



Mitigated Negative Declaration

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

Publication Date:
Public Review Period: 30 days
State Clearinghouse Number:
Permit Sonoma File Number: ZPE 21-0196
Prepared by: Robert Aguero

Pursuant to Section 15071 of the State CEQA Guidelines, this proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration and the attached Initial Study, constitute the environmental review conducted by the County of Sonoma as lead agency for the proposed project described below:

Project Name:	Diamond Mountain Minor Timberland Conversion
Project Applicant:	Arvin Babu
Project Location/Address:	2199 Diamond Mountain Road
APN:	120-240-015
General Plan Land Use Designation:	Resources and Rural Development (RRD)
Zoning Designation:	RRD B6 25
Decision-Making Body:	Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department
Appeal Body:	Sonoma County Board of Zoning Adjustments
Project Description:	See Project Description, below

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" as indicated in the attached Initial Study and in the summary table below.

Table 1. Summary of Topic Areas

Topic Area	Abbreviation*	Yes	No
Aesthetics	VIS		X
Agricultural and Forest Resources	AG		X
Air Quality	AIR		X
Biological Resources	BIO	X	
Cultural Resources	CULT	X	
Energy	EN		X
Geology and Soils	GEO		X
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	GHG		X
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	HAZ		X
Hydrology and Water Quality	HYDRO		X
Land Use and Planning	LU		X
Mineral Resources	MIN		X
Noise	NOISE		X
Population and Housing	POP		X
Public Services	PS		X
Recreation	REC		X
Transportation and Traffic	TRAF		X

Tribal Cultural Resources	TCR	X	
Utility and Service Systems	UTL		X
Wildfire	WILD		X
Mandatory Findings of Significance		X	

RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES

The following lists other public agencies whose approval is required for the project, or who have jurisdiction over resources potentially affected by the project.

Table 2: Responsible and Trustee Agencies

Agency	Activity	Authorization
California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection	Less than 3-Acre Timber Conversion	14 CCR § (1104.1.i)
California Department of Fish and Wildlife	Incidental Take Permit for listed animal species	CA Endangered Species Act
Regional Water Quality Control Board (North Coast)	Wetland dredge or fill	Clean Water Act, Section 401
State Water Resources Control Board	Generating storm water (construction, industrial, or municipal)	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requires submittal of NOI
US Army Corps of Engineers	Wetland dredge or fill	Clean Water Act, Section 404
US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and or National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)	Incidental Take Permit for listed plant and animal species	Federal Endangered Species Act

ENVIRONMENTAL FINDING

Based on the evaluation in the attached Initial Study, the project described above will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, provided that the mitigation measures identified in the Initial Study are incorporated into the conditions of approval for the project, and a Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared. The applicant has agreed in writing to the identified mitigation measures for the project.

Prepared by: Robert Aguero

Date:

Table of Contents

RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES	2
INTRODUCTION.....	4
PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	4
PROJECT SITE AND SURROUNDING LANDS	4
SETTING	4
ISSUES RAISED BY THE PUBLIC OR AGENCIES.....	4
EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS.....	7
I. AESTHETICS.....	7
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.....	8
III. AIR QUALITY.....	10
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	11
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES	23
VI. ENERGY.....	25
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS	26
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS	29
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	30
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	32
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING.....	34
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES	35
XIII. NOISE	36
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING	37
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES.....	38
XVI. RECREATION	39
XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC	40
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES	41
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.....	42
XX. WILDFIRE.....	43
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	45
REFERENCES & TECHNICAL REPORTS	47



Initial Study

Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department

2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95403

(707) 565-1900 FAX (707) 565-1103

INTRODUCTION

This report is the Initial Study required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The report was prepared by the Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department, Project Review Division and Natural Resources Section. Information on the project was provided by the applicant. Technical studies provided by qualified consultants to support the conclusions are available for public review at the Permit and Resource Management Department. Other reports, documents, maps, and studies referred to in this document are available for review at the Permit and Resource Management Department (Permit Sonoma).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Arvin Babu (applicant) proposes to convert 2.99 acres +/- of timberland and 4.1 acres total of forestland on an 40 acre +/- property located at 2199 Diamond Mountain Road in eastern Sonoma County (see Figure 1: Project Location). The purpose of the timberland conversion is to facilitate the development of a 4.1 acre vineyard. Approximately 4.1-acres of existing on-site vegetation/trees will be included in the conversion area. The proposed project requires a Zoning Permit application approval from Permit Sonoma for a minor timberland conversion.

The forested areas contain Douglas-fir, tanoak, and Pacific Madrone. Conversion of the land will involve the removal of trees and brush from an area of 4.1 acres in size (see Figure 2: Project Aerial). This area will be converted to bare ground which will eventually be the site of the vineyard.

Site Access – The property is primarily accessed from Napa County via Diamond Mountain Road. The existing driveway is accessed from the intersection of Sharp Road and Diamond Mountain Road. Vineyard development will require the construction of a network of internal dirt access roads and vineyard “avenues” connected to the entrance road.

PROJECT SITE AND SURROUNDING LANDS

SETTING

The subject property is approximately 5 miles south of Calistoga in rural/eastern Sonoma County. The parcel has a General Plan designation of Resources and Rural Development (RRD). It is zoned as RRD B6 25, which allows agricultural uses and residential development with a maximum density of one unit per 25 acres. The property is bounded by vineyards to the north, and forested lands to the east, south and west.

ISSUES RAISED BY THE PUBLIC OR AGENCIES

The proposed project will require permit approval from CAL FIRE for a less than three-acre timber conversion application. Vineyard development will be subject to a VESCO permit from the Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures

Map #1

Vicinity Map - Wings Capital LLC - Diamond Mountain



N
1 in = 2,000 ft
Date: 12/30/2021

Section 13 T08N, R07W MDB&M
APN: 120-240-015
Sonoma County

Forest Ecosystem Management
Salix Natural Resource Management

Legend

- Property Boundary
- Project Area
- Existing Roads

FIGURE 1: PROJECT LOCATION



FIGURE 2: PROJECT AERIAL

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This section analyzes the potential environmental impacts of this project based on the criteria set forth in the State CEQA Guidelines and the County's implementing ordinances and guidelines. For each item, one of four responses is given:

No Impact: The project would not have the impact described. The project may have a beneficial effect, but there is no potential for the project to create or add increment to the impact described.

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would have the impact described, but the impact would not be significant. Mitigation is not required, although the project applicant may choose to modify the project to avoid the impacts.

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated: The project would have the impact described, and the impact could be significant. One or more mitigation measures have been identified that will reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

Potentially Significant Impact: The project would have the impact described, and the impact could be significant. The impact cannot be reduced to less than significant by incorporating mitigation measures. An environmental impact report must be prepared for this project.

Each question was answered by evaluating the project as proposed, that is, without considering the effect of any added mitigation measures. The Initial Study includes a discussion of the potential impacts and identifies mitigation measures to substantially reduce those impacts to a level of insignificance where feasible. All references and sources used in this Initial Study are listed in the Reference section at the end of this report and are incorporated herein by reference.

The applicant has agreed to accept all mitigation measures listed in this Initial Study as conditions of approval for the proposed project, and to obtain all necessary permits, notify all contractors, agents, and employees involved in project implementation and any new owners should the property be transferred to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures.

I. AESTHETICS

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 within a State scenic highway?				X
c) In non-urbanized areas substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			X	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				

Comment

The project site is not in an area designated as visually sensitive by the Sonoma County General Plan. The project site is not located within a SR (Scenic Resource) combining district or along a scenic corridor. The project is not readily visible from publicly accessible viewpoints.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment

The parcel is not located within or near a State scenic highway.

Significance Level:

No Impact

- c) In non-urbanized areas substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?**

Comment

Although the project proposes removal of approximately 2.99 acres of existing fire-damaged timberland and 1.2 acres of non-timberland forestland, the parcel is not visible from publicly accessible vantage points. The nearest publicly accessible road is Diamond Mountain Road, and the project site is located on the opposite side of the ridgeline from this road. , The majority of the forested areas on site would remain. There are several similar land uses (vineyards) in close proximity to the project site with vineyard and vineyard facilities in close proximity to Diamond Mountain Road. Conversion of the project area will result in visual changes consistent with surrounding land uses.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment

There are no new structures proposed that would introduce new sources of light and glare. Removal of 2.99 acres of onsite vegetation would not require lighting nor would it introduce new sources of glare to the project area.

Significance Level:

No Impact

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

Would the project:

Potentially
Significant

Potentially
Significant Unless

Less Than
Significant

No Impact

	Impact	Mitigation Incorporated	Impact	
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 Williamson Act				X
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526) or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?			X	
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest			X	
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X

Would the project:

- a) **Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

Comment

The parcel is not designated as Prime or Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

Significance Level:

No Impact

- b) **Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or Williamson Act Contract?**

Comment

The project does not conflict with an existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract.

Significance Level:

No Impact

- c) **Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526) or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?**

Comment

The project parcel is not zoned Timberland Production, timberland, or forestland.

Significance Level:

Less Than Significant Impact

- d) **Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

Comment

The proposed project involves the one-time removal of 2.99 acres of timberland and 4.1 acres total of forestland pursuant to the County of Sonoma and the CAL FIRE permit process for minor timberland conversions. The permit process for timber-removal is consistent with State and local policies, assuming the applicant shows bona fide intent to convert to the proposed use. This one time removal is exempt from any

mitigations according to County and State policy. The applicant has supplied a water feasibility report to support their intent to convert to a vineyard.

Significance Level:

Less Than Significant Impact

- e) **Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

Comment

The project does not involve other changes in the environment that could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use. The subject property will remain agricultural use and the majority of the site would remain undisturbed.

Significance Level:

No Impact

III. AIR QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard?				X
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?				X

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

Would the project:

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

Comment

The project would not conflict or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan. The project is within the jurisdiction of the Northern Sonoma County Air Pollution Control District (NSCAPCD). The NSCAPCD does not have an adopted air quality plan.

Significance Level:

No Impact

- b) **Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard?**

Comment

There will not be a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region

is in non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard.

Significance Level:

No Impact

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Comment

The project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations as there will not be a significant level of pollutants associated with the potential uses of the property and the adjoining properties are also not significant sources of pollutants.

Significance Level:

No Impact

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?)

Comment

The project will not result in other emissions that affect a substantial number of people. The surrounding area has a low population density and agricultural and logging operations are common in this area. The project is limited to the one time removal of 2.99 acres of timberland.

Significance Level:

No Impact

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife 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, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, 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 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

Salix Natural Resource Management and Forest Ecosystem Management prepared a biological assessment for the applicant to determine the potential for the project to impact special status plants, animals, and vegetation

communities. The first year of NSO surveys was conducted in 2021 and will continue in 2022. The assessment study area includes the entirety of the project parcel. The assessment biological resource evaluation area (BREA) is the area that includes all lands within 1-mile of the boundaries of the parcel involved, as well as the County-defined drainage upstream and including the subject parcel.

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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

The biological assessment identified four plant and eleven animal species likely to occur in the project area. These species are evaluated below.

Special Status Plant Species

Special status plant species are those species that are legally protected under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) and/or the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) as listed or proposed for listing as threatened or endangered, as well as species that are considered rare by the scientific community. For example, the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) has identified some species as List 1,2 or 3 species and may be considered rare or endangered pursuant to Section 15380(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines. The CDFW has compiled a list of "Special Plants" (CDFW 2013), which include California Special Concern species. These designations are given to those plant species whose vegetation communities are seriously threatened. Although these species may be abundant elsewhere they are considered to be at some risk of extinction in California. Although Special Concern species are afforded no official legal status under FESA or CESA, they may receive special consideration during the planning stages of certain development projects and adverse impacts may be deemed significant under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Four special status plant species were identified as having high potential to occur in the project biological survey area, with two species being present in the survey area. The following discussion of these species is also found in the biological assessment.

Loch Lomond button-celery (*Eryngium constancei*) – High Potential to Occur, Species Present

This small perennial herb is endemic to a small region within the Mayacamas mountain range within Lake and Sonoma counties. It is a member of the carrot family (Apiaceae) and is found only within and along the margins of vernal pools. When young, it is a fleshy plant which produces infrequent white flowers; once dry it can become quite prickly. It is named after a large population found near Loch Lomond in Lake County. It is listed both State and Federally as endangered, and has a CNPS rare plant ranking of 1B.1.

This plant was re-discovered in 2021 within the vernal pool within the survey area, but outside the Project Area. Originally recorded into the CNDDDB in 1996 (EONDx 30021) and later revisited in 2013, there are two distinct populations in two distinct vernal pools. It is only one of two populations found in Sonoma County and one of five populations known in general. Only one vernal pool is located within the bounds of the property and the survey area. This entire vernal pool area is populated with Loch Lomond button-celery, over 20,000 plants in total. The vernal pool is located approximately fifty feet from the permanent access road which lies to the south. On the north side of the vernal pool (outside of the bounds of the property), there is a vineyard and rock wall. On the east side, the vernal pool fades into a non-native herbaceous layer of grasses and sweetpea. On the west side, the vernal pool is bordered by a Douglas-fir forest with white oak and a valley oak. The property line generally divides the vernal pool in half.

The closest point of the project site is approximately 350' to the west. Potential impacts to this plant include crushing or burying of plants with fill, burn piles or other slash; compaction from heavy equipment or other mechanized equipment; changes in hydrology due to upslope management or roadwork; desiccation from adjacent canopy removal and potential nutrient imbalances from application of fertilizers, herbicides or other chemicals that might filter into the pool. It is suggested that seed should be collected by person(s) with appropriately issued CDFW collection permit and sent to Rancho Santa Ana seedbank for storage. This will allow for the preservation of genetic diversity found within this population of *Eryngium constancei*.

The project is not expected to impact Loch Lomond button-celery, and will implement an Equipment Exclusion Zone (EEZ) that will be delineated with flagging along the road which borders the south side of the vernal pool and 75 feet away on both the west and east sides to keep equipment out of the sensitive pool area.

Any waste materials produced during the project (such as fill, wastewater or any other material) should not be deposited in or within 200 feet of the edge of the vernal pool. Drainage facilities such as ditch relief culverts or rolling dips shall not be installed where runoff can contribute material into the vernal pool.

Napa false-indigo (*Amorpha californica* var. *napensis*) – High Potential to Occur, Species Present

This deciduous shrub in the pea family (Fabaceae) grows 2-6 ft. tall and is found along woodland edges and chaparral. It is endemic to the Sonoma and Napa County region. Intricate flowers are closely set on slender spikes and are made up of a tiny intense indigo-purple petal with protruding bright orange stamens. See discussion of this species below on Glass Wildfire Impacts to Plants. These plants do not have a State or Federal Listing but are listed by the California Native Plant Society as 1B.2.

There are several small populations of this plant located within the survey area, but outside the Project Area. They are located along the access road, between the power line right-of-way and the access road, and directly across from the project area. These plants were not observed during early surveys and subsequently discovered in September 2020 after an aggressive post-fire clean up of the Glass Wildfire. The population likely became more abundant due to increase in sunlight from the removal of dead vegetation. These plants resulted likely from a residual seed bank or from coppice sprouting. These plants are early successional species, preferring more open canopies and their presence is directly related to the disturbance resulting from vegetation management along the road and power line.

Calistoga ceanothus (*Ceanothus divergens*) – High Potential to Occur

Calistoga ceanothus is an evergreen shrub in the buckthorn family (Rhamnaceae). It is found between 350 to 3,120 feet. The plant's preferred habitat is on shrub-covered, rocky, volcanic slopes. It is endemic to a small area in the Napa and Sonoma County region near Calistoga. The blue or purple flowers bloom in April and May. These plants do not have a State or Federal Listing but are listed by the California Native Plant Society as 1B.2. Calistoga ceanothus was not identified within the Study or Project Area.

Cobb Mountain lupine (*Lupinus sericatus*) – High Potential to Occur

This perennial member of the pea family (Fabaceae) is endemic to the Lake, Napa and Sonoma County region. Like other lupines, it has a whorl of leaves and are quite distinct from other lupines with spoon-shaped leaves. It prefers soils that are gravelly or thin, and generally is found on soils of volcanic origin. It readily colonizes disturbed places where canopy cover has been severely reduced (see discussion of this plant below on Glass Wildfire Impacts to Plants). These plants do not have a State or Federal Listing but are listed by the California Native Plant Society as 1B.2. Cobb Mountain lupine was not identified within the Study or Project Area.

Special Status Animal Species

Eleven (11) special status animal species were found to have the potential to occur within the study area. The following discussion of these species can also be found in the biological assessment.

The eleven (11) wildlife species with the potential to occur within the Study Area include:

- Vaux's Swift
- Olive-Sided Flycatcher
- Purple Martin
- Northern Spotted Owl
- Pallid Bat
- Sonoma Red-Tree Vole
- Ringtail
- Townsend's Big-Eared Bat

- Western Red Bat
- Long-Eared Myotis
- Fringed Myotis

The following discusses these target species in greater detail and their sensitivity to habitat loss.

Vaux's Swift (*Chaetura vauxi*) – Moderate Potential to Occur

Migration & Movement: Vaux's Swifts are summer residents of northern California.

Habitat: Preferred nesting habitats include redwood, Ponderosa pine, and Douglas-fir forests, often near water. Nests and roost sites are typically built on the vertical inner wall of a large, hollow tree or snag, especially tall stubs charred by fire. Occasionally nests in chimneys and buildings. Feeds exclusively on flying insects high in the air over most terrains and habitats.

Breeding Season: Arrive in California mid-April and breeds from early May to mid-August. Leave breeding grounds mid-August to early September. Solitary nesting is typical; however, communal roosts particularly during migration are common. Vaux's Swifts are known to have nested in Sonoma County.

Potential Threats: Removal of nest-sites. Sometimes heavily parasitized by lice.

Study Area: Suitable Vaux's Swift habitat is found within the study area and area immediately adjacent to the study area. The habitat may have been improved due to the Glass wildfire

Olive-Sided Flycatcher (*Contopus cooperi*) – Moderate Potential to Occur

Migration & Movement: Olive-Sided Flycatchers are summer residents in a wide variety of forest and woodland habitats below 9,000' throughout California.

Habitat: Preferred nesting habitats include mixed conifer, montane hardwood-conifer, Douglas-fir, redwood, red fir, and lodgepole pine; usually along forest edges. Requires large, tall trees, usually conifers, for nesting and roosting sites; and often uses dead tips of uppermost branches of the tallest trees in the vicinity for singing posts and hunting perches. Nests are an open cup of grasses, mosses, lichens, rootlets, or pine needles 5' to 70' above the ground. These birds forage for flying insects in forest openings, burns, edges, and other mixed open areas in forest habitats.

Breeding Season: Detailed life history information is lacking. Peak of egg-laying is in June. Olive-Sided Flycatchers are known to have nested in Sonoma County.

Potential Threats: Habitat degradation and loss is the most important threat.

Study Area: Suitable Olive-Sided Flycatcher habitat is found within the study area and area immediately adjacent to the study area. The habitat may have been downgraded due to the Glass wildfire due to large swaths of overstory canopy cover burned. No Olive-Sided Flycatchers were observed within the study area.

Purple Martin (*Progne subis*) – Moderate Potential to Occur

Migration & Movement: Uncommon to rare local resident in a variety of wooded, low-elevation habitats throughout the state.

Habitat: Purple Martins frequent old-growth, multi-layer, open forests and woodlands with snags during the breeding season. They forage over riparian areas, forests, and woodlands. They also occur in coniferous habitats, including closed-cone pine-cypress, ponderosa pine, Douglas-fir, and redwood forests. Nests are in an old woodpecker cavity (often a tall, large cavity tree), but will use human-made structures such as nesting box, buildings, on utility poles, under bridges, or in a culvert. Purple martins forage on insects, especially large ones like dragonflies.

Breeding Season: Purple Martins breed April through August, with peak activity in June. Purple Martins are known to breed in Sonoma County.

Potential Threats: Populations have declined because of loss of large snags, fire suppression, and competition for nest cavities from European starlings and house sparrows.

Study Area: Suitable Purple Martin habitat is found within the study area. The impact of the Glass Wildfire may have improved the potential for nest sites (creation of snags and cavity trees). No purple martins were observed within the study area.

Northern Spotted Owl (*Strix occidentalis caurina*) – Moderate Potential to Occur

Migration & Movement: Resident within suitable habitat.

Habitat: Northern Spotted Owl's habitat includes a forest with dense, multi-layered canopy of several tree species; tree species of varying sizes and ages; abundant snags/cavity trees, broken tops, or platform-like structures; and open spaces among the lower branches to allow for flight. USFWS further defines NSO habitat as having at least 40% overstory canopy cover, with nesting/roosting habitat within stands exceeding 60% overstory canopy (with over 80% preferred). In this area, there appears to be a preference for narrow, steep-sided canyons with north-facing slopes. Feed primarily upon woodrats, but also known to eat squirrels, mice, voles, and rabbits.

Breeding Season: Northern Spotted Owls breed February through August, with peak activity in April and May. Northern Spotted Owls are known to breed in Sonoma County.

Potential Threats: Sensitive to habitat destruction and fragmentation. Invading barred owls displacing NSOs from their territories.

Study Area: Marginal nesting habitat is present within the Study Area, but it is only marginal due to location of the study area on the landscape (near ridge top). Northern Spotted Owls might forage within the study area. No Northern Spotted Owls were detected within the study area, with year 1 of the nocturnal protocol surveys being completed in 2021.

Pallid Bat (*Antrozous pallidus*) – Moderate Potential to Occur

Migration & Movement: A relatively common species of low elevations in California.

Habitat: Occurs in wide variety of habitats including grasslands, shrublands, woodlands, and forests; but most common in open, dry habitats with rocky areas for roosting. Day roosts are in caves, crevices, mines and hollow trees or buildings. Roosts must protect bats from high temperatures. Night roosts may be in more open sites. Tree roosting has been documented within snags, basal hollows of conifers, and within bole cavities in oak trees. Prey items are primarily arachnids and insects including beetles, orthopterans, homopterans, moths, spiders, scorpions, solpugids, and Jerusalem crickets.

Breeding Season: Mates from late October to February with maternity colonies forming in early April. Young are born April – July, with most in May and June. Young have been observed flying in July and August.

Potential Threats: Sensitive to disturbance of roosting sites.

Study Area: The study area does have habitat present for foraging and roosting (cavity trees). The CNDDDB lists occurrences of Pallid Bats within the biological resources evaluation area. Due to the Glass Wildfire, some burned hollow trees may have been created. No bats were observed within the study area during nocturnal NSO surveys; however, a targeted bat survey was not completed under this assessment.

Sonoma Red-Tree Vole (*Arborimus pomo*) – Moderate Potential to Occur

Migration & Movement: Distributed along the North Coast from Sonoma County north to the Oregon border, being more or less restricted to the fog belt.

Habitat: Sonoma Red-Tree Voles are arboreal species that occur in redwood, Douglas-fir and montane hardwood-conifer habitats. Males nest in a tree nest constructed of fir needles or in some cases in shallow burrows at the base of fir trees, beneath the litter. Females spend most of their lives in trees constructing large, domed nursery nests of Douglas-fir (grand fir) needles. Nests are constructed most often in fir trees. Red-Tree Voles are specialists on eating the needles of Douglas-fir and grand fir, with twigs and needles gathered during the night. Needle resin ducts are removed with the remaining part eaten. Resin ducts are used to line the nest cup.

Breeding Season: Red-Tree Voles breed year-round but most often from February to September.

Potential Threats: Sensitive to logging removing fir trees and drought.

Study Area: It is highly likely the study area is outside the range for this species due to hot, dry conditions; and location outside the fog belt. The few stick nests located within the study area did not possess the tell-tail resin ducts indicating red tree voles.

Ringtail (*Bassariscus astutus*) – Moderate Potential to Occur

Migration & Movement: A widely distributed, common to uncommon permanent resident in California.

Habitat: Occurs in various riparian habitats, and in brush stands of most forest and shrub habitats, at low to middle elevations. Primarily carnivorous, eating rodents (woodrats and mice) and rabbits. Will also eat birds, eggs, reptiles, invertebrates, fruit, nuts, and some carrion. Use hollow trees, logs, snags, cavities in talus or other rocky areas, and other recesses are used for cover. Nests in rock recesses, hollow trees, logs, snags, abandoned burrows, or woodrat nests. Usually found within ½ mile of permanent water.

Breeding Season: Young are born in May – June, with an average litter of 3.

Potential Threats: Predators include bobcats, raccoons, foxes, and large owls. Potential competition for food exists between ringtails and raccoons, foxes, coyotes, large owls, rattle and gopher snakes.

Study Area: The study area does have habitat present for foraging and roosting (cavity trees, rocky areas), although it is marginal due to location on landscape (on ridge top and distance from permanent water). Due to the Glass Wildfire, some burned hollow trees may have been created. No ringtails were identified within the study area.

Townsend's Big-Eared Bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii*) – Moderate Potential to Occur

Migration & Movement: Townsend's Big-Eared Bats are found throughout California, with their distribution not well known. They are a relatively sedentary species making short movements to hibernations sites.

Habitat: This species is found in all but subalpine and alpine habitats, being most abundant in mesic habitats. Small moths are the principal food of this species, with beetles and a variety of soft-bodied insects also taken. Caves, mines, tunnels, buildings, or other human-made structures are used for roosting with separate day, night, hibernation and maternity roosts used. Small clusters or groups (less than 100 individuals) of females and young form the maternity colony. Glean insects from brush or trees and feeds along habitat edges.

Breeding Season: Mating occurs from November – February. Births occur in May and June with a peak in late May. Young are weaned in 6 weeks and are able to fly in 2 ½ to 3 weeks after birth.

Potential Threats: Extremely sensitive to disturbance of roosting sites. Rabies is known to occur.

Study Area: The study area does have habitat present for foraging and roosting sites (hollow trees, snags, large rock outcrop). The CNDDDB does list occurrences of Townsend's Big-Eared Bats within the 5-mile assessment area. Due to the Glass Wildfire, some burned hollow trees may have been created increasing

roosting sites. No bats were observed within the study area during nocturnal NSO surveys; however, a targeted bat survey was not completed under this assessment.

Western Red Bat (*Lasiurus blossevillii*) – Moderate Potential to Occur

Migration & Movement: Western Red Bats are locally common in some areas in California. There is migration between summer and winter ranges, and migrants may be found outside the normal range.

Habitat: Foraging occurs over a wide variety of habitats including grassland, shrub lands, open woodlands, forests, and croplands. They roost primarily in trees, less often in shrubs. Roosts are often along the edges of habitats and are often adjacent to stream, fields, or urban areas. Family groups may roost together and nursery colonies are found with many females and their young. May be found foraging with many other bat species, but usually does not roost with other species.

Breeding Season: Western red bats mate in August and September. Births are from late May through early July, with young capable of flight between 3 to 6 weeks of age.

Potential Threats: Rabies incidence in western red bats is relatively high. A variety of animals including hawks, owls, opossums, cats, and jays' prey on them.

Project Area: The study area does have habitat present for foraging and roosting (tree cavities and snags). Due to the Glass Wildfire, some burned hollow trees may have been created increasing roosting sites. No bats were observed within the study area during nocturnal NSO surveys; however, a targeted bat survey was not completed under this assessment.

Long-Eared Myotis (*Myotis evotis*) – Moderate Potential to Occur

Migration & Movement: The Long-Eared Myotis (bat) is widespread in California but generally uncommon within most of its range. Local movements to suitable hibernacula are made.

Habitat: Long-Eared Myotis have been found in nearly all brush, woodland, and forest habitat; but coniferous woodlands and forests seem to be preferred. They feed primarily on a variety of arthropods including beetles, moths, flies, and spiders. Foraging flight is slow and maneuverable, and this species is capable of hovering. They do require water. This species roosts in buildings, crevices, spaces under bark, and snags. Caves are used primarily as night roosts.

Breeding Season: Mates in the autumn. The young are born from May through July, with a peak in June. Most young are flying by early August. The maximum recorded longevity is 22 years.

Potential Threats: Sensitive to disturbance of roosting sites.

Study Area: The study area does have habitat present for foraging and roosting sites (under bark and snags). Due to the Glass Wildfire, some burned hollow trees may have been created increasing roosting sites. No bats were observed within the study area during nocturnal NSO surveys; however, a targeted bat survey was not completed under this assessment.

Fringed Myotis (*Myotis thysanodes*) – Marginal Habitat, Low Potential to Occur

Migration & Movement: The bat, Fringed Myotis, is widespread in California. Their abundance appears to be irregular, being common in some areas and absent in others.

Habitat: Optimal habitats are pinyon-juniper, valley foothill hardwood and hardwood-conifer, generally at 4000 – 7000 feet. Fringed myotis feed mostly on beetles but also on moths, arachnids, and orthopterans. They will roost in caves, mines, buildings, and crevices. Separate day and night roosts may be used; with adults and subadults forming separate groups in the roosts. Maternity colonies of up to 200 individuals are located in caves, mines, buildings or crevices. Require a water source.

Breeding Season: Mating occurs in the fall with the young being born from May through July, with peaks in late June. Young females are mature in their first year with males being mature in their second year. Fringed myotis are known to live for 18 years.

Potential Threats: Possible predators include owls and snakes. Disturbance at roosting sites.

Project Area: The study area does have marginal habitat present; however, may be below the optimal habitat elevational requirements. No bats were observed within the study area during nocturnal NSO surveys; however, a targeted bat survey was not completed under this assessment.

No special status wildlife species were identified within the study area. All wildlife species identified are listed in the appendix of the biological assessment.

The project could have potential significant impacts to sensitive plant and animal species. The implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 – 6 will reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

Significance Level:

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

Project Impacts

Passerines and raptors nesting in the project area could be impacted if construction occurs during the nesting season (March through August).

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: The following mitigation measures should be followed in order to avoid or minimize impacts to birds that may potentially nest in the trees:

- 1) Grading or removal of nesting trees should be conducted outside the nesting season, which occurs between approximately February 1 and August 31.
- 2) If grading between August 31 and February 1 is infeasible and groundbreaking must occur within the nesting season, a pre-construction nesting bird survey of the grasslands and adjacent trees shall be performed by a qualified biologist within 7 days of ground-breaking. If no nesting birds are observed no further action is required and grading shall occur within one week of the survey to prevent “take” of individual birds that could begin nesting after the survey.
- 3) If active bird nests are observed during the pre-construction survey, a disturbance-free buffer zone shall be established around the nest tree(s) until the young have fledged, as determined by a qualified biologist.
- 4) The radius of the required buffer zone can vary depending on the species, (i.e., 75-100 feet for passerines and 200-300 feet for raptors), with the dimensions of any required buffer zones to be determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW.
- 5) To delineate the buffer zone around a nesting tree, orange construction fencing shall be placed at the specified radius from the base of the tree within which no machinery or workers shall intrude.

After the fencing is in place there will be no restrictions on grading or construction activities outside the prescribed buffer zones.

Project Direct Impacts

Removal of trees may cause **direct mortality of roosting bats**, if the trees provide suitable roosting habitat and are removed during seasonal periods of inactivity (maternity season or winter).

Preventing Take of Tree-roosting Bats – General Discussion

As with those bats that roost in buildings, colonial bats that roost in trees are seasonally inactive (e.g. non-volant young during maternity season or torpid bats during winter months). Unlike with buildings however, bats cannot readily be humanely evicted from trees. This is because many trees have numerous cavities, crevices,

or large areas of exfoliating bark that cannot be fitted with one-way exits, or cannot even be safely worked on due to poor condition or lack of accessibility. This is particularly true of snags due to their extremely poor condition; however, snags provide some of the most preferred and substantial bat tree roost habitat.

Conducting visual cavity surveys is only rarely possible due to difficulty with access and number of trees and night emergence surveys of potential roost trees is generally only feasible logistically and economically, where a few habitat trees occur, because only 1-2 trees can be surveyed each night per observer. Also, because bats tend to switch tree roosts more frequently than more stable roosts such as caves, mines, rock outcrops, buildings, bridges, or culverts, negative results have extremely limited temporal validity (24-48 hours), which would result in multiple mobilizations by tree cutters in order to remove trees immediately after a negative survey. In the event a tree is found to be occupied, a method for safely getting the bats out of the tree will still be needed.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: To prevent take of individual roosting bats a bat habitat assessment of the trees to be removed should be conducted by a qualified bat biologist. A method has been developed that provides the most reasonable and cost-effective opportunity for bats to abandon the roost tree prior to cutting, which has been in use for over ten years. This is a two-step method, *conducted over two consecutive days*, and works by creating noise and vibration by cutting non-habitat branches and limbs from habitat trees using chainsaws only (no excavators or other heavy machinery) on Day 1. The noise and vibration disturbance, together with the visible alteration of the tree, is very effective in causing bats that emerge nightly to feed, to not return to the roost that night. The remainder of the tree is removed the following day - Day 2. Trees that are proposed for two-step removal will be identified in the field prior to removal.

Two-step tree removal must only occur during seasonal periods of bat activity as described above; however, there are certain, limited exceptions, such as when the roost features can be visually surveyed and absence of bats can be determined, or when the roost features do not provide suitable maternity or overwintering habitat (e.g. shallow crevices in bark or wood). In a small percentage of trees, there are accessible cavities which could support colonial roosts, a visual inspection using fiber optic or video probes could be conducted outside the seasonally restricted periods, to permit removal at that time, if no bats are present. If all roost features can be completely surveyed, the entire tree may be removed in one action, making two-step removal unnecessary.

Specific recommendations based on the habitats on the site will be made to prevent direct impacts to individuals that may be roosting on the site:

Two-step removal of bat habitat trees must only be conducted during seasonal periods of bat activity, which are in this region, between March 1 (or after evening temperatures rise above 45F and/or no more than 1/2" of rainfall within 24 hours occurs), and April 15, or between August 31 and October 15 (or before evening temperatures fall below 45F and/or more than 1/2" of rainfall within 24 hours occurs).

Monitoring: If any bat habitat trees are proposed to be removed, an assessment shall be provided by a qualified bat biologist to Permit Sonoma identifying the trees to be removed, potential for bats to roost in the trees, and methods used to remove the trees while protecting bat species.

Impacts to Special Status Animal Species

The Project has the potential to impact Vaux's Swifts, Purple Martins, and Olive-Sided Flycatcher nesting habitat by direct tree removal. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 and BIO-3 will reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3: If tree removal is anticipated during primary bird nesting season (01MAR – 31JUL) a preconstruction survey will be necessary. The preconstruction survey can be combined with the nesting bird survey recommended above. To include the Vaux's swift, purple martin and olive-sided flycatcher, the nesting survey should be completed by a surveyor familiar with their vocalizations. Snags and cavity trees should be searched for evidence of potential nesting birds.

Northern Spotted Owl

Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Northern Spotted Owl surveys are required. The protocol survey requires a minimum of 2 years of surveys prior to tree removal when harvesting within northern spotted owl habitat, with surveys required in each year timber harvest activities are to occur. A single year of protocol surveys have been completed (2021 breeding seasons) with no northern spotted owls or barred owls detected. A separate northern spotted owl assessment report will be completed specifically for this Project.

Impacts to Special Status Plant Species

Removal of trees and development of the vineyard could impact special status plant species. The following Mitigation Measures will be used to reduce impacts to special status plant species.

Loch Lomond button-celery, (Eryngium constancei)

Mitigation Measures BIO-5: To prevent damage or take of Loch Lomond button celery and the vernal pool on site, an EEZ (Equipment Exclusion Zone) will be delineated with flagging along the road which borders the south side of the vernal pool, and 75 feet away on both the west and east sides to keep equipment out of the sensitive pool area.

Any waste materials produced during the project (such as fill, wastewater or any other material) will not be deposited in or within 200 feet of the edge of the vernal pool. Drainage facilities such as ditch relief culverts or rolling dips shall not be installed where runoff can contribute material into the vernal pool.

Napa false-indigo (Amorpha californica var. napensis)

Mitigation Measure BIO-6: A preconstruction survey shall be conducted prior to ground disturbing activities. Special status plants found in the survey will be identified and flagged and protected from disturbance during project construction through flagging.

- b) **Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

Comment

Riparian Habitat

Special Status Vegetation Communities

Sensitive natural communities are those that are considered rare in the region, may support special status plant or wildlife species, or may receive regulatory protection (i.e., through Section 404 of the Clean Water Act [CWA] and/or Sections 1600 et seq. of the California Fish and Wildlife Code). In addition, sensitive natural communities include plant communities that have been identified as having highest inventory priority in the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB). The second edition of *A Manual of California Vegetation* (Sawyer, et al. 2009) also provides the rarity ranking status of these communities.

The following sensitive natural communities are found in the project area:

Northern Vernal Pool (Holland 1986)

Less than 1 acre of vernal pool is located within the survey area. The vernal pool is located approximately 350' outside the Project Area (Block B). As no MCV classification correlates to this community the botanist classified it as a new Alliance predominantly on dominant herbaceous species present: Douglas pogogyne-Loch Lomond Button-celery (*Pogogyne douglasii-Eryngium constancei*).

Tanoak (*Notholithocarpus densiflorus*) Alliance, G3 S3

Approximately 5 acres of the Tanoak Alliance is found within the survey area with 1.2 acres of that total within the Project Area. Membership rules for Tanoak Alliance state that there must be more than 60% relative cover in the tree layer. Tanoak is dominant or co-dominant in the tree canopy with Douglas-fir, coast live oak, black oak, coast redwood and/or California bay laurel. Impacts from completion of the project would be a loss of 1.2 acres of the Tanoak Alliance. Due to the Glass Wildfire impacts, the area of Tanoak dominated stands will grow without replanting of burned Douglas-fir. It is expected that the original 5 acres of Tanoak (present pre-

Glass Wildfire) will expand.

Tanoak is susceptible to sudden oak death (*Phytophthora ramorum*). There is the potential for impacts from sudden oak death, if found onsite or nearby, to impact the remaining forestland after conversion activities.

The following non-sensitive natural communities are located in the project area as well:

Douglas-fir Forest (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*) Forest Alliance

Douglas-fir Forests occur in the Coast Range, Klamath Range, Cascade Range, and Sierra Nevada from Del Norte County to Santa Barbara County (CNPS 2021). These forests are typically situated on all topographic positions and aspects, underlain by a variety of substrates including serpentine and volcanics. Douglas-fir is the dominant tree, with the potential for other overstory trees of redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*), tanoak (*Notholithocarpus densiflorus*), Pacific madrone (*Arbutus menziesii*), and California bay (*Umbellularia californica*).

Chamise (*Adenostoma fasciculatum*) Shrub Alliance

The Chamise Alliance occurs across cismontane California in a variety of topographic settings from coastal bluffs to steep, lower montane slopes. Stands older than 60 years of age produce little new growth as dead stem biomass increases. Chamise is the dominant shrub in this community, with co-dominants of manzanita (*Arctostaphylos* spp.), lilac (*Ceanothus* sp.), yerba santa (*Eriodictyon californicum*), buckwheat (*Erigeron* spp.), sage (*Salvia* sp.) and Poisonoak (*Toxicodendron diversilobum*). The shrub canopy is intermittent to continuous and approximately 4 meters tall.

Avena spp. - Bromus spp. Herbaceous Semi-Natural (wild oats and annual brome grasslands) Alliance

Dominant or co-dominant with other non-natives in the herbaceous layer such as *Atriplex semibaccata* and *Hordeum* spp. This Alliance includes *Avena barbata*, *Avena fatua*, *Brachypodium distachyon*, *Briza maxima*, *Bromus diandrus*, *Bromus hordeaceus* and/or *Hordeum murinum*. Emergent trees and shrubs may be present at low cover. Herbs are generally less than 1.2 meters tall and the cover is open to continuous.

The project could have potential significant impacts on sensitive natural communities. Mitigation Measure BIO-7 and BIO-8 will reduce these impacts to less than significant.

Significance Level:

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

Mitigation Measure BIO-7: Outside of the remaining existing stands of Tanoak Alliance within the study area (3.8 acres), a botanist or forester shall monitor for 2 years the survey area for tanoak regeneration. An additional 2.4 new acres (2:1) will be tended to ensure that it meets the standards of at least 60% relative tree cover of tanoak within the stand. These areas were classified as Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*) which is not considered a sensitive natural community and conversion to Tanoak (*Notholithocarpus densiflorus*) Alliance will not constitute a timberland conversion.

Mitigation Measure BIO-8: In order to protect remaining Tanoak from sudden oak death (*Phytophthora ramorum*), if sudden oak death is found at or near the project site, equipment shall be sanitized at the end of each work day. Infected cut material shall be disposed of onsite and not transported out of the worksite.

- c) **Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

Comment

Waters of the U.S. and State

There are no perennial or ephemeral streams or watercourses in the project area.

Wetlands

Wetlands are protected and fall within the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), and the state Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). As discussed above, there is a vernal pool located on the project parcel that also contains a population of Loch Lomond button celery. The project, through the implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-5 would reduce any impacts to less than significant.

Significance Level:

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

- d) **Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**

Comment

Wildlife movement includes migration (i.e., usually one way per season), inter-population movement (i.e., long-term genetic flow) and small travel pathways (i.e., daily movement corridors within an animal's territory). While small travel pathways usually facilitate movement for daily home range activities such as foraging or escape from predators, they also provide connection between outlying populations and the main corridor, permitting an increase in gene flow among populations.

As described in the California Essential Connectivity Project (Spencer, et al. 2010), the project location is considered to be within the North Coast Ecoregion. No Natural Landscape Blocks (i.e., large, relatively natural habitat blocks that support native biodiversity), or Essential Connectivity Areas (i.e., areas essential for ecological connectivity between Natural Landscape Blocks) are identified on the project site. (Spencer, et al. 2010).

Wildlife connectivity of this site to other open upland habitat in the area occurs within the surrounding forestland. The undeveloped nature of the site allows for unimpeded movement through the parcel. The proposed vineyard development will impede movement by the larger terrestrial species, such as deer, but allow for wildlife movement of smaller species. The small size of the vineyard, ~4 acres will be easily circumnavigated by any species movement through the project area.

Potential Impacts to Migratory Birds from the Project

Migratory bird species may nest in or adjacent to the project area. Construction disturbance during the breeding season could result in the loss of fertile eggs or nestlings, or otherwise lead to nest abandonment. The proposed project may also result in a small, temporary reduction of foraging or roosting habitat for migratory bird species.

Mitigation Measure BIO-1 and BIO-3 would reduce impacts to migratory birds and other birds to a less than significant level.

Significance Level:

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

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

Regulatory Framework

Sonoma County Municipal Code Sec. 26-88-140. - Minor timberland conversions.

Minor Timberland Conversions are allowed on properties zoned LIA (Land Intensive Agriculture), LEA (Land Extensive Agriculture), DA (Diverse Agriculture), RRD (Resources and Rural Development), RRDWA (Resources and Rural Development/Agricultural Preserve, and AR (Agriculture and Residential), provided they are in compliance with the conditions and criteria set forth in 14 CCR § 1104.1. Minor timberland conversions approved by the County must be less than three acres, show a bona fide intent to convert the timberland to the proposed use, and be conducted in compliance with the provisions 14 CCR § 1104.1(i).

California Forest Practice Rules – 14 CCR § 1104

Tree removal is exempt from a required conversion permit and timber harvesting plan requirements under the conditions or criteria set forth in 14 CCR § 1104.1(i). Tree removal and timber operations are required to comply with all other applicable provisions of the Z'berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act, regulations of the Board of Forestry, and provisions of county general plans, zoning ordinances and any implementing ordinances. The exemption is applicable to a conversion of timberland to a non-timber use only, of less than three acres in one contiguous ownership. The exemption is a one-time use per contiguous land ownership.

Sonoma County General Plan

The Sonoma County General Plan 2020 (Sonoma County 2008) Land Use Element and Open Space & Resource Conservation Element both contain policies to protect natural resource lands including, but not limited to watershed, fish and wildlife habitat, biotic areas, and habitat connectivity corridors.

Comment

Tree Removal

As allowed under the minor timberland conversion permit, the proposed project would not require replacement trees as a result of the tree removal. The timberland conversion allows for a one time tree removal permit based on the property owners written statement "*certifying that the Minor Timberland Conversion is a one-time conversion to a non-timber growing use, that there is a bona fide intent to undertake and complete the conversion in conformance with the provisions in of Section 26-88-140d of the Sonoma County Zoning Code*".

In addition, the proposed project will include a Less Than 3-acre Conversion Exemption permit from CAL FIRE which includes similar requirements and conditions for one-time timber conversion to non-timber growing uses. The project as proposed is consistent with the criteria and guidelines for both local and state agency requirements. Therefore, the impact is considered less-than-significant and no mitigation is required.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant Impact

- f) **Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan?**

Comment

There are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plans within the project area.

Significance Level:

No Impact

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X		
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?		X		

- a) **Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?**

Comment

Tom Origer & Associates conducted a cultural resources survey of the property in March of 2021. The survey

included archival research at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University (NWIC File No. 20-1776), examination of the library and files of Tom Origer & Associates, and field inspection of the project location.

Archival and historical map review and the field survey indicate that a historical resource is located in the project area. The resource is the remnants of a residential site. Additionally, an isolated pit feature was found, similar to one found at the location of the residential site. Scattered modern metal cans, pots, a wash basin, and glass bottle fragments were also found throughout the property along the access road.

The historical archaeological residential site on the property has elements that have the potential to yield information about early to late 20th century occupation in this hilly, remote, area.

The following protection measures will be implemented to reduce project impacts to a less than significant level: .

- The site boundary will be flagged with Special Treatment Zone Flagging (STZ) and the archaeology site outside the road prism will be designated as an Equipment Exclusion Zone (EEZ).
- In addition to the STZ flagging, Tom Origer & Associates will encircle the Diamond Mtn. Historical Archaeological Site deposit boundary with a single, continuous band of yellow caution tape.
- No timber operations or staging within the flagged site boundary, except use of the existing road.
- The gravel road through the site boundary will be designated as an Equipment Limitation Zone (ELZ) that will allow use of the road by vehicles and machinery associated with timber operations.
- Road widening through the archaeology site is prohibited.
- Trees within 100 feet of the flagged site boundary will be felled and skidded away from the site boundary.

Although no other historic properties or cultural resources meeting the definition of a historic property were identified within the project site; incorporation of Mitigation Measure CULT-1 below will reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.

Significance Level:

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

Mitigation

Mitigation Measure CULT-1: Accidental Archaeological findings

There is the possibility that buried archaeological deposits could be present on any portion of the property, and accidental discovery could occur. In keeping with the CEQA guidelines, if archaeological remains are uncovered, work at the place of discovery should be halted immediately until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the finds (§15064.5 [f]). Prehistoric archaeological site indicators include: obsidian and chert flakes and chipped stone tools; grinding and mashing implements (e.g., slabs and handstones, and mortars and pestles); bedrock outcrops and boulders with mortar cups; and locally darkened midden soils. Midden soils may contain a combination of any of the previously listed items with the possible addition of bone and shell remains, and fire affected stones. Historic period site indicators generally include: fragments of glass, ceramic, and metal objects; milled and split lumber; and structure and feature remains such as building foundations and discrete trash deposits (e.g., wells, privy pits, dumps).

Monitoring: Permit Sonoma Project Review staff shall check plans for notation of the condition, prior to issuance of grading permits and shall conduct site inspections as necessary during construction. This condition shall be noted on all grading and construction plans and provided to all contractors and superintendents on the job site.

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

Comment

With the implementation of protection measures described above and Mitigation Measure CULT-1, there will

be no substantial adverse changes in the significance of archaeological resources.

Significance Level:

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

Mitigation

Implementation of **Mitigation Measure CULT-1**.

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

Comment

There are no known burial sites in the vicinity of the project site. However, as discussed in V(a) and (b) above, if accidental human remains are uncovered during project activities, all work shall be halted until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the finds (§15064.5 [f]). If the remains were determined to be Native American interment, the Coroner will follow the procedure outlined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15065.5(e). Incorporation of Mitigation Measure CULT-2 below will reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.

Significance Level:

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

Mitigation

Mitigation Measure CULT-2. Accidental Excavation of Human Remains

The following actions are promulgated in Public Resources Code 5097.98 and Health and Human Safety Code 7050.5, and pertain to the discovery of human remains. If human remains are encountered, excavation or disturbance of the location must be halted in the vicinity of the find, and the county coroner contacted. If the coroner determines the remains are Native American, the coroner will contact the Native American Heritage Commission, pursuant to the procedures outlined in CEQA guidelines Section 15606.5(e). The Native American Heritage Commission will identify the person or persons believed to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American. The most likely descendent makes recommendations regarding the treatment of the remains with appropriate dignity.

Monitoring: Permit Sonoma Project Review staff shall check plans for notation of the condition, prior to issuance of grading permits and shall conduct site inspections as necessary during construction. This condition shall be noted on all grading and construction plans and provided to all contractors and superintendents on the job site. The Sonoma County Coroner shall be informed if human remains are discovered. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, if such remains are of Native American origin, the appropriate Tribal Heritage Preservation Officer, as determined by the State Native American Heritage Commission, shall be contacted.

VI. ENERGY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?				X
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				X
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?				

Comment

Short-term energy demand would result from construction activities occurring as a result of tree removal and other site activities. Short-term demand would include energy needed to power worker and vendor vehicle trips as well as construction and logging equipment. Long-term energy demand would result from operation of the project, which would include activities such as irrigation, and management and maintenance of the proposed vineyards.

Although implementation of the project would result in a slight increase in energy usage compared to current conditions due to the new agriculture production on the project site, the increase in energy use would not be wasteful nor inefficient because of best management practices related to vineyard development incorporated into site development.

Significance Level:

No Impact

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Comment

The project does not include construction of habitable structures, and would not be required to comply with Title 24, Part 6 of the California Code of Regulations, Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Additionally, the project is not located in an identified area designated for renewable energy productions nor would the project interfere with the installation of any renewable energy systems. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct with applicable State and local plans for promoting use of renewable energy and energy efficiency.

Significance Level:

No Impact

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking				X
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv. Landslides?				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 on- or off-site 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 direct or indirect risks to life or property?			X	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems				X

where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste-water?

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

X

- a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

Comment

The site is not within a fault hazard zone as defined by the Alquist-Priolo fault maps. The project site is not mapped by the California Geological Survey (CGS) to be underlain by a "Holocene-active" earthquake fault capable of resulting in surface fault rupture. The nearest "Holocene-active" earthquake fault mapped in accordance with the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist Special Publication 42, is the San Andreas fault, approximately 1.5-miles southwest of the project site. The proposed project does not include development of any habitable structures or activities requiring development of structures for stability or foundations. After tree removal, the property will be developed in part as a vineyard.

Significance Level:

No Impact

- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking

Comment

All of Sonoma County is subject to seismic shaking that would result from earthquakes along the San Andreas, Healdsburg-Rodgers Creek, and other faults. The proposed project is tree removal required for the development of a vineyard. The project would therefore not expose people to substantial risk of injury from seismic shaking.

Significance Level:

No Impact

- iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Comment

The project site is located in a Liquefaction Hazard Area of very low susceptibility. All construction activities will be required to meet permit requirements, including seismic safety standards and soil test/compaction requirements. The proposed project is tree removal required for the development of a vineyard. The project would therefore not expose people to substantial risk of injury from seismic shaking.

Significance Level:

No Impact

- iv. Landslides?

Comment

The project site and area proposed for tree removal and site preparation is generally characterized as gentle slopes and not prone to landslides. There are no known landslide areas within the area of the subject site proposed for modification as part of the project.

Significance Level:

No Impact

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?**Comment**

Erosion and sediment control BMPs will be installed on bare soil following timber operations. Therefore, no significant adverse soil erosion or related soil erosion water quality impacts are expected given the mandated conditions and standards that need to be met. The project will be required to comply with the County's VESCO ordinance, which requires erosion and sediment control BMPs for orchard and vineyard developments.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant Impact

Figure 4. Soils Map**c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?****Comment**

As discussed in VII(a) and (b) above, the project site is characterized as generally stable soils. Erosion and sediment control BMPs will be installed on bare soil following timber operations. The proposed project, and ongoing operations of the subject property have a low danger of landslide, lateral spreading liquefaction or subsistence. The project site is not characterized as a geologic unit or unstable soil that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. Therefore, impacts related to the development of the project are considered less than significant and no further mitigation is required.

Significance Level

Less than Significant Impact

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?**Comment**

The proposed project involves the removal of 2.99 acres of timberland and 4.1 total acres for future development as vineyard. No physical improvements or structures will be constructed as a result of the project. No substantial risks to life or property would be created from soil expansion at the proposed project, even if it were to be affected by expansive soils.

Significance Level:

Less Than Significant Impact

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste-water?**Comment**

The proposed project involves the removal of 2.99 acres of timberland and 4.1 total acres for future development as vineyard. No wastewater disposal systems are required for construction of the project

Significance Level:

No Impact

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

Comment

There are no known unique paleontological resources, sites, or unique geological features. Implementation of BMPs and mitigation measures CULT-1 and CULT-2 required if unknown subsurface resources are discovered during construction activities would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant Impact

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				

Comment

The project is within the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The County utilizes the GHG emissions significance recommended by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) as County thresholds. For projects other than stationary sources, the greenhouse gas significance threshold is 1,100 metric tons per year of CO₂e or 4.6 metric tons of CO₂e per service population (residents and employees) per year. BAAQMD's staff's analysis is found in the document titled "Revised Draft Options and Justification Report, October, 2009," which is a publicly available document that can be obtained from the BAAQMD website or from Permit Sonoma.

The carbon lost from the tree removal would be offset in the long-term lifespan of a planted vineyard across the project area. It's not expected that the short-term timber harvesting operations would yield significant enough carbon emissions to push the project past the threshold of significance of 1,100 metric tons of CO₂e/year threshold. The project would have a less than significant impact on GHG emissions because the project would not generate a significant amount of GHG emissions.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant Impact

- b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?**

Comment

The County does not have an adopted Climate Action Plan but has established GHG reduction goals outlined in the Climate Change Action Resolution. The project, by implementing current County codes and State regulations, would be consistent with local and State plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant Impact

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 handle 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 which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?			X	

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

Small amounts of potentially hazardous materials will be used on this project during construction activities such as fuel, lubricants, and cleaning materials. Proper use of materials in accordance with local, State, and federal requirements, and as required in the construction documents, will minimize the potential for accidental releases or emissions from hazardous materials. This will assure that the risks of the project uses impacting the human or biological environment will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant Impact

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?**Comment**

The project would not generate or produce hazardous materials. Hazardous materials (diesel fuels, solvents, oils, etc.) are contained in products used on site for use and maintenance of equipment and machinery. The use, storage, and transport of such products are controlled by the local Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA). Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment

The project site is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

Significance Level:

No Impact

- d) **Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

Comment

The project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

Significance Level:

No Impact

- e) **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?**

Comment

The site is not within the Airport Referral Area as designated by the Sonoma County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan.

Significance Level:

No Impact

- f) **Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

Comment

There is no adopted emergency response or evacuation plan for the County.

Significance Level:

No Impact

- g) **Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?**

Comment

According to the Safety Element of the General Plan, the project site is located in an area with very high potential for large wildland fires. No structures are proposed as part of the project.

Workers may be exposed to incidental ignition risks as a result of timber operations. Timber operations and timber harvesting machinery will be operated in a manner that is consistent with local and State policies to reduce the risk of fire related to timber operations.

Slash disposal shall be conducted in accordance with the Forest Practice Rules (14 CCR 1104.1) to reduce fire risk of post-harvest conditions.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant Impact

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?			X	
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?				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 or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site			X	
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite			X	
iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff			X	
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?				X
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?			X	
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?			X	
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?				

Comment

The proposed project includes 4.1 acres of tree removal and site preparation for vineyard development. Vineyard development would require grading permits and compliance with all applicable standards and provisions of the Sonoma County Code and all other relevant laws and regulations. The Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures will require implementation of erosion control measures and other standards to ensure that no water quality standards or waste discharge requirements are violated.

Land disturbance of the project development area would be subject to National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements. The conditions of approval require that documentation of coverage under the State Water Resource Control Board's Construction General Permit (General Permit) must be submitted to the Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures prior to issuance of any VESCO permit.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant Impact

- b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?**

Comment

The project site is located in a Class 3 – Marginal Groundwater area as mapped in the Sonoma County Groundwater Availability Map. The site is not within a major groundwater basin mapped by the County. The proposed project includes 2.99 acres of timberland conversion and total 4.1 acres of forestland conversion needed for future vineyard development. A hydrogeologic report prepared by EBA engineering was prepared for the applicant. The report consisted of a groundwater availability study, which made the findings that based on projected water usage from vineyard development and operation and estimated groundwater availability, there would not be a significant impact on current and future groundwater availability at the project site.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant Impact

- c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:**

- i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site**

Comment

There are no blue line streams on the site.

Following conversion activities, erosion control BMPs will be put in place to reduce the potential for erosion of bare soil.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant Impact

- ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite**

The project would not result in an increase in the amount of impervious surface area on the project site. Post-construction storm water best management practices would be utilized to maintain current storm water run-off. Conditions of approval would require compliance with Sonoma County Low Impact Development (LID) regulations prior to issuance of grading permits. Application of these standards will reduce impacts from increased surface runoff to a less than significant level.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant Impact

- iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff**

Comment

The area proposed for tree removal (approximately 4.1 acres). The proposed project has been designed to prevent and/or minimize drainage impacts through the proper site design. Drainage impacts typically include storm water flooding of local roadways, soil erosion, standing water, and nuisance conditions for property owners and neighbors. Storm water drainage systems may take many forms such as site grading, swales, ditches, small or single run drain pipes, a piping system or network, or a combination of all these. Drainage systems should also integrate storm water treatment and flow control storm water best management practices discussed above.

Conditions of approval would require that erosion control BMPs are installed after tree removal over any

areas of bare soil.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant Impact

iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?

The project would not impede or redirect flood flows.

Significance Level:

No Impact

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

According to Figure PS-1e of the General Plan, the project site is outside of the 100-year Flood Hazard Area. There are no blue line streams on the property; a headwater stream on the eastern portion is outside the proposed project activities. The project site is not located in an area subject to seiche or tsunami. Mudflows can be triggered by heavy rainfall, earthquakes, or volcanic eruption.

Existing flood hazards that could affect new development are considered in this analysis. Impacts of the environment on the proposed project are analyzed as a matter of County policy, not because such analysis is required by CEQA.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant Impact

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Timber operations in the North Coast Region are eligible for a Categorical Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements under the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board's Order No. R1-2014-0011. Any violations of the requirements of the Categorical Waiver will require resolution with North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board staff.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant Impact

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X

a) Physically divide an established community?

Comment

The project would not physically divide a community. It does not involve construction of a physical structure (such as a major transportation facility) or removal of a primary access route (such as a road or bridge) that would impair mobility within an established community or between a community and outlying areas.

Significance Level:

No Impact

- b) **Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

Comment

The project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, including in the Sonoma County General Plan and zoning ordinance.

The parcel's General Plan land use designation of Resource and Rural Development allows tree removal and agriculture uses as permitted uses.

Significance Level:

No Impact

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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

- 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?**

Comment

The project site is not located within a known mineral resource deposit area (Sonoma County Aggregate Resources Management Plan, as amended 2010).

Significance Level:

No Impact

- 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?**

Comment

The project site is not located within an area of locally-important mineral resource recovery site and the site is not zoned MR (Mineral Resources) (Sonoma County Aggregate Resources Management Plan, as amended 2010 and Sonoma County Zoning Code). No locally-important mineral resources are known to occur at the site.

Significance Level:

No Impact

XIII. NOISE

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				

Comment

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

The primary ambient source of noise in the project area is primarily due to rural woodland noises, with distant traffic noise along Diamond Mountain Road also influencing ambient conditions. The closest residential uses are about 2,000 feet from the project area to the north. Considering the distance of the proposed project activities and access road from adjacent noise sensitive uses, the small size and number of employees of the proposed project, the mechanical equipment, it is expected that noise from the timber operations would result in a less than 3 dBA increase in the average Day/Night (Ldn) noise levels at any adjacent noise sensitive use. This increase is much less than the defined significance level of a 5 dBA increase in the Ldn.

The County does not establish noise standards for timber harvesting in its General Plan or County Code. Timber harvesting would generate noise and may temporarily increase noise levels at adjacent residential receivers. Tree removal is expected to be completed in a few weeks. Timber operations would not involve substantial site improvements, but rather limited tree removal and grubbing.

Noise generating sources would include chainsaws, chipping equipment and vehicles needed to remove tree material from the site. The hauling of excavated material and construction materials would generate truck trips on local roadways. Noise sensitive residential land uses are located about 200 feet from the access road. Based on these distances, the expected source levels, and distance and terrain attenuation, noise levels at these closest residences would be below a Leq of 60 dBA during typical busy construction periods and would meet General Plan noise tables. Based on the duration of construction and distance to sensitive receptors, this would be a less than significant impact.

A standard condition of approval will be required: If noise complaints are received from nearby residents, and they appear to be valid complaints in Permit Sonoma's opinion, then the applicant shall conduct a Noise Study to determine if the current operations meet noise standards and identify any additional noise measures necessary to attenuate noise. A copy of the Noise Study shall be submitted to the Project Review Health Specialist within sixty days of notification from Permit Sonoma that a noise complaint has been received. The owner/operator shall implement any additional measures needed to meet noise standards.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant Impact

b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**Comment**

The project includes construction activities that may generate ground borne vibration and noise. These levels would not be significant because they would be short-term and temporary, and would be limited to daytime hours. There are no other activities or uses associated with the project that would expose persons to or generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant Impact

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**Comment**

The project site is not located in the vicinity of an existing airport or airport land use zone and would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive aircraft noise levels.

Significance Level:

No Impact

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				

Comment

The project entails the removal of existing mature vegetation for preparation of vineyard development. No population growth would occur as a result of the project.

Significance Level:

No Impact

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**Comment**

No housing will be displaced by the project and no replacement housing is proposed to be constructed.

Significance Level: No Impact

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service rations, response times or other performance objectives for any of the				
i. Fire protection?				X
ii. Police?				X
iii. Schools, parks, or other public facilities?				X
iv. Parks?				X
v. Other public facilities?				X

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

i. Fire protection?

Comment

Tree removal on the project site would not involve substantial adverse physical impacts associated with provision of public facilities or services and the impact would be less than significant.

The project is located in the SRA, and the Sonoma County Fire District will continue to serve this area. There will be no increased need for fire protection resulting from the project.

Significance Level:

No Impact

ii. Police?

Comment

The Sonoma County Sheriff will continue to serve this area. There will be no increased need for police protection resulting from the project.

Significance Level:

No Impact

iii. Schools, parks, or other public facilities?

Comment

No new schools, parks or other public facilities would be required as a result of the tree removal and site preparation on the subject property.

Significance Level:

No Impact

iv. Parks?**Comment**

The project will not result in physical development of new structures for residential purposes and will not result in the need for any new park facilities.

Significance Level:

No Impact

v. Other public facilities?**Comment**

No sewer or water services are needed for development of the project. There are no structures or residences proposed that would require services or public facilities. The project proposes land uses that are consistent with the General Plan. Expanded facilities are not currently reasonably foreseeable.

Significance Level:

No Impact

XVI. RECREATION

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

- a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

Comment

The proposed project would not involve activities that would cause or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of parks or recreational facilities. The project will have no impact on the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities.

Significance Level:

No Impact

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Comment

The proposed project does not involve activities that would require recreational facilities or require construction

or expansion of existing facilities.

Significance Level: No Impact

XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?			X	
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?				X
c) Substantially increase hazards due to geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X

- a) **Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?**

Comment

There are no programs, plans or ordinances, or policies that address the circulation system for this area of the County nor any plans or policies that regulate typical agricultural truck traffic. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Significance Level:

No Impact

- b) **Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?**

Comment

The proposed project is the one-time conversion of 2.99 acres of timberland. It is not expected that the project will have a long term increase in the amount and distance of vehicle miles travelled. Therefore, there is no impact and no mitigation is required.

Significance Level:

No Impact

- c) **Substantially increase hazards due to geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

Comment

There are no proposed geometric design features or incompatible uses that could substantially increase hazards.

Significance Level: No Impact

- d) **Result in inadequate emergency access?**

Comment

The project would not increase hazards since it maintains the existing alignment of the roadway and would not create hazards from incompatible uses.

Significance Level:

No Impact

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Potentially
Significant
Unless Mitigation
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No
Impact

- a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California native American tribe, and that is:

- i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5030.1(k), or
- ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

X

X

- a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California native American tribe, and that is:

- i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5030.1(k), or

Comment

As discussed in Section V, Cultural Resources, above, the Historic Property Survey identified no tribal cultural resources within the project site, Standard construction monitoring mitigation measures (Mitigation Measure CULT-1 and CULT-2, above) which would also be included as a Condition of Approval of the project.

On December 8, 2021, Permit Sonoma staff referred the project application to Native American Tribes within Sonoma County to request consultation under AB-52. The County received no requests for consultation.

There are no known archaeological resources on the site, but the project could uncover such materials during construction. Mitigation Measure CULT-1 and CULT-2 will reduce the impact to less than significant.

Significance Level

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

Mitigation

See Mitigation Measure CULT-1 and CULT-2, above.

- ii. **A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.**

Comment

As discussed in XVIII(a)(i), there are no known cultural or Tribal resources on the project site. However, as discussed in V(a) and (b) and XVIII(a)(i) above, if human remains are accidentally uncovered during project activities, all work shall be halted until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the finds (§15064.5 [f]). If the remains were determined to be Native American interment, the Coroner will follow the procedure outlined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15065.5(e). Incorporation of Mitigation Measure CULT-2 will reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.

Significance Level

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

Mitigation

See **Mitigation Measure CULT-1 and CULT-2**, above.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?				X
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				X
e) Comply with federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?				

Comment

The proposed project includes 2.99 acres of timberland conversion and 4.1 acres total of forestland for a vineyard. The project would not require the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities. All permits related to the development of the vineyard would be required to comply with the Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures' VESCO conditions for permit issuance. There would be no construction or relocation of new facilities which could cause significant environmental effects.

Significance Level

No Impact

- b) **Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?**

Comment

The proposed project includes 2.99 acres of timberland conversion and 4.1 total acres of forestland for a vineyard. The project would not require the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities. All permits related to the development of the vineyard would be required to comply with the Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures' VESCO conditions for permit issuance. There would be no construction or relocation of new facilities which could cause significant environmental effects.

Significance Level:

No Impact

- c) **Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?**

Comment

See comment XIX(a and b)

Significance Level:

No Impact

- d) **Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?**

Comment

The proposed project includes 2.99 acres of timberland conversion and 4.1 total acres of forestland conversion and site preparation for future development as a vineyard. Trees proposed for removal would be felled using standard logging techniques and equipment. Logging and slash material will be lopped and piled for chipping on site, or reserved for firewood, and/or hauled off-site. No materials from tree removal would be required to be hauled off site for disposal in a solid waste

Significance Level:

No Impact

- e) **Comply with federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

Comment

See comment XIX(d) above.

Significance Level:

No Impact

XX. WILDFIRE

Would the project:

Potentially
Significant
ImpactPotentially
Significant
Unless
MitigationLess Than
Significant
ImpactNo
Impact

Incorporated

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire severity zones, would the project:

- | | |
|--|---|
| a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | X |
| b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? | X |
| c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk of that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? | X |
| d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? | X |

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire severity zones, would the project:

- a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Comment

The subject property is located in a State Responsibility Area of very high fire hazard severity zone. There are no project features that would impair an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. The project would comply with current CAL FIRE and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. Impacts would be considered less than significant.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant Impact

- b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

Comment

The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. The project entails the removal of 2.99 acres of timberland and 4.1 acres total of forested areas on the property and site preparation for vineyard development. Slash generated from the tree removal will be removed and will not remain as a potential fire hazard. Future vineyard operations would include irrigated vines and no physical structures are included as part of the development.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant Impact

- c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk of that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

Comment

The project does not require installation of new infrastructure or new overhead power lines for development of the project. There are no project features that would impair an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant

- d) **Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?**

Comment

Areas of tree removal would be replanted with vines and would be developed according to requirements for compliance with VESCO regulations. There would be no areas exposed to landslides or slope instability as a result of the project, therefore impacts are considered less than significant.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				

Comment

As demonstrated by this environmental checklist, the project will not have any direct or indirect adverse effects that would 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. See Biological Resources sections IV(a) – IV(d) for impact assessments and mitigation measures. The mitigation measures in Cultural Resources section V and Tribal Resources section XVIII will ensure that potential impacts to previously unknown archaeological, cultural, or Native American resources will be reduced to less than significant levels.

Significance Level:

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

Comment

The project would develop a type of agricultural use on the property that is consistent with the 2020 General Plan and was considered by the 2020 General Plan EIR. Cumulative projects include development of agricultural uses in the project area. As noted in this initial study, this project will not result in significant adverse impacts related to traffic congestion, safety or noise. The project will not make a considerable contribution to any other significant cumulative impacts.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant Impact

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

Comment

The project would not result in any significant changes to the existing environment. Temporary impacts to Air Quality and Noise produced on the site will be minimal because construction activities and amplified sound would not occur outside typical working hours. Based on the discussion and information provide in this initial study, the project’s environmental effects will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Significance Level:

Less than Significant Impact

References

1. Association of Bay Area Governments, Manual of Standards for Erosion and Sediment Control Measures; May, 1995
2. BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines; Bay Area Air Quality Management District; April 1999; California Air Resources Board (CARB)
3. California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, Sonoma County Important Farmland Map, 1996
4. California Department of Fish & Wildlife, California Natural Diversity Database
5. California Department of Water Resources, Evaluation of Groundwater Resources, Bulletin 118; 2003 (<http://water.ca.gov/groundwater/bulletin118/publications.cfm>)
6. California Environmental Protection Agency – <http://www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/corteseList/default.htm>; California Regional Water Quality Control Board – <http://geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov/>; California Department of Toxic Substances Control – http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/calsites/cortese_list.cfm, and Integrated Waste Management Board – <http://www.ciwm.ca.gov/SWIS/Search.asp>
7. County of Sonoma, Assessor's Parcel Maps
8. County of Sonoma, Heritage or Landmark Tree Ordinance, County Code Chapter 26D
9. Flood Insurance Rate Maps, Federal Emergency Management Agency <https://msc.fema.gov/portal>
10. Permit Sonoma, General Plan Environmental Impact Report (<http://www.sonoma-county.org/prmd/gp2020/gp2020eir/index.htm>)
11. Permit Sonoma, Sonoma County General Plan 2020 (as amended), September 23, 2008.
12. Permit Sonoma, Visual Assessment Guidelines, no date
13. Sonoma County Aggregate Resources Management Plan and Program EIR, 1994
14. Special Report 120, California Division of Mines and Geology; 1980.
ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_120/SR_120_Text.pdf
15. State of California Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones; 1983.
http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Pages/official_release.aspx
16. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey of Sonoma County, California; 1972
(https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_MANUSCRIPTS/california/sonomaCA1972/sonomaCA1972.pdf)

Technical Reports

1. Pamela Town and Heather Morrison, Biological Resource Reconnaissance Survey, December 31, 2021.
2. Less Than 3-Acre Conversion Exemption, Scott R Butler, Environmental Resource Management, 2021
3. Hydrogeologic Report for General Plan Policy WR-2E 2199 Diamond Mountain Road, Calistoga, California, Sonoma County APN 120-240-015, April 2022