

4.2 AGRICULTURE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

4.2	AGRICULTURE	4.2-1
	Impacts Evaluated in other Sections	4.2-1
	Setting	4.2-1
	Regional	4.2-1
	Project Area	4.2-1
	Important Farmland Series Maps.....	4.2-1
	Williamson Act Lands	4.2-2
	Agricultural Crop Summary	4.2-2
	Goals, Objectives, and Policies.....	4.2-3
	Evaluation Criteria with Significance Thresholds	4.2-4
	Methodology	4.2-5
	Loss of Farmland	4.2-5
	Conflict with Williamson Act Contracts.....	4.2-5
	Timberland Conversion	4.2-5
	Sharpshooter Threat to Vineyards	4.2-6
	Impacts and Recommended Mitigation Measures	4.2-7
	Cumulative Impacts	4.2-12
	Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures	4.2-14
	Preparers and References	4.2-15
	Preparers	4.2-15
	Reviewers.....	4.2-15
	References.....	4.2-15

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.2-1	Sonoma County Agricultural Summary	4.2-3
Table 4.2-2	Goals, Objectives, and Policies – Agriculture.....	4.2-3
Table 4.2-3	Evaluation Criteria with Significance Thresholds – Agriculture	4.2-4
Table 4.2-4	Agriculture Impacts	4.2-7
Table 4.2-5	Status Farmland Affected by the SSP	4.2-8
Table 4.2-6	Changes in Sonoma County Status Farmlands 1996-2004	4.2-12
Table 4.2-7	Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures – Agriculture....	4.2-14

4.2 AGRICULTURE

This section discusses loss of important agricultural lands, conflicts with Williamson Act contracts, and potential for damage to adjacent vineyards by increased glassy-winged sharpshooter populations. To provide a context for these analyses, the Setting Section provides information on classification of farmlands, data on existing agriculture in the study area and project area, and a summary of policies regarding agricultural resources, including Williamson Act contracts and local General Plan policies.

IMPACTS EVALUATED IN OTHER SECTIONS

The following items are related to the Agriculture Section, but are evaluated in other sections of this document.

- Agricultural Zoning. The potential for conflicts with agricultural zoning is addressed in Section 4.1, Land Use.
- Soil Erosion. Erosion from construction activities is discussed in Section 4.3, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity. Sedimentation in waterways is evaluated in Section 4.6, Surface Water Quality.

SETTING

Regional

Large areas of Sonoma County are farm or grazing lands. Land within the SSP study area is used for vineyards, dairy, crop production, and seasonal storage of recycled water, which is used to irrigate the nearby agricultural lands.

Project Area

Each of the five storage sites are located on land owned by the City of Santa Rosa (City). The existing land uses include seasonal storage of recycled water and hay production. In addition, Kelly Farm includes the Kelly Farm wetland that uses recycled water. The predominant character of the area is open space with rural residences, vegetable farms, and dairies on adjacent lands. The sites are designated as Unique Farmland on the State's Important Farmland Maps. None of the properties are under Williamson Act contracts, as they are owned by the City.

Important Farmland Series Maps

The California Department of Conservation has modified the U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service maps to show farmland and urban areas in California. These Important Farmland Series Maps for Sonoma County (California Department of Conservation, 2004) classify the farmlands of the state as:

- Prime Farmland. This category of land has the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics to sustain long-term agricultural production. The land has the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields of crops. Prime Farmland must have been used for irrigated agricultural production some time during the four years prior to the mapping date.
- Farmland of Statewide Importance. Although similar to Prime Farmland, this category of land has minor shortcomings, such as greater slopes or less ability to store soil moisture. This land must have been used for the production of irrigated crops at some time during the four years prior to the mapping date.
- Unique Farmland. This land has lesser quality soils and is used for the production of the states leading agricultural crops. This land is usually irrigated, but may include non-irrigated orchards or vineyards as found in some climatic zones in California. Lands must have been cropped sometime during the four years prior to the mapping date.
- Farmland of Local Importance. This land is of importance to the local agricultural economy, determined by each county's board of supervisors and local advisory committees. Examples include the hay producing areas of the Santa Rosa Plain, Petaluma Valley, and Sonoma Valley. Additional areas include those lands which are classified as having the capability for producing locally important crops such as grapes, corn, etc., but may not be planted at the present time. These areas include coastal lands from Fort Ross to Stewart's Point, areas surrounding Bloomfield, Two Rock, Chileno Valley, and areas of Sonoma Valley in the vicinity of Big Bend, Vineburg, and Schellville.

Throughout this section these categories of farmlands: Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance, are referred to collectively as Farmland, or status farmlands. The lands that comprise status farmlands do not include grazing land, other land, or urban land, which are separate classifications.

Williamson Act Lands

Another classification of agricultural lands of concern is Williamson Act contract lands as defined in the California Land Conservation Act of 1965. The law was enacted to protect agriculture and open space land and to adjust imbalanced tax practices. Williamson Act contracts, also known as agricultural preserves, offer tax incentives for agricultural land preservation by ensuring that land will be assessed for its agricultural productivity rather than its highest and best uses.

Agricultural Crop Summary

Table 4.2-1 presents approximate bearing acreage and cash value of the most important crops in Sonoma County for 2006. The table indicates the dominance of viticulture in terms of cash value and greatest land acreage.

TABLE 4.2-1
Sonoma County Agricultural Summary

Crop	Acreage	Cash Value
Wine Grapes	60,302	\$430,496,900
All Apples	3,042	\$5,237,900
Fruits and Nuts	373	\$399,800
Vegetable Crops	297	\$7,416,600
Livestock and Poultry	NA	\$38,350,300
Livestock and Poultry Products (including milk)	NA	\$75,442,100
Field Crops	7,002	\$5,962,500
Timber Products	NA	\$6,323,938

Source: Sonoma County Agricultural Commission, Crop Report 2006

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES

Table 4.2.2 identifies goals, objectives, and policies from the City of Santa Rosa General Plans that provide guidance for the management of agricultural resources. The table also indicates which criteria in Section 4.2, Agriculture, are responsive to each set of policies.

TABLE 4.2-2
Goals, Objectives, and Policies – Agriculture

Adopted Plan Document	Document Section	Document Numeric Reference	Policy	Relevant Evaluation Criteria¹
Santa Rosa General Plan	Open Space and Conservation Element	Goal OSC-C Policy OSC-C-2 Policy OSC-C-3	Encourage preservation of agricultural lands adjacent to the City.	1

Source: Santa Rosa 2002

Notes: ¹Evaluation criteria are identified in Table 4.2-3.

EVALUATION CRITERIA WITH SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS

TABLE 4.2-3

Evaluation Criteria with Significance Thresholds – Agriculture

Evaluation Criteria	As Measured by	Significance Thresholds	Sources of Criteria
1. Will the SSP cause loss of Farmland?	Acres of status farmland ¹ lost.	Greater than 0 acres	California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Appendix G, Checklist Item II (a)
2. Will the SSP cause conflict with Williamson Act contracts?	Acres of land that would be removed from Williamson Act contracts as a result of the Incremental Recycled Water Program (IRWP).	Greater than 0 acres	CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Checklist Item II (b) ² California Land Conservation Act of 1965
3. Will the SSP reduce agricultural soil productivity due to erosion of topsoil from application of recycled water?	Acres of erodible soils irrigated by recycled water and not subject to erosion control plans under the Sonoma County Vineyard Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance or the California Forest Practice Rules.	Greater than 0 acres	CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Checklist Item II (c) ³ California Forest Practice Rules (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, 2008)
4. Will the SSP reduce agricultural soil productivity due to build-up of trace elements or salinity?	a. Suitability of recycled water for irrigation [pH units, milligrams per liter (mg/L), or millimhos per centimeter (mmhos/cm)].	Exceedance of United Nations Food or Agricultural Organization (FAO) Guidelines	CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Checklist Item II (c) ³ FAO, R.S. Ayers and D.W. Westcott, authors, 1985, Water Quality for Agriculture, Irrigation and Drainage Paper 29, Revision 1, Reprinted 1994.
	b. Metals loading (kilograms/hectare) in soils from application of recycled water and fertilizer/manure.	Exceedance of state guidelines or federal rules	CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Checklist Item II (c) ³ State Water Resources Control Board Report #84-1 (Pettygrove G.S. and Asano, T., 1996) EPA 503 Rules for applications of sludge
5. Will the SSP result in the conversion of timberlands to non-timber uses?	Acres of timberland converted to non-timber use without approval of a Timberland Conversion Permit or an Exemption.	Greater than 0 acres	CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Checklist Item II (c) ³ California Timber Practice Act, (Z'berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act), Division 4, Chapter 8, Public Resources Code

TABLE 4.2-3
Evaluation Criteria with Significance Thresholds – Agriculture

Evaluation Criteria	As Measured by	Significance Thresholds	Sources of Criteria
6. Will the SSP cause damage to adjacent vineyards by increasing glassy-winged sharpshooter populations?	Plants not locally grown or purchased from nurseries with approved inspection programs.	Greater than 0 plants	CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Checklist Item II (c) ³ Sonoma County Agricultural Commissioner Sonoma County Viticulture Advisor

Notes:

1. For the purposes of this document, Farmland or status farmland includes the following categories defined by the California Department of Conservation: Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance.
2. Conflicts with agricultural zoning which are included in Checklist Item II (b) are addressed in Criteria 1 of Table 4.1-2 (Section 4.1, Land Use) in this Environmental Impact Report (EIR).
3. Criteria 3 and 4 address the potential for loss of productivity of agricultural soils resulting from the application of recycled water under the IRWP. These criteria do not apply to the SSP because the SSP does not involve the application of recycled water.

METHODOLOGY

Loss of Farmland

Loss of farmland refers to the conversion of status farmland as defined above into non-agricultural uses.

The *2004 Important Farmland Series Maps for Sonoma County* (mapped at a scale of 1:100,000) printed in 2006 by the Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (Department of Conservation 2004) was used to evaluate the potential for impacts to status farmland by the construction of SSP facilities. The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program’s GIS Data (2007) Service for Sonoma County was also used.

Conflict with Williamson Act Contracts

Farmlands under Williamson Act contracts that are converted to public facility uses would potentially result in the cancellation of the contracts under Section 6 of the Act, and therefore would represent a conflict with the contract. In addition, acquisition of land under Williamson Act contracts may create remainder parcels that may not qualify for the minimum parcel size under Williamson Act requirements. Such unqualified and uncontracted land may be vulnerable to future conversion pressures, and therefore creation of remainder parcels not qualifying for Williamson Act contract would also represent a conflict.

Timberland Conversion

Under the California Forest Practice Act of 1973 (Z'berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act) conversion of timberland occurs when land that has commercial timber species is converted to a use other than growing of timber. Commercial timber species are defined in the

California Forest Practices Rules, adopted pursuant to the Z'berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act, on a regional basis. Within the SSP area, which is located primarily in the Coast Forest District (Sonoma County et al) the predominant commercial species are coast redwood and Douglas fir. Other important commercial species for the Coast Forest District include other species of fir, as well as species of cedar, pine, hemlock, and spruce. Any timberland conversion of more than 3 acres as defined under the Z'berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act requires approval of a Timberland Conversion Permit from the California Division of Forestry and Fire Protection.

Sharpshooter Threat to Vineyards

Over the past decade, the blue-green sharpshooter has become an important insect vector of Northern California. This insect family of leafhoppers includes the glassy-winged sharpshooter, which is a threat to California vineyards due to its ability to spread Pierce's disease (*Xylella fastidiosa*), a disease that kills grapevines in one or two years after infection by clogging the vine's nutrient transporting vessels with growing bacteria. Because no practical cure for Pierce's disease exists, aggressive approaches have been taken to prevent the disease. The counties of Napa, Sonoma, Solano, and Marin are inspecting incoming plant shipments from Southern California. Beginning in May 2007, plants with a Certificate of Compliance "Sharpshooter Spotter" seal signed by the Sonoma County Agricultural Commissioner are available from retailers that are in compliance with this inspection effort to keep the glassy-winged sharpshooter out of Sonoma County. Sonoma County businesses involved in the retail sales of inspected plants are listed at http://www.buginfo.org/sonoma/certified_retailers.htm. The blue-green sharpshooter is most common along stream banks or in ravines or canyons that have dense growth of trees, vines, and shrubs. Because it feeds on succulent new growth in areas of abundant soil moisture and shade, it can sometimes be found in ornamental landscaping around homes.

For the purpose of analysis in this Program EIR, it was assumed that the greatest risk for introduction of the glassy-winged sharpshooter or the blue-green sharpshooter would be from the introduction of vegetation from outside the area that could harbor sharpshooter eggs. Therefore, the analysis addresses the risk of introduction of such vegetation through SSP activities.

IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES

TABLE 4.2-4
Agriculture Impacts

Evaluation Criteria	Significance Threshold	Impact	Type of Impact ¹	Level of Significance ²
2.1. Will the SSP cause loss of Farmland?	Greater than 0 acres			
KF1 <i>Storage component</i> <i>Pump Station component</i>		61 acres 1.1 acre	P P	● ●
KF2 <i>Storage component</i> <i>Pump Station component</i>		47 acres 1.1 acre	P P	● ●
BF1 <i>Storage component</i> <i>Pump Station component</i>		48 acres 1.1 acre	P P	● ●
BF2 <i>Storage component</i> <i>Pump Station component</i>		41 acres None	P P	● ==
AF <i>Storage component</i> <i>Pump Station component</i>		50 acres None	P P	● ==
2.2. Will the SSP cause conflict with Williamson Act contracts?		Greater than 0 acres	None	P
2.3. Will the SSP reduce agricultural soil productivity due to erosion of topsoil from application of recycled water?	Greater than 0 acres	None	P	==
2.4. Will the SSP reduce agricultural soil productivity due to build-up of trace elements or salinity?	Greater than 0 acres	None	P	==
2.5. Will the SSP result in the conversion of timberlands to non-timber uses?	Greater than 0 acres	None	P	==
2.6. Will the SSP cause damage to adjacent vineyards by increasing glassy-winged sharpshooter populations?	Greater than 0 acres	Revegetation of temporarily disturbed areas	C	○

Notes: 1. Type of Impact:
 C Construction
 O&M: Operation and Maintenance
 P: Permanent

2. Level of Significance:
 ● Significant impact before and after mitigation
 ⊙ Significant impact before mitigation; less than significant impact after mitigation
 ○ Less than significant impact; no mitigation proposed
 == No impact

Impact: 2.1. Will the SSP cause loss of Farmland?

Analysis: *Storage component - Significant: KF1, KF2, BF1, BF2, and AF*

The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program designates each of the sites as Unique Farmland. The status farmland designation and the acres of status farmland permanently and temporarily disturbed at each of the SSP sites are shown in Table 4.2.5. The permanent loss of status farmland is considered a significant impact.

**TABLE 4.2-5
Status Farmland Affected by the SSP**

Alternative	Status Farmland Type	Permanent Impacts to Status Farmland (acres)	Temporary Impacts to Status Farmland (acres)
KF1	Unique Farmland	62.1 acres	89 acres
KF2	Unique Farmland	48.1 acres	63 acres
BF1	Unique Farmland	49.1 acres	75 acres
BF2	Unique Farmland	41 acres	66 acres
AF	Unique Farmland	50 acres*	52 acres*

* Includes the 74 acres of land needed for the SSP facilities less the 24 acres encompassed by the two existing ponds.

Construction activities associated with the Storage component would temporarily disturb additional status farmland. However, this disturbance would be short-term and would not result in a permanent loss of status farmland. This impact is considered less than significant.

Pump Station component - Significant: KF1, KF1, and BF1; No Impact: BF2 and AF

The Pump Station component at the storage sites would be an inboard pump station and pad-mounted transformer constructed on the storage pond embankment. As such, it would not affect any farmland.

Electrical power would be supplied to the pump stations via new underground or overhead service. The trench for the underground 12 kilovolts (kV) electric line is about 1-foot wide, and would be filled with the soil removed after installation. Although the power line would be placed within an area designated as status farmland, the land disturbance would be short-term and would not result in a permanent loss of status farmland. The new overhead

power line at the AF site would require poles, but the installation of new power poles would not present a barrier to agricultural production. This impact is considered less than significant.

Implementation of Mitigation 3.3.18, Minimize Temporary and Permanent Visual Impacts to reduce land use and visual resources impacts from the inboard pump stations at the KF1, KF2, and BF1 sites could include constructing the pump station outboard at-grade instead of inboard on the pond embankment. Construction of an approximately 45 feet by 47 feet by 22 feet high outboard pump station at any of these three sites would result in the loss of an additional 1.1 acres of status farmland at each site. This would be a significant impact with no feasible measures available to reduce it to less than significant. There would be no at-grade pump station at BF2 or AF; therefore there would be no impact to status farmland from construction of the pump station.

Mitigation: No feasible mitigation has been identified.

After

Mitigation: *Storage component - Significant: KF1, KF2, BF1, BF2, and AF*

Pump Station component – Significant: KF1, KF2, and BF1

The City could identify no feasible measures to reduce or avoid the permanent loss of 41 to 62.5 acres of status farmland that would result from construction of Storage component facilities or at-grade pump station facilities due to implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.3.18. Among the measures considered was use of the County's Small Farms Initiative on other City-owned properties. The Small Farms Initiative allows farmers access to public lands zoned for agriculture, thereby putting agricultural land into agricultural production and providing land to farmers who otherwise would not have access to farmland. This initiative is effective in increasing the amount of land that is in agricultural production and making status farmland available to farmers who otherwise would not have access to such lands. However, because the initiative does not increase the total amount of status farmland in Sonoma County, use of the Small Farms Initiative would not be effective in mitigating the SSP impact of reducing the total amount of status farmland in Sonoma County.

Because no feasible mitigation measures have been identified for the permanent significant impact due to loss of status farmland, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Impact: 2.2. Will the SSP conflict with Williamson Act contracts?

Analysis: *Storage component - No Impact: KF1, KF2, BF1, BF2, and AF*

The Storage component at the KF1, KF2, BF1, BF2, and AF sites would not be located in land that is under Williamson Act contract, and thus no conflicts with Williamson Act contracts would occur.

Pump Station component - No Impact: KF1, KF2, BF1, BF2, and AF

The Pump Station component at the KF1, KF2, BF1, BF2, and AF sites would be located in land that is under Williamson Act contract, and thus no conflicts with Williamson Act contracts would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is needed.

Impact: 2.3. Will the SSP reduce agricultural soil productivity due to erosion of topsoil from application of recycled water?

Analysis: *Storage component - No Impact: KF1, KF2, BF1, BF2, and AF*

The Storage component does not involve the application of recycled water, and therefore would not reduce agricultural soil productivity due to erosion of topsoil from application of recycled water.

Pump Station component - No Impact: KF1, KF2, BF1, BF2, and AF

The Pump Station component does not involve the application of recycled water, and therefore would not reduce agricultural soil productivity due to erosion of topsoil from application of recycled water.

Mitigation: No mitigation is needed.

Impact: 2.4. Will the SSP reduce agricultural soil productivity due to build-up of trace elements or salinity?

Analysis: *Storage component - No Impact: KF1, KF2, BF1, BF2, and AF*

The Storage component does not involve the direct application of recycled water to agricultural soils, and therefore would not reduce agricultural soil productivity due to build-up of traces elements or salinity from application of recycled water.

Pump Station component - No Impact: KF1, KF2, BF1, BF2, and AF

The Storage component does not involve the direct application of recycled water to agricultural soils, and therefore would not reduce agricultural soil productivity due to build-up of traces elements or salinity from application of recycled water.

Mitigation: No mitigation is needed.

Impact: 2.5. Will the SSP result in the conversion of timberlands to non-timber uses?

Analysis: *Storage component - No Impact: KF1, KF2, BF1, BF2, and AF*

The Storage component would not be located on timberlands. Therefore, no conversion of timberlands would occur.

Pump Station component - No Impact: KF1, KF2, BF1, BF2, and AF

The Pump Station component would not be located on timberlands. Therefore, no conversion of timberlands would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is needed.

Impact: 2.6. Will the SSP cause damage to adjacent vineyards by increasing glassy-winged sharpshooter populations?

Analysis: *Storage component - Less than Significant: KF1, KF2, BF1, BF2, and AF*

Construction of the Storage component would require site revegetation to return areas of temporary disturbance to preconstruction appearance. Revegetation of temporary disturbance areas could result in the introduction of plants, which potentially could harbor insect species or diseases deleterious to agricultural production including vineyards. Under Project Measure 3.2.1, Purchase Locally Grown or Inspected Plants, the City would purchase all landscaping and revegetation plants from locally grown stock or from a nursery that has an approved monitoring program for the glassy-winged sharpshooter. This measure would prevent an increase in the risk of sharpshooter populations, and therefore the impact is less than significant.

Pump Station component - Less than Significant: KF1, KF2, BF1, BF2, and AF

Construction of the Pump Station component would require site revegetation to return areas of temporary disturbance outside the storage pond to preconstruction appearance, especially if at-grade pump stations are built at KF1, KF2, BF1 or BF2 due to implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.3.18. Revegetation of temporary disturbance areas could result in the introduction of plants, which potentially could harbor insect species or diseases deleterious to agricultural production including vineyards. Under Project Measure 3.2.1, Purchase Locally Grown or Inspected Plants, the City would purchase all landscaping and revegetation plants from locally grown stock or from a nursery that has an approved monitoring program for the glassy-winged sharpshooter. This measure would prevent an increase in the risk of sharpshooter populations, and therefore the impact is less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is needed.

No Project Alternative

Impact: 2.7.1 through 2.7.6. Will the No Project alternative impact agriculture based on evaluation criteria 1 through 6?

Analysis: *No Impact*

The No Project alternative would not cause the loss of agricultural land (including land under Williamson Act contracts) or reduce agricultural soil productivity. Because no facilities would be constructed under the No Project alternative, there would be no potential to remove timberland, and no

plantings would occur that might cause an increase of glassy-winged sharpshooter species, related species or insect populations deleterious to agriculture.

Mitigation: No mitigation is needed.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Impact: 2.1C Will the SSP plus cumulative projects cause loss of farmland?

Analysis: *Less than Significant: KF1, KF2, BF1, BF2, and AF*

Changes in status farmland in Sonoma County from 1996 to 2000 and from 2002 to 2004 are shown on Table 4.2-6. The data were derived from the Department of Conservation’s Sonoma County Farmland Conversion Report for 1996 to 2000 and 2002 to 2004. Data for subsequent years are not yet available. The data for the 1996 to 2000 period show a net increase of 1,832 acres, while the 2002 to 2004 period shows a net increase of 103 acres of status farmland.

Impacts of the SSP on status farmland (i.e., non-cumulative impacts) have been designated as significant and unavoidable. These impacts would offset some of the gains in status farmland acreage. Nonetheless, the data do not support the conclusion of a significant cumulative loss of farmland in Sonoma County as a whole. Therefore, the cumulative impact is found to be less than significant.

**TABLE 4.2-6
Changes in Sonoma County Status Farmlands 1996-2004**

Years	Prime Farmland	Farmland of Statewide Importance	Unique Farmland	Farmland of Local Importance	Net Change in Status Farmland
1996-2000	+2,758	+3,218	+8,112	-9,359	+1,832
2002-2004	-986	-732	-487	+2,308	+103

Source: State of California 2002, 2004

Notes: Status Farmland is Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance as defined by the California Department of Conservation.

Mitigation: No mitigation is needed.

Impact: 2.2C through 2.5C. Will the SSP plus cumulative projects cause agricultural impacts based on criteria 2-5?

Analysis: *No Impact: KF1, KF2, BF1, BF2, and AF*

No SSP sites are under Williamson Act contract, the SSP does not include irrigation of lands with recycled water, and none of the sites support

commercial timber. Therefore, the project does not contribute to any cumulative impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is needed

Impact: 2.6C. Will the SSP plus cumulative projects cause damage to adjacent vineyards by increasing glassy-winged sharpshooter populations?

Analysis: *Less than Significant: KF1, KF2, BF1, BF2, and AF*

Construction of the SSP would require site revegetation to return areas of temporary disturbance to preconstruction appearance. Revegetation of temporary disturbance areas could result in the introduction of plants which potentially could harbor insect species or diseases deleterious to agricultural production including vineyards. However, implementation of Project Measure 3.2.1 Purchase Locally Grown or Inspected Plants, would prevent an increase in the risk of sharpshooter. The county-wide effort by the Agricultural Commissioner to prevent the spread of the glassy-winged sharpshooter would reduce the potential for impacts to vineyards from other cumulative projects. Therefore, the SSP would not have a considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is needed.

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

TABLE 4.2-7

Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures – Agriculture

Impact	Level of Significance	Mitigation Measure
KF1		
2.1 The Storage component could cause loss of status farmland.	●	No feasible measures have been identified.
2.1 The Pump Station component could cause loss of status farmland.	●	No feasible measures have been identified.
KF2		
2.1 The Storage component could cause loss of status farmland.	●	No feasible measures have been identified.
2.1 The Pump Station component could cause loss of status farmland.	●	No feasible measures have been identified.
BF1		
2.1 The Storage component could cause loss of status farmland.	●	No feasible measures have been identified.
2.1 The Pump Station component could cause loss of status farmland.	●	No feasible measures have been identified.
BF2		
2.1 The Storage component could cause loss of status farmland.	●	No feasible measures have been identified.
AF		
2.1 The Storage component could cause loss of status farmland.	●	No feasible measures have been identified.

Notes: Level of Significance:

●: Significant impact before and after mitigation

⊙: Significant impact before mitigation; less than significant impact after mitigation

PREPARERS AND REFERENCES

Preparers

Ladd Miyasaki, Winzler & Kelly

Reviewers

Carrie Lukacic, Winzler & Kelly

Carol Kielusiak, Winzler & Kelly

Patricia Collins, Winzler & Kelly

References

California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection, www.bof.fire.ca.gov, 2007.

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. 2004. Important Farmland Series Maps for Sonoma County.

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, Map Products, File Transfer Protocol (FTP), Geographical Information Service (GIS), 2007. http://www.consrv.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/map_products/download_gis_data.htm.

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. 2002. Table A-37, Sonoma County, 2002-2004 Land Use Conversion.

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. 2004. Sonoma County Status Farmland Conversion Report 2002-2004.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Resource Management, Forest Practice Program. 2008. California Forest Practice Rules 2008.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Non-Industrial Timber Management Plans in California, Report to Legislature. 2003.

California State Water Resource Control Board, 1984. Irrigation with Reclaimed Municipal Wastewater A Guidance Manual, Report No. 84-1, Pettygrove G. & Asano T. 1996.

Consulting Engineers and Land Surveyors of California, CELSOC, 2007 California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines.

CH2MHill. City of Redwood City, Redwood City Recycled Water Project IS/MND. June 2002.

County of Napa, Agricultural Commission, Glassy-winged Sharpshooter, Blue Green Sharpshooter and Pierce's Disease information, <http://www.co.napa.ca.us/GOV/Departments/26400/pests/gwss.asp#bgss>.

- Napa Sanitation District. Suitability Study of Napa Sanitation District Recycled Water For Vineyard Irrigation. March 2006.
- Rousseau, Bill, Chief Deputy Assessor, Sonoma County Tax Assessor's Office, Santa Rosa, CA. personal communication with Ladd Miyasaki, Winzler & Kelly.
- Santa Rosa, City of. Department of Community Development. 2002. Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan. Adopted June 18, 2002.
- Santa Rosa, City of. Department of Community Development, GIS Map Search. 2007. <http://ci.santa-rosa.ca.us/>.
- Santa Rosa, City of and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 1996. Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement for the Santa Rosa Long-Term Wastewater Project. 1996.
- Sonoma County. 1989. Sonoma County General Plan. Revised to Reflect Amendments and Correction as of March 1, 1994.
- Sonoma County, County Clerk-Recorder-Assessors Database. Accessed database at 585 Fiscal Drive, Suite 103F, Santa Rosa, 2007.
- Sonoma County, Office of the Agricultural Commissioner. 2006 Agricultural Crop Report, Sonoma County, 2008.
- Sonoma County, Office of the Agricultural Commissioner. 1999 Vineyard Erosion & Sediment Control, VESCO, Sonoma County, 2007.
- State of California. California Land Conservation Act of 1965 (Williamson Act) as amended. Government Code Section 51200-51297 et.seq.
- State of California. California Forest Practice Act of 1973 (Z'berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act) as amended. Division 4, Chapter 8, Public Resources Code.
- United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) R.S. Ayers and D.W. Westcott, authors, 1985, Water Quality for Agriculture, Irrigation and Drainage Paper 29, Revision 1, Reprinted 1994.