

# Environmental Checklist

1. **Project Title:** Fairfax Conversion
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection  
P.O. Box 944246  
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Allen Robertson
4. **Project Location:** Sonoma County, Portions of the north ½ and west ½ of section 18 and the west ½ of section 17, T10N R13W MDB&M. Approximately ¾ of a mile southeast of Annapolis on Annapolis Road.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Codorniu Napa, Inc.  
1345 Henry Road  
Napa, CA 94559
6. **General Plan Designation:** Sonoma Coast/Gualala Basin, Resources and Rural Development.
7. **Zoning:** Resources and Rural Development (RRD)
8. **Description of Project:** The proposed project includes the issuance of a Timberland Conversion permit, which would exempt approximately 171 acres of a 190-acre vineyard area/project site (on a 324-acre property) from Forest Practice Act tree planting requirements, in order to facilitate the development of a vineyard. The proposed project also includes a Timber Harvest Plan (THP). Documentation for the THP is incorporated into the conversion application by reference. The permittee would comply with all applicable county, state, and federal codes, ordinances, or other regulations and would obtain all necessary approvals. The affected area would remain zoned Resources and Rural Development following the removal of forest growth for development of the vineyard, which would permit the uses proposed for the project site.
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** Land uses adjacent or nearby to the proposed project site are commercial forestland, agricultural, rural residential, and open space.
10. **Other Public Agencies whose Approval Is Required:**
  - California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection – Timberland Conversion Permit and Timber Harvest Plan
  - Sonoma County – Erosion Control Plan and Vineyard Development Permit, Grading Permit, Drainage Permit (ministerial decisions).

**Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:**

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

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources                        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |  |

**Determination:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>I. AESTHETICS.</b>				
Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	X			
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a scenic highway?	X			
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	X			
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	X			

## Discussion

- a-c. The Fairfax Conversion Project is located in Sonoma County, the most northerly of the nine counties in the San Francisco Bay Region, located along the Pacific coastline about forty miles north of San Francisco and the Golden Gate Bridge. Sonoma County's 1,500 square miles include a diverse mosaic of landforms, environments, and human settlements. The project area is visible from the ridges and ridgetops surrounding the plan area, permanent access roads located on the plan area, and Annapolis Road, located adjacent to the plan area. Viewpoints from surrounding ridgetops are limited by distance and topography as they are half a mile to more than a mile from the conversion Timber Harvest Plan (THP) area.

The project site is in a rural area and is surrounded by commercial timberland, vineyards, agricultural areas, and rural residential home sites. The proposed project would convert the project site, currently dominated by trees and open grassland areas, to a vineyard site with open areas for preservation of the creek corridors and habitat areas. Given that the proposed project would remove numerous trees and change the character of the site from timberland to vineyard and that these changes may be visible to adjacent property owners and from adjacent roads, the proposed project would cause a *potentially significant* impact to aesthetics.

### Mitigation Measure

*Further analysis of this impact will be included in the Fairfax Conversion EIR.*

- d. The proposed project would include the installation of lighting in the corporation yard area. In addition, nighttime and early-morning vineyard activities may occur during the grape harvest. Therefore, the proposed project could have a *potentially significant* impact related to light and glare.

### Mitigation Measure

*Further analysis of this impact will be included in the Fairfax Conversion EIR.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES.</b>				
<p>In determining whether impacts on agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation. Would the project:</p>				
a.	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?			X
b.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?			X
c.	Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?			X

**Discussion**

a-c. The proposed project site is zoned Resources and Rural Development (RRD). According to the Sonoma County Zoning Ordinance, the purpose of the RRD zoning classification is to provide protection of lands needed for commercial timber production, geothermal production, aggregate resources production; and lands needed for protection of watershed, fish and wildlife habitat, biotic resources, and for agricultural production activities that are not subject to all of the policies contained in the Agricultural Resources Element of the General Plan. Permitted uses under this zoning include the outdoor growing and harvesting of shrubs, plants, flowers, trees, vines, fruits, vegetables, hay, grain and similar food and fiber crops, including wholesale nurseries. The objective of this project, producing a wine grape crop, conforms to the purpose of the current zoning and its permitted uses. The project site is not Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or listed as Farmland of Statewide Importance. The project site is not under Williamson Act contract. As a result, the proposed project would have *no impact* on the loss of agriculture land or agricultural zoning and would result in an increase, rather than a decrease, of agricultural land.

Mitigation Measure  
*None required.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>III. AIR QUALITY.</b>				
When available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	X		
b.	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	X		
c.	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a non-attainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	X		
d.	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	X		
e.	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X

**Discussion**

a–d. The project area is located in the western portion of unincorporated Sonoma County. The project area lies within the Northern Sonoma County Air Pollution Control District (NSCAPCD). The primary influence on winds in the area is the ocean, along with the convection-based daily on-shore breezes associated with it.

Construction-related air quality impacts would occur with the development of the proposed project and related infrastructure improvements. Clearing and grading activities would comprise the major source of construction dust emissions. In addition, woody waste that remains following timber clearing operations may be burned onsite. Project construction would also require the use of diesel-fueled equipment such as dozers, excavators, scrapers, and loaders. Short-term construction activities would result in dust and equipment exhaust emissions that could, at times, contribute to nuisances or deterioration of local air quality. Construction activities, such as excavation, grading, burning, and worker vehicle traffic, may generate temporary increases in ozone precursors (reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrous oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>)) and particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>).

Due to elevated concentrations of particulate matter from earth moving activities as well as diesel exhaust, and smoke from burn piles, the development of the proposed project has the potential to

conflict with applicable air quality plans. This would be considered a *potentially significant* impact.

Mitigation Measure

*Further analysis of this impact will be included in the Fairfax Conversion EIR.*

- e. The project is located in a rural area of Sonoma County where relatively few people reside or work. Although the project would include agricultural use, vineyards are not expected to create odors that would affect people. Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact* on odors affecting people.

Mitigation Measure

*None required.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b>				
Would the project:				
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	X		
b.	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	X		
c.	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	X		
d.	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	X		
e.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	X		
f.	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			X

## Discussion

a,b,d,e. The proposed project site is located in Sonoma County. Located on the Pacific coastline, Sonoma County is bordered by Mendocino County to the north, Lake and Napa Counties to the east, and Marin County to the south. The project area is located on Beatty Ridge, a broad, flat ridge between Grasshopper Creek and the Wheatfield fork of the Gualala River. The project site is accessible from Annapolis Road (a county road) via two private permanent gravel roads and seasonal roads. The project site has been logged, pastured, and farmed in the past.

The project site supports two main vegetation communities, North Coast coniferous forest and Valley and Foothill Grassland. Additionally, several watercourses and springs are located on the project site.

Sonoma County supports habitat for numerous special-status plant and wildlife species. Given the location of the site and the habitats occurring on the site, special-status species could occur on or adjacent to the project area. Implementation of the proposed project could affect special-status plant and wildlife species. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *potentially significant* impact to special-status species.

Mitigation Measure

*Further analysis of this impact will be included in the Fairfax Conversion EIR.*

- c. The project site contains several drainages that would be considered waters of the U.S. under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Additionally, a small wetland area is located in the western part of the project area that may be considered a jurisdictional wetland. Although the proposed project includes buffers around the creek corridors and pond, the project may require fills within jurisdictional waters for road crossings, outfalls, or other project activities. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *potentially significant* impact to jurisdictional waters.

Mitigation Measure

*Further analysis of this impact will be included in the Fairfax Conversion EIR.*

- f. The project site is not within the boundaries of an existing Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Communities Conservation Plan. Therefore, the project would have *no impact* related to known HCP or other conservation plans.

Mitigation Measure

*None required.*



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b>				
Would the project:				
a.	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			
	1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	X		
	2. Strong seismic ground shaking?	X		
	3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	X		
	4. Inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?	X		
	5. Landslides?	X		
	6. Flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	X		
	7. Wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas and where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	X		
b.	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	X		
c.	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in an onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	X		
d.	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	X		
e.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?			X

## Discussion

- a(1-6). The plan area is located on a broad flat ridge between Grasshopper Creek and the Wheatfield Fork of the Gualala. Slopes on the project site are generally south- and east-facing and elevations within the project site range from 660 feet to 860 feet above sea level.

The Soil Survey of Sonoma County, California, classifies the soils on the project site as Goldridge fine sandy loam (GdE and GdF) on 15 to 50 percent slopes and Hugo very gravelly loam (HkF) on 30 to 75 percent slopes. According to the Geotechnical Investigation for the project site (Brunsing Associates, Inc., June 25, 2004), the site may be subject to strong ground shaking in the event of a local earthquake. The nearest active faults are the San Andreas and Maacama Faults, located approximately 3 miles southeast and 21 miles northeast, respectively, of the project.

Given that the project site would be subject to strong ground shaking, implementation of the proposed project may expose people to risks from earthquake, ground failure, landslides, and mudflows. Additionally, should the proposed on-site irrigation reservoir fail during an earthquake, the project could expose people to flooding hazards. This impact would be considered *potentially significant*.

Mitigation Measure

*Further analysis of this impact will be included in the Fairfax Conversion EIR.*

- a(7). The general vicinity of the project site is at risk from wildfire. Forest fires in the past have burned over the entire area. For these reasons, the proposed project may expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. This would be considered a *potentially significant* impact.

Mitigation Measure

*Further analysis of this impact will be included in the Fairfax Conversion EIR.*

- b-d. Because existing soil conditions have a moderate hazard of erosion, the proposed project has the potential to result in erosion during timber harvesting, vineyard development, and vineyard operation. This impact would be considered a *potentially significant* impact.

Mitigation Measure

*Further analysis of this impact will be included in the Fairfax Conversion EIR.*

- e. The proposed project does not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater systems. Therefore, *no impact* would occur.

Mitigation Measure

*None required.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b>				
Would the project:				
a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	X		
b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	X		
c.	Emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	X		
d.	Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	X		
e.	Be located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, be within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X
f.	Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?		X	
g.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	X		
h.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	X		

## Discussion

- a-d. During operation of the proposed vineyard, hazardous materials such as solvents, and equipment oils and lubricants would be present on-site. Operations would be carried out with equipment that uses petroleum products. Operation of the vineyard would involve the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, usually in the form of petroleum based fuels and oils. The closest school

(Horicon School) is located approximately ¼-mile to the west. Residences are located on properties adjacent to the proposed project site. For these reasons, the proposed project could potentially expose the public or the environment to hazardous substances. This would be considered a ***potentially significant*** impact.

Mitigation Measure

*Further analysis of this impact will be included in the Fairfax Conversion EIR.*

- e. According to the Sonoma County General Plan, the proposed project is not located in an airport land use plan area. The closest public airstrip is in Gualala, located approximately 10 air miles northwest of the project site. Therefore, ***no impact*** would occur to local airport land use plans.

Mitigation Measure

*None required.*

- f. The closest private airstrip is located approximately ¾-mile to the north of the project area. However, the proposed project would not result in substantial population increases and would subsequently not significantly add to the air traffic from the private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed project would have a ***less-than-significant*** impact to local airports.

Mitigation Measure

*None required.*

- g. Construction traffic or unforeseen construction-related delays could impede emergency response vehicles during transport of harvested trees or transportation of harvested grapes from the proposed project. This impact would be considered ***potentially significant***.

Mitigation Measure

*Further analysis of this impact will be included in the Fairfax Conversion EIR.*

- h. The general vicinity of the project site is at risk from wildfire. Forest fires in the past have burned over the entire area. For these reasons, the proposed project may expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. This impact would be considered ***potentially significant***.

Mitigation Measure

*Further analysis of this impact will be included in the Fairfax Conversion EIR.*

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b>					
	Would the project:				
a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	X			
b.	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	X			
c.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite?	X			
d.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding onsite or offsite?	X			
e.	Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	X			
f.	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	X			
g.	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
h.	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the levee or dam failure?	X			
j.	Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	X			

## Discussion

- a-f. Implementation of the proposed project would require grading for vineyard planting, irrigation of the vines, and on-going agricultural activities. The proposed project also includes construction of a 73-acre foot reservoir. The reservoir would be recharged utilizing surface runoff and rainwater

and used for irrigation of the proposed vineyard. A well is proposed to provide water for vineyard workers, but ground water sources would not be utilized for irrigation purposes.

In accordance with Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act, the State of California periodically identifies waters where water quality standards are not being met. In its latest Section 303(d) list, adopted through Resolution 98-45 on 23 April 1998, the Regional Water Board identified the Gualala River as impaired due to elevated sedimentation. All of the watercourses within the project area are part of the larger Gualala River Watershed. Although the proposed project includes buffer areas along watercourses on the project site, grading activities for project implementation and ongoing vineyard activities have the potential to result in further degradation of water quality within adjacent drainages and the Gualala River, without incorporation of appropriate erosion control measures. This would be considered a *potentially significant* impact.

Mitigation Measure

*Further analysis of this impact will be included in the Fairfax Conversion EIR.*

- g-h. The proposed project would not involve constructing housing or structures in the 100-year floodplain. Therefore, *no impact* would occur.

Mitigation Measure

*None required.*

- i. The proposed project includes construction of a 73-acre foot reservoir. The Geotechnical Investigation for the project site (Brunsing Associates, Inc., June 25, 2002) indicates that soils on the project site are sandy silty residual/colluvial soils. These soils would be subject to collapse when loaded in a saturated condition. If the reservoir were not designed and properly constructed, failure of the reservoir could occur in an earthquake. This would be considered a *potentially significant* impact.

Mitigation Measure

*Further analysis of this impact will be included in the Fairfax Conversion EIR.*

- j. Tsunamis are defined as sea waves created by undersea fault movement. A tsunami poses little danger away from shorelines; however, when a tsunami reaches the shoreline, a high swell of water breaks and washes inland with great force. Waves may reach fifty feet in height on unprotected coasts. Historic records of the Bay Area used by one study indicate that nineteen tsunamis were recorded in San Francisco Bay during the period of 1868-1968. Maximum wave height recorded at the Golden Gate tide gauge (where wave heights peak) was 7.4 feet. Given that the project site is located in an inland area, well removed from the Bay and delta regions, a tsunami would not reach the project area.

A seiche is a long-wavelength, large-scale wave action set up in a closed body of water such as a lake or reservoir, whose destructive capacity is not as great as that of tsunamis. Seiches are known to have occurred during earthquakes, but none have been recorded in the Bay Area. In addition, the project is not located near a closed body of water. Therefore, the project site is not anticipated to experience seiches in the future.

Mudflows typically occur in mountainous or hilly terrain. The Geotechnical Investigation for the project site (Brunsing Associates, Inc., June 25, 2002) indicates that soils on the project site are sandy silty residual/colluvial soils. These soils would be subject to collapse when loaded in a saturated condition. For this reason, the implementation of the project without appropriate excavation and erosion control measures could result in potential mudflows.

The above analysis indicates that the project site would not be threatened by a seiche or tsunami; however, the project site could be subject to mudflow in the event that proper erosion control and excavation measures are not followed. This would be considered a *potentially significant* impact.

Mitigation Measure

*Further analysis of this impact will be included in the Fairfax Conversion EIR.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b>				
Would the project:				
a.				X
b.	X			
c.				X

## Discussion

- a. Land uses adjacent to or near the proposed project site are commercial forestland, agricultural, rural residential, and open space. The project site currently consists of timberland and open grassland. Following implementation of the project, the site would consist of vineyard, open space, and a small shop area. The proposed project would not physically divide an established community; therefore, *no impact* would occur.

Mitigation Measure

*None required.*

- b. The project site is located in the Sonoma Coast/Gualala Basin planning area of the Sonoma County General Plan. The General Plan designation of the project site is Resources and Rural Development. This category allows very low-density residential development within areas intended to protect lands for commercial timber harvest, lands within the Known Geothermal Resource Area, lands for aggregate resource production, and natural resource lands. These areas are also intended to protect against intensive development in areas constrained by natural hazards, protect lands needed for agricultural production activities, and protect County residents from proliferation of growth in which there is inadequate infrastructure.

This parcel is zoned Resources and Rural Development (RRD). The purpose of lands zoned RRD is to provide protection of lands needed for commercial timber production, geothermal production, aggregate resources production; lands needed for protection of watershed, fish and wildlife habitat, biotic resources, and for agricultural production activities that are not subject to all of the policies contained in the Agricultural Resources Element of the General Plan. Permitted uses under this zoning includes the outdoor growing and harvesting of shrubs, plants, flowers, trees, vines, fruits, vegetables, hay, grain and similar food and fiber crops, including wholesale nurseries.

A consistency analysis has not been completed at this time; therefore, a *potentially significant impact* could result related to land use and zoning consistency.

Mitigation Measure

*Further analysis of this impact will be included in the Fairfax Conversion EIR.*

- c. The proposed project is not within any known habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans. Therefore, ***no impact*** would occur.

Mitigation Measure

*None required.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b>				
Would the project:				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				X

## Discussion

- a-b. The primary extractive resource in Sonoma County is aggregate resources. Sonoma County has adopted the Aggregate Resources Management (ARM) Plan, a plan for obtaining future supplies of aggregate material. This plan serves as the state-mandated mineral management policy for the County and is intended to accomplish the mandated purposes. The project area does not contain any identified mineral resources including aggregates. Because mineral resources have not been identified within the vicinity of the proposed project, *no impact* to mineral resources is anticipated.

Mitigation Measure

*None required.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XI. NOISE.</b>				
Would the project:				
a.	Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?	X		
b.	Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	X		
c.	Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	X		
d.	Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	X		
e.	Be located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X
f.	Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?		X	

## Discussion

a-d. The project area is located in the vicinity of existing agricultural operations, including vineyards and commercial timberland. The proposed project would result in a temporary increase in noise during clearing, soil preparation and crop establishment periods. On-going agricultural operations would require use of diesel generators and heavy machinery. These operations may result in increases in noise levels that may exceed established noise standards on and adjacent to the site. This impact would be considered *potentially significant*.

### Mitigation Measure

*Further analysis of this impact will be included in the Fairfax Conversion EIR.*

e. The proposed project is not located in an airport land use plan area or within 2 miles of a public or public use airport. Therefore, *no impact* would occur.

### Mitigation Measures

*None required.*

f. Two private airstrips are located within 2 miles of the project site, approximately 0.75 miles northwest and 1.5 miles northeast of the project area. However, the project site would not include

residents or other sensitive receptors. Agricultural workers would not be exposed to excessive noise levels by the occasional over flight by private aircraft. Therefore, the nearby private airstrip would have a *less-than-significant* impact on the proposed project.

Mitigation Measure

*None required.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b>				
Would the project:				
a.			X	
Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				
b.				X
Displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
c.				X
Displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				

## Discussion

- a. At present, residences do not exist on the project site. A corporation yard is proposed as part of the project; however, housing is not proposed. The proposed project would not reduce existing levels of available housing. Vineyard operations would require the use of seasonal employees during the harvest season. Seasonal employment can range from two months to six months, depending on the rate at which the grapes ripen. For a 200-acre vineyard, approximately 50 workers would be needed for harvesting if mechanical harvesting is not used. Six full-time employees would be needed for year-round vineyard operations. The proposed project would utilize a workforce base that lives primarily in the Healdsburg and Geyserville areas, and some would carpool in to the site. The project is not expected to have any influence on growth trends in the area and would not induce significant additional population growth. Therefore, the impact to population growth would be considered *less-than-significant*.

Mitigation Measure

*None required.*

- b. The proposed project would not require displacement of existing housing. Therefore, *no impact* would occur.

Mitigation Measure

*None required.*

- c. The proposed project would not require displacement of any people. Therefore, *no impact* would occur.

Mitigation Measure

*None required.*

---

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

---

**XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES.**

Would the project:

- a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

Fire protection?				X
Police protection?				X
Schools?				X
Parks?				X
Other public facilities?				X

**Discussion**

- a-e. In this area of Sonoma County, fire protection is primarily the responsibility of the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. Sea Ranch also maintains a volunteer fire department. Police protection is provided by the Sonoma County Sheriff’s Department. The closest school is located in Annapolis, located approximately 0.25 miles from the project site. The closest public park is Soda Springs Reserve, located approximately 1.5 miles north of the project area.

The proposed project involves the conversion of existing forestland to vineyard and would not create a need for new facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection and police services. The proposed project would not result in any adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered public facilities. The project would not create new residential areas and therefore would not create any new demand for schools, parks, or other public facilities. Therefore, *no impact* would occur.

Mitigation Measure  
*None required.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XIV. RECREATION.</b>				
Would the project:				
a.	Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X
b.	Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X

## Discussion

- a. The ownership and operational staffing requirements of the conversion activities would not substantially elevate the local population levels, or alter present recreational use patterns. The closest public park is Soda Springs Reserve, located approximately 1.5 miles north of the project area. The proposed project would not create any new residential land uses. Due to the project's locale, an increase in the use of existing recreational facilities, including parks, would not be anticipated. Therefore, *no impact* would occur.

Mitigation Measure

*None required.*

- b. The proposed project does not include or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, *no impact* would occur.

Mitigation Measure

*None required.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</b>				
Would the project:				
a.	Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	X		
b.	Cause, either individually or cumulatively, exceedance of a level-of-service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	X		
c.	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?			X
d.	Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	X		
e.	Result in inadequate emergency access?	X		
f.	Result in inadequate parking capacity?		X	
g.	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			X

## Discussion

- a.,b. The proposed project would generate traffic from temporary logging operations and on-going agricultural activities. Logs would be hauled off the conversion THP area via a private road system to Annapolis Road (a county road), then either (1) west to State Route 1 (SR1) or (2) east to Skaggs Springs Road (a county road), then east on Skaggs Springs Road to Dry Creek Road, and east on Dry Creek Road to State Highway 101. On-going vineyard operations would result in increased traffic along the haul route intermittently throughout the year for long-term operation of the vineyard, particularly during pruning and harvest periods. Because the project would result in an increase in existing traffic levels and patterns, this impact would be considered *potentially significant*.

### Mitigation Measure

*Further analysis of this impact will be included in the Fairfax Conversion EIR.*

- c. The traffic to and from the site would be limited to vehicular traffic and would not result in a change in air traffic patterns. Therefore, ***no impact*** would occur.

Mitigation Measure

*None required.*

- d., e. The proposed project is located along Annapolis Road, off of SR-1. SR-1 is a two-lane roadway that runs north/south. Annapolis Road is a two-lane undivided roadway with curves that result in a poor line of sight. The proposed project would require realignment of the existing driveway for vineyard operations and would require use of farm equipment. Because the project would generate new traffic along narrow, rural roads, implementation of the project could result in hazardous conditions on the surrounding roadways. This impact would therefore be considered ***potentially significant***.

Mitigation Measure

*Further analysis of this impact will be included in the Fairfax Conversion EIR.*

- f. The proposed project would result in a need for parking for full-time and seasonal workers; however, the planned corporation yard and internal roadways on the project site would contain adequate space for parking to accommodate workers. Therefore, this impact would be considered ***less-than-significant***.

Mitigation Measure

*None required.*

- g. The proposed project would not modify alternative modes of transportation and is not a people-intensive use that would affect existing alternative transportation. Consequently, ***no impact*** would occur.

Mitigation Measure

*None required.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b>				
Would the project:				
a.	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	X		
b.	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X
c.	Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	X		
d.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed?	X		
e.	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X
f.	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?		X	
g.	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?		X	

## Discussion

- a., c. Implementation of the proposed project would require grading for vineyard planting, irrigation of the vines, and on-going agricultural activities. The proposed project also includes construction of a 73-acre foot reservoir. The reservoir would be recharged utilizing overland sheetflow of rainwater runoff and direct rainfall on the reservoir. Reservoir water would be used for irrigation of the proposed vineyard. A well is proposed to provide water for vineyard workers, but ground water sources would not be utilized for irrigation purposes.

In accordance with Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act, the State of California periodically identifies waters where water quality standards are not being met. In its latest Section 303(d) list, adopted through Resolution 98-45 on 23 April 1998, the Regional Water Board identified the Gualala River as impaired due to elevated sedimentation. All of the watercourses within the

project area are part of the larger Gualala River Watershed. Although the proposed project includes buffer areas along watercourses on the project site, grading activities for project implementation and ongoing vineyard activities have the potential to result in further degradation of water quality within adjacent drainages and the Gualala River, without incorporation of appropriate erosion control measures. This impact would be considered *potentially significant*.

Mitigation Measure

*Further analysis of this impact will be included in the Fairfax Conversion EIR.*

- b., e. Public service agencies do not provide water, wastewater collection and treatment, or storm water drainage services to this rural area. The project area is served by individual septic tanks and leach fields. The proposed project would involve timberland conversion and the subsequent operation of a vineyard and would rely on portable toilets for sanitary disposal. Thus, the project would not require construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, *no impact* would occur.

Mitigation Measure

*None required.*

- d. Operation of the proposed project would require water for irrigation purposes. The proposed project includes construction of a 73-acre foot reservoir. The reservoir would be recharged utilizing overland sheetflow of rainwater runoff and direct rainfall on the reservoir. Reservoir waters would be used for irrigation of the proposed vineyard. A well is proposed to provide water for vineyard workers, but ground water sources would not be utilized for irrigation purposes. If the proposed 73-acre-foot reservoir is not sufficient for irrigation purposes, sufficient water supplies may not be available. This impact is considered *potentially significant*.

Mitigation Measure

*Further analysis of this impact will be included in the Fairfax Conversion EIR.*

- f–g. Implementation of the proposed project would not generate substantial amounts of solid waste. Refuse associated with lunches brought by workers would be minimal, and would be properly disposed of. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less-than-significant* impact to landfills and solid waste.

Mitigation Measure

*None required.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>				
a.	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	X		
b.	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	X		
c.	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	X		

**Discussion**

a-c. The proposed project would change the project site from timberland to vineyard. As mentioned previously, the conversion of the project site from timberland to vineyard could interfere with habitats on the project site and could potentially harm special-status plant and/or animal species. Grading of the project site could affect potential archeological resources. In converting timberland to vineyard, the visual character of the site would be impacted, thereby potentially affecting adjacent property owners and those traveling on adjacent roads. Additionally, conversion from timberland to vineyard could result in erosion into the Gualala River, listed as impaired by the Regional Water Board due to elevated sedimentation. Such impacts may have substantial adverse effects on human beings and may contribute to incremental environmental impacts in the project region, which may be considered cumulatively considerable. For these reasons, the proposed project would have a *potentially significant* impact.

Mitigation Measures

*Further analysis of this impact will be included in the Fairfax Conversion EIR.*