

To: CAL FIRE- Santa Rosa Office

From: Jamie Hall

135 Ridgeway Ave

34910 Annapolis Rd

Santa Rosa, CA 95402

Annapolis, CA 95412

04/24/2011

Subject : Comments on" Partially Recirculated Draft EIR Fairfax Conversion Project"

SHC# 2004082094

Please include this document in the public comments file.

**Land Use:** Chapter 1 pg, 1-7, According to the original plan (Pg, 117) the conversion area was 105 acre , this would mean that the current proposal would actually be 11 acres larger. The actual overall area is not significantly less in that the amount of overall area encompassed by this project, just small isolated exclusions within the overall site have been selected. This fact does not take into account the fragmentation of the ecosystem that this project represents, nor is this mentioned in the analysis.

**Biological Resources:** This paragraph seems to contradict itself "The DEIR found that the proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts to etc." then goes on to say that the 19 acre reduction of plantable vineyard area would result in the preservation of more biological resources than the original plan, as I pointed out in the first chapter the original plan was 105 acres, so 116 acres would not mean less impact. I believe the fragmentation mentioned above negates any claims of less than significant level impact. The overall loss of habitat and biodiversity far outweighs any claims of no significant impact.

**Hazards:** The comments above, about original acres and overall area covered by this project apply equally to the use of toxic chemicals. The original DEIR states the Toxic chemicals will only be used when and if necessary, but anyone who lives around vineyards knows that they always seem necessary. In an area where rain and fog are ever present the use of fungicides are always required on a regular basis, and overspray is always present.

**Cultural Resources:** The DEIR found that the proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts to etc." The exclusion of a few sites will not significantly enhance the significance as an important Native American site. The loss of biodiversity that made it so important to the Native Americans is just as important as the few small plots set aside.

3.5-2 **Impacts to prehistoric cultural resources**, Archaeological Sites Identified as Ineligible for listing. Pg 3.5-26. A sentence in *Artesa Site-01*, states the site is "very possibly the Kashaya Pomo ethnographic

village of Kabatui, which is known to have been present in the general vicinity, and that human remains may be present". Why is this sentence crossed out?

I have had contact with important persons within the Kashia Pomo tribe and they are very concerned about the loss of this important cultural site.

**Transportation and Circulation:** Most if not all workers on this project will come from out of this area as we have seen in all other vineyard projects in this area, thus adding to short term and long term significant Impacts. The assumption that vineyard workers would carpool is just speculation, most workers use older more polluting vehicles which break down and are left to be vandalized as anyone using Skaggs Springs road can attest. No provisions are made by the owners to take workers enmasse via Vans to the work site.

**Aesthetics:** This chapter is patently false. All the forest along the west side of Annapolis Rd from the old Horicon School to near the western Star Cross property line will be removed This stretch of road, approx .4 mi. plus the loss of forest at the east end of the property, approx .3 mi. (total .7 mi.) constitutes almost half of the total road front from the west to the east end of the property, 1.8 miles total. Minus Star cross road frontage (.3 mi.) gives us 1.5 mi. of project road frontage, .7mi. loss of forest = .7mi. lost grassland habitat. This would seem to be a considerable impact upon the general Aesthetics on Annapolis Road considering that it is only 14 miles in length.

I don't find the Aesthetics of Vineyard in any way comparable to that of forest or grassland. This includes the diminishing of wildlife presently seen along these potentially "lost" scenic corridors

**Cumulative Impacts:** pgs 4-3 and 4-7, At least twice in this section the statement "business as usual" Is used to assume that the THP process of local forest management is the only other alternative to this project , no mention is made of the alternative of putting the property into a forest preserve or some such conservation program. This make the statement on page 4-11 (The above analysis shows that the proposed project sequesters more carbon over the 100-year analysis period than the No Project – Timber Resource Alternative) totally superfluous, since no options other than the "business as usual" option are discussed.

**Summary of Impacts:** Considering all of the comments above the repeated comment of "less tha significant impacts" is not only not true but repetition will not make it true. .

**Conclusion:** Vineyard Sections 1a, 1b and 1c are the sections we are most concerned about as in previous comments , we request that these sections be removed from the plan. They will destroy forest cover and add to solar reflection to our home, 1a is upwind of our home and overspray will pollute us and our property, runoff will drain into our water source.

Sincerely Jamie and Kathy Hall