sources of local propagules, container sizes, and seeding rates; (c) a schematic depicting the mitigation area; (d) a local seed and cuttings and planting schedule; (e) a description of the irrigation methodology; (f) measures to control exotic vegetation on site; (g) specific success criteria; (h) a detailed monitoring program; (i) contingency measures should the success criteria not be met; and (j) identification of the party responsible for meeting the success criteria and providing for conservation of the mitigation site in perpetuity. Monitoring of restoration areas should extend across a sufficient time frame to ensure that the new habitat is established, self-sustaining, and capable of surviving drought.

CDFW recommends that local onsite propagules from the Project area and nearby vicinity be collected and used for restoration purposes. Onsite seed collection should be appropriately timed to ensure the viability of the seeds when planted. Onsite vegetation mapping at the alliance and/or association level should be used to develop appropriate restoration goals and local plant palettes. Reference areas should be identified to help guide restoration efforts. Specific restoration plans should be developed for various Project components as appropriate. Restoration objectives should include protecting special habitat elements or re-creating them in areas affected by the Project. Examples may include retention of woody material, logs, snags, rocks, and brush piles. Fish and Game Code sections 1002, 1002.5 and 1003 authorize CDFW to issue permits for the take or possession of plants and wildlife for scientific, educational, and propagation purposes. Please see our website for more information on Scientific Collecting Permits at www.wildlife.ca.gov/Licensing/Scientific-Collecting#53949678-regulations-.

5. *Nesting Birds:* Please note that it is the Project proponent's responsibility to comply with all applicable laws related to nesting birds and birds of prey. Migratory non-game native bird species are protected by international treaty under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918, as amended (16 U.S.C. 703 *et seq.*). CDFW implemented the MBTA by adopting the Fish and Game Code section 3513. Fish and Game Code sections 3503, 3503.5 and 3800 provide additional protection to nongame birds, birds of prey, their nests and eggs. Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 of the Fish and Game Code afford protective measures as follows: section 3503 states that it is unlawful to take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any bird, except as otherwise provided by the Fish and Game Code or any regulation made pursuant thereto; section 3503.5 states that is it unlawful to take, possess, or destroy any birds in the orders Falconiformes or Strigiformes (birds-of-prey) or to take, possess, or destroy the nest or eggs of any such bird except as otherwise provided by the Fish and Game Code or any regulation adopted pursuant thereto; and section 3513 states that it is unlawful to take or possess any migratory nongame bird as designated in the MBTA or any part of such migratory nongame bird except as

DocuSign Envelope ID: 5726D706-711D-43C7-B7C6-6DA3F194FCAA

provided by rules and regulations adopted by the Secretary of the Interior under provisions of the MBTA.

Potential habitat for nesting birds and birds of prey is present within the Project area. The Project should disclose all potential activities that may incur a direct or indirect take to nongame nesting birds within the Project footprint and its vicinity. Appropriate avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures to avoid take must be included in the EIR.

CDFW recommends that the EIR include specific avoidance and minimization measures to ensure that impacts to nesting birds or their nests do not occur. Project-specific avoidance and minimization measures may include, but not be limited to: Project phasing and timing, monitoring of Project-related noise (where applicable), sound walls, and buffers, where appropriate. The EIR should also include specific avoidance and minimization measures that will be implemented should a nest be located within the Project site. In addition to larger, protocol level survey efforts (e.g. Swainson's hawk surveys) and scientific assessments, CDFW recommends a final preconstruction survey be required no more than three (3) days prior to vegetation clearing or ground disturbance activities, as instances of nesting could be missed if surveys are conducted earlier.

6. *Moving out of Harm's Way:* The Project is anticipated to result in the clearing of natural habitats that support native species. To avoid direct mortality, the lead agency may condition the EIR to require that a qualified biologist with the proper permits be retained to be onsite prior to and during all ground- and habitat-disturbing activities. The qualified biologist with the proper permits may move out of harm's way special-status species or other wildlife of low or limited mobility that would otherwise be injured or killed from Project-related activities. Movement of wildlife out of harm's way should be limited to only those individuals that would otherwise be injured or killed, and individuals should be moved only as far as necessary to ensure their safety (i.e., CDFW does not recommend relocation to other areas). It should be noted that the temporary relocation of onsite wildlife does not constitute effective mitigation for habitat loss.

7. *Translocation of Species*: CDFW generally does not support the use of relocation, salvage, and/or transplantation as the sole mitigation for impacts to rare, threatened, or endangered species as these efforts are generally experimental in nature and largely unsuccessful.

The EIR should incorporate mitigation performance standards that would ensure that impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures proposed in the EIR should be made a condition of approval of the Project. Please note that obtaining a permit from CDFW by itself with no other mitigation proposal may constitute mitigation deferral. CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4, subdivision (a)(1)(B) states that formulation of mitigation measures should not be deferred until some future time. To

DocuSign Envelope ID: 5726D706-711D-43C7-B7C6-6DA3F194FCAA

avoid deferring mitigation in this way, the EIR should describe avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures that would be implemented should the impact occur.

California Endangered Species Act

CDFW is responsible for ensuring appropriate conservation of fish and wildlife resources including threatened, endangered, and/or candidate plant and animal species, pursuant to the CESA. CDFW recommends that a CESA Incidental Take Permit (ITP) be obtained if the Project has the potential to result in "take" (Fish & G. Code § 86 defines "take" as "hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill") of State-listed CESA species, either through construction or over the life of the Project.

CESA-listed species with the potential to occur in the area include but are not limited to: foothill yellow-legged frog (*Rana boylii*), Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop (*Gratiola heterosepala*), willow flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii*), tricolored blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*), and Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*).

The EIR should disclose the potential of the Project to take CESA-listed species and how the impacts will be avoided, minimized, and mitigated. Please note that mitigation measures that are adequate to reduce impacts to a less-than significant level to meet CEQA requirements may not be enough for the issuance of an ITP. To issue an ITP, CDFW must demonstrate that the impacts of the authorized take will be minimized and fully mitigated (Fish & G. Code §2081 (b)). To facilitate the issuance of an ITP, if applicable, CDFW recommends the EIR include measures to minimize and fully mitigate the impacts to any State-listed species the Project has potential to take. CDFW encourages early consultation with staff to determine appropriate measures to facilitate future permitting processes and to engage with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and/or National Marine Fisheries Service to coordinate specific measures if both state and federally listed species may be present within the Project vicinity.

Native Plant Protection Act

The Native Plant Protection Act (Fish & G. Code §1900 *et seq*.) prohibits the take or possession of State-listed rare and endangered plants, including any part or product thereof, unless authorized by CDFW or in certain limited circumstances. Take of State-listed rare and/or endangered plants due to Project activities may only be permitted through an ITP or other authorization issued by CDFW pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 14, section 786.9 subdivision (b).

Lake and Streambed Alteration Program

The EIR should identify all perennial, intermittent, and ephemeral rivers, streams, lakes, other hydrologically connected aquatic features, and any associated biological resources/habitats present within the entire Project footprint (including utilities, access and staging areas). The environmental document should analyze all potential temporary, permanent, direct, indirect and/or cumulative impacts to the above-

DocuSign Envelope ID: 5726D706-711D-43C7-B7C6-6DA3F194FCAA

mentioned features and associated biological resources/habitats that may occur because of the Project. If it is determined the Project will result in significant impacts to these resources the EIR shall propose appropriate avoidance, minimization and/or mitigation measures to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code requires an entity to notify CDFW prior to commencing any activity that may do one or more of the following: substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow of any river, stream or lake; substantially change or use any material from the bed, channel or bank of any river, stream, or lake; or deposit debris, waste or other materials that could pass into any river, stream or lake. Please note that "any river, stream or lake" includes those that are episodic (i.e., those that are dry for periods of time) as well as those that are perennial (i.e., those that flow year-round). This includes ephemeral streams and watercourses with a subsurface flow. It may also apply to work undertaken within the flood plain of a body of water.

If CDFW determines that the Project activities may substantially adversely affect an existing fish or wildlife resource, a Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) Agreement will be issued which will include reasonable measures necessary to protect the resource. CDFW's issuance of an LSA Agreement is a "project" subject to CEQA (see Pub. Resources Code 21065). To facilitate issuance of an LSA Agreement, if one is necessary, the EIR should fully identify the potential impacts to the lake, stream, or riparian resources, and provide adequate avoidance, mitigation, and monitoring and reporting commitments. Early consultation with CDFW is recommended, since modification of the Project may avoid or reduce impacts to fish and wildlife resources. To submit an LSA Notification package, please go to https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Environmental-Review/LSA.

Please note that other agencies may use specific methods and definitions to determine impacts to areas subject to their authorities. These methods and definitions often do not include all needed information for CDFW to determine the extent of fish and wildlife resources affected by activities subject to Notification under Fish and Game Code section1602. Therefore, CDFW does not recommend relying solely on methods developed specifically for delineating areas subject to other agencies' jurisdiction (such as United States Army Corps of Engineers) when mapping lakes, streams, wetlands, floodplains, riparian areas, etc. in preparation for submitting a Notification of an LSA.

CDFW relies on the lead agency environmental document analysis when acting as a responsible agency issuing an LSA Agreement. CDFW recommends lead agencies coordinate with us as early as possible, since potential modification of the proposed Project may avoid or reduce impacts to fish and wildlife resources and expedite the Project approval process.

The following information will be required for the processing of an LSA Notification and CDFW recommends incorporating this information into any forthcoming CEQA document(s) to avoid subsequent documentation and Project delays:

DocuSign Envelope ID: 5726D706-711D-43C7-B7C6-6DA3F194FCAA

1. Mapping and quantification of lakes, streams, and associated fish and wildlife habitat (e.g., riparian habitat, freshwater wetlands, etc.) that will be temporarily and/or permanently impacted by the Project, including impacts from access and staging areas. Please include an estimate of impact to each habitat type.

2. Discussion of specific avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures to reduce Project impacts to fish and wildlife resources to a less-than-significant level. Please refer to section 15370 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Based on review of Project materials, aerial photography, and observation of the site from public roadways, the Project site may support unnamed tributaries to Antelope Creek, Secret Ravine, and associated riparian habitat. CDFW recommends that the EIR fully identify the Project's potential impacts to the stream and/or its associated vegetation and wetlands.

Placer County Conservation Program

The Project is located within the Foothills Potential Future Growth Area of the Placer County Conservation Program (PCCP). The PCCP includes three distinct integrated components: the Western Placer County Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Community Conservation Plan, the Western Placer County Aquatic Resources Program, and the Western Placer County In-Lieu Fee Program.

CEQA Guidelines section 15125(d) states that EIRs must discuss any inconsistencies between projects and applicable plans (including habitat conservation plans/natural community conservation plans). Because the PCCP is approved and in implementation, CDFW recommends the EIR include a discussion of each Project alternative's consistency with the PCCP and how the County will ensure that implementation of the Project alternatives do not impede the PCCP's ability to meet its biological goals and objectives.

ENVIRONMENTAL DATA

CEQA requires that information developed in environmental impact reports and negative declarations be incorporated into a database, which may be used to make subsequent or supplemental environmental determinations (Pub. Resources Code, § 21003, subd. (e)). Accordingly, please report any special-status species and natural communities detected during Project surveys to the CNDDB. The CNNDB field survey form can be found at the following link: https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB/Submitting-Data. The completed form can be submitted online or mailed electronically to CNDDB at the following email address: CNDDB@wildlife.ca.gov.

FILING FEES

The Project, as proposed, would have an effect on fish and wildlife, and assessment of filing fees is necessary. Fees are payable upon filing of the Notice of Determination by

DocuSign Envelope ID: 5726D706-711D-43C7-B7C6-6DA3F194FCAA

the Lead Agency and serve to help defray the cost of environmental review by CDFW. Payment of the fee is required in order for the underlying project approval to be operative, vested, and final. (Cal. Code Regs, tit. 14, § 753.5; Fish & G. Code § 711.4; Pub. Resources Code, § 21089.)

CONCLUSION

Pursuant to Public Resources Code sections 21092 and 21092.2, CDFW requests written notification of proposed actions and pending decisions regarding the Project. Written notifications shall be directed to: California Department of Fish and Wildlife North Central Region, 1701 Nimbus Road, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670.

CDFW appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Notice Of Preparation of the EIR for the Project 8 Winery Project and recommends that Placer County address CDFW's comments and concerns in the forthcoming EIR. CDFW personnel are available for consultation regarding biological resources and strategies to minimize impacts.

If you have any questions regarding the comments provided in this letter or wish to schedule a meeting and/or site visit, please contact Patrick Moeszinger, Senior Environmental Scientist (Specialist) at (916) 767-3935 or patrick.moeszinger@wildlife.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:
Juan Torres for
FB2E6AFEDBDE458...
Kelley Barker
Environmental Program Manager

ec: Juan Torres, Senior Environmental Scientist (Supervisory)
Patrick Moeszinger, Senior Environmental Scientist (Specialist)
Department of Fish and Wildlife

Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse, Sacramento

Literature Cited

Sawyer, J. O., T. Keeler-Wolf, and J. M. Evens. 2009. A Manual of California Vegetation, 2nd ed. California Native Plant Society Press, Sacramento, California. http://vegetation.cnps.org/

California Department of Transportation

DISTRICT 3
703 B STREET | MARYSVILLE, CA 95901-5556
(530) 513-0584 | FAX (530) 741-4245 TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov/dist3

February 11, 2022

GTS# 03-PLA-2022-00901
03-PLA-193-7.85
SCH # N/A

Shirlee Herrington
Environmental Coordination Services
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190
Auburn, CA 95603

Project 8 Winery (Formerly Penryn Winery)

Dear Ms. Herrington:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the review process for the project referenced above. We reviewed this local development for impacts to the State Highway System (SHS) in keeping with our mission, vision, and goals, some of which includes addressing equity, climate change, and safety, as outlined in our statewide plans such as the California Transportation Plan, Caltrans Strategic Plan, and Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure.

The comments below are based on the NOP circulated for review regarding the proposed development of a 17.96-acre winery across three parcels at 7615 Callison Road in Penryn, CA.

Traffic Operations – Highway Operations

The traffic study for this project should include the following intersections including trip generation:

- SR 193 and Taylor Road
- SR 193 and SR 80
- SR 80 and Newcastle Road

If you have any questions regarding these comments or require additional information, please contact David Dosanjh, Intergovernmental Review Coordinator for Placer County, by phone (530) 565-3905 or via email to David.Dosanjh@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Kevin Yount

KEVIN YOUNT, Branch Chief
Office of Transportation Planning
Regional Planning Branch—East

January 18, 2022

Shirlee I. Herrington
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive, Suite #190
Auburn, CA 95603

Ref: Gas and Electric Transmission and Distribution

Dear Shirlee,

Thank you for submitting Project 8 Winery (PLN21-00198) plans for our review. PG&E will review the submitted plans in relationship to any existing Gas and Electric facilities within the project area. If the proposed project is adjacent/or within PG&E owned property and/or easements, we will be working with you to ensure compatible uses and activities near our facilities.

Attached you will find information and requirements as it relates to Gas facilities (Attachment 1) and Electric facilities (Attachment 2). Please review these in detail, as it is critical to ensure your safety and to protect PG&E's facilities and its existing rights.

Below is additional information for your review:

1. This plan review process does not replace the application process for PG&E gas or electric service your project may require. For these requests, please continue to work with PG&E Service Planning: https://www.pge.com/en_US/business/services/building-and-renovation/overview/overview.page.

2. If the project being submitted is part of a larger project, please include the entire scope of your project, and not just a portion of it. PG&E's facilities are to be incorporated within any CEQA document. PG&E needs to verify that the CEQA document will identify any required future PG&E services.

3. An engineering deposit may be required to review plans for a project depending on the size, scope, and location of the project and as it relates to any rearrangement or new installation of PG&E facilities.

Any proposed uses within the PG&E fee strip and/or easement, may include a California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) Section 851 filing. This requires the CPUC to render approval for a conveyance of rights for specific uses on PG&E's fee strip or easement. PG&E will advise if the necessity to incorporate a CPUC Section 851filing is required.

This letter does not constitute PG&E's consent to use any portion of its easement for any purpose not previously conveyed. PG&E will provide a project specific response as required.

Sincerely,

Plan Review Team
Land Management

Attachment 1 – Gas Facilities

There could be gas transmission pipelines in this area which would be considered critical facilities for PG&E and a high priority subsurface installation under California law. Care must be taken to ensure safety and accessibility. So, please ensure that if PG&E approves work near gas transmission pipelines it is done in adherence with the below stipulations. Additionally, the following link provides additional information regarding legal requirements under California excavation laws: https://www.usanorth811.org/images/pdfs/CA-LAW-2018.pdf

1. Standby Inspection: A PG&E Gas Transmission Standby Inspector must be present during any demolition or construction activity that comes within 10 feet of the gas pipeline. This includes all grading, trenching, substructure depth verifications (potholes), asphalt or concrete demolition/removal, removal of trees, signs, light poles, etc. This inspection can be coordinated through the Underground Service Alert (USA) service at 811. A minimum notice of 48 hours is required. Ensure the USA markings and notifications are maintained throughout the duration of your work.

2. Access: At any time, PG&E may need to access, excavate, and perform work on the gas pipeline. Any construction equipment, materials, or spoils may need to be removed upon notice. Any temporary construction fencing installed within PG&E's easement would also need to be capable of being removed at any time upon notice. Any plans to cut temporary slopes exceeding a 1:4 grade within 10 feet of a gas transmission pipeline need to be approved by PG&E Pipeline Services in writing PRIOR to performing the work.

3. Wheel Loads: To prevent damage to the buried gas pipeline, there are weight limits that must be enforced whenever any equipment gets within 10 feet of traversing the pipe.

Ensure a list of the axle weights of all equipment being used is available for PG&E's Standby Inspector. To confirm the depth of cover, the pipeline may need to be potholed by hand in a few areas.

Due to the complex variability of tracked equipment, vibratory compaction equipment, and cranes, PG&E must evaluate those items on a case-by-case basis prior to use over the gas pipeline (provide a list of any proposed equipment of this type noting model numbers and specific attachments).

No equipment may be set up over the gas pipeline while operating. Ensure crane outriggers are at least 10 feet from the centerline of the gas pipeline. Transport trucks must not be parked over the gas pipeline while being loaded or unloaded.

4. Grading: PG&E requires a minimum of 36 inches of cover over gas pipelines (or existing grade if less) and a maximum of 7 feet of cover at all locations. The graded surface cannot exceed a cross slope of 1:4.

5. Excavating: Any digging within 2 feet of a gas pipeline must be dug by hand. Note that while the minimum clearance is only 12 inches, any excavation work within 24 inches of the edge of a pipeline must be done with hand tools. So to avoid having to dig a trench entirely with hand tools, the edge of the trench must be over 24 inches away. (Doing the math for a 24 inch

wide trench being dug along a 36 inch pipeline, the centerline of the trench would need to be at least 54 inches [24/2 + 24 + 36/2 = 54] away, or be entirely dug by hand.)

Water jetting to assist vacuum excavating must be limited to 1000 psig and directed at a 40° angle to the pipe. All pile driving must be kept a minimum of 3 feet away.

Any plans to expose and support a PG&E gas transmission pipeline across an open excavation need to be approved by PG&E Pipeline Services in writing PRIOR to performing the work.

6. Boring/Trenchless Installations: PG&E Pipeline Services must review and approve all plans to bore across or parallel to (within 10 feet) a gas transmission pipeline. There are stringent criteria to pothole the gas transmission facility at regular intervals for all parallel bore installations.

For bore paths that cross gas transmission pipelines perpendicularly, the pipeline must be potholed a minimum of 2 feet in the horizontal direction of the bore path and a minimum of 12 inches in the vertical direction from the bottom of the pipe with minimum clearances measured from the edge of the pipe in both directions. Standby personnel must watch the locator trace (and every ream pass) the path of the bore as it approaches the pipeline and visually monitor the pothole (with the exposed transmission pipe) as the bore traverses the pipeline to ensure adequate clearance with the pipeline. The pothole width must account for the inaccuracy of the locating equipment.

7. Substructures: All utility crossings of a gas pipeline should be made as close to perpendicular as feasible (90° +/- 15°). All utility lines crossing the gas pipeline must have a minimum of 12 inches of separation from the gas pipeline. Parallel utilities, pole bases, water line ‘kicker blocks’, storm drain inlets, water meters, valves, back pressure devices or other utility substructures are not allowed in the PG&E gas pipeline easement.

If previously retired PG&E facilities are in conflict with proposed substructures, PG&E must verify they are safe prior to removal. This includes verification testing of the contents of the facilities, as well as environmental testing of the coating and internal surfaces. Timelines for PG&E completion of this verification will vary depending on the type and location of facilities in conflict.

8. Structures: No structures are to be built within the PG&E gas pipeline easement. This includes buildings, retaining walls, fences, decks, patios, carports, septic tanks, storage sheds, tanks, loading ramps, or any structure that could limit PG&E’s ability to access its facilities.

9. Fencing: Permanent fencing is not allowed within PG&E easements except for perpendicular crossings which must include a 16 foot wide gate for vehicular access. Gates will be secured with PG&E corporation locks.

10. Landscaping: Landscaping must be designed to allow PG&E to access the pipeline for maintenance and not interfere with pipeline coatings or other cathodic protection systems. No trees, shrubs, brush, vines, and other vegetation may be planted within the easement area. Only those plants, ground covers, grasses, flowers, and low-growing plants that grow unsupported to a maximum of four feet (4’) in height at maturity may be planted within the easement area.

11. Cathodic Protection: PG&E pipelines are protected from corrosion with an “Impressed Current” cathodic protection system. Any proposed facilities, such as metal conduit, pipes, service lines, ground rods, anodes, wires, etc. that might affect the pipeline cathodic protection system must be reviewed and approved by PG&E Corrosion Engineering.

12. Pipeline Marker Signs: PG&E needs to maintain pipeline marker signs for gas transmission pipelines in order to ensure public awareness of the presence of the pipelines. With prior written approval from PG&E Pipeline Services, an existing PG&E pipeline marker sign that is in direct conflict with proposed developments may be temporarily relocated to accommodate construction work. The pipeline marker must be moved back once construction is complete.

13. PG&E is also the provider of distribution facilities throughout many of the areas within the state of California. Therefore, any plans that impact PG&E’s facilities must be reviewed and approved by PG&E to ensure that no impact occurs which may endanger the safe operation of its facilities.

Attachment 2 – Electric Facilities

It is PG&E's policy to permit certain uses on a case by case basis within its electric transmission fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) provided such uses and manner in which they are exercised, will not interfere with PG&E's rights or endanger its facilities. Some examples/restrictions are as follows:

1. Buildings and Other Structures: No buildings or other structures including the foot print and eave of any buildings, swimming pools, wells or similar structures will be permitted within fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) areas. PG&E's transmission easement shall be designated on subdivision/parcel maps as "**RESTRICTED USE AREA – NO BUILDING."**

2. Grading: Cuts, trenches or excavations may not be made within 25 feet of our towers. Developers must submit grading plans and site development plans (including geotechnical reports if applicable), signed and dated, for PG&E's review. PG&E engineers must review grade changes in the vicinity of our towers. No fills will be allowed which would impair ground-to-conductor clearances. Towers shall not be left on mounds without adequate road access to base of tower or structure.

3. Fences: Walls, fences, and other structures must be installed at locations that do not affect the safe operation of PG&'s facilities. Heavy equipment access to our facilities must be maintained at all times. Metal fences are to be grounded to PG&E specifications. No wall, fence or other like structure is to be installed within 10 feet of tower footings and unrestricted access must be maintained from a tower structure to the nearest street. Walls, fences and other structures proposed along or within the fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) will require PG&E review; submit plans to PG&E Centralized Review Team for review and comment.

4. Landscaping: Vegetation may be allowed; subject to review of plans. On overhead electric transmission fee strip(s) and/or easement(s), trees and shrubs are limited to those varieties that do not exceed 10 feet in height at maturity. PG&E must have access to its facilities at all times, including access by heavy equipment. No planting is to occur within the footprint of the tower legs. Greenbelts are encouraged.

5. Reservoirs, Sumps, Drainage Basins, and Ponds: Prohibited within PG&E's fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) for electric transmission lines.

6. Automobile Parking: Short term parking of movable passenger vehicles and light trucks (pickups, vans, etc.) is allowed. The lighting within these parking areas will need to be reviewed by PG&E; approval will be on a case by case basis. Heavy equipment access to PG&E facilities is to be maintained at all times. Parking is to clear PG&E structures by at least 10 feet. Protection of PG&E facilities from vehicular traffic is to be provided at developer's expense AND to PG&E specifications. Blocked-up vehicles are not allowed. Carports, canopies, or awnings are not allowed.

7. Storage of Flammable, Explosive or Corrosive Materials: There shall be no storage of fuel or combustibles and no fueling of vehicles within PG&E's easement. No trash bins or incinerators are allowed.

8. Streets and Roads: Access to facilities must be maintained at all times. Street lights may be allowed in the fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) but in all cases must be reviewed by PG&E for proper clearance. Roads and utilities should cross the transmission easement as nearly at right angles as possible. Road intersections will not be allowed within the transmission easement.

9. Pipelines: Pipelines may be allowed provided crossings are held to a minimum and to be as nearly perpendicular as possible. Pipelines within 25 feet of PG&E structures require review by PG&E. Sprinklers systems may be allowed; subject to review. Leach fields and septic tanks are not allowed. Construction plans must be submitted to PG&E for review and approval prior to the commencement of any construction.

10. Signs: Signs are not allowed except in rare cases subject to individual review by PG&E.

11. Recreation Areas: Playgrounds, parks, tennis courts, basketball courts, barbecue and light trucks (pickups, vans, etc.) may be allowed; subject to review of plans. Heavy equipment access to PG&E facilities is to be maintained at all times. Parking is to clear PG&E structures by at least 10 feet. Protection of PG&E facilities from vehicular traffic is to be provided at developer's expense AND to PG&E specifications.

12. Construction Activity: Since construction activity will take place near PG&E's overhead electric lines, please be advised it is the contractor's responsibility to be aware of, and observe the minimum clearances for both workers and equipment operating near high voltage electric lines set out in the High-Voltage Electrical Safety Orders of the California Division of Industrial Safety (https://www.dir.ca.gov/Title8/sb5g2.html), as well as any other safety regulations. Contractors shall comply with California Public Utilities Commission General Order 95 (http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/gos/GO95/go_95_startup_page.html) and all other safety rules. No construction may occur within 25 feet of PG&E's towers. All excavation activities may only commence after 811 protocols has been followed.

Contractor shall ensure the protection of PG&E's towers and poles from vehicular damage by (installing protective barriers) Plans for protection barriers must be approved by PG&E prior to construction.

13. PG&E is also the owner of distribution facilities throughout many of the areas within the state of California. Therefore, any plans that impact PG&E's facilities must be reviewed and approved by PG&E to ensure that no impact occurs that may endanger the safe and reliable operation of its facilities.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Plan Review Team
Land Management

PGEPlanReview@pge.com

February 18, 2022

Shirlee I. Herrington
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive, Suite #190
Auburn, CA 95603

Re: Project 8 Winery (PLN21-00198)
7615 Callison Road, Penryn, CA 95663

Dear Shirlee:

Thank you for providing PG&E the opportunity to review your proposed plans for Project 8 Winery (PLN21-00198) dated 1/13/2022. Our review indicates your proposed improvements do not appear to directly interfere with existing PG&E facilities or impact our easement rights.

Please note this is our preliminary review and PG&E reserves the right for additional future review as needed. This letter shall not in any way alter, modify, or terminate any provision of any existing easement rights. If there are subsequent modifications made to your design, we ask that you resubmit the plans to the email address listed below.

If you require PG&E gas or electrical service in the future, please continue to work with PG&E's Service Planning department: https://www.pge.com/cco/.

As a reminder, before any digging or excavation occurs, please contact Underground Service Alert (USA) by dialing 811 a minimum of 2 working days prior to commencing any work. This free and independent service will ensure that all existing underground utilities are identified and marked on-site.

If you have any questions regarding our response, please contact the PG&E Plan Review Team at (877) 259-8314 or pgeplanreview@pge.com.

Sincerely,

PG&E Plan Review Team
Land Management

18 February 2022

Shirlee Herrington
Placer County
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, CA 95603
sherring@placer.ca.gov

COMMENTS TO REQUEST FOR REVIEW FOR THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION FOR THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, PROJECT 8 WINERY (PLN21-00198) PROJECT, SCH#2022010188, PLACER COUNTY

Pursuant to the State Clearinghouse's 13 January 2022 request, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board) has reviewed the *Request for Review for the Notice of Preparation for the Draft Environmental Impact Report* for the Project 8 Winery (PLN21-00198) Project, located in Placer County.

Our agency is delegated with the responsibility of protecting the quality of surface and groundwaters of the state; therefore our comments will address concerns surrounding those issues.

I. Regulatory Setting

Basin Plan

The Central Valley Water Board is required to formulate and adopt Basin Plans for all areas within the Central Valley region under Section 13240 of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Each Basin Plan must contain water quality objectives to ensure the reasonable protection of beneficial uses, as well as a program of implementation for achieving water quality objectives with the Basin Plans. Federal regulations require each state to adopt water quality standards to protect the public health or welfare, enhance the quality of water and serve the purposes of the Clean Water Act. In California, the beneficial uses, water quality objectives, and the Antidegradation Policy are the State's water quality standards. Water quality standards are also contained in the National Toxics Rule, 40 CFR Section 131.36, and the California Toxics Rule, 40 CFR Section 131.38.

The Basin Plan is subject to modification as necessary, considering applicable laws, policies, technologies, water quality conditions and priorities. The original Basin Plans were adopted in 1975, and have been updated and revised periodically as required, using Basin Plan amendments. Once the Central Valley Water Board has adopted a Basin Plan amendment in noticed public hearings, it must be approved by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board), Office of

Administrative Law (OAL) and in some cases, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). Basin Plan amendments only become effective after they have been approved by the OAL and in some cases, the USEPA. Every three (3) years, a review of the Basin Plan is completed that assesses the appropriateness of existing standards and evaluates and prioritizes Basin Planning issues. For more information on the *Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins*, please visit our website:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/

Antidegradation Considerations
All wastewater discharges must comply with the Antidegradation Policy (State Water Board Resolution 68-16) and the Antidegradation Implementation Policy contained in the Basin Plan. The Antidegradation Implementation Policy is available on page 74 at:
https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/sacsjr_201805.pdf

In part it states:

Any discharge of waste to high quality waters must apply best practicable treatment or control not only to prevent a condition of pollution or nuisance from occurring, but also to maintain the highest water quality possible consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the State.

This information must be presented as an analysis of the impacts and potential impacts of the discharge on water quality, as measured by background concentrations and applicable water quality objectives.

The antidegradation analysis is a mandatory element in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System and land discharge Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) permitting processes. The environmental review document should evaluate potential impacts to both surface and groundwater quality.

II. Permitting Requirements

Construction Storm Water General Permit
Dischargers whose project disturb one or more acres of soil or where projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Construction General Permit), Construction General Permit Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ. Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, grubbing, disturbances to the ground, such as stockpiling, or excavation, but does not include regular maintenance activities performed to restore the original line, grade, or capacity of the facility. The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). For more information on the Construction General Permit, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/constpermits.shtml

Phase I and II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permits[1]
The Phase I and II MS4 permits require the Permittees reduce pollutants and runoff flows from new development and redevelopment using Best Management Practices (BMPs) to the maximum extent practicable (MEP). MS4 Permittees have their own development standards, also known as Low Impact Development (LID)/post-construction standards that include a hydromodification component. The MS4 permits also require specific design concepts for LID/post-construction BMPs in the early stages of a project during the entitlement and CEQA process and the development plan review process.

For more information on which Phase I MS4 Permit this project applies to, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/municipal_permits/

For more information on the Phase II MS4 permit and who it applies to, visit the State Water Resources Control Board at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/phase_ii_municipal.shtml

Industrial Storm Water General Permit
Storm water discharges associated with industrial sites must comply with the regulations contained in the Industrial Storm Water General Permit Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ. For more information on the Industrial Storm Water General Permit, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/industrial_general_permits/index.shtml

Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit
If the project will involve the discharge of dredged or fill material in navigable waters or wetlands, a permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act may be needed from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). If a Section 404 permit is required by the USACE, the Central Valley Water Board will review the permit application to ensure that discharge will not violate water quality standards. If the project requires surface water drainage realignment, the applicant is advised to contact the Department of Fish and Game for information on Streambed Alteration Permit requirements. If you have any questions regarding the Clean Water Act Section 404 permits, please contact the Regulatory Division of the Sacramento District of USACE at (916) 557-5250.

Clean Water Act Section 401 Permit – Water Quality Certification
If an USACE permit (e.g., Non-Reporting Nationwide Permit, Nationwide Permit, Letter of Permission, Individual Permit, Regional General Permit, Programmatic

[1] Municipal Permits = The Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Water System (MS4) Permit covers medium sized Municipalities (serving between 100,000 and 250,000 people) and large sized municipalities (serving over 250,000 people). The Phase II MS4 provides coverage for small municipalities, including non-traditional Small MS4s, which include military bases, public campuses, prisons and hospitals.

General Permit), or any other federal permit (e.g., Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act or Section 9 from the United States Coast Guard), is required for this project due to the disturbance of waters of the United States (such as streams and wetlands), then a Water Quality Certification must be obtained from the Central Valley Water Board prior to initiation of project activities. There are no waivers for 401 Water Quality Certifications. For more information on the Water Quality Certification, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/water_quality_certification/

Waste Discharge Requirements – Discharges to Waters of the State
If USACE determines that only non-jurisdictional waters of the State (i.e., "non-federal" waters of the State) are present in the proposed project area, the proposed project may require a Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) permit to be issued by Central Valley Water Board. Under the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, discharges to all waters of the State, including all wetlands and other waters of the State including, but not limited to, isolated wetlands, are subject to State regulation. For more information on the Waste Discharges to Surface Water NPDES Program and WDR processes, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/waste_to_surface_water/

Projects involving excavation or fill activities impacting less than 0.2 acre or 400 linear feet of non-jurisdictional waters of the state and projects involving dredging activities impacting less than 50 cubic yards of non-jurisdictional waters of the state may be eligible for coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board Water Quality Order No. 2004-0004-DWQ (General Order 2004-0004). For more information on the General Order 2004-0004, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2004/wqo/wqo2004-0004.pdf

Waste Discharge Requirements – Discharges to Land
The discharge of winery wastewater and residual solids to land is subject to regulation under individual WDRs or Central Valley Water Board Order R5-2015-0005 (the Conditional Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements for Small Food Processors, Small Wineries and Related Agricultural Processors within the Central Valley Region, or Waiver). The Waiver is structured to regulate winery waste discharge on a tiered basis, based on the volume of waste discharged to land annually. In accordance with California Water Code Section 13260, the project proponent is required to submit a Report of Waste Discharge (RWD) to apply for the Waiver. We recommend that the RWD be submitted 12 to 18 months before the expected startup date.

Pursuant to the State Board's Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems Policy, the regulation of the septic system may be regulated under the local agency's management program.

For more information on waste discharges to land, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/waste_to_land/index.shtml

Dewatering Permit

If the proposed project includes construction or groundwater dewatering to be discharged to land, the proponent may apply for coverage under State Water Board General Water Quality Order (Low Threat General Order) 2003-0003 or the Central Valley Water Board's Waiver of Report of Waste Discharge and Waste Discharge Requirements (Low Threat Waiver) R5-2018-0085. Small temporary construction dewatering projects are projects that discharge groundwater to land from excavation activities or dewatering of underground utility vaults. Dischargers seeking coverage under the General Order or Waiver must file a Notice of Intent with the Central Valley Water Board prior to beginning discharge.

For more information regarding the Low Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2003/wqo/wqo2003-0003.pdf

For more information regarding the Low Threat Waiver and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/waivers/r5-2018-0085.pdf

Limited Threat General NPDES Permit

If the proposed project includes construction dewatering and it is necessary to discharge the groundwater to waters of the United States, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Dewatering discharges are typically considered a low or limited threat to water quality and may be covered under the General Order for *Limited Threat Discharges to Surface Water* (Limited Threat General Order). A complete Notice of Intent must be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board to obtain coverage under the Limited Threat General Order. For more information regarding the Limited Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/general_orders/r5-2016-0076-01.pdf

NPDES Permit

If the proposed project discharges waste that could affect the quality of surface waters of the State, other than into a community sewer system, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. A complete Report of Waste Discharge must be submitted with the Central Valley Water Board to obtain a NPDES Permit. For more information regarding the NPDES Permit and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/help/permit/

If you have questions regarding these comments, please contact me at (916) 464-4709 or Greg.Hendricks@waterboards.ca.gov.

Greg Hendricks
Environmental Scientist

cc: State Clearinghouse unit, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, Sacramento

Shirlee Herrington

From: Leslie Warren <lesliewarren52@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 12, 2022 7:21 PM
To: Shirlee Herrington
Cc: Jeanne Wilson; Shane Hanofee
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Project 8 Winery Berkema feedback

Dear Shirlee,

The subject proposed project would require the approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the construction and operation of a Large, and to allow an increase from 50 to 75 maximum attendees (at one time) for Agricultural Promotional Events; as well Winery on 40+ acres, the operation of an accessory restaurant as a Variance to allow the octagon building to reach a height of 75 feet from the finished grade (plus rooftop mechanical equipment that will be screened from view).

On behalf of the California Native Plant Society, Redbud Chapter, I am writing to express our concern about the subject project because of its impact on grasslands, which are proposed to be converted to vineyard and commercial structures.

Has the County's analysis considered the fact that tilling and grading for vineyard will loosen dirt, disturb microorganisms that live within it and release carbon into the atmosphere? How much stored carbon will be released with construction of the proposed agricultural practice? How would carbon emissions be offset?

Tilling the soil will contribute to groundwater depletion as it will adversely affect soils' ability to retain precipitation. To what degree will this project contribute to groundwater depletion?

The 40 acre project site is primarily grassland. Has the County considered that grasses are powerful devices for drawing down carbon from the atmosphere? Has the County undertaken a comprehensive and cumulative assessment of how much grassland in Placer County has been lost to other uses in the past 50, 25, 10 years? Please explain how Placer County is monitoring grassland conversion and the cumulative impact of Countywide conversion on native flora and fauna populations; including insects as declines pollinators, including bees, butterflies and moths is directly attributable to loss of grasslands.

If this project depends upon groundwater:

1) how much water will be pumped annually and how will ground water pumping be monitored?
2) does the project have the potential to adversely affect existing well users?
3) what is the County's policy for managing groundwater drawdown?

How will the impervious surfaces proposed as a part of this project contribute seasonally to increasing local ambient temperatures? Increasing temperatures increases plants' need for water, affecting plants growth, reproduction and resilience.

Thank you for your attention to these questions snd concerns.

Sincerely,

Leslie Warren
Co-chair

Conservation Advocacy Committee
CNPS Redbud

Sent from my iPhone

Shirlee Herrington

From: Defend Granite Bay - A Community Association <defendgb@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 11, 2022 1:00 PM
To: Shirlee Herrington
Cc: GBCA; Alliance For Environmental Leadership; public-interest@live.com; Michael Garabedian
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Notice of Preparation of an EIR for the proposed Project 8 Winery Comments

DEFEND GRANITE BAY

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed Project 8 Winery.

The proposed project would require the approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the construction and operation of a Large Winery on 40+ acres, the operation of an accessory restaurant, and to allow an increase from 50 to 75 maximum attendees (at one time) for Agricultural Promotional Events; as well as a Variance to allow the octagon building to reach a height of 75 feet from the finished grade (plus rooftop mechanical equipment that will be screened from view).

Concerns include the following items:

1) Is adequate septic, water and parking proposed to accommodate a greater number of guests per ag promotional event?

2) Will additional traffic fees be required to mitigate for additional VMT and how will this increase impact Placer County VMT targets?

3) If the property is a Williamson Act parcel, will the applicant revoke the Williamson Act status since the commercial restaurant, kitchen and dining room exceed 1200 sq ft. (see Government Code § 51250 (b))?

The developer intentionally purchased a property which was sloped to accommodate gravity flow for extraction and to enhance water recycling.

4) An explanation of how the requested 75 ft is in compliance with California Government Code Section 65906.

The northerly parcel is zoned F-B-X 20-Acre Minimum; and the remaining parcels are zoned RA-B-100.

5) Neither zoning district allows for commercial restaurants (see 17.10.010 and 17.06.050). How is formal seating for lunch and dinner “related to” the primary use on a property as a winery or farm brewery.

6) Will additional traffic mitigation fees be required for the increased intensity of use?

The Defend Granite Bay Board and members

PUBLIC INTEREST COALITION

Sent via email: cdraecs@placer.ca.gov February 11, 2022
jbyous@placer.ca.gov> sherring@placer.ca.gov

To: Placer County CDRA
Subj: Public Comment—NOP—Proposed Project 8 Winery

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this most egregious proposal.

First, we incorporate by reference comments made during the Placer County Scoping meeting held at 1 pm on Tuesday, February 8, 2022. These would include but not be limited to: Not allowing variances as to Antelope Canal setbacks, solar disturbances over septic leach field compliance; consider another location—possibly next to a structure where height is over code limits in western Placer County's rural area near Hwy 65; and others.

Second, Placer County's Winery and Farm Breweries ordinance, 17.56330, states that the purpose of this section is to provide for the orderly development of wineries within agricultural zoning districts. Because this proposal is so incongruous with orderly development, one person asked how the project has come as far as it has. At what point does the County enforce compliance with its own ordinances and simply deny applications? Not only are taxpayer dollars wasted due to many hours of staff time spent on such an obvious incompatible proposed project in a "Rural Residential" or a "Residential Agricultural" zone, but also, neighbors and the public have to take personal time to point out how an unacceptable 75' high facility with a revolving floor is not orderly development and also violates County height ordinances. The EIR should examine how or why compliance with existing ordinances that have already been environmentally reviewed is being ignored, and how this project complies with the County's Ridgeline Protection policies.

Third, the parcel size of this winery is under 20 acres. Thus, according to Winery Ordinance Code (WO), the maximum number of attendees at one time is much lower than the applicants stated at one of the MAC meetings, and the maximum "Special Events/Year" is also much reduced from what is proposed. The WO appears to allow a larger facility with this statement under Table 2:

> An administrative review permit may be waived if a minimum of ten (10) contiguous acres is under the same ownership and deed restricted to preclude their separate sale, and if the structures related to the use meet the standards for the base zone district.

It is not clear that the applicants can utilize this "contiguous" acres work-around because it is in reference to a different section. However, assuming they can use it to comply with the ordinance, then please make public the language of the deed restriction and provide proof that it was recorded and that it is in perpetuity.

If the contiguous acres work-around is not meant to apply to the number of attendees (different section), then the project must not be allowed to have any of the larger number of events nor the larger number of attendees.

P.O. Box 671 Loomis, CA 95650 Public-Interest@live.com

Fourth: Since the state of California allows wineries to serve beer, more information needs to be revealed as to the serving of beer at this proposed winery and how it will impact traffic, air quality, hours of operation, etc.

Thank you for considering our views,

Marilyn Jasper, Chair
Public Interest Coalition
P.O. Box 671
Loomis, CA 95650
Public-Interest@live.com

Shirlee Herrington

From: Ann Henderickson-Pantos <rustyartgal@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 24, 2022 9:46 AM
To: Shirlee Herrington
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Project 8

Good morning Ms. Herrington,

I am writing regarding the Project 8 winery. I am a local resident. In reading about the project, I was unsure if the public was able to utilize the restaurant and tasting room. I plan to attend the meeting and I am looking to clarify some of the items in the proposal. I'm sure I will have other questions as I read further . . .

Thank you!

Ann Henderickson
1497 Sisley Rd, Penryn,

Shirlee Herrington

Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Re: question Project 8

From: Ann Henderickson-Pantos <rustyartgal@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 5, 2022 12:36 PM
To: Jennifer Byous <JByous@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: question Project 8

Hello again Ms. Byous,

I'm writing again to ask questions about Project 8. I am trying to figure out how the project benefits local folks. I'm wondering what a person can expect to pay for lunch/dinner after they arrive for their reservation. I also would like to know what the price for wine tasting will be. In Napa Valley it is not uncommon to pay $50 or more. Do you know if the winery is planning to be an organic grower? I called a high-end winery in Napa Valley and I was informed that none of the wineries in the Napa valley have a tower for their gravity-flow filtration of wine, it is all accomplished underground. I was also informed that gravity-flow filtration was not common there.

Thanks again for your time,

Ann Henderickson

On Wed, Jan 26, 2022 at 5:53 PM Ann Henderickson-Pantos <rustyartgal@gmail.com> wrote:

> Hello Jennifer Boyus,
>
> I am a neighbor of the Project 8 winery construction. As a neighbor, I was wondering if Project 8 is welcoming the locals to patronize the new restaurant and tasting room. It was a bit unclear when I was reading the project description. I'm sure I will have other questions as I read on but it's a lot to digest at once . . .
>
> Thank you for your time!
>
> Ann Henderickson

EIR Scoping Meeting on the Project 8 Winery Project:

Placer County CEQA Decision makers:

Following are my concerns related to the proposed Project 8 Winery:

First of all, I will address the appearance of the project in relation to the community look and feel. The building, while beautifully designed, looks as if it would be more at home in an industrial park. Penryn is a quiet burg where folks enjoy the peaceful country life. There was an article in the Sacramento Bee last year on April 9th titled, "Penryn has slower pace, open air" and also stated "Quaint streets and landscapes really give the feel of a far-off small town". In my opinion, the look and scope of the project is too contrary to the way of life the people of Penryn expect. Scale back the size, and design buildings that fit with the country casual vibe here. Additionally, Guard shacks don't belong in Penryn, it sends the wrong message about our community. At the last MAC meeting I went to, the office stood up and gave the crime report: there was a fist fight at the Valencia Club and 2 Mountain Dews were stolen from the Fast Pak.

Next, I would like to address the variance that is being requested for gravity flow filtration of their high-end wine. Project 8 hopes to build a tower 75 feet tall plus more footage on top for mechanical equipment covered with tents, (by the look of the rendering). That is over double the maximum allowable building height which is 36 feet. The total drop for gravity filtration would be approximately 160 feet so the additional footage must be underground. They say the 75-foot tower is required for gravity filtering their fine wine. This is not true. I spoke with a winemaker from Caymus Winery in Napa Valley about gravity wine filtration. He said there are some wineries in Napa Valley that filter their wine by gravity flow however there are no towers, all the footage is located underground. Additionally, mechanical filters are able to filter high-end wine and they are the go-to way to filter wine in Napa Valley. Therefore, there is absolutely no need for the variance and it should be denied. The beauty of the tree-lined ridge would be interrupted forever.

Grapes are typically a heavily sprayed crop. I worry about the pesticides and herbicides traveling to nearby neighbors and to adjacent woodlands where wildlife live, not to mention being carried down the storm drain that empties at Callison Rd. Will Project 8 be practicing organic farming? I hope so.

On the subject of wildlife, I don't remember seeing anything about degradation or loss of habitat and the identification of any listed Federal and/or State threatened, endangered, or special-status species protected by both the Endangered Species Act and the California Endangered Species Act (CESA). A recent EIR prepared in Placer County based queries of CDFW's Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) indicated there are as many as 23 special-status wildlife species and 19 special-status plant species that occur within the Rocklin and surrounding eight quadrangles.

Further, there are at least 4 migratory birds of concern known to occur in the proposed action area. There was no mention of migratory birds. The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), although a federal law, makes it a federal crime to “take’ birds or bird parts, including feathers, eggs, or nests without special permission from the U.S. Secretary of the Interior. Impacts to migratory birds can occur from noise, loss and degradation of habitat due to development, poisoning, collision from human structures, lighting and reflection of and into glass.

Another concern of mine is that water is scarce these days, is it fair that we are all being asked to conserve water when large projects like this are being okayed? I have read of the measures being taken by Project 8 to conserve water but it’s not enough and is it wise to OK a project of this magnitude in the middle of years of drought?

The scope of this project brings too much traffic and too many people. Addressing air quality as a result of increased traffic, it is important to acknowledge that Placer County is out of attainment for PM-2.5 and 8-HR ozone. There are over 100 parking stalls planned and that is the minimum so the plan states. I would be against any requests that would allow more visitors. Callison Rd. is purported to be widened from 22 feet 32 feet along the winery area. Vehicles already race from Taylor Rd. turning on to Callison Rd. It is a real danger to pedestrians (I was almost hit there). A wider road would encourage faster speeds. The entrance belongs on Taylor Rd. And, no we don’t need sidewalks and another stop light, I hear from folks all the time complaining about the light at Taylor and Penryn roads, that they have long waits when nary a vehicle is around.

I understand that there will be a sculpture in the front of the project. I hope consideration will be given to commission a local artist. A good candidate would be Phil Evans. He is a metal sculptor that is highly regarded and he has completed many public pieces. There are many other excellent sculptors in the area as well.

Has the project owner thought of constructing a walking path on the property? It would be a nice gesture to provide a walking path and picnic tables under the oaks for local folks to enjoy. This could be a way of offering an olive branch to the community.

In closing, why is this project needed and how will it serve the private individuals and citizens living in the community? How will this project affect future growth here? Deep thought, planning and research are required because Project 8 will change the face of our beloved town forever. What is more important, catering to one person or saving our way of life for a whole community?

Ann Henderickson-Pantos

Colonel Christopher Pantos, USAF ret. 1497 Sisley Rd. Penryn

Carol Brock

1230 Honker Pond Court Penryn, CA 95663

Tel: Home Phone (916) 663-9725 Mobile Phone (916) 531-2752 cb2@aol.com

1/26/22

Shirlee Herrington
Environmental Coordination Services
Placer Count Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive, St 190
Auburn, CA 95603

Placer County Development Resource Agency;

I am writing in response to the Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed Project 8 Winery. I am a homeowner in the impact area with several major concerns.

1.The project site is located in an area designated as "agricultural-related uses" in unincorporated Placer County. The proposed winery is an industrial /retail use - not agricultural. Therefore should it even be considered for approval?

2. *Ground water and well contamination.* Acres of grapes have already been planted during a period of high drought. Was there ever an environmental report done on the impact the huge well put in might have on the wells of the local home owners? What recourse do we, local homeowners in the area of the Project 8 Winery, have if our wells now run dry due to this high production winery well? Was an environmental report done on the potential ground water contamination due to chemicals used on the grapes? What recourse will the homeowners have?

3. Pollution and safety from traffic. Callison Road is a small, rural road that has not had much traffic until the Project 8 Winery began its development nearly two years ago (prior to environmental reports done?). The proposal is requesting that a maximum of 200 people at one time can attend a special event at that the facility, and that the project can have 208 special events annually. That means 57% of the year local homeowners would have to worry about their safety when driving and walking on Callison between the hours of operation, up to 10 p. m. at

night. That means 100 more cars on a now quiet rural road with possibly inebriated drivers coming from wine tasting and the restaurant/ special events. What safety measures will be taken to protect Penryn citizens walking in the area of the winery project? Sidewalks? Can the entry to the winery not be off of Taylor Road to save the rural integrity of the area? (Reference Placer County General Plan Visual and Science Resources Policy 1.K.1)

4. Erosion and drainage issues. I reference the Placer County General Plan Visual and Scenic Resources Policy 1,K.4, Policy 1.K.6, and Open Space for the Preservation of Natural Resources Policy 6,E.2)

There is a large pond on my property registered with the State Water Resource Board designated as a 'fire pond' located on Placer County Parcel Map 75424. Per the agreement, "said fire pond is for the purposes of fire suppression"and has a Placer County public fire hydrant on it.

(This pond is a tributary to Red Ravine thence Secret Ravine thence Miners Ravine thence Dry Creek thence Natomas Main Drainage Canal thence the Sacramento River.) The water that enters this pond enters dozens of other ponds on its way to the Sacramento River.

During the the 28 years of my ownership I have maintained the pond to support the 'fire pond' description, maintaining the water level and depth as well as keeping the water free of debris and weeds, being careful to always support the fish/wildlife population that lives in the pond. Never once has the water become less than clear nor filled with mud.

During the storm last fall on October 24-25, went approximately 24-30" above its normal level. When the water receded, the decks and stairs going to the pond, covered by the deluge, were covered in mud. The pond continued to look like liquid mud four weeks after the storm. When it rained again after that the pond once again looked like liquid mud. Turtles live in the pond and when they came out to bathe in the sun they were totally covered with mud. We still cannot determine if any fish continue to live in the pond due to the silt filled water from the decomposed granite assault on it. We assume the pond is considerably shallower due to all of the dirt that has poured into it.

I am enclosing photos of the pond representative of the 28 years I have lived here - and then from and since the weekend of the storm.

In trying to determine why so much dirt upstream washed into the pond from us - something that had never occurred before during the 28 years I have owned this property and pond, when hiking up the hills where the water flows from, we found a great deal of earth moved by the Penryn Winery and Hilltop Restaurant proposed developer. There is evidence of rain caused gullies and ditches, pipes ready to put in but not yet done so, etc. I am also enclosing photos of what we found there. It seemed obvious that the damage done to our pond with liquified granite mud has been due to the movement of dirt on the acreage of this development and lack of prevention taken.

It seems obvious that this new development did not incorporate sound soil conservation practices and minimize land alteration. Thousands of yards of dirt have been graded, moved and added to. It does not appear that cuts and fills have been limited nor graded areas replanted to ensure establishment of plant cover before the rainy season, (Policy 1.K.4) Per policy 1.K.6, developments near or on portions of hillsides are not to cause or worsen natural hazards such as erosion, sedimentation or water quality concerns. Erosion and sediment control measures [should be included] with temporary vegetation sufficient to stabilize the disturbed areas.

What mediations can we expect 'after the fact' of the above failures to follow the General Plan? We now sit with a shallower fire pond on our property, full of new weeds as well as sediment. This can impact the amount of water now available to use to fight local fires.. This can also have an impact on the value of my property. Does the developer not bear any responsibility for protecting the water rights of those of us and wildlife downstream of his development as well as the property values of surrounding homes?

If not already done, I would strongly recommend the Planning Commission members take a tour of the development, independent of wining and dining offered by the developer. Please take an unbiased look at the agricultural rural lifestyle the homeowners have chosen and would like to protect.

Sincerely,

Carol Brock

Carol Brock

1230 Honker Pond Court, Penryn 95663

pond taken 11/19

pond taken 7/21

pond taken 11/21

pond taken 11/21

photos taken 11/4/22 from development property

phots taken 1/28/22 - culvert bringing in water
and weeds now growing in water

Project 8 Winery

RECEIVED
FEB 10 2022
CDRA - Planning

Feb 2, 2022

Greetings Shirlee Herrington,

My name is Lindsay Markin and a 25-year resident on the corner of Callison Rd and Ridgeview. The Winery is the best thing that could have happened to us. Mike is extremely accommodating and conscious of all the surrounding neighbors. His plans and vision are big and going to be successful. Change is inevitable and I have to admit our little valley has experienced very little over the years. All the work I have witnessed regarding this project has been professional, up to code and not cutting any corners. In fact he has fixed many water problems that has plagued us for many years. When I first met Mike his motto was 'He wants to be a good neighbor' a year later he has backed that up 10 fold with his actions. He has shown a willingness to work with everyone and listen to the needs and wants of the neighborhood. The value of all our homes will only benefit from a world renown winery. I am also in favor of the building on top of the ridge. Tasting room, restaurant, research lab, will draw an elite clientele.

Sincerely,

Lindsay Markin

Lindsay Markin
7411 Callison Road
Penryn, Ca 95663

Ridgeline Protection

Various Placer County planning documents including the County General Plan and Rural Design Guidelines address ridgeline protection, both containing goals, policies and implementation strategies or measures. The **Placer County General Plan** establishes policies and programs that regulate ridgeline development and alterations including:

Residential Land Use Policy 1.B.5
The County shall require residential project design to reflect and consider natural features, noise exposure of residents, visibility of structures, circulation, access, and the relationship of the project to surrounding uses. Residential densities and lot patterns will be determined by these and other factors. As a result, the maximum density specified by General Plan designations or zoning for a given parcel of land may not be realized.

Visual and Scenic Resources Policy 1.K.1
The County shall require that new development in scenic areas (e.g., river canyons, lake watersheds, scenic highway corridors, ridgelines and steep slopes) is planned and designed in a manner which employs design, construction, and maintenance techniques that:

a. Avoids locating structures along ridgelines and steep slopes;
b. Incorporates design and screening measures to minimize the visibility of structures and graded areas; and,
c. Maintains the character and visual quality of the area.

Visual and Scenic Resources Policy 1.K.2
The County shall require that new development in scenic areas be designed to utilize natural landforms and vegetation for screening structures, access roads, building foundations, and cut and fill slopes.

Visual and Scenic Resources Policy 1.K.3
The County shall require that new development in rural areas incorporates landscaping that provides a transition between the vegetation in developed areas and adjacent open space or undeveloped areas.

Visual and Scenic Resources Policy 1.K.4
The County shall require that new development incorporates sound soil conservation practices and minimizes land alterations. Land alterations should comply with the following guidelines:

a. Limit cuts and fills;
b. Limit grading to the smallest practical area of land;
c. Limit land exposure to the shortest practical amount of time;
d. Replant graded areas to ensure establishment of plant cover before the next rainy season;
e. Create grading contours that blend with the natural contours on site or with contours on property immediately adjacent to the area of development; and,

f. Provide and maintain site-specific construction Best Management Practices (BMPs).

Visual and Scenic Resources Policy 1.K.6
The County shall require that new development on hillsides employ design, construction, and maintenance techniques that:

a. Ensure that development near or on portions of hillsides do not cause or worsen natural hazards such as erosion, sedimentation, fire, or water quality concerns;
b. Include erosion and sediment control measures including temporary vegetation sufficient to stabilize disturbed areas;
c. Minimize risk to life and property from slope failure, landslides, and flooding; and,
d. Maintain the character and visual quality of the hillside.

Scenic Routes Policy 1.L.3
The County shall protect and enhance scenic corridors through such means as design review, sign control, undergrounding utilities, scenic setbacks, density limitations, planned unit developments, grading and tree removal standards, open space easements and land conservation contracts.

Development Form and Design Policy 1.O.3
The County shall require that all new development be designed to be compatible with the scale and character of the areas. Structures, especially those outside of village, urban, and commercial centers, should be designed and located so that:

a. They do not silhouette against the sky above ridgelines or hilltops;
b. Roof lines and vertical architectural features blend with and do not detract from the natural background or ridge outline;
c. They fit the natural terrain; and,
d. They utilize building materials, colors, and textures that blend with the natural landscape (e.g. avoid high contrasts).

Development Form and Design Policy 1.O.4
The County shall require that new rural and suburban development be designed to preserve and maintain the rural character and quality of the County.

Vegetation Policy 6.D.1
The County shall encourage landowners and developers to preserve the integrity of existing terrain and natural vegetation in visually-sensitive areas such as hillsides, ridges, and along important transportation corridors.

Vegetation Policy 6.D.9
The County shall require that development on hillsides be limited to maintain valuable natural vegetation, especially forests and open grasslands, and to control erosion.

Open Space for the Preservation of Natural Resources Policy 6.E.2
The County shall require that new development be designed and constructed to preserve the following types of areas and features as open space to the maximum extent feasible:

a. High erosion hazard areas;
b. Scenic and trail corridors;
c. Streams, streamside vegetation;
d. Wetlands;
e. Significant stands of vegetation;
f. Wildlife corridors; and,

g. Any areas of special ecological significance

Placer County Rural Design Guidelines, 1997.
Several sections of the Rural Design Guidelines deal with conservation of the natural landscape including:

Greenbelts, Open Spaces, Native Vegetation, Habitat and Wildlife Protection Goal 5
Conservation of the natural landscape, including minimizing disturbance to natural terrain and vegetation, should be an overriding consideration in the design of any project, paying particular attention to its protection and the preservation of existing native vegetation.

Lot Design- Goal 2
To assist in designing home locations on lots to preserve the local rural character.

Lot Design- Implementation Technique 5
Buildable portions of lots should be designed to protect natural resources/features by incorporating trees, wetlands, streams, rock outcroppings, etc. into the overall project for long term preservation. It is not always necessary to completely avoid these resources, they can often be incorporated into a project design. Residences should be located on the edges of topographical changes and vegetation areas (i.e. wooded areas), or just below ridge lines.

Preservation of Scenic Areas Goal 1
To avoid creating predominant landmarks which impose on the rural landscape and the natural skyline in ways that cause the contiguous rural landscape to be interrupted.

Preservation of Scenic Areas Implementation Techniques

1. Homes and accessory structures should blend into the environment.
2. Where possible, structures should be tucked along tree lines or along other topographical changes in contour.
3. On lots located along ridge tops, houses and accessory structures should be built just below the ridge line where there are no existing trees to prevent the structures from becoming the predominant feature on the rural landscape. Otherwise, such development should be screened by new plantings of sufficient height and bulk at maturity to minimize visual encroachment to the greatest extent possible.

Protection Measures

Steep slope regulations are frequently based on environmental considerations such as erosion and sedimentation controls, while ridgeline regulations have more emphasis on view protection. County policy stipulates that development should not take place in such a way as to create major or lasting visible scars on the landscape or a major negative visual impact. The County seeks to accomplish the following:

1. Provide hillside development standards to minimize the impact of man-made structures and grading on views of existing landforms, unique geologic features, existing landscape features and open space as seen from designated public roads;
2. Protect and preserve views of major and minor ridgelines from designated public roads and recreational areas;
3. Minimize cut and fill, earthmoving, grading operations and other such man-made effects on the natural terrain to ensure that finished slopes are compatible with existing land character; and,
4. Promote architecture and designs that are compatible with hillside terrain and minimize visual impacts.

Shirlee Herrington

From: pneifer <pneifer@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 10, 2022 6:24 PM
To: Shirlee Herrington
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Email address for public comments on Project 8 Winery

Please include these comments on the NOP for the Project 8 Winery.

The bridge walkway over the PCWA water canal and antelope creek should be evaluated for environmental impact. Can the canal walls support a bridge? Can things be thrown into the water from the bridge?

The proximity to the rail road and tracks with a building design to tower above the train and tracks should be evaluate.

The amount of underground excavation and digging, rock removal and tunneling into granite and earth should be evaluated for environmental impact, including erosion, water contamination and safety of patrons for emergency evacuation.

Another environmental impact would include the loss of water seeping into the groundwater with this much of the earth covered with roads, buildings, parking and other structures.

Patty Neifer
Penryn resident
Pneifer@gmail.com
916 934-9050

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

-------- Original message --------
From: Shirlee Herrington <SHerring@placer.ca.gov>
Date: 2/8/22 8:25 AM (GMT-08:00)
To: pneifer <pneifer@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Email address for public comments on Project 8 Winery plus ridgeline document

CDRAECS or my email both work. I’ve forwarded your request to have the document projected. They will let you know at the meeting if it’s possible.

Thank you,

Placer County Environmental Coordination Services

From: pneifer <pneifer@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 5, 2022 4:44 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public comment from Patty Neifer Project 8 Winery NOP

This concern regarding the EIR of the Project 8 Winery is based on the undetermined maximum public capacity of the project area.

While the winery ordinance defines a maximum capacity for tasting rooms and for special events at a winery, there is no capacity limit on the number of visitors to the winery at any given time. This fact would make the EIR inaccurate.

In the case of an auxiliary restaurant and Project 8 auxiliary public spaces, there is not a maximum capacity defined. In addition to the guests dining inside the restaurant in a facility of this size, there will likely also be overlapping public visitors to the gift shop, wine store, wine caves and viewing areas. Guests will be taking advantage of the expansive hilltop terrace, sightseeing from the rooftop observation area, participating in wine cave tours, using the two large meeting rooms and taking walks in the vinyard and along the designated paths.

Since reservations are not required and public guests accessing the winery are not limited, agriculture tours, wine club members, and other activities offered at the winery will attract an undetermined number of visitors.

Since there is no defined maximum occupancy capacity, how can the environmental impact study accurately identify the impacts of this project?

The addition of a 3600 square foot outside dining and observations area, together with the size of the restaurant and the separate rooftop wine tasting area and conference rooms add up to over 10,000 sq foot of public use area.

My comment is that before an EIR can be done, the capacity of traffic and guests must be identified and defined. What process is being used to calculate public usage for the purpose of the EIR.

Patty Neifer
916 934-9050
Penryn resident
Pneifer@gmail.com

Shirlee Herrington

From: Heidi Storm <heidimstorm@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 6, 2022 2:21 PM
To: Shirlee Herrington
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Winery tower in Penryn

Hello Sherry,
I am not in favor of the new construction planned for the winery on Callison Road. The neighborhood out here is so peaceful and quiet, it would be ruined by having the volume of tourists that would come to a 72 parking-spot facility. The roads are not wide enough in the neighborhood and Callison Road itself is already dangerous for bikers and walkers as it has no shoulders. Outsiders driving in would add to the danger, especially as they leave tanked up on wine. The winery is already taking up more than its share of PCWA water and that concerns us all for the future. I think even worse than having a winery is the monstrosity of the structure that is planned. It would completely damage the image of our rolling hills and pastures region.
Thank you for asking for our opinions.

Confidentially,
Heidi Storm

Shirlee Herrington

From: lisa clingan <skylalisa@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 6, 2022 9:15 AM
To: Shirlee Herrington
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Oppose Winery

Good morning Shirlee,

I am emailing to oppose this winery. We are life long, third generation Newcastle residents. We live off of Taylor rd. Our roads cannot accommodate a huge winery such as this. Newcastle residents also do not want to commercialize our area. It is incredibly upsetting that our local Government is not trying to preserve these small towns. We live here because we don't want all the traffic and the people. Thanks so much,

Lisa Clingan

Shirlee Herrington

From: Morgan Buttram <buttrammorgan@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 6, 2022 8:08 PM
To: Shirlee Herrington
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Winery with 75ft restaurant

To Whom It May Concern,

My concerns with a 75 ft tall restaurant is that it will take all, if not most water resources that many local farmers orchards and cattle ranchers and farmers (including my home) surrounding area of Penryn will be limited. Being that California has been in a drought the past several years, a giant winery that will take up the local water supply does not seem appropriate. Secondly, I'm most concerned with pesticides that will be used on the wine grapes as it goes into the soil and will run down any creeks as well as, penetrate deep in the water supply in the surrounding areas (including my property), will be ingested by people and animals. Lastly, a 75ft tall restaurant is a absurd and invasion of local homes privacy. Whomever this builder/owner of this proposed winery and restaurant may be, they are excavating and demolishing the beautiful rolling hills and nature preserves that was once a residence of native Americans.

I hope my concerns will help mediate a decision of good merit.

Best,

Local of Newcastle.

Shirlee Herrington

From: Sara Stephens <sarastephens313@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 6, 2022 5:53 PM
To: Shirlee Herrington
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public Comment: Project 8 Winery Loomis/Penryn

Dear Sherri,
My name is Sara Mattia and my family and I have lived in the Loomis/Penryn area for 15 years and my father had a business in Loomis for 20+ years. We have been involved in our community for over 20 years. I volunteer extensively with 4-H, FFA, the Placer/Nevada Cattlewoman's Association, my children's schools and do what I can to support the youth in our community. I have been watching this winery and development project go in on a daily as I drive my kids to school along Taylor Rd. This development project is NOT in the care and keeping of the rural community I care about and love. Though the grape vines do support agriculture in the community, an aerial restaurant on the top of the hill which could potentially accommodate parking of 75+ spots are not what the roadways, the traffic, the noise ordinances and the residential area should accommodate. I do support a small restaurant that doesn't not stand like an eyesore on the hill.

I am unable to attend the Zoom meeting due to work commitments, but I would like my opposition to this project, as it currently stands, acknowledged in the public comments, please. If there are modifications to the project to scale it back to mesh more with the care and keeping of a rural community, I would be more in favor.

Thank you
sara mattia

EIR Scoping Meeting on the Project 8 Winery Project

Shirlee Herrington

From: Tim Onderko <loomisusa@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 6, 2022 9:48 AM
To: Shirlee Herrington
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Penryn Winery Project (PLN21-00198) EIR

Dear Shirlee, I'm writing to express my support for the proposed Penryn Winery, restaurant, tasting room and production facility Project, known as Project 8 Winery (PLN21-00198).

The proposed design and facility will provide a destination attraction to the area which will bring employment opportunities and tax revenue to Placer County.

My family and I are residents of Loomis. We look forward to visiting the new facility when it opens, should the project be approved.

We urge the planning commission to support the project as proposed including the requested structural height variance.

Sincerely,

Tim Onderko
Loomis, CA

Shirlee Herrington

From: Tish Walters <tish.walters@icloud.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 6, 2022 8:41 AM
To: Shirlee Herrington
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Penryn Restaurant/winery

We have a beautiful home on Penryn Road ! we are very against this gigantic restaurant. The winery is OK but this enormous 75 ft building with the restaurant rotating on top is absolutely ridiculous! we do not want it in our area. We don't mind the winery but we don't want the traffic on Callison and Taylor and we don't want to gigantic restaurant. The Walters 5308633080

Sent from my iPhone

Shirlee Herrington

From: Doug Diruscio <doug.diruscio@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 4:34 PM
To: Shirlee Herrington
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Project 8 Winery
Attachments: build site.jpeg

Planning Commission,

My property is surrounded on 3 sides by the project 8 vineyards and I feel that the proposed restaurant, events center, and processing facility will have a profoundly negative impact on the rural environment I currently enjoy. The request to build a 75 foot heigh, equivalent to a 6 story building, on the top of an undeveloped hill in rural placer county should not be granted. Such a request would spurn deliberation and trepidation in the developed cities of Roseville and Rocklin, but is totally out of place in our rural countryside. Please see the attached photo taken from my property towards the proposed build site (You can see a scissor lift on-top of the hill).

The requested variance actually exceeds 75 feet as it does not include the height of "rooftop mechanical equipment" that will make the building even larger. The other requested variance is to expand the occupancy limit from 50 to 75, as one of the closest neighbors I am concerned about the noise generated from 75 people drinking wine 6 stories high as they overlook my property. I ask that neither the height or the occupancy variance be granted for this winery and that the project work within the confines of the already generous Placer County wine ordinance that was recently updated after extensive review.

I welcome a winery under 30 feet high with a maximum occupancy of 50 people at the building site. Please do not grant these variances as they will create a negative noise and visual environment for a rural community. When I purchased my property the neighboring land was protected by the Williamson Act to ensure its rural composure, please don't allow it to become a wine entertainment park.

Regards,

Doug DiRuscio
871 Peach Tree Lane
Penryn, CA 95663

Comments on the Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Project 8 Winery in Penryn

From:
Gabriele Windgasse, DrPH
3570 N Lakeshore Blvd
Loomis, CA95650

Date: February 7, 2022

Dear Planning Commission members,

I am a member of the Horseshoe Bar/Penryn MAC and have several questions and concerns regarding the proposed Project 8 Winery in Penryn. In my opinion, the project as proposed is an unreasonable impairment of the natural resources of the Horseshoe Bar/Penryn area and would constitute a significant irreversible impact. The predominant structure is more than 75 ft tall and is incongruent with the surroundings and the ridgeline. The project would create a predominant landmark which imposes on the landscape and natural skyline. A beautiful winery with an excellent accessory restaurant, event space, and wonderful views can be accomplished on that site with a different design.

Specific comments on scope and content of EIR.

1. The NoP does not specifcy how tall the overall structure is: in addition to the 75 ft of the building's height above grade – what height is added by the mechanical equipment and the screen? This overall height of building and screen should be used when the county is considering granting a height variance above the maximum allowable building height of 36 ft.

2. Should the octagon be considered an „agricultural structure“ since levels 1, 2, 3, and 4 are not primarily agricultural? Only the sublevel and the top level are related to ag use.

3. Does the overall height of building and screen require warning features for aviation safety (i.e. blinking lights at night etc)? There are several small local airports nearby that could be affected.

4. As part of the EIR, please provide a map of the viewshed from the tallest point of the octagon/screen: from which points is this structure visible? Which major roadways, parks, trails, towns are affected from changing the ridgeline with a permanent landmark like this?

5. The proposed parking stalls are given as minima (minimum of 72, 19 and 27, for octagon top, warehouse, and wine cave, respectively - total of 118) – what are the maximum parking stalls that can be installed?

6. The sub-level structures range from 20 ft below grade (octagon, 8000 sf) to 90 ft below grade (wine cave, 32,000 sf), in addition to the vertical shaft to the top of the hill and horizontal tunnels. How much volume will be removed from the inside of the hill? Where will the massive volumes of excavated material be placed? Do the excavated materials contain potentially hazardous materials (for example arsenic compounds) and how would dust emissions and leachate be managed during construction and operation? What potential impact could the excavation have on quality of

groundwater, surface water, and drinking water of the area, including the public and private wells on the site? Will the excavation cause the water level to change?

7. Aestetics:
    a. Please consider in this section of the EIR how this project may look 20 or 50 years from now. I would assume that the restaurant stopped revolving, and the then-owner may either be unable or unwilling to invest sufficiently in the required upkeep. The structure may be too expensive to repair or tear down, and it may deteriorate into an eyesore, a very visible ruin on a hilltop.
    b. Please discuss how approval for this project can set a precedent for future ridge top developments: for example residences, hotels, restaurants , condominiums on other ridgelines.
    c. What lights are proposed for all structures, roads and landcaping? How far would these lights be visible at night?

8. Agriculture and Forestry Resources:
    a. How many trees (type, age) would need to be cut down for this project as proposed?

9. Landuse and Planning
   Please request that the applicant follow the established guidance, for this site, including:
    a. The Horseshoe Bar/Penryn Community Plan (https://www.placer.ca.gov/3033/Horseshoe-Bar-Penryn-Community-Plan#:~:text=The%20Horseshoe%20Bar%2FPenryn%20Community,at%20least%20the%20year%202010) amendedin 2005, pages 115-116, specifically speaks to the importance of natural landforms, vistas, viewsheds, and maximizing the preservation of natural beauty.

       „Because the dominant features of the Planning Area contributing to the open quality are the natural landforms and vegetation, structures should be subordinate thereto. .... The scale of building, the siting of structures, and the design and materials of construction shall be harmonious with the natural setting so that the visual quality of open spaces will not be unreasonably impaired."
       „A variety of vistas shall be provided and preserved ranging from the small enclosed private views to the more distant views shared by the community. The viewsheds of 1-80, AuburnFolsom Road, King Road, Indian Hill Road, Clark Tunnel Road and Perryn- Taylor Road shall be protected to preserve existing scenic vistas of the Sacramento Valley, Loomis Basin Foothills, high peaks of the Sierra Nevada, and Folsom Lake."
       „Require development of all building sites and residences in a manner minimizing disturbance to natural terrain and vegetation, and maximizing preservation of natural beauty and open space."

    b. The Placer County Rural-Design Guidelines
       https://www.placer.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/10134/Rural-Design-Guidelines-PDF
       places the natural landscape as the dominant feature. *„Structures that dominate the landscape interrupt the rutral continuity of the area*". The specific goals are: *„1) to avoid*

creating predominant landmarks which impose on the landscape and the natural skyline in ways that cause the contiguous rural landscape to be interrupted; ... 2) To protect ... public view corridors along ...Interstate 80 from actions which degrade their scenic quality".

c. The Placer County Design Guidelines Manual (https://www.placer.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/3828/Placer-County-Design-Guidelines-Manual-PDF), page 101 spells out the special district guidelines for Penryn, including: *„maximum height shall not exceed two (2) stories, low silhouette, low profile. ... Structures should be built just below the ridgeline, to prevent the structure from becoming the predominant feature on the rural landscape.... Ensuring that structures do not emerge above the treetops"*

Summary

I am greatly concerned that approving the Project 8 Winery as proposed will set a precedent for future ridgeline or other developments in Placer County. This project - as proposed - significantly impacts the common good of open space, vistas, and the natural beauty of the area. These concepts are defined and protected in many Placer County Guidelines.

I urge the Planning Commission to request changes that align this project with existing guidelines. A beautiful winery with an excellent accessory restaurant, event space, and great views can be accomplished on that site – it does not require a 75ft+ structure that is – or could become - an eyesore for many Placer County residents and visitors.

Thank you for your consideration.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely

Gabriele Windgasse, DrPH
windgasse@hotmail.com
c 916.316 3726

Shirlee Herrington

From: Pierre Marchal <gpmarchal@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 7:29 PM
To: Shirlee Herrington
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Winery in Penryn

I do not oppose the winery concept. I do oppose the height of the structure. It is noted as 75' PLUS mechanical equipment with screening. What's the total. It says the commercial structure contains a residence. Perhaps if that was not part of the structure it could be lower. After all, it is already on a hilltop. The next concern are the parking lots, noted with a minimum number of stalls. What is the maximum? What happens to the contaminated runoff from these parking areas. How is the sewage from this property handled. The downtown area of Penryn was required to have a sewer system installed because the local soils could not filter sewage properly and well water was contaminated. With an increase of numbers of people, restaurant, and everything else, it is a concern. I would like to close by acknowledging that we the local population actually have no say and no recourse if the four supervisors we can not vote for or against choose to ignores us. Remember, money talks.

G Pierre Marchal
Penryn, CA
916-316-3145

Shirlee Herrington

From: Ryan Fogarty <rfogarty13@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 3:00 PM
To: Shirlee Herrington
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Project 8 Winery Comments

Hi Shirlee,

Thank you for taking comments here.

My two primary concerns around the winery are:

1) The visual impact on the generally natural landscape in our home, Penryn/Newcastle. It is ironic that the very reason they want to build a 75ft restaurant/observation deck is to be able to see the beautiful area/land that is beautiful because it has no 75ft towers/buildings. Why on earth would we allow this to happen for the benefit and greed of one family? The winery owners are showy people who do not share the same values of modesty, nature, environmental respect that make our towns great (Just look at their house off of Sierra College). Let's not let them ruin the area -- we are already under assault from developers, left and right (literally).

2) The impact on water usage in the area. Water is already a scarce resource and with weather patterns the way they are, it doesn't appear that this will change any time soon. Between this and the Bickford Ranch project, water has become a huge concern.

Ryan Fogarty
Penryn

Placer County Environmental Coordination Services

From: Cathy Chappell <chappell.cathy@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 2:40 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Project 8 Winery EIR preparation

in the EIR please address the following:

- ground water quality and quantity impacts
- air quality impacts
- loss of wildlife habitat
- increased traffic and road use impact and safety
- aesthetic impacts including
    - 75' height variance for the ridgeline octagon building especially given county restrictions on ridgeline construction
    - massive wall at entrance and guard shack, not in keeping with the neighborhood
- culture issues including appropriateness of
    - a large commercial facility in a rural residential/agricultural area.
    - a full service "accessory" restaurant in a residential neighborhood

I am concerned about this project on many levels, including the owner's continued development of the property prior to the EIR and the many irregularities of variances and encroachment he has already successfully negotiated.

In particular I am opposed to the 75' height variance, on the ridgeline/hilltop. In the EIR, alternatives should be considered including no building, or a limited building for wine production only restricted at the allowed 36', relocating the wine production and associated buildings to the owner's Taylor Road parcel.

I am opposed to the extended hours of the "accessory" restaurant and the variance for increased capacity. The EIR should address the apparent disconnect between the restaurant's hours of operation and typical winery tasting room hours. It appears that the tail is wagging the dog in this arrangement. In the EIR, alternatives should be considered including no restaurant, locating the restaurant on the owner's Taylor Road parcel, and/or significantly restricted hours of operation.

This invasive, large commercial operation is not appropriate for the rural residential and agricultural make up of Callison Rd.

Thank you in advance for addressing these issues.
Catherine Chappell
7276 Callison Rd.
Penryn, CA 95663

Placer County Environmental Coordination Services

From: Steve Fettke <stevefettke@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 7:10 PM
To: Placer County Environmental Coordination Services
Cc: Steve Fettke
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Project 8 Winery Comment

I think most aspects of the winery look good.

But the 75-foot-tall octagonal restaurant is obtrusive and out of place. It will be too visible from surrounding areas, dominating the sightlines. And will loom over close neighbors, impacting their privacy. I don't think it needs to be that tall to have good views anyway and should stay within the allowed maximum heigh above grade.

My other concern is the large parking lot uphill of the restaurant. It seems too big for that location. A lot of oak trees would need to be removed. And a lot of grading would need to be done. It seems like there should be a less impactful place on the property to put a parking lot.

Steve Fettke
Unincorporated Loomis, CA

Shirlee Herrington

From: Jennie Nitta <jennieknitta@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 9, 2022 11:46 AM
To: Shirlee Herrington
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Winery

We believe this project is extremely inappropriate for our neighborhood. A 75' tall rotating restaurant on top o
over 100 people? The volume of traffic? Noise? Pollution?

It is a very large,busy commercial project in a very quiet residential/agricultural area.

We are especially concerned about the following-

Digging tunnels three stories down deep into the ridge and drilling through granite for the underground meeting rooms and public a

Everyone in the area gets their drinking water from wells. How will this affect the groundwater.

Wildlife displacement

How much light pollution will this cause? What will our evening sky look like?

Congestion and pollution from additional traffic. Taylor Road already backs up through the area several times a day. This project w
the area as they travel through on the freeway. The intersection at Taylor and English Colony will need a traffic light to accommoda
Penryn exit. English Colony Road will be impacted as people try to access the winery from Lincoln and beyond. There is a one lan
tracks where English Colony Road crosses. The traffic on this road is already going to be severely impacted with the Bickford proje
way will use Clark Tunnel and the west part of Callison. Both roads are very narrow, with numerous blind spots on the hills and cur

Erosion and drainage issues.

Building a structure on top of the ridge is not typical in Placer County. Ridgeline protection specifications are in place, but not being

How will the PCWA ditch be protected from contamination?

We are fine with the winery but the scope and size of the event center and restaurant are beyond what is app

Thank you,
Mark and Jennie Nitta
Abbott Road
Penryn

Vitp}Jsv{ evh

Shirlee Herrington

From: Beth G. <sunflower_1102@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 11, 2022 1:22 PM
To: Shirlee Herrington
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Penryn Winery Comments

Dear Planning Commissioners and Supervisors:

Please consider my concerns as a county resident of 45 years and owner of three acres in Penryn since 1978. The rural community atmosphere, with open fields, livestock. oak woodlands, friendliness of the residents, and winding roads are just a few of the pluses of living here. The planned incoming Penryn Winery will contribute to a demise of such valued features.

This is a **HUGE** development, not only in acreage, but height, with a **75'** restaurant tower (which is totally against Placer County's own ridge guidelines, as is the ridgetop location,) and depth, three stories deep for production facilities and underground meeting rooms. Present plans call for tunneling down into the ridge and drilling through the granite base rock, allowing water movement from the subterrain aquifers. Well users will face possible contamination. Will the company and/or County pay for new wells? Has the County required guarantees that any contamination mitigation be paid for in full by the Penryn Winery? Is the County committed to file suit for residents and pay for court costs?! What will the company do to prevent PCWA canal contamination, including run off? Drainage from the property and erosion from earth displacement must be strictly observed and requirements enforced. Once the development is built, will there be frequent, unannounced County inspections and evaluations to make sure rules are adhered to into the future?

The expected customers will be arriving via Taylor Road, a two-lane road that has already seen a substantial increase in residential and commuter traffic. Those vehicles bring with them air and noise pollution, degrading the environment. While on the subject of pollution, with this large ridgetop development, even with down facing lighting, there will be light released, effecting the night skies.

Finally, speaking on behalf of the voiceless, wildlife will have needed habitat forever removed by the buildings, patios, terraces, observation decks, hillside parking, landscaping, and walking paths proposed. The Bickford and Lincoln developments have already removed gigantic chunks of wildlife habitat.

The attraction of a fancy new winery, adding to Placer's desire to grow in their wine destination status, and the hoped-for taxes, can color supervisors' view of the actual cost of such a project. I urge you to require a much scaled down version of this proposed winery, eliminate underground drilling, the tower, and guarantee company mitigation of problems created. Please be aware of the trick of closing a company where the documents were signed, and opening a new one, free of past commitments and responsibilities!

Thank you for your careful consideration of my concerns.

Sincerely,

Beth A. Sunflower Gouveia

Beth A. Sunflower Gouveia
5165 Abbott Road
Penryn, CA 95663
916-663-9567
sunflower_1102@hotmail.com

Shirlee Herrington

From: Larry Gouveia <lxgc802@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 11, 2022 3:13 PM
To: Shirlee Herrington
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Project 8 Winery, Penryn

Good Afternoon,

My name is Larry Gouveia, I live at 5165 Abbott Rd, Penryn and I wish to voice my concerns about the size and scope of this project.

First, it is planned for a ridge top which goes against the Placer County Planning Commission guidelines.

It will add light, water and air pollution to this RURAL community.

Traffic will increase significantly to freeway and local roads which are already at capacity on weekends and commuter hours.

Creating wine caves and cellars into the hillside does not seem very eco friendly.

Water usage to grow grapes is using up an already precious resource.

What about winery patrons driving under the influence of alcohol. How many traffic accidents and possible fatalities are considered “acceptable”?

I’m not a teetotaler, I enjoy a good glass of wine. I just think there are enough wineries in California and around the world to keep everyone supplied.

Thank you.

Lawrence Gouveia

Sent from my iPhone

February 11, 2022

Shirlee I. Herrington
Environmental Coordination Services
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive, Suite #190
Auburn, CA 95603
sherring@placer.ca.gov

RE: Project 8 Winery NOP

Dear Ms. Herrington,

My husband and I attended the recent EIR Scoping Meeting on the Project 8 Winery Feb. 8, 2022. We appreciated the many comments of the citizens who were able to attend during the week at a time when many in our community are at work.

We have admired the new plantings of grapes along Taylor Road and Callison Road that enhance our communities agricultural setting. However, we do have concerns about the proposed developments on the 17.96 acres. We submit the following comments to help provide responsible agencies and interested persons with additional concerns regarding the scope of this project.

Traffic Circulation

While the document provided for the meeting discusses road improvements on Callison Road in front of the winery entrance it does not take into consideration the impacts of traffic on Sisley Road, Old English Colony or Callison Road where it connects to Old English Colony. These Roads, (Sisley Road and Callison Road) travel through the rural residential community. Community members run, bike, walk their dogs, ride horses, school age children will walk home from school on these roads during the winery's hours of operation. This presents a public safety concern. These roadways are narrow, have deep drainage ditches on the sides, blind curves, no center line and have no night lighting. Wine will be served at this facility which raises the concerns of DUI's and potential injuries to the community residents that live on these roads.

> A commercial development of the size and scope that is proposed would be better suited to have an entrance off of Taylor Road.

Further concern is Sisley Road from Taylor Road to Callison Road. Sisley Road is a historic section of the Lincoln Highway; and needs to be protected from excessive use. Sisley Road is the most direct route from the intersections of Rock Springs and Taylor Road to the Callison Road entrance of the Winery.

> Review of the historic status of Sisley Road and its potential protections and uses must be reviewed.

Accessory Use Restaurant

The proposed restaurant does not comply with the intended county guidelines. This proposed project would set a new precedent for development in Penryn beyond the intent and spirit of the Winery Ordinance Placer County established. The proposed full-service restaurant presents significant impacts to the present and reasonably foreseeable future of the developments in the Penryn community.

The Ridge Line

The architectural rendering of the proposed octagon building raising up 5 stories is deceptive. Clearly a number of trees will be removed, and the tower will be significantly exposed. We suggest that significant study be given to the requested height of the building. Having the building itself remain at the 36-foot level is acceptable, but not on the ridge line. The tower infringes on the ridge line policy of Placer County. Additionally, the upper levels of this facility would provide a view into the yards of the neighborhood evading personal privacy of residents. This raises the potential of a public nuisance violations.

Hours of Operation

Penryn is a rural residential community. The proposed facility operating from 7 A. M. to 10 P.M. introduces an intense commercial atmosphere to their neighborhood. The established county limits of 50 attendees at one time for Agricultural Promotional Events is acceptable. However, there is no limit to the number of events. The proposed projects plans on 208 events a year. A limit of the number of events must be considered should the Planning Commission approve the increase of attendees.

It should be recognized that increasing beyond this limit significantly increases traffic into the community unfamiliar with our roadways or considerate of the bucolic lifestyle of the community. Additional persons and cars will increase the noise level, affect air quality, increase pollution, increase need for potable water, and increased wastewater. These issues should be given considerable review in the determination of an increase from the limit the 50-attendee limit as well as the number of events.

Septic System and Bio Reactor System

The project proposes a Septic permit be obtained from Placer County Environmental Health Department. Separate and apart from the Septic System the project proposes a High Strength Membrane BioReactor system. BioReactor systems have greatly improved since first being introduced but there are still concerns of these systems potentially leaking into the ground affecting the quality of ground water and potentially creating a swampy area on neighboring parcels. A significant review of the BioReactor System and geological impacts must be given significant consideration.

Night Sky – Light Pollution

Lighting is an issue in the rural area. Residents enjoy the night sky. Any lighting must be downward and turned off after closing.

Napa Green Certified

What exactly is this certification? It appears to be a vintner trade group that shares information on sustainable development and land use. Clearly a trade group has its on priorities and those differ significantly from the surrounding community. Review the attached link.
https://www.northbaybusinessjournal.com/article/industry-news/napa-green-certification-whats-it-take-for-a-winery-or-vineyard-to-get-it/

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments on this proposed project. We hope the planning department will review these issues and make the Project 8 Winery a project that can be enjoyed and supported by the community.

Sincerely,

Michael and Cheryl Schmit
7911 Logan Lane
Penryn, CA. 95663

Shirlee Herrington

From: Cheryl Berkema <cheryl.berkema@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 11, 2022 4:54 PM
To: Shirlee Herrington
Cc: Cheryl Berkema
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Project 8 Winery Berkema feedback

Hello Shirlee,

Can you please forward my comments to the appropriate individuals?

Subject: Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed Project 8 Winery

The proposed project would require the approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the construction and operation of a Large Winery on 40+ acres, the operation of an accessory restaurant, and to allow an increase from 50 to 75 maximum attendees (at one time) for Agricultural Promotional Events; as well as a Variance to allow the octagon building to reach a height of 75 feet from the finished grade (plus rooftop mechanical equipment that will be screened from view).

Please ensure the environmental document covers the following areas and answers the following questions:

1) The Project Aesthetics are of concern. Please respond to how a “rotating light house” that destroys panoramic views for all but attendees of the facility is justified.
2) Please provide materials to be used to construct all buildings.
3) Please explain how the use of the lighthouse as a marketing tool is a necessity and how the structure and movement of the structure is compatible with neighboring properties.
4) Please explain how a rotating restaurant promoting an event center and restaurant rather than ag production does not make the restaurant a primary rather than accessory use. Please explain exactly how the building meets an accessory restaurant definition.
5) Please explain how much water will be used on site to produce the AG crop, for 50 event attendees, for 75 attendees, for the restaurant, workers and for general usage on the property and how it will be provided. Is a well providing water on the property.
6) Placer County is currently working on a proposal for using state filtration devices to filter arsenic that the County has found is present in much of Placer County (see January 12th 2022 Board of Supervisor meeting). Please explain what if any water will require filtration and the type of filtration used. Also please provide any storage of water onsite.
7) Please explain why a variance for number of attendees should be granted when the newly created winery ordinance was specifically designed for 50 event attendees for Ag Promotional events for a winery of the proposed size.
8) The proposed design of the building (shape and heigh and movement) would require variances are needed for proposed usage. The proposed usage is beyond what other neighboring parcels are allowed. Please explain why this property is allowed privilege beyond what others are allowed.

9) Please provide VMT estimates for attendees and workers and any corresponding traffic fees for mitigation. How will sustainability goals in Placer County and for the State of California be met?
10) An explanation of how the requested 75 ft tall building is in compliance with California Government Code Section 65906.
11) Please explain how the property zoning allows for a commercial restaurant.
12) Please provide parking requirements
13) Please provide lighting requirements for the project proposal
14) Please provide hours of operation and applicable noise ordinances
15) Please provide any enforcement resources required to monitor the winery eveny activity and winery operation sactivity

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments

Cheryl Berkema

Placer County Resident

Shirlee Herrington

From: Chuck-Muriel Davis <chamdavis@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 7, 2022 12:05 PM
To: Shirlee Herrington
Cc: Beverly Roberts; Jim Holmes
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Courtesy Reminder: Project 8 Winery (PLN21-00198), Scoping Meeting- CONCERN
Attachments: Project 8 Winery NOP_FINAL.pdf

RE: Project 8 Winery (PLN21-00198), Scoping Meeting

Hi Shirlee,

I would like to file an official complaint and concern that this Scoping Meeting is being held in the middle of a work day, so that concerned residents who work are not able to attend!

As proposed, this project will have a huge impact on the Penryn area and the Penryn residents; which indicates that this Scoping Meeting should be held in the evening.

I request that the Feb 8th, 1pm, Scoping Meeting be held again in the evening, as a separate meeting or as part of the Horseshoe Bar/Penryn MAC meeting.

I also request the the comment period be extended 30 or more days beyond the Feb 11th date. This NOP will take time to decipher and there are more details of the project available in the NOP since the issue was at the HB/Penryn MAC.

Muriel Davis
2/7/2022

On Wednesday, February 2, 2022, 10:55:24 AM PST, Shirlee Herrington <sherring@placer.ca.gov> wrote:

Good Morning Interested Agencies and Individuals:

Friendly reminder regarding the Scoping Meeting scheduled for next Tuesday at 1pm.

Advisory: While the meeting is being offered both “in-person” and virtually via “Zoom”, the County encourages virtual participation due to the recent increase in COVID-19 transmission.

See below and attached for additional meeting information.

Shirlee Herrington

From: Chuck-Muriel Davis <chamdavis@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, February 11, 2022 12:04 PM
To: Shirlee Herrington; Placer County Environmental Coordination Services; Jennifer Byous
Cc: Jim Holmes; Beverly Roberts
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Project 8 Winery (PLN21-00198)--Concerns & comments

RE: Project 8 Winery (PLN21-00198)

TO: Planning Commissioners and Placer County CDRA

This winery project, as proposed, is inappropriate for the residential agriculture area of Penryn because it's scope is so expansive that it is more a commercial event center than a winery! A project this massive does not fit the area on Callison.

Here are a list of concerns:

1. **Attendees** - the variance to increase attendees from 50 to 75 should NOT be approved. The limit in the ordinance has proven to work well. And wineries already have a 200 person(at one time) maximum for special events. What I could not find in the NOP was a limit on the number of people in the restaurant.

2. **Restaurant** - the proposed restaurant is NOT an 'accessory restaurant' as is allowed in the winery ordinance. Almost half of the 4750sf 4th level is planned for the dining area....that's much too big for an 'accessory'. And where in Placer County is there a winery or restaurant that requires four stories with an elevator? At an earlier MAC meeting, the owner expressed his view of this project to be a 'destination' type place, and that would be a place that is more than a winery with an accessory restaurant!

3. **Ridgeline violation**- putting a 75ft tall building on a ridgeline in a residential agriculture violates the county ordinance on protecting our ridgelines. The wine tasting area can be below the ridgeline, along with an 'accessory' restaurant. But, if a destination restaurant is being requested, then it should not be part of the winery. One alternative would be to replace the pond on the corner of Taylor and Callison with the proposed huge restaurant.

4. **Traffic** - the scope of this project would attract people from all over, maybe to only ride the rotating restaurant, making this project an 'attraction', rather than a winery. The traffic created by this 'attraction' would create dangerous conditions on the following roads that are narrow and have ditches on both sides:
English Colony, Clark Tunnel, Callison, Sisley, and Rock Springs!
These roads are used by families to walk on and to ride bikes on.
Increased traffic would be hazardous!

Even without a restaurant, the traffic from the events would affect traffic because:

"*Agricultural Promotional Events could occur any day of the week from 7:00 AM to 10:00 PM. Pursuant to Section 17.56.330(D)(4)(a), Agricultural Promotional Events are not limited in number.* "

5. **Water contamination** - Residents have a real concern about the possible contamination of the underground water aquifer and possible contamination of the water in the PCWA canal. We hope the EIR will closely evaluate the water usage and filtering of the project.

6. **Dark Sky** - having a building on the top of a ridge would drastically affect the darkness in this Penryn area, which is currently very dark. Having downward lighting along the roads and pathways will be bad enough, but to have lighting 75 ft up affects the entire area.

These items are just a few of the concerns that residents of Penryn have! This project is of no benefit to the Penryn area, but as proposed, will negatively impact the quality of life for the families who live in the area. A four-story 'destination' restaurant with a rotating dining area would be more appropriate in an area by the I-80 corridor, perhaps higher up in the Newcastle or Auburn area.

Please do NOT allow this project to move forward as currently proposed.

Sincerely,
Muriel Davis
2/11/2022
Penryn

Shirlee I. Herrington
Environmental Coordination Services
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive, Suite #190
Auburn, Ca 95603
sherring@placer.ca.gov

Dear Ms. Herrington,

Please accept this letter in reference to the Project 8 Winery NOP and the document presented at the community meeting.

We like many of our neighbors, have admired the new plantings of grapes along Taylor Road and Callison Road that augment our communities agricultural setting. However, we do have concerns about the proposed developments on the 17.96 acres. We submit the following comments to help provide responsible agencies and interested persons with additional concerns regarding the scope of this project.

Traffic Circulation

While the document provided for the meeting discusses road improvements on Callison Road infront of the winery entrance it does not take into consideration the impacts of traffic on Sisley Road, Old English Colony or Callison Road where it connects to Old English Colony. These Roads, (Sisley Road and Callison Road) travel through the rural residential community.

Community members run, bike, walk their dogs, ride horses, school age children will walk homefrom school on these roads during the winery's hours of operation. This presents a public safety concern. These roadways are narrow, have deep drainage ditches on the sides, blind curves, no center line and have no night lighting. Wine will be served at this facility which raises the concerns of DUI's, or at least some level of impaired driving and potential injuries to the community residents that live on these roads.

A commercial development of the size and scope that is proposed would be better suited to having an entrance off of Taylor Road where an entrance currently exists.

Further concern is the route of Sisley Road from Taylor Road to Callison Road. Sisley is a rural historic section of the Lincoln Highway; and needs to be protected from excessive use. Sisley Road is the most direct route from the intersections of Rock Springs and Taylor Road to the Callison Road entrance of the Winery. Again, community members run, bike, walk their dogs, ride horses, school age children will walk home from school on these roads during the winery's hours of operation. As is usually the case, visitors from outside this community will have little regard for the care and attention that is necessary while traveling our rural roads.

The historic status of Sisley Road and its necessary protections and uses must be

reviewed with an eye towards public safety and non-disruption of neighborhoods.

Accessory Use Restaurant

The proposed restaurant does not comply with the intended county guidelines. This proposed project would set a new precedent for development in Penryn beyond the intent and spirit of the Winery Ordinance Placer County established. The proposed full-service restaurant presents significant impacts to the present and reasonably foreseeable future of the developments in the Penryn community.

The Ridge Line

The proposed tower infringes on the ridge line policy of Placer County. The architectural rendering of the octagonal building, raising up 5 stories, is deceptive as is the surrounding tall tree line. Clearly a number of trees will be removed, and the tower will be significantly exposed. We suggest that significant study be given to the requested height of the building. Having the building relocated away from the ridge line and remain at the 36-foot level is acceptable. Additionally, the upper levels of this facility would provide an intrusionary view into the homes and yards of the neighborhood thereby invading the personal privacy of residents. A privacy that is one of the highly regarded reasons folks desire to live in this rural setting. This raises the potential of public nuisance violations.

Hours of Operation

As previously said, Penryn is a rural residential community. The proposed facility operating from 7 A. M. to 10 P.M. introduces an intense commercial atmosphere to their neighborhood. The established county limits of 50 attendees at one time for Agricultural Promotional Events is acceptable. However, there is no limit to the number of events. The proposed project plans on 208 events a year. A limit of the number of events must be considered should the Planning Commission approve the increase of attendees.

It should be recognized that increasing beyond this limit significantly increases traffic into the community unfamiliar with our roadways or the considerate bucolic lifestyle of the community. Additional persons and cars will increase the noise level, affect air quality, increase pollution, increase need for potable water, and increased wastewater. These issues should be given considerable review in the determination of an increase from the limit the 50 attendee limit as well as the number of events.

Amplfied Sound

In rural areas sound can travel significant distances. In similar situations a greater than 1600-foot setback has been recommended. Even with such a setback it is not uncommon for neighbors around the Valencia Club to hear the club's amplified sound. Amplified sound can be very disruptive to the neighborhood. This is why the vast majority of use permits prohibit outdoor amplified sound.

Septic System and Bio Reactor System

The project proposes a Septic permit be obtained from Placer County Environmental

Health Department. Separate and apart from the Septic System the project proposes a High Strength Membrane BioReactor system. BioReactor systems have greatly improved since first being introduced but there are still concerns of these systems potentially leaking into the ground affecting the quality of ground water and potentially creating a swampy area on neighboring parcels. A significant review of the BioReactor System and geological impacts must be given substantial consideration.

Night Sky - Light Pollution

Lighting is an issue in the rural area. Residents enjoy the night sky. Any lighting must be downward, limited solely to the project's land and turned off after closing.

Napa Green Certified

What exactly is this certification? It appears to be a vintner trade group that shares information on sustainable development and land use. Clearly a trade group has its own priorities and those differ significantly from the surrounding community. Review the attached link. https://www.northbaybusinessjournal.com/article/industry-news/napa-green-certification-whats-it- take-for-a-winery-or-vineyard-to-get-it/

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments on this proposed project. We hope the planning department will review these issues and make the Project 8 Winery a project that can be enjoyed and supported by the community.

Sincerely,

Gary Cheris Deborah Cheris

Gary and Deborah Cheris
7705 Logan Lane
Penryn, Ca 95663

gcheris@gmail.com

Project 8 Winery Project
NOP Scoping Meeting Comment Summary

Date: February 8, 2022
Time: 1:00 PM
Location: Planning Commission Hearing Room

I. Presentation by Project Planner Jennifer Byous

II. Verbal Comments (arranged in order of "appearance" of commenter):

In Person

Patty Neifer – Penryn Resident

- Remarked that she has researched EIRs following the NOP;
- Noted that CEQA requires analysis of aesthetic impacts;
- Read aloud what a ridgeline structure should look like in accordance with Placer County definitions and policies;
- Expressed concerns of potential impacts related to night lighting and interruption of scenic corridors (i.e., architecture type and height of the structure); and
- Expressed a desire for a project alternative where the structures are not built near a ridgeline.

Janet Kellman – Penryn Resident

- Expressed concerns over the project, which have spanned multiple months;
- Asked where does the commenter's freedom end and the developer's freedom begin;
- Asked why, given the culture and aesthetic of Penryn, does an "over-the-top" development need to be built;
- Asked why the project needs to be large and prominent;
- Expressed concern over the scale of the project;
- Asked if light fixtures associated with the project would be upward-facing and interfere with natural night views;
- Asked for the meaning of a minimum parking lot and if there is a maximum;
- Expressed concern regarding the access on Callison Road, which commenter believes is very dangerous (i.e., twisty and narrow), especially for potentially intoxicated people; and
- Asked if the entrance could be moved to Taylor Road.

Claudia Starkey - Penryn Resident

- Expressed concerns over the fencing's influence on local wildlife;
- Expressed concern about nighttime light and noise impacts and how such impacts would be prevented;

- Expressed concern about groundwater disruption, as all local residents are on wells that could be disrupted;
- Expressed concerns about placing the main site entrance on Callison Road, due to narrow pavement width;
- Expressed concern about developing a commercial project in a residential and agricultural area; and
- Disagreed that a large winery should be approved based on the property owner farming on the property.

Cheryl Schmit – Penryn Resident

- Detailed how the commenter, and many others, worked and saved to live in a rural residential area;
- The commenter's greatest concern is that the only access mentioned is on Callison Road, which the commenter believes can be dangerous;
- Expressed concern over increased traffic, as a result of the project;
- Expressed that other roads in the project vicinity should be analyzed, as the commenter believes such roads can also be dangerous, especially during inclement weather; and
- Wanted an alternative location for the proposed project, off of Taylor Road.

Gayle Russel – Penryn Resident

- Expressed that allowing the proposed project to bypass zoning regulations with respect to ridgelines is wrong;
- Advised that attention should be paid to potential aesthetic impacts associated with the project;
- Commented that Callison Road is not safe for the proposed project;
- Disagreed with overriding the County Winery Ordinance;
- Expressed concerns about night lighting; and
- Expressed concerns about potential drainage, erosion, and groundwater pollution impacts.

Mike Schmit – Penryn Resident

- Disagreed with the proposed height of the octagon building and the requested variance to allow the building to be constructed on top of the mountain;
- Commented that patrons from the Lincoln area would use "bad roads" to travel to the site;
- Expressed concern about nighttime light pollution;
- Expressed concern about privacy with views available from the octagon building;
- Commented that due to the rural residential nature of the area, 8:00 PM would be a more appropriate closing time for events than the proposed 10:00 PM;
- Noted that alternative restaurants are available in nearby downtown areas; and
- Expressed concern that fencing around Antelope Canal would restrict wildlife access.

Leslie Bizuratt – Granite Bay Area Resident

- Agreed with all previously shared concerns;
- Expressed concern about tree preservation and believes that the exhibits are not accurate, with the trees not likely to be preserved; and

- Remarked that the proposed project would require lots of grading and tree cutting that are not represented in the exhibits.

Ann Henderickson – Penryn Resident

- Remarked that the variance is not necessary and that the project needs could be met without the requested building height;
- Commented that the scope of the project is too large for Penryn;
- Expressed concern over increased traffic and the resulting increase in pollution;
- Remarked that there is too little water to support the project operation;
- Expressed concern that pesticides would contaminate groundwater;
- Remarked that the building is too large for the community;
- Remarked that a guard shack "would send a negative message about our community";
- Expressed concern that protected species and habitats are not mentioned in the NOP;
- Asked how the project would affect future roads;
- Asked how the project would benefit and serve the individuals living in the community;
- Asked if the project would commission a local artist;
- Recommended providing a walking path and picnic table for local residents to enjoy;
- Remarked that the structure does not fit in with the project site surroundings;
- Cited the Sacramento Bee to express that the size of the project does not fit the casual country vibe of the community;
- Expressed skepticism that the variance is necessary for proper wine filtration and believes the variance is unnecessary and should be denied;
- Asked if the proposed project would practice organic farming;
- Remarked that barbed wire fences will be dangerous to animals; and
- Remarked that there are many special-status species in the project area, which are not commented upon in the NOP.

Online

Carol Brock

- Remarked that the project site is designated for agricultural uses, and the proposed winery would be an industrial and retail project and, therefore, should not be considered for approval;
- Expressed concern about groundwater and well contamination;
- Asked if a report had been prepared about potential impacts the winery's well could have on local residential wells;
- Expressed concern about water supply for local homeowners;
- Expressed concern about pollution and safety impacts from project-generated traffic;
- Expressed concern that most of the year locals would have to be worried about their safety driving and walking around the project area, due to winding and narrow roads;
- Asked what safety measures would be taken to protect residents on roads and sidewalks;
- Asked if access to the site could be moved to Taylor Road to save the rural integrity of the area;
- Referenced Placer County General Plan Visual Resource Policies 1.K.4, 1.K.6, and 1.K.1;

- Expressed concern over potential erosion issues;
- Remarked that a fire pond is located on their property that eventually enters the Sacramento River and that a recent storm polluted the pond, due to poor erosion prevention practices by the project;
- Asked what remediations the homeowners could expect after the fact for erosion effects, noting potential impacts on property values and insurance; and
- Asked if the developer would bear any responsibility for protecting local water rights.

Neyamaya Stone

- Agreed with previously shared concerns;
- Remarked that the EIR should address volatile organic compounds that result from wine-making in the Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions chapter;
- Remarked that the Hazards chapter should evaluate potential impacts of fungicides used in wine-making on local livestock;
- Expressed concern about detention ponds in another local project;
- Remarked that the Hydrology chapter should include analysis of what aquifer project-generated wastewater would go into;
- Expressed concern that the octagon building's height cannot be mitigated;
- Asked if a scaled-back alternative would be considered, such as the project without the restaurant or with half the parking spaces; and
- Asked why 91 parking spaces are needed when the project is seeking an exception for 75 people, remarking that the implied 200 people would not be compatible with the surroundings.

Muriel Davis

- Agreed with all previously made statements;
- Remarked that commercial development does not fit with the area;
- Remarked that the ridgeline should be protected at all costs;
- Expressed concern about project-generated traffic on small roads that are narrow with ditches on either side, remarking that the roads cannot support project-generated traffic;
- Expressed concern about water pollution that could affect all local wells and the aquifer beneath;
- Expressed concern about potential impacts to agricultural uses from water pollution;
- Remarked that the trees would be cut down without permission;
- Expressed concern about air quality impacts from increased traffic;
- Expressed concern about noise and light pollution from year-round events;
- Expressed a desire to continue having views of the stars;
- Suggested that the restaurant be built by the pond off of Taylor Road;
- Expressed concern for the local wildlife;
- Remarked that the project does not fit the local aesthetic; and
- Expressed hopes that future meetings would be scheduled in the evening for ease of working people.

Marilyn Jasper – Public Interest Coalition

- Expressed concerns over the "exorbitant height" and the "questionable depth" of the proposed project;
- Expressed concern about inconsistencies in the description of the project dimensions across multiple documents;
- Remarked that the winery does not contain the necessary amount of acreage to hold the number of suggested attendees;
- Remarked that the County Winery Ordinance allows contiguous parcels that must be "deed restricted" and asked who would enforce those deed restrictions in perpetuity;
- Expressed concern about setbacks from the Antelope Canal;
- Expressed concern that the project's solar array would be inconsistent with the County not wanting anything on leach fields; and
- Remarked that the project should include an alternative location, preferably in a commercial zone.

Will Baird

- Asked how the project has proceeded to its current point without a meeting allowing for public comment;
- Remarked on current address off Callison Road;
- Expressed concern about the runoff from the "massive amounts" of dirt hauled to the site; and
- Remarked that the pictures presented in the meeting do not reflect the current reality.

Karen Green

- Remarked that the term "accessory restaurant" does not reflect the reality of what the restaurant will be;
- Remarked that the term, "accessory restaurant," is not clearly defined;
- Remarked that the proposed project goes beyond the scope of an "accessory" restaurant;
- Remarked that the project site is big enough to accommodate multiple uses at once and provide each with food, which is realistically beyond the scope of an accessory restaurant; and
- Remarked that what is being proposed is an event center, and should, therefore, be analyzed as such.