

EARLIER COMMENTS RECEIVED ON FIRST MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

| <u>Commentor</u> | <u>Date of Comment(s)</u> |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Brian Stucker | April 15, 2016 |
| Wendy Walker and William B Davis | April 11, 2016 |
| William A. Chapman | April 8, 2016 |
| Bruce and Robyn Rominger | April 8, 2016 |
| Sheri Rominger | April 8, 2016 |
| Barbara Dieter | April 8, 2016 |
| Valerie Whitworth | April 8, 2016 |
| Kayla Guerrero | April 8, 2016 |
| Bob Schneider, Tuleyome | April 8, 2016 |
| Candee Briggs | April 8, 2016 |
| Joe Rominger | April 7, 2016 |
| Bill O'Neil | April 7, 2016 |
| Katherine Rominger | April 7, 2016 |
| Jaci Guerrero and Steve Roehrs | April 6, 2016 |
| Peter and Deborah Hunter | April 6, 2016 |
| Rick and Patty Rominger | April 4, 2016 |
| Evelyne Rominger | April 4, 2016 |
| Neil and Peg Rutger | April 3, 2016 |

Mariani Nut Company April 1, 2016
Dennis Mariani Sr, Dennis Mariani Jr, Mark Mariani

Thomas P Tomich March 31, 2016

Doug Rominger March 31, 2016

Robyn Rominger March 30, 2016

Central Valley Regional March 29, 2016
Water Quality Control Board

Yocha Dehe Cultural Resources March 28, 2016

Sarah Rominger March 26, 2016

Ann & Nathan Bohl March 23, 2016

From: brian stucker <bdstucker@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, April 15, 2016 10:32 AM
To: Stephanie Cormier
Subject: Comments on F&P

Morning Stephanie

The F&P proposal is wrong headed and not good for our particular area. My involvement with the venture started when they purchased 80 acres from me in 2014. We were farming 100+/- acres of walnuts across the road and it was quite evident the trees were young (two years old) and going to be there for a long time. We were told the buyers intended to use the place as a weekend getaway for the next 15-20 years as they were still working in the bay area. One was with major player at a corporation and the other was a successful veterinarian. They said they may try to establish a B&B in the distant future, but not until their retirement. They, I later found out from discussions with the county, had been planning to establish a much larger venue prior to making the offer to buy my ranch.

That is none of my business what they do with the property, after all, they are buying it and can do what they want. If, however, they had told us their plans, we'd have suggested they find another place because a large public event center would not fit in with the planned use of our remaining property. We intend on planting another 300-400 acres of orchard over the next 5-10 years and will have a significant agricultural enterprise operating on the lands surrounding them. This was conveyed to their realtor at that time with absolute certainty. Their realtor was marketing the remainder of our property concurrently, knew this fact, and even brought us subsequent offers for the un-planted portion of the property.

The suggested buffer of 300' and/or the planting of a tree hedge will not adequately prevent the drift of non-listed sprays we will be using on the surrounding orchards. I would be more supportive of this operation if the venue was further away from my existing ag operations. In addition, there will be large ag equipment using the road at the same times they will be having their peak season; spring, summer, and fall. We also have a commercial water well drilling company and that equipment will be going in

and out of the ranch during those same months. We need clear access on Rd. 29 to be able to conduct our ongoing (and prior established) business without significant interference.

Rd. 29 is essentially a three mile DEAD END, one lane road past Co. Rd. 88 heading west. The neighbors all cooperate in passing and pulling over when large trucks and tractors are moving on the road. This will no longer be possible with the throngs of city visitors who are not schooled nor interested in cooperating with local traffic customs. Plus, when fueled with alcohol which will be served at these events, there will exist all the elements for a very dangerous situation indeed. I would be more supportive of this venue if the county required, as part of their approval, a new two lane road with good turn around space at the dead end. The one lane road is simply too small to serve any type of large public venue on an ongoing and yearly basis

The other concern is the suggestion that cooperation between me and the F&P folks in coordinating spray times, harvest, or other normal large scale ag operations with their events. This is probably a non starter since they have filed suite against me and have said very nasty and dishonest things about me in several public meetings. In fact, they have had many negative encounters with all of the surrounding neighbors and it is probably a given fact that the F&P operators will do what ever they want regardless of any rules imposed on them by the county.

My wish is that the county decision makers trust the people that have encountered the F&P operators thus far in this long process; the neighbors. All of us neighbors on the surrounding roads are against this project and against these operators. The F&P operators did come to the neighbors first when it was to be a small venue with a few cabins and no farming.

That didn't fly, so they regrouped and kept moving the goal post. The neighbors were sceptical of their real intentions and realized they potentially were being played for fools.

So, they have misrepresented certain facts, and spread false rumors to gain favor with certain people in the town of Winters (who wish to 'cash in' on this operation). Please note that us neighbors rarely agree on everything completely, but these operators have really galvanized our resolve against them. The county would be

wise to consider all the facts, listen to the surrounding neighbors, and completely reject any application for a public use facility on this one lane farm road. Thanks, Brian Stucker

**William B. Davis MD
Wendy Walker Davis Ph.D.
110 Edwards Street
Winters, California 95694**

April 8, 2016

Stephanie Cormier
Yolo County Planning Department
297 W. Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695

Dear Ms. Cormier,

We are writing regarding our distress and unease about the Yolo County Planning Department's Initial Study (Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration Zone File #2015-0018) for the business Field and Pond Bed and Breakfast and large event center located at the end of Road 29. The study does not adequately address health and safety issues, it does not address the impact of the new business on neighboring farm operations and it seems to set the bar very low for the requirements of the business to meet the definition of an "agritourism" site. We have lived and worked in Winters, California for 30 years and have always been proud of the progressive agriculture and wonderful local programs and businesses that promote agriculture. We know that agritourism can be a good thing for our community when done well. However, there are grave safety concerns and issues of fairness that are not adequately addressed in this Initial Study and we urge the planning department to take a second look and make sure that they are fully addressed.

Specifically, we are concerned about fire danger and the safety of using a narrow dead end road with two small bridges that can hold one vehicle at a time (one way) as the sole entrance and exit for large events such as weddings. This road already must daily accommodate the movement of various farm machinery, including harvesters, trucks, double load semis carrying tomatoes, cattle trucks and tractors. We know this road well, we have visited farms on the road and one of us (Dr. William Davis) has done house calls in several of the homes on that road. It is not in good shape with disheveled, broken pavement in parts. There are dips in the road where you cannot see oncoming traffic.

An even more profound safety concern is the very real fire danger. Those of us living in this region have already been warned by Cal Fire that severe fire danger is ongoing. Field and Pond is located on 80 acres located in a designated Fire Hazard Severity Zone. There have been fires in the area in recent years. For this reason, it seems important that very specific and complete fire safety precautions should replace the rather vague language in the Study. For example, a commitment to require sprinklers in all buildings housing people, a safe exit plan for guests and a plan for how Field and Pond plans to keep Road 29, which is the deepest entry point into the Berryessa Range, accessible to Cal/Fire and other emergency crews who use the property at the

western end of Road 29 as a fire staging area. Large tractors and bulldozers, firetrucks and fire crews must pass unimpeded by exiting guests. It is not clear to us how this will be possible from the mitigation measures described in the Study.

Finally, we are concerned about the precedent of granting a use permit under the agricultural commercial uses in the A-X Zone when the Study clearly states that the project does not meet the County's definition of agritourism, and may or may not ever meet the definition (see page 49). The intent of agritourism is to promote agriculture. The proper location is a working farm/agricultural operation. The primary activities of tourists is enjoyment, education or involvement in the activities of the agricultural operation. It seems that in the other agritourism locations we have visited that the activities are also compatible with the farm operation.

In the case of Field and Pond, the activities are not compatible with their farming neighbors. Some have raised concerns that it may put them out of business. Of course, we can't know that for certain, however, it seems unfair that the potential negative impact of neighboring farms is not addressed in this study. It appears that farmers are being required to accommodate Field and Pond rather than Field and Pond accommodating the realities of farming. For example, an event center like Field and Pond likely plans events months in advance. Farming is a day to day business. There is a limited time to plant, spray, or harvest before a freeze. It has to happen whether or not there is a party of 100 people down the road. How will Field and Pond deal with the scenario of getting their guests in and out during harvest with semi-trucks and tractors running on the road day and night? How will they keep wedding guests healthy and safe at their outdoor events when farmers need to spray their crops? If the owners of Field and Pond truly want to be farmers someday, these are questions they should be prepared to answer.


We respectfully ask that the health and safety and fire concerns raised regarding this business be revisited and addressed. We also think it is imperative that the agritourism codes be followed. In fact, it seems that if the codes are followed it would likely be concluded that this is a potentially good business in a bad place.

Sincerely,

William B. Davis MD



Wendy Walker Davis Ph.D.



The Clarence Scott Ranches

- Established in 1850 -

c/o William A. Chapman
4038 Boulder Drive
Antioch, California 94509 - 6233

Telephone: (925) 754 - 3595

March 31, 2016

Stephanie Cormier

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

292 W. Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695

Re) Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Field & Pond project - File Number ZF2015-0018:

Dear Ms. Cormier:

As a Yolo County landowner with property located at the west end of Yolo County Road 29, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Field & Pond bed-and-breakfast inn and **large event center** on County Road 29 in Winters, because it would infringe on our Right-to-Farm and would set a dangerous precedent for Yolo County.

The proposed Field & Pond project – File Number ZF2015-0018 -- is **commercial development** of agricultural lands, and there are several specific reasons why I urge the planning commissioners to deny this application for a conditional-use permit, as follows:

!. **Number of Events requested and the related traffic:**

How many events will be hosted per annum? The documentation lists a range of eight increasing to seventy-two - **Paid events** per year – scheduled during the spring, summer and fall of each year.

This will **DRAMATICLY** increase the **vehicle usage** on a Fire Access / Agricultural Use road!

Based on a limit of 45 events per annum; with an estimated 100 vehicle trips per event:

VEHICLE USAGE will increase by approximately **4,500 vehicle trips per year**.

Yolo County Road 29 consist of a **one lane agricultural – Fire access** – roadway. The West Bridge – adjacent to Field and Pond is a **ONE LANE bridge** (built in the early 1900s).

ANY FOOT traffic using the bridge (to access the Southern portion of Field and Pond property) - especially at dusk – would constitute a game of **dodge ball** with the local vehicle usage.

The Field and Pond attendee drivers will be from out-of-the-area (generally) and unfamiliar with the roadway and its conditions; with some attendees driving after dark.

Farming activities can be in conflict – since farming is weather directed – and must be done based upon conditions, as they exist – will the **Large Event Center** adjust its event schedule for farming - field preparations, planting, and Harvest?

2. Attendees -

If each paid event hosted an average of 200 +/- per event and 45 events were scheduled per annum the **LARGE EVENT CENTER** would service some **9,000 attendees**.

If only 10 percent of the attendees smoked – this remote rural area would have 90 NEW potential fire starting conditions each year.

3. Fire

Yolo County Road 29 is the only paved Fire Access roadway – allowing emergency and fire-related equipment access to the western hill range of Yolo County – between Putah Canyon and Capay Valley (Madison) .

Due to the increase in vehicle usage – there is a potential for increase in vehicle caused fires.

Due to the number of event attendees – there is a potential for increase in smoker caused fires.

Range fires will happen (remember the Berryessa Fire, Valley Fire, Wragg Canyon Fire, and the Jerusalem Fire – as recent fire event). Will the fire-related equipment be delayed and/or denied access due to the **Large Event Center** attendees evacuating?

4. Electric power

The **West End of Yolo County Road 29** is connected to Pacific Gas and Electric Company's distribution service via electric lines which run parallel to the Yolo County Road 29 roadway. Should an impaired (DUI) out of the area visitor - crash into an electric pole – my facility could lose ALL power and its ability to pump water for our livestock.

What recourse would the local Yolo landowner have?

5. Code Enforcement

What is the current staffing for Code Enforcement personnel? How will that change in the future budget? Who will enforce the code conditions of the use permit?

Conditional-use permits without Code Enforcement is is just verbiage.

The original plans - as described to me - was for a **SMALL Bed-and-Breakfast** using the **EXISTING Cannedy Residence footprint**. Which would comply with the following code amendment statement:

F. Amend Sec. 8-2.306(1), page 91, as follows:

(1) Bed and breakfasts

(1) A "small" bed and breakfast is defined as one which has six (6) guest rooms or cottages, or less; and that holds less than twelve special events per year and the events have less than 150 attendees; and which generates less than 100 vehicle trips on any given day of operations (such as a wedding).

NOW the chipmunk has been revealed to be an elephant -- consisting of new multi-buildings, excessive vehicle traffic (4,500 + per year) to service a crowd of some 9,000 + attendees .

Yolo County Road 29 is not suited to become **Woodstock West**.

The proposed Field & Pond project – File Name ZF2015-0018 - is **commercial development** of agricultural lands, and that is why I urge the planning commissioners to deny this application for a conditional-use permit.

Sincerely,

William A. Chapman

Yolo County Planning Department

Yolo County Planning Commission

The letter is in response to the Initial Environmental Study for the Field & Pond Permit, Zone File #2015-0018.

I agree with the planning staff's assessment of this project as not meeting Yolo County's definition of Agri-tourism. Because of that assessment alone there should be no consideration of more than the eight by-right events.

There are numerous other reasons this is not an appropriate location for this type of business which I will explain below.

1) **Physically divide an established community?** (pg 48)

The study says "The project would not divide an established community".

It has already divided our community!

There is a close knit established community of residents who reside in the west Rd. 29 area. We have an established Neighborhood Watch group that communicates regularly about activities on the road and surrounding areas and we keep an eye on each other's homes and property. We have families that have been on this road for over 150 years and others for only about five years and we all cherish our quiet, safe neighborhood and are unanimous in our opposition to this project. This project will be very disruptive to our lifestyle, threaten our businesses, reduce our property values and be a threat to our safety and our children's safety. Adding this much traffic will physically divide some of our ranch from others when events are happening by not allowing us to access those nearby fields with our farm equipment. It will annually bring thousands of strangers to our community that are not familiar with our roads and will create noise, traffic safety issues, light pollution and be a nuisance. Living out here my entire life I have had many dealings with poachers, trespassers, people who get stuck off the edge of the road and even people who are lost and are just asking directions. These will all increase exponentially when you bring that many new people in unfamiliar with the area.

2) Discussion item d) (pg 14)

Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?

Yes, there will be an adverse affect.

The numerous headlights traveling back down the road at night after an event will shine in at least three bedrooms of residents living on Rd. 29 because of the curves in the road. They will also be detrimental the numerous wildlife species that are primarily nocturnal and will be disturbed by the cars and their lights and be at greatly increased risk of being run over.

3) **Required Notification.** (pg 17)

The applicant is required to notify those living along CR 29. This an admission of the adverse impacts that those CR 29 residents will be facing for each event? What are we supposed to do when we are notified of an event? Are we supposed to change what we are planning to do, lock our doors, leave for the day, modify our farming schedule? Our experience farming around another event center is that either we accommodate their event by changing our farming operation or their event will be disturbed. The other event center we farm around has never asked us our schedule and offered to change or cancel one of their events to accommodate our farming operation.

You say the applicant “will be required to coordinate with adjacent agricultural operators”. What does that mean? Will they cancel a wedding if it conflicts with my tomato harvest ? I don’t know my tomato harvest schedule until sometimes the last minute when a cannery may ask for fewer or more loads causing me to pick faster or slower or even stop for a few days. I cannot predict when I will be harvesting a field. When I see the word “coordination” it really means we are expected to accommodate their schedule. What will the neighbors compensation be for these adverse effects? What mitigation could be implemented if I lose a tomato contract?

4) **Air Quality.**

The state of California has a cap-and-trade fund with hundreds of millions of dollars to help mitigate for greenhouse gas emissions. One of the primary things they look at when funding projects is will they reduce VMT (vehicle miles traveled). Why are we considering a project when it will increase VMTs when the state is trying so hard to reduce them. How can you say the impact is not significant if this study does not even calculate how many VMTs will result from the project?

5) **Biological resources.**

The study only discusses impacts to wildlife species during construction. The impacts of the events themselves are not addressed. For example it says no new construction within 100 feet of Chickahominy Slough or the pond, but what about 150 or 300 people dancing to live music on a regular basis within 30 feet? That has a significant impact on wildlife. Swainson hawks, or tricolored blackbirds will not nest anywhere in the vicinity with that kind of noise and human disturbance. Right now tricolored blackbirds are attempting to establish a colony in the two acre pond in the center of the event site. These are a candidate for listing as a Federal Endangered Species. When a species is a “candidate” it is afforded all of the same protections as if it were already on the endangered species list. Has the county studied this to make sure there is no adverse effects from the construction going on now and what the impacts of future events will be?

The golden eagles that have historically nested in the Foothill pines on our property only 600 feet to the south will not stay in the area if this impact occurs? The noise level at our property line will be above 66 dBA according to the study. All music should be restricted to indoor sites only to keep from driving off these and many other wildlife species. We have already witnessed deer running from the area during an event. This will have a negative impact on the

conservation values of the Wildlife Heritage Foundation's easement across the creek and our property that has a proposed wildlife conservation easement only 600 feet south of this project.

Western Pond Turtles inhabit ponds in this area and are known to travel overland from one pond to another. One of the leading causes of turtle mortality is being run over by vehicles and yet there is a parking lot proposed within 20 feet of the pond.

The previous owner of the F & P property built several small levees on the south side of the creek in the conservation easement area many years ago that have become seasonal wetlands/vernal pools (See attachment A). This is in the area of the proposed orchards and row crops the applicants say they will plant in the future. If these wetlands are destroyed how will that be mitigated? Have they been surveyed to see what species are there now?

6) Road Safety

According to the American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Guidelines for Geometric Design of Very Low-Volume Local Roads one of the biggest safety hazards to traffic on narrow rural roads is unfamiliar drivers.

The Yolo County Notice of Intent to adopt a Neg Dec correctly classifies CR. 29 as serving local and agricultural traffic. According to AASHTO this can fit into one or both of the two classifications; "rural minor access road" or "rural agricultural access road". When an event center is added to the road, with its increased traffic and unfamiliar drivers it's classification changes to a "rural recreation and scenic road". The standards for this classification are higher than for the minor access or agricultural access roads. This makes previous traffic studies based on current conditions inadequate.

There are two very sharp turns that exceed 90 degrees without wide enough pavement for two vehicles to pass. If two vehicles approach from different directions one has to wait for the other to pass through the turn before it proceeds. These turns have a radius of around 65 feet and require a large reduction in speed at the approach. Needing drastic changes in speed is another red flag that leads to a decrease in safety in the AASHTO guidelines.

Two other turns with the still small radius of about 160 feet are very dangerous because they both have negative superelevations (measurement of slope that designates how much bank the turn has) on the outside lane that causes unfamiliar drivers to go off of the road as they pass around the corner. Even at posted speeds these two turns are hazardous and unsafe when two cars approach in opposite directions because of the narrow pavement and negative superelevation that makes the vehicles lean out when going around the corner. One of them has very low visibility and a narrow culvert on one end which prevents vehicles from moving off of the pavement to pass another vehicle and this adds to the danger for unfamiliar drivers. When you consider wide farm equipment (our average farm implement is 16 feet wide) that completely covers the pavement in many sections of this road and the trucks that haul our tomatoes that are 60 feet long you bring in another element of danger for unfamiliar drivers.

Meeting this wide and long equipment on the turn with poor visibility and a culvert means the vehicle driver will have to completely stop and back up to let the tractor and implement or truck through. If there is a line of cars (the applicant says all event traffic arrives in about 15 minutes) how are you going to stop and back up? These are the reasons we will have to alter our farm operations and will be at risk of losing some of our tomato contracts.

I believe a much more thorough biological assessment and road study need to be done to make a proper decision on this project.

For these reasons and others that I have not listed I am opposed to this project.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Bruce J. Rominger". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long, sweeping underline.

Bruce J. Rominger
Rominger Brothers Farms
28800 Co. Rd. 29
Winters, CA 95694

April 7, 2016

VIA EMAIL (Stephanie.cormier@yolocounty.org)

Stephanie Cormier, Senior Planner
Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department
292 W. Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695

***Re: Comments to Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (File #2015-0018)
Field & Pond Bed & Breakfast and Special Event Facility Use Permit***

Dear Ms. Cormier:

We write to inform you and the Yolo County Planning Commission (“Commission”) that the above-referenced project (“Project”) requires more evaluation of impacts to neighboring rural and natural communities than is currently provided in the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (“IS/MND”). The IS/MND does not propose feasible mitigation measures in key areas of concern to the community, such as transportation, agricultural resources and public services. As such, the IS/MND is defective. In order to properly analyze the impacts associated with this Project, the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) requires the County to prepare an environmental impact report (“EIR”).

Simply put, the Project cannot be approved using the IS/MND circulated for review on March 8, 2016, as the basis for the County’s CEQA determination. Approval of this Project would result in significant environmental impacts that must be disclosed under CEQA, and feasible mitigation measures must be imposed. In order for neighbors along County Road 29, and the broader agricultural community in Yolo County, to even consider supporting the establishment of a new event center and bed and breakfast, in a rural area surrounded by active farming, we need assurances that all of the environmental impacts of the Project are properly considered and addressed. More importantly, disclosure of such impacts is required under CEQA.

We note that large event centers have successfully taken form in Yolo County, and we applaud successful enterprises such as Seka Hills and Full Belly Farms on Highway 16 and Berryessa Gap Vineyards on Highway 128 that hold large events centered on agri-tourism. Yet, these event centers are placed near high-capacity roadways in areas that do not conflict with active farming operations. If the environmental impacts of this Project are not properly addressed, we will continue to make our voice heard, to strongly urge that the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors disapprove this Project.

Our main concerns are summarized below, especially as they pertain to the CEQA requirements for evaluating this Project and providing adequate mitigation:

Legal Requirements for Preparing an EIR

CEQA provides that “[a]ll local agencies shall prepare, or cause to be prepared by contract, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report on any project that they intend to carry out or approve which may have a significant effect on the environment.” (Pub. Res. Code § 21151.) Courts have interpreted this requirement under a “fair argument” standard. Section 21151 requires preparation of an EIR “whenever it can be fairly argued on the basis of substantial evidence that the project may have significant environmental impact.” (*Sierra Club v. County of Sonoma* (1992) 6 Cal. App. 4th 1307, 1316, citing *No Oil, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles* (1974) 13 Cal.3d 68, 75.) If there is substantial evidence of a significant impact, contrary evidence is not adequate to support a decision to dispense with an EIR. (*Sierra Club, supra*, at 1316.) “Section 21151 creates a low threshold requirement for initial preparation of an EIR and reflects a preference for resolving doubts in favor of environmental review when the question is whether any such review is warranted. (*Id.*)

Our comments below show substantial evidence, as contained in the IS/MND itself, and as shown in the physical environmental along County Road 29, showing that, at the minimum, preparation of an EIR is required under CEQA. The EIR should also implement the feasible mitigation measures suggested below, which in our consultation with CEQA practitioners are standard practices in mitigating the significant environmental impacts of a project. Moreover, the EIR should acknowledge the additional, substantial evidence of significant environmental impacts provided by other landowners and agricultural workers along County Road 29, and their suggested mitigations, which were provided in response to the IS/MND.

Project Description

The Project Description of the IS/MND is confusing and does not clearly describe event center operations. The IS/MND does not clearly state how many total events will be held on the property. The IS/MND discusses for-profit events, non-profit events, farming operations, farm educational tours, corporate retreats and other activities. The IS/MND states that the applicant is proposing up to 35 large events between 150-300 people, with an unspecified number of corporate retreats and farm tours, and that the applicant may seek to increase the number of events that occur during March through November.

For the larger events, the IS/MND states that the number of attendees will range from approximately 120-300. This is not a reasonable range to estimate Project impacts. In addition, website advertisements for the Project have advertised that the property can accommodate up to 1,000 attendees per event. The County also did not appear to count non-profit events in the overall event total. Nor does the IS/MND contemplate whether a “non-profit” event will result

in use of the property free of charge, or merely that the property will be rented out by a tax-deductible nonprofit for such events.

An urban youth program using the name Fresh Start is proposed, however the Project Description is devoid of information as to how many of these events will be held, when they will be held, and how many attendees will be expected to attend on any given occasion. A quick online search points to a Fresh Start program out of Baltimore City and Washington, D.C., geared to the referral of juveniles from the Maryland Department of Juvenile Services. This program involves 40 weeks of job training; is this what is being proposed? How would these trips be coordinated with active farming in the area, from a traffic perspective and to ensure the safety of visiting children and juveniles? The IS/MND lacks the required analysis to fully disclose any potentially significant environmental impacts relating to this operation.

In addition, there are established educational organizations in Yolo County that offer similar programming for children and juveniles. This Project would have far more credibility if a viable education partner was chosen that is already active within the community, rather than referring to a speculative, unestablished program that has no track record or close ties to agriculture in California. As discussed below, this information is vital as it relates to determinations regarding the County's A-X agricultural zoning district and agricultural mitigation requirements.

In addition to the proposed youth program, more information is needed to describe the proposed farming activities. For example, where will the equipment be located in order to farm 50 acres in row crops and orchards, especially if barns are proposed to be converted to assembly uses? At least one barn should be permanently dedicated for agriculture to ensure that the Project serves an agricultural purpose. In relation to agricultural operations, more information regarding proposed water use and water efficiency measures is required. Is the existing well sufficient, or will an additional well be required? This question is not answered in the IS/MND.

For CEQA purposes, the Project Description establishes the baseline of environmental analysis. The Project Description should use worst-case scenario estimates to ensure that maximum protection is afforded to the environment. The Project Description should clearly describe features of the Project in a way that allows the public to understand the scope of potentially significant impacts, as compared against the environmental baseline. Therefore, the Project Description in the IS/MND should be revised to clearly establish the number of events that will be held, regardless whether they are permitted activities or require authorization under a CUP.

CEQA analysis must take into account the whole of the action, which includes all on-site activities, and off-site, cumulative, project level, direct and indirect, construction and operational impacts. Here, however, the IS/MND is defective because it does not clearly state the total number of events that were analyzed throughout the document, nor does it state that the limited number of events (35, as reduced down to 24) applies to all of the types of events that may occur on the property. Nor does the IS/MND describe the environmental impacts of the proposed

farming operations. These impacts, by themselves, are significant and require preparation of an EIR, as discussed in our comments below challenging the water use assumptions in the IS/MND.

Overall, the lack of details and misinformation regarding events, youth programs, and realistic agricultural operations shows that the Project is an ill-conceived, non-farm oriented party center attempting to masquerade as an agricultural operation in order to receive Project approval in an Agricultural Extensive (A-X) zone. The planting of an ornamental orchard is part and parcel to this attempt to gain permits by a non-agriculturally related event center.

Aesthetics

c) The Project will substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and surroundings.

Although the IS/MND notes that the Project purports to provide a high-end, luxury experience, it concludes that the Project will not have significant aesthetic impacts merely because the Project relies on the area's "rustic beauty." The measurement of natural beauty should be taken from the character and quality of the property as it exists before any events are held. The site is extremely rural, situated almost at the terminus of a dead-end road. The area is sparsely populated and rarely visited. Allowing thousands of people to the area substantially changes and degrades the existing visual character and quality of the site. At the minimum, as noted below, a lighting plan should be required to ensure that events will not degrade the existing visual character with lighting from party-goers, DJ's and conference attendees. Light impacts from vehicles traveling to and from the property, however, will remain significant and unavoidable and should be discussed further as part of the EIR process.

d) The Project would potentially create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area

Night-time glare is a concern among residents along County Road 29 and adjacent areas. The IS/MND states that this impact will be less than significant because "[t]he project will be conditioned to require that any proposed outdoor lighting shall include light fixtures that are low-intensity, shielded and/or directed away from adjacent properties in order to minimize glare and overspill on adjacent parcels, the night sky, and the public right-of-way."

Events at this property, however, will require third party vendors to provide most of the staging equipment. To avoid potentially significant aesthetic impacts, the County must ensure that these vendors do not provide additional lighting that could potentially face upward into the sky and outward onto the landscape. The IS/MND should therefore require the applicant to submit a lighting plan for public review and approval by the County. The Project should be conditioned so that no lighting is allowed on the property that is inconsistent with the approved lighting plan.

Agricultural Resources

b) The Project would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use

The project, as proposed, conflicts with the Yolo County Municipal Code (“Yolo Code”). The Yolo Code requires that land uses in agricultural zones support and enhance agriculture as the predominant land use in the County. (Yolo Code § 8-2.301.) “Agricultural Commercial and Rural Recreation Uses” are defined as “commercial uses incidental to the agricultural or horticultural operations of the area that preserve the rural lifestyle and stimulate the agricultural economy.” (Yolo Code § 8-2.303.) This includes event centers as allowable uses; however, such uses are required to be incidental to agricultural operations, and must stimulate the agricultural economy.

The IS/MND states aspirational goals for incorporating agricultural operations in the Project:

- Grazing agreements with ranchers interested in using the southern portions of the property for pasture *are being sought* (p. 2)
- The applicant *intends to enhance the agricultural value of the property* by restoring grazing contracts and converting portions of the land that show greater potential for crop growth...(p. 48)
- As proposed by the applicant, Field and Pond *will be an “agri-tourism” ranch...* (p. 49)

Regardless of the above aspirational goals, a wedding, event and corporate retreat center with accompanying bed & breakfast, in a location entirely surrounded by active farming operations, creates more conflicts than it does to support agriculture on the Property and along County Road 29. The IS/MND itself notes that the proposed cottages and event center are “for business purposes and not to augment agricultural productivity of the land.” (IS/MND, p. 18.) Later on, the IS/MND clearly states that “the initial phase of the project cannot be characterized as meeting the County’s definition of agri-tourism, even though later phases may meet the definition.” (IS/MND, p. 49.)

Tellingly, the IS/MND notes that operation of a large event center “may be incompatible with agricultural uses of the property....” The IS/MND concludes, however, that the “typical event” will likely fall within range of 150 attendees per event as currently allowed by right under the County Municipal Code. In its proposed mitigation, however, the IS/MND confusingly authorizes 4 events to be held with up to 300 attendees. Based on the above findings, the County must therefore conclude that such a large event is incompatible with the existing zoning, that such impacts are significant and unavoidable, and therefore a EIR be should be prepared.

It is irrelevant that applicants “intend” or “hope” to restore agriculture to the site. Amorphous hopes cannot be the basis for finding that the project meets the required zoning code definitions. Moreover, the proposed agricultural activities of the Project are undeniably incidental to its primary purpose of the property to serve as an event center and bed and breakfast. Again, the

scant details of the farm educational program suggest that this element of the Project will likely not come to fruition.

Based on the above, the Project will not function as an “agricultural use” defined under Section 8.2-303 of the Yolo Code, and as a matter of law the IS/MND cannot conclude under CEQA that the Project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use.

In addition, the IS/MND is deficient for failing to require mitigation for the loss of agricultural land under the Agricultural Conservation and Mitigation Program. As noted above, the IS/MND finds that the Project proposes to convert 11 acres of agricultural land to a predominantly business purpose. The County’s Agricultural Conservation and Mitigation Program defines agricultural land or farmland as land that is “capable of agricultural production”. (Yolo Code § 8-2.404(b).) Here, all of the acreage being converted to primarily business purposes are capable of agricultural production. Conformance with the Mitigation Program is thus required where the conversion of up to 11-acres of the Project Homestead area would alter the use of that area from land that is capable of agricultural production to a predominantly business purpose (wedding and event center, and bed and breakfast). The Project cannot provide in-place mitigation unless land is encumbered with a new easement, in addition to the existing easement area.

Most importantly to us, the IS/MND should better address the potentially significant impacts that the Project will have on existing agriculturally zoned properties and farming operations along County Road 29. Mitigation Measure AG3 suggests that no buildings will be allowed to be placed or repurposed for non-agricultural uses within a 500-foot buffer from adjacent agricultural operations. We would like the County to confirm that this is the intent of this measure, and if so, please clarify this with a revised mitigation measure. In addition, the proposed condition of Project approval requiring the applicant to enter into binding, written agreements with adjacent landowners should be incorporated as a mitigation measure in the IS/MND. This agreement should include a \$5 million single incident or \$10 million umbrella policy to cover any loss of life or injuries and to hold harmless the farming operations in the area from any suit arising from one of their events. In addition, the proposed condition of approval on page 17 of the IS/MND, to require coordination with adjacent agricultural operations, should be built into the mitigation measure requiring a written agreement between the Project applicant and adjacent landowners.

Even with this proposed mitigation, interruptions to adjacent farming activities will be inevitable. County Road 29 provides the sole means of accessing the Project site; County Road 29 is heavily used by large agricultural trucks, tractors and other implements involved in farming, day and night, year round especially February to November; and most importantly, it is virtually impossible to coordinate wedding events, which are scheduled up to one year in advance, with agricultural events such as tomato harvests, which are entirely dependent on climatic conditions, canneries demands, crop ripeness and other variables particular to large scale farming operations. As such, impacts to existing zoning of adjacent agricultural uses would be significant, unavoidable and devastating to local farmers.

Mitigation Measure AG-2 is insufficient to cure the significant impact the Project will have on agricultural operations in the area. Measure AG-2 purports to limit events to 24. Measure AG-2 does not, however, take into account the unlimited “nonprofit” events, corporate retreats, farm tours and other undisclosed events that the Project may hold. There is no mention of limits on the number attendees that might frequent such events. As such, the analysis is incomplete and insufficient under CEQA. Even the proposed 24 events under Measure AG-2 would increase visits to the area by up to 4,200 people. That is approximately 140 times the number of persons living on County Road 29. This sheer volume of attendees will undeniably impede surrounding farming operations.

Measure AG-2 requires the use of shuttles for events that exceed 150 attendees. Has the County analyzed the size of such shuttles, and would the proposed shuttle be able to pass the large agricultural transport trucks that utilize County Road 29? Research shows that people refuse to use shuttles. They want to arrive and depart at their will. There is no legal way to require a guest to utilize a shuttle unless access to the property will be denied to those arriving in their vehicles. Will arrivees in cars be turned away? If a guest falls ill how will they be evacuated since there will be no vehicle to evacuate them? Moreover because the wedding party and vendors are not included in the shuttle requirement will they be restricted to 5 cars, 50 cars or 100? Clearly, the proposal to use shuttles is not an effective mitigation.

e) The Project would result in changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

The statement on Page 20 of the IS/MND, that “the project will not remove any active farmland from production” should be deleted since, as noted above and throughout, the IS/MND finds that the Project proposes to convert up to 11 acres of agricultural land to predominantly business and non-agricultural purposes.

Mitigation Measure AG-3 claims to mitigate potential conflicts with adjacent agricultural activities such as the spraying of restricted or non-restricted materials, by enforcing a 500 foot buffer from adjacent agricultural operations. The IS/MND at page 20, however, states that the Project's three residences, barns, two-acre pond, and other outbuildings are within 300 feet or closer to the nearest actively farmed parcel. Additionally, the Project’s proposed parking area is within 50 feet of the orchard across the street. All event activities will be in and around these facilities, therefore the 500 foot border does not appear to be an effective mitigation. On a practical level, the ineffectiveness of Measure AG-3 confirms that future conflicts are likely to arise if events are held in this area. If the Project is approved, these potential conflicts threaten all agricultural operations along County Road 29 and would likely lead to the eventual conversion of this farmland to non-agricultural uses.

The proposed condition of approval on page 21 requires foliage screening or fencing to ensure that event attendees are not affected by spray or drift. This proposed condition will also not be

effective. Sprays are designed to penetrate through, around and over an entire canopy of foliage. A fence could not be built high enough to mitigate the impacts of these sprays, therefore the location of an event center in an active agricultural area will inevitably lead to conflicts with surrounding agricultural operations.

For all of the reasons stated above, the IS/MND is flawed, the proposed mitigations are ineffective, additional mitigations are necessary, and an EIR must be prepared to disclose and provide further opportunity to discuss the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts to agricultural resources.

Air Quality

The IS/MND provides the significance standards under the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District, but it does not follow through with a thorough analysis of the Project-related impacts to show that no reasonable likelihood exists that the Project's air emissions will have a significant impact on the environment.

As noted above, we are concerned that the IS/MND did not fully analyze all air emissions related to the maximum number of events that are reasonably likely to occur under the use permit. The IS/MND should analyze all trips generated by corporate events, farm tours, large events, extra-large events, nonprofit events, the proposed onsite farming activities, in addition to construction-related emissions and all other emissions required to be analyzed under CEQA. The IS/MND should also evaluate the use of generators and portable equipment onsite.

Ultimately, the IS/MND does not mention how many tons per year of emissions the Project is expected to emit. The analysis does not identify sensitive receptors but only states that there are relatively few. Does this take into account the farm workers who work daily in the area, or just residents? Moreover, it is not the number of sensitive receptors that matters. It is whether they exist at all. Also, with respect to construction-related emissions, the IS/MND does not provide sufficient detail as to the length of the construction period.

For the reasons stated above, the IS/MND is incomplete and additional analysis is required to fully disclose the Project's air quality impacts, as required under CEQA.

Biological Resources

The Project proposes construction of a parking area to accommodate 75 vehicles. Based on the site plan included in the IS/MND, the parking area is in close proximity to Chickahominy slough and Salt Creek. The IS/MND does not address nor analyze the potential impacts of this parking area on the slough or creek. The pollutants from the vehicles parked in the lot will run off into the slough and creek, thus having a substantial effect on those riparian habitats. Moreover, the County prohibits new construction or development within 100 feet of waterways. The IS/MND fails to mention whether the parking lot is outside of this prescriptive area. A map or diagram

should be prepared showing the required setback in relation to the proposed operation of the property. Also, the setback should be physically identified to patrons and event attendees. And most importantly, the IS/MND should require, as a mitigation measure, preparation of a storm water pollution prevention plan (“SWPPP”) to ensure that runoff from the parking lot is channeled away from riparian areas and other sensitive habitats.

The IS/MND conducts no analysis as to whether the Project will substantially interfere with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with the established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. The question here is not, as the IS/MND purports, that there cannot be an effect on these wildlife species because the majority of the property is under a wildlife easement. Rather, the proper question, unasked and unanalyzed in the IS/MND is whether the ongoing operations of a large event center and bed and breakfast will have such effect. For instance, the IS/MND fails to account for the effects of noise and lighting upon resident wildlife. There is an abundance of wildlife in the area, many of which are nocturnal. These animals’ feeding and migration patterns will be completely disrupted by the noise and attendant party activities. There are various raptors in the daytime hours and owls at night that protect neighboring orchards and fields from rodents and other pests. Farmers depend on these predators to mitigate significant financial loss caused by borrowing rodents. Moreover, the cattle and sheep that graze on the adjacent properties will avoid the grazing areas close to the property line forcing the neighboring farmer to lose valuable acres of grazing land. The IS/MND’s finding of less than significant impact is conclusory and a more detailed analysis is warranted.

For the reasons stated above, the IS/MND is incomplete and an EIR is necessary.

Cultural Resources

a) The project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of California Code of Regulations, Title 14, ch. 3

The IS/MND concludes that there is no impact to cultural resources, since the property is not currently designated as a County historical resource. Section 15064.5 provides, however, that a historical resource may include “[a]ny object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record.” The County’s 1986 Historic Resources Survey, provides substantial evidence that the property holds significant history for the County, and for the role that pioneers played in settling California and the West. As the stated purpose of this project is to honor the legacy of farming in Yolo County, the Project should do more to preserve the historical values on the property. This should be more fully disclosed in an EIR for the Project.

Geology and Soils

With respect to onsite septic systems, the IS/MND states that the Project will be conditioned to require a site map and site evaluation review and approval prior to implementation to ensure all proposed and existing onsite wastewater disposal systems can adequately serve the project. In order for a proper analysis under CEQA to be conducted, information regarding the ability of the soil to handle the current or proposed septic system must be analyzed. Although the Project proposes to utilize portable toilets, it is reasonable to assume that the permanent bathrooms will be used preferentially. Overloading of the onsite septic system could affect the groundwater supply, or surface water supplies if spillage occurs into the onsite slough or creek. These impacts are potentially significant and should be analyzed more closely in an EIR.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

f) The project would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area

The IS/MND notes that a condition of project approval will require the applicant “to provide a disclosure and notification statement for guests regarding ongoing agricultural operations in the area, which may include the aerial spraying of pesticides within the project vicinity. With the implementation of this required notification process, the project is not expected to pose a threat to employees or guests of the proposed Field & Pond project.”

Mere disclosure of a safety hazard, however, does nothing to mitigate the actual risk. As discussed below regarding Transportation and Traffic impacts, feasible mitigation measures include road widening, repaving and striping, lighting and other actual measures to increase roadway safety other than providing signage. These are all established and customary mitigation measures under CEQA and the County’s police power to mitigate significant safety impacts.

The IS/MND noted resident concerns about increased traffic incidences that would result in the area due to the Project's placement. County Road 29 is a dead-end roadway. It is narrow, with some stretches only 14 feet wide, and there are several 90-degree turns. County Road 29 is unlit, and there are two severe dips in the road, one where your vision is obstructed as to oncoming traffic. The road is already used by heavy farm equipment year-round. There is no middle line on large stretches of the road, and there are no paved shoulders. There are two bridges where two vehicles cannot pass at the same time.

Bringing thousands of people each year who are unfamiliar with the road's conditions results in a severe safety hazard to attendees, residents and workers of County Road 29. More importantly, the proposed condition of approval, to disclose the poor road conditions along County Road 29 (IS/MND, p. 43), does nothing to actually mitigate these hazards.

The IS/MND notes that the property is within a Moderate Fire Zone, as determined by the State of California (p. 57), but also that the Project site is located in a designated Fire Hazard Severity Zone (p. 43). We ask that the County explain this distinction and how the IS/MND analyzed these zones differently.

The IS/MND focuses mainly on fires in buildings and onsite and states the Project's requirement to comply with Fire Code safety requirements such as sprinklers (though it is not stated whether the project actually meets the parameters for requiring said sprinklers) and onsite water storage to mitigate the threat to people or structures of wildfire. The threat of wildfire in the Project area is severe according to the IS/MND. Defensible space, sprinklers in buildings, water storage can all be effective in combatting fire but the IS/MND fails to show how these will lessen exposure to wildfire. What's more, the IS/MND fails to account for the very real reactions of attendees should they be confronted with a wildfire approaching from the hills towards the Project site. The only exit route is through County Road 29; this will impede the fire and rescue vehicles attempting to arrive at the Project site. If the fire approaches from County Road 29, however, there will be no option for safely evacuating from the property. Motorists unfamiliar with the dead-end road will turn away from the fire and towards the dead-end of County Road 29. If shuttles are required, those attendees may become stranded. If shuttles do flee toward the East, they will have to navigate the incoming fire protection vehicles made more dangerous since County Road 29 contains no turn-outs.

The above situations illustrate some of the significant safety risks, and none are adequately addressed or analyzed in the IS/MND. They are not adequately mitigated, nor do we see how effective mitigation can be provided due to the limited access. These potentially significant impacts must be disclosed for further evaluation and analysis in a Project EIR.

Hydrology and Water Quality

b) The project could substantially deplete groundwater or interfere with groundwater recharge

More information is required as to the water usage and availability of the existing well to serve the anticipated needs on the property. If agricultural operations are in fact commenced, the IS/MND grossly underestimates the annual water requirements for 50 acres of row crops and orchards.

The Project applicants state that their planned agricultural operations (50 acres of nut tree and vegetable crops) together with the needs of the event center and bed and breakfast, will use approximately 179,000 gallons of water annually, of which only 30,000 was claimed to be used by the trees and row crops. (IS/MND, p. 45.) This claim is wholly without merit and illustrates the applicant's lack of expending even a modicum of time to acquire even a basic knowledge of farming requirements.

A crude rule of thumb is that trees or row crops require roughly 3 to 3.5 acre feet per acre of irrigation water annually to produce a crop. Using this yardstick, the Project's annual water requirements for the crops alone would be approximately 49 to 57 million gallons of water. This does not even take into account the massive amounts of water needed to keeping the property's lake filled, or support the needs of the event center and bed and breakfast.

A neighboring landowner has a well that has been there for years just a few feet West of their property. Another well exists approximately 1/4 mile North of the Project. There are also two more additional agricultural wells approximately 1/2 mile from the Project, immediately to the East on another adjacent landowners property. The water table along County Road 29 is overdrawn; when either of these landowners run any of these wells, if the other wells are running there is a drastically diminished flow. The proposed mitigation of requiring bottled water for drinking during events is nonsensical; the Project's impacts to the water table must absolutely be analyzed in a full EIR.

The IS/MND summarily concludes that agricultural operations in Yolo County have increasingly adopted efficient irrigation systems. For the proposed project, however, the use of efficient irrigation systems are assumed, but not required. Once the actual amount of water usage is ascertained, efficiency measures should be required as Project mitigation, to ensure consistency with the County's General Plan.

Lastly, although the IS/MND concludes that the applicant will need to apply for a new permit if an agricultural well is required, the IS/MND does not sufficiently analyze whether proposed water use on the property will require additional water supplies. Based on the above, and the historical output of adjacent wells, an agricultural well will be required. We expect the IS/MND to carefully analyze this issue, which is obviously of great concern among all adjacent landowners along County Road 29.

Land Use and Planning

b) The project conflicts with an applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project.

The project does not meet the County's definition of agri-tourism and the IS/MND states this fact, as mentioned above and throughout the document. This fatal defect is unable to be mitigated.

The definition of agri-tourism confers significant benefits on those who meet the definition. The Project does not and cannot claim the rights under the Yolo Code that were drafted to foster agri-tourism in the County. The Project, as proposed, should be denied.

Troublingly, the IS/MND is replete with references to what the Project "intends", "hopes" or "estimates" to achieve. The IS/MND must be based in reality, on the facts as they occur today. It

cannot be based on guestimates and desires. It is admirable that the Project applicants intend to start up a farming operation but, until that operation is up and running, it is merely conjecture (though it is telling that while they have expended vast amounts of time and money to establish their event center, they have not yet installed significant farming operations or educated themselves as to the basics of an agricultural operation).

Noise

a) The project would expose persons to noise in excess of applicable standards

The IS/MND inappropriately relies on a 75-dB CNEL standard for outdoor noise levels. The proposed use of the property as a wedding and event center is in significant contrast to the character of the area. The applicable night-time standard for this rural area should be 45 dB or 60 dB CNEL.

The IS/MND assumes that there will be no impacts to adjacent properties, but fails to perform an adequate noise contour analysis. Regardless of the dB standard (45, 60 or 75), the characteristics of the property must be evaluated, to confirm that other properties will not receive channelized noise impacts in proximity to their residences.

To ensure that amplified music does not interfere with the tranquil nature of the surrounding area, such music should be limited to indoor use only, in buildings that have undergone noise reduction measures from an acoustics specialist. Moreover, operational hours for all event activities should terminate at 9:00 p.m., with all attendees and vendors to leave the premises by 10:00 pm to ensure that neighbors are not significantly disturbed by noise impacts.

Based on the above, the IS/MND should rely on a noise contour study, and an EIR should be prepared to fully disclose the Project's noise impacts.

Public Services

a) The proposed project would result in substantial adverse impacts to fire and police protection

Public safety in the event of a wildland fire is a significant concern to all who live along County Road 29. The IS/MND does not clearly address whether fire truck access will be affected by attendee vehicles or shuttle buses that will utilize the roadways in the vicinity. In addition to the concerns raised above, if a fire occurred on the property during a harvest, is County Road 29 wide enough to accommodate the passing of fire trucks? Road widths should be analyzed and evaluated to determine if widening is required. If the County refuses or does not have funds to pay for widening, the obligation should be on the applicant to ensure that County Road 29 is sufficiently improved to address any public safety issues that may arise.

We strongly disagree with the provision in the IS/MND that the applicant will be required to merely “acknowledge that there are no plans for the County to improve or rehabilitate County Road 29.” This does not meet the requirements of CEQA. Impacts must not only be disclosed, they must be mitigated when feasible. Widening and improving County Road 29 is clearly a feasible option to merely acknowledging that the road is in poor quality.

Transportation and Traffic

The IS/MND transportation analysis is invalid because it is based on ephemeral assumptions. Through circular logic, the IS/MND states that County Road 29 is not defined as a General Plan roadway, and therefore does not require level of service (LOS) analysis. The uses proposed by this Project clearly require the County to analyze County Road 29 using LOS analysis.

In addition, the traffic counts from 2003 are outdated and should be substantiated by an up-to-date traffic survey. The traffic survey should evaluate the existing LOS of County Road 29, while factoring in additional agricultural operations, the addition of more than 5,000 trips per year for event operations, the traffic generated by the proposed youth program, and all other proposed activities for the property.

County Road 29 is a dead-end roadway. It is narrow with some stretches only 14 feet wide. There are several 90 degree turns. It is unlit and there are two severe dips in the road, one where your vision is obstructed as to oncoming traffic. The road is already used by heavy farm equipment year round.

Again, the proposed mitigation, to physically warn drivers of traffic hazards, does not meet the requirements of CEQA. Moreover, requiring a "parking attendant or security guard" at the site similarly does nothing to address the roads dangerous conditions. It is unclear how a parking attendant in any way lessens the dangers of County Road 29. A security guard at the event center may control fighting or other similar nuisances that will arise but will in no way mitigate road dangers. Feasible mitigation should require the applicant to make roadway improvements, and to ensure that adequate public safety services can travel to the property through County Road 29 during peak harvesting periods.

The project would also result in inadequate emergency response. The current width and highly crowned surface of County Road 29 already impedes emergency access. If hundreds of vehicles, with their attendant passengers, tried to flee a wildfire or house fire, this would substantially impair the arrival of oncoming emergency vehicles through County Road 29. In several places, County Road 29 is not wide enough to allow two vehicles to pass each other and stay on the roadway. The observed driver custom is to travel towards the middle of the road, especially when crossing bridges and the narrower sections of Road 29. Wider vehicles cannot pass each other simultaneously on the bridges without a head on collision so one must pull to the side and wait for the other to pass. Local traffic is aware of this; visitors will not be. Beyond widening the road, there is no mitigation for the impending disaster of a head-on collision by shuttle or

automobile drivers unfamiliar the design characteristics of County Road 29. The County cannot approve this Project without requiring the Project applicant to fully improve and widen County Road 29 up to its connection with County Road 89.

Utilities

d) The project may not have sufficient water supply

Again, the IS/MND states that a new well may be required, but as noted above, the IS/MND does not properly analyze whether the existing supply is sufficient, nor does it provide an accurate summary of proposed water use for the project.

Based on each of the concerns raised above, CEQA requires a more thorough analysis of the Project than what is currently provided in the IS/MND. More importantly, due to the number of potentially significant impacts caused by the Project, an EIR should be required. We raise these concerns with the hope that future conflict, disputes and litigation can be effectively avoided.

Thank you for considering the issues we have raised. We appreciate the opportunity to continue to have our voice heard throughout this process, and we look forward to the County's response to our comments as we continue to participate in our public review of this Project.

Sincerely,

Sheri Rominger

cc: Yolo County Planning Commission Chair Leroy Bertolero
Yolo County Planning Commissioners Muller, Kasbergen, Hall, Vergis, Friedlander and Reynolds

Comments on Field and Pond Use Permit Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration Zone File #2015-0018

County Road 29 is a dangerous dead end road that was designed decades ago obviously by the landowners who farmed on it. The road's sharp turns and curves appear to have been designed so the road would not interfere with landowner's parcels and farming activities. Clearly it was not designed with safety in mind, otherwise they would have made it straight the entire length of the road.

According to a county official I spoke to ,current county standards for safe roads are: Two paved lanes,14 feet each, paved two feet shoulders on each side and one foot gravel shoulders on each side. County Road 27 west of Hwy 505 to CR89 appears to conform to these requirements . One can also see what the county considers safe with the recent road improvement west of Davis at the intersection of CR31 and CR95, where there had been many accidents, including several fatalities.

County Road 29 doesn't even come close to meeting any county safety standards due to the following road conditions.

Narrow Lanes-There are places where the road width is really one lane. Various places on it measure 13'7",14 +",15+",16+", etc. well below the 19' foot road described by the applicant in one of their proposals.

Dangerous Curves-There are several blind curves and an additional S curve s Curves which is very difficult to navigate.

Road Surface-In many sections of the road the pavement is uneven due to the county only partially paving small sections of the lanes. Unfortunately the most uneven surface is on the section running beside the PG&E/SMUD natural gas transmission facility. Due to the unevenness in the road particularly at that location sometimes you are forced to correct your steering while driving in these areas.

PG&E/SMUD Natural Gas Transmission Station- Large amounts of Natural gas are transferred from two large Trans Canadian pipelines to larger pipe/pipes to service the Sacramento area. Not only is the road surface bad by the facility, but the road dips down making driving there even more difficult. It temporarily causes a blind spot where you can lose sight of traffic entering from a drive there and when travelling west bound any cars pulling out of the houses located close to the side of the road. Additionally, not all the pipes are underground. There are several pipes that are above ground, close to the side of the road making them very dangerous if a vehicle should go off the road and hit them, there could be a deadly explosion. In the past one of the trailers on a large cattle truck flipped over just after passing the facility and going up the rise in the dip. There were cows running all over. We were just lucky he had passed the facility . Otherwise it could have possibly caused a catastrophic explosion.

Traffic Fatalities and Injuries on County Roads 29,88 and 89 in the vicinity of 29 and 29 A

Staff Report-According to a 2/18/2016 staff report "Traffic collision history report, prepared by Yolo County traffic engineers, revealed a total of one traffic incident (a non-collision overturned vehicle) in the last five years,ie. From January1, 2010 through December 31,2015."

FACT- Fatalities and Injuries County Road 29-

1. May 16, 2010, Tommy Serafini died when he lost control of his car on the widest part of the road in the daytime.
2. April 11, 2014, two occupants were injured when their car overturned.

In the past-neighbors recalled two other fatal vehicle accidents.

Fatality County Road 88- A CHP officer told me six years ago a male died when he lost control when he drove over a bridge, built in 1917, approximately one mile north of CR 29.

Fatalities County Road 89-

1. May 16, 2012, - 1.1 mile south of entrance to CR 29, Ricardo Murillo was killed in a vehicle accident.

2. October 10, 2013, - 327 feet from entrance to CR 29, Jose Fierros was killed and driver severely injured.
3. September 2, 2015, - 1.1 mile from entrance to CR 29, Harold Browning burned to death in a vehicle accident the other driver was severely injured.

In fact, from 2007 to 2015, there have been seven people killed in vehicular accidents on County Road 89 between the area of CR 27 and 31 and CR 29 and CR 88. **From 2007 to 2009, only two had been killed but it should concern everyone that the number of fatalities has doubled in the last six years and all of those have been on CR 29 or close by on CR88 and CR89.**

INJURIES

From 2005 to 2015, on CR 89 between the area of CR27 and CR 31, there were 46 injury accidents with five severely injured.

From 2005 to 2011, in our area on CR 89 with the closest cross street of CR29 and CR29A there were two injury accidents, one with severe injuries. However, from 2011 to 2015, the injury accidents, including one severe injury, have more than quadrupled to ten, including the two on our road.

The sharp increase in fatalities and injury accidents in our immediate area is very alarming. The last thing we need in this area is for the volume of traffic to be

increased whether it be car, large shuttles, or even larger busses.

Signage Mitigation

Posting signs on our road is not going to necessarily prevent the risk of injury or death when you dramatically increase the volume of traffic on our road. Since 2015 there were 5 broadside accidents at the intersection of CR 89 and CR 27 where there are stop signs and intersection signs posted. One person was killed, 14 injured, 2 severely.

There was also a serious accident at the intersection of CR89 and CR29A, where a car was broadsided, one person was severely injured. There are stop signs and intersection signs there as well.

About March 10, 2016, a vehicle traveling east on CR 29 skidded past the stop sign and ran into the sign which indicates you must turn left or right on CR90. The sign was knocked over from the force of the impact. Two signs did not help in that instance.

Volume of traffic

The applicants are requesting up to 35 events for the first year with possibly up to 300 attendees. This would be in addition to the 8 (or 12) yearly events provided for in the code for a total of 43 to 47 events per year. According to page 6 of the staff report the applicants goal is to “Increase the number of events per year (i.e.,

up to two events per week for nine months out of the year), if acceptable to the county.” That would be a total of 72 events on top of the by right events.

This appears to contradict the applicants statement in a proposal which we received I believe in July of 2015. In their Business Approach section, “ For example, we travel to both Australia and Mexico at least once a year to visit family. We will continue to do this and with each year, we will likely increase the length of our trips. What this means is that we have no interest in doing multiple events in a single weekend, committing ourselves to a non-stop year round operation schedule, or taking on events that extend into the late night hours. We value the tranquility of our house...”

Obviously, my neighbors and I would like to enjoy the tranquility of our houses, farm and ranches on County Road 29. However, next year having the possibility of 11,700 attendees, (10,500 (35 x 300) + 1200 (8(?) X150) traveling to the hospitality event center will certainly impact that in many ways such as i.e., increasing the danger on our roads, impacting long established agriculture operations. These numbers do not include the Field and Pond employees, delivery trucks (one of which already almost ran into a neighbor) porta potty delivery trucks with trailers, musicians, photographers, wedding planners, caterers, bartenders, parking attendant, security guard, bakers, florist, etc.

It's a bit confusing, but it appears the staff is recommending the applicants be permitted for profit events limited to one week for the months of May, June, July, August, September and October which would equal 24 events. However, the "combined" events would not be 24, but could be 36 (12+24) or 32 (8+24). It is confusing because the report seems to include 8 possible months, April thru November. Does that mean they can randomly pick which months during the 8 months they can have their weekly events because if not, four events per month for 8 months would be a total of 32 events on top of the by right events. Supposedly 4 out of the 24 staff recommended for profit events may have 300 attendees and the other 20 plus the by right events will have up to 150. Apparently, shuttle will be required for the four events which have up to 300 attendees. However, there are no specifications regarding how these requirements will be enforced. I think it is incumbent upon the staff to specify exactly how any of this will be enforced in light of the fact that a Cease and Desist Notice dated December 4, 2015, had to be sent to the applicants regarding one or more violations of County Code Section 8-2.306(k)(3)(1).

There should be a comprehensive plan for enforcing any proposed mitigation measures as to vehicles to be used and also enforcement as to number of attendees at events.

The reality is there are just some things that cannot be fixed, mitigated. The danger to the public through increasing volumes of traffic on a narrow, dangerous rural road is one of them. The County has made it quite clear that they have no intention of improving the road nor in reality could they remove the blind curves and S curve, straighten it out, or remove the PG&E / SMUD natural gas transmission facility. This is just not the right location for a large hospitality event center.

Barbara Dieter

Note: Apparently, applicants have another more recent project description which was not sent to us so I am unable to specifically address any purported mitigations, if any, in that one until I receive it.

Stephanie Cormier
Yolo planning and Public Works Department
292 W. Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695

Dear Ms Cormier,

Re file ZF2015-0018

In regard to the project Field and Pond, I was glad to see that the problem of rural movement of machinery was taken into account, but was unclear that alerting farmers in the area three weeks ahead could really make provisions that would not impact farming in the area. Most event at the B&B will take place during summer and harvest (Mar-Nov) and will involve alcohol, when machinery is used the most. The significant increase in traffic that is most likely going to be affected by alcohol consumption seems to be a real risk and problem. The road is not easy to navigate in the daylight and would either significantly hinder large machinery movement or slow any traffic to the B&B to a crawl. In night conditions, although most agriculture equipment would not be on the road, the narrowing and any influence alcohol would play could be truly dangerous. I do hope, as a small farmer who has limited means of getting big equipment moved to my land due to urban intrusion, that the county takes this seriously into consideration.

Having lived in rural Yolo County and needing the sheriff for life and death matters several times during that time, I know how thinly stretched the sheriff forces are. They could not respond to my call regarding an armed intruder for over an hour. Combine this with a narrow and dangerous road and alcohol usage and it may be that the B&B needs to do what the Tribal folks did, which is add to the money in the sheriff department for personnel and help with improvement of roads.

The wildlife studies are required initially, but I would say, as the wife of a biologist, that ongoing measurements to be sure there are no impact, especially to the tricolored black bird, would be a favorable activity and to the credit of the applicant if they would include regular monitoring of the species that might be affected. I do not know if the pond is extensive enough to be used as a guide for migrating birds, but if it is (and many migrants use these wetland areas to rest and recover as well as find their way, this needs to be fully taken into consideration if extensive noise and building is taking place around the pond.

Overall, I believe that small B&B venues introduce urban people to the pleasures and sometimes the inconveniences of rural life. Urban ventures transplanted to the country from the city that host rock bands and large crowds are not really showing guests the country. Rather, they are taking advantage of what looks like a clear slate to establish an urban activity in a rural setting--perhaps not the best introduction for guests to country living or the values that the agricultural and country life strive for.

It was significant to me that, in this project, the water for the guest activities(149,000 gallons) was 4 times that of the agricultural usage (30,000gallons). Since agriculture uses more water than cities usually, this reversal in the middle of agricultural territory seems to be very wasteful and excessive.

I was taken initially with the Park Winters establishment when they were simply renovating the old buildings and improving the property. I was taken aback when I went out last time to see the large convention hall and venue that they had built. While it is stylish and in good taste for an urban setting, I feel that if it is the only one in that rural setting it may be ok, but if Park Winters and the Field and Pond project establish a precedent that allows mushrooming of these sorts of projects that then establishes an oasis of development that can become urban sprawl without the city attached. I believe that we need to move very slowly in order to not set precedents that we may not want.

I believe that the folks proposing the project are true in saying that they have good intentions. I question whether they have done their homework and understand the culture that they may disrupt. I already witnessed a truly ugly presentation in the Winters City Council Chambers where this project and Park Winters chose to personalize and say what I know to be statements lacking truth about their neighbors. Agricultural communities work together. Their very survival requires that. I would urge the applicants to begin to integrate into this culture and learn from it so that they can be appropriate neighbors.

Sincerely,
Valerie Whitworth
POB 757,
Winters, CA 95694

April 7, 2016

To Ms. Stephanie Cormier:

We are writing in response to the Initial Study written for the Field and Pond Bed and Breakfast and large event center proposal.

We were both born and raised in Winters and are now raising our own children in Winters. Winters has always been a town surrounded by local farming operations. A lot of families in Winters make their livings from working in agriculture, either on local farms or at Mariani's. Many of our friends and family members have ties to agriculture in the area.

We are very concerned with the Field and Pond proposed project. The owners of Field and Pond are not farmers. They are a commercial business. A wedding center has nothing to do with agriculture.

This project will not only conflict with the farming operations surrounding their event center, it will hurt those farming families that have been farming that land for generations. It's not fair that farmers should have to change their operations to cater to a new event center.

Field and Pond claims that it will bring business dollars to Winters. No one I know in Winters could afford a wedding at these expensive event centers.

For all of these reasons we strongly oppose the Field and Pond proposal.

Sincerely,

Kayla and Joseph Guerrero



08 April 2016

Stephanie Cormier, Senior Planner
Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department
292 West Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695

Subject: Comments, Negative Declaration, Field and Pond Project, ZF2015-0018

Dear Ms. Cormier,

Tuleyome offers the following comments to the Planning Department regarding the Initial Study (IS) and Draft Negative Declaration (NegDec) for the proposed Field and Pond Event Center Project on Road 29 in western Yolo County.

Tuleyome owns property at the west end of Road 29. At the end of Road 29, a 4x4 dirt road leads through the Scott Ranch to Tuleyome's 640-acre Ireland Ranch located abutting Bureau of Land Management lands at Rocky Ridge. We lease the property for grazing and large cattle trucks are used in the fall and winter to transport cows to and from summer pastures. In the future please notice Tuleyome in all email or mail correspondence with respect to the Field and Pond Project as we have a direct interest.

Tuleyome remains concerned about the CEQA compliance process in Yolo County. The IS/NegDec fails to meet the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) with respect to the proposed project, failing to avoid, reduce, or offset adverse environmental consequences as required by law.

Not too long ago, Tuleyome sued Yolo County over the proposed Bogle wind development environmental process. The adopted NegDec was clearly inadequate and the courts agreed. We appear to have a similar attempt by the county with the Field and Pond Project to adequately address the legal CEQA process. This is unfair to the applicants, residents of Yolo County, and watch dog citizens groups that defend our environmental laws. Yolo County can and must do better.

With this letter Tuleyome incorporates comments submitted on April 4, 2016 by Chad Roberts.

Tuleyome also feels that the discussion of waste water disposal on sight is inadequate. First, we assume, but there is no discussion, that the septic systems will need to be expanded for the

special events and for the bed and breakfast operations. There needs to be a full wastewater study conducted by a licensed civil engineer for the facilities in the EIR to evaluate leach field location and capacity. These studies cannot be simply put off until a future date but must be done in conjunction with the CEQA review process. The soils may have high percolation but that must be determined. In addition, movement of increased flow rates to Chickahominy Slough must to be evaluated. The simple statement that the applicants will simply import rows of porta-pottys to serve the weddings, corporate trainings, and other upscale events is incongruent with the events they discuss. The EIR must discuss as an alternative a septic system capable of handling flows from peak capacity crowds of 300 as they are planning.

Tuleyome is concerned about traffic on this narrow, winding, rural road. This road is not like the larger roads in the flat land areas of Yolo County and what may be acceptable there certainly may not be adequate in the rolling hill area in the county. There is often large farm equipment moving on this road during the spring and fall when most of the planned events will occur. There is increased danger to farmers and to attendees. This can be a greater safety problem as folks approach the site with a setting sun in their eyes. The concept of a shuttle system appears inadequate, unworkable, and unenforceable to mitigate this problem. A full traffic study by a licensed traffic engineer needs to be conducted to fully understand and propose enforceable mitigation measures. This may include widening the road and repaving the road as needed.

Our comments should not be construed to mean that this is all of the issues that must be studied and addressed to meet CEQA requirements.

In summary, we support Chad Roberts comments that, “A revised and expanded CEQA assessment of the project’s effects is necessary to meet CEQA requirements. The county may choose to retract the proffered Negative Declaration for revision (an approach that must include conducting all necessary studies, using qualified personnel, as well as identifying adequate mitigating measures or programs that avoid, reduce, or offset the project’s impacts). However, the most appropriate and timely response (for the county as well as for the applicant) would be for the county to require the preparation of a legally adequate Environmental Impact Report.”

Sincerely,



Bob Schneider
Senior Policy Director
530-304-6215
bschneider@tuleyome.org

April 8, 2016

Stephanie Cormier

Yolo County Planning Department

292 W. Beamer Street

Woodland, CA 95695

Dear Ms. Cormier:

I am concerned with the Planning Department's Initial Study for Field and Pond. I am particularly concerned with fire dangers. I do not believe the County's mitigation efforts regarding Field and Pond match the potential danger of fires in this area.

Field and Pond is located on 80 acres, surrounded by grasslands and trees to the south and west, orchards to the north, and grasslands, trees and row crops to the east of the property. Because of this year's rains, there will be more fuel for fires.

Page 43 of the Initial Study says the project is located in a designated Fire Hazard Severity Zone and will be required to implement several fire safety measures in order to reduce the project's risk from wildland fires. It says that sprinklers *may* be required in all occupancies used for sleeping quarters, all structures over 5,000 square feet and all occupancies over 100 persons.

1. Sprinklers *must* be required to protect public health and safety.
2. How will the county mitigate this vague language around whether or not sprinklers are required?

The Initial Study says that onsite water storage shall also be maintained at the site for firefighting purposes.

1. What is the capacity of the proposed water storage area?
2. Where is the water storage area to be?
3. Under Mitigation Measure AG-3, the applicant will be required to maintain a 500-foot buffer from adjacent agricultural operations for any newly constructed buildings. Is a water storage area considered a newly constructed building? If so, where will it be built?
4. Can that water source be used to fight an on-site fire prior to emergency fire fighting crews arriving on the property?
5. Will Field & Pond owners be trained to use the water source?

Road 29 is the deepest entry-point into the Berryessa Range. Because of this, Cal/Fire and other emergency crews use the property at the western end of Road 29 as a fire staging area. Large tractors with over-sized bulldozers and other fire fighting equipment must be able to get up the road unimpeded. Field and Pond guest vehicles existing the property will impede the ability of fire crews to reach the staging area which presents a serious threat to public health and safety.

- o How will this concern be mitigated?

There are fire road access conditions and requirements. CCR, Title 19, Division 1, §3.05(a) Fire Department Access and Egress. (Roads) states that required access roads from every building to a public street shall be all-weather hard-surfaced (suitable for use by fire apparatus) right-of-way not less than 20 feet in width. Such right-of-way shall be unobstructed and maintained only as access to the public street.

- §503.2.1 Dimensions. Fire apparatus access roads shall have an unobstructed width of not less than 20 feet (6096 mm), exclusive of shoulders, except for approved security gates in accordance with Section 503.6, and an unobstructed vertical clearance of not less than 13 feet 6 inches (4115 mm).
- §503.4 Obstruction of fire apparatus access roads. Fire apparatus access roads shall not be obstructed in any manner, including the parking of vehicles. The minimum widths and clearances established in Section 503.2.1 shall be maintained at all times.
 - Is the county saying all of these requirements are optional?
 - How will these serious issues be mitigated?

The Initial Study says that event parking will be prohibited from parking along County Road 29 to ensure that fire access vehicles are not impeded.

1. If 100 or more vehicles are trying to exit Field and Pond at the same time that fire crews are trying to access the property, there will be problems. The road is narrow and in several places, two vehicles cannot pass at the same time.
2. To mitigate these concerns, there should be required turn out spaces where Field and Pond guest's vehicles can pull over to allow fire crews to pass. Currently there are no turn out spaces on the road.
3. How will the county mitigate the increased risk to public health and safety when emergency crews will be impeded from reaching the site and there are no turn outs for passing areas?

I notice there is no mention of the potential loss of life to animals that frequent the slough and surrounding area near Field and Pond should a wildfire burn through the property. Given that a wildlife easement runs through the Field and Pond property this issue cannot be overlooked.

I am also concerned with the proposals use of shuttles which will leave anywhere from 50-275 guests on the property with no way out should a wildfire occur, since the busses will return to their depot after dropping off passengers and only one 28 rider shuttle will be left on site throughout the event.

1. How will the serious threat to public health and safety be mitigated if guests are left on the Field and Pond property without any transportation out in case of a fire?

The issue of fire safety is of grave concern. We have seen several wildfires in this area over the past years, threatening people, livestock and property. These fires are particularly fast-moving and dangerous when the north wind blows. The example of last year's Valley Fire is a good illustration of this. The mitigation measures proposed by the County Planning Department do not take fully take into consideration the very real risk to public health and safety by wildfire.

Please address these fire concerns.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Candee Briggs



24909 County Road 29

Winters, Ca 95694 9014

April 7, 2016

Stephanie Cormier, Senior Planner
Yolo County Planning Commission
292 W. Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695

CC: Yolo County Planning Commission Chair, Leroy Bertolero
Planning Commission Members Amon Mueller, Jack Kasbergen, Darin Hall, Sydney Vergis,
Daniel Friedlander, Pat Reynolds

Re: Field and Pond Use Permit File # 2015-0018 Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

Dear Ms. Cormier,

I write to inform the Commission that the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") be prepared prior to approval of the above-referenced project. Proposed findings included in the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration are inadequate. In actuality, said project will have a substantial adverse effect on several of the Environmental Factors reviewed in the IS/MND. Clear substantial evidence exists, and has been presented, that the project will substantially effect the environment and that the proposed mitigations would not cure such an effect.

Our concerns are enumerated below, in the order they appear in the IS/MND.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project cannot be adequately reviewed and analyzed based on the project description included in the IS/MND. The description of number of events and attendees is purely conjecture throughout the document. Project applicants request 35 events for the first year, but want to bump up to 45 after that year terminates (however the project description later states that the Applicants seek to ~~host 2 events per week for 9 months out of the year. This then would be a total of 72 events.~~). Commission staff later on recommends 24 events. The number of attendees range from "approximately" 120-300. However, websites on which the project applicants advertise (and for which they provided the information to the site) state that they can accommodate up to 1,000 attendees per event. It is not stated and it is never clear as to which numbers were used to analyze this project.

Moreover, a true analysis of the project's effects on the environment cannot be had since the County does not appear to count "unpaid" events in the overall event total. Therefore, the Applicants will have their 24, 35, 45 or 72 events but will also have an unlimited amount of "unpaid" events. Considering that the unpaid events could be held 2 -3 times a day each and every

day of the year, a failure to account for this in the IS/MND dooms the Study to fail in all its findings. An accurate picture of the project's scope and effects cannot be documented. To mitigate this the County should require that all events, whether paid or unpaid, be counted to the project's total number of allowed events.

Further, Applicants supposition that they will implement an "urban youth program" is devoid of information as to how many of these events will be held and how many attendees will be accommodated, or even when they will be held. Moreover there is not any description of what the actual program entails. As such the IS/MND cannot properly analyze its effects on the environment.

All analysis must take into account the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational. As shown above, the IS/MND cannot claim to meet this test.

Despite these fatal errors in analysis which renders the IS/MND wholly ineffectual, I will continue to comment on the remaining Environmental Factors.

AESTHETICS

a). The project will have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. The IS/MND fails to take into account that the area west of the project is part of the Berryessa Snow Mountain National Monument. This vista will be substantially impeded by lighting from outdoor events. It does not appear that the Commission in any way consulted with the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management to receive any concerns the Federal Government might have with locating an Event Center and B&B at the base of the monument. The monument is home to Bald Eagles, Golden Eagles, Black Bears, Mountain Lions, Black Tailed Deer, the Northern Spotted Owl and many rare plants. Bringing what will amount to tens of thousands of people to the base of the monument will substantially effect viewing of these species.

c). The project will substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and surroundings. The IS/MND appears to have measured this by the fact that the project purports to be a high-end, luxury experience and then concludes that there will not be a significant impact because the project relies on the area's "rustic beauty." However, the baseline measurement should be taken from the character and quality of the site as it exists before any events are held or a B&B is opened. The site is extremely rural, situated almost at the terminus of a dead-end road. The area is sparsely populated and rarely visited. Allowing thousands of people to the area substantially changes and degrades the existing visual character and quality of the site. On top of just the sheer volume of attendees, events will degrade the existing visual character with lighting and noise from party-goers, DJ's and conference attendees and all with their attendant vehicles.

d). The proposal will create new sources of substantial light to the area. It cannot be evaluated from the IS/MND if the condition of approval will actually mitigate the light pollution and light glare that will emanate from the project. There is no discussion of what lumen level will be

required and how that level will be measured. Furthermore, there is no condition that the project applicant be required to utilize a lighting expert to design an appropriate "dark-sky" lighting plan. Without that, the IS/MND is ineffective.

For the reasons stated above, the IS/MND is flawed, the mitigations are ineffective and an EIR is necessary.

AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

b). Zoning

The first paragraph in this section appears to find that the project is in accord with relevant zoning codes. Rather, the project conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use. To begin with, the project does not meet the County's own purpose stated in Sec. 8-2.301 stating "the Agricultural zones are to provide for land uses that support or enhance agriculture as the predominant land use in the unincorporated area of the County." The project does not support or enhance agriculture as the predominant land use since it will have severe negative effects on the surrounding agricultural operations (see below.) What's more, the project itself counts on events and a B&B as its predominant use. Agriculture at the site currently is nonexistent, and as described in the IS/MND, will be purely incidental to the project. Moreover, Sec 8-2.303 c) states that the Agricultural Use type of Agricultural Commercial "includes uses incidental to the agricultural or horticultural operations that preserve the rural lifestyle and stimulate the agricultural economy." The project cannot purport to meet this definition as the commercial use is actually the primary use. A large event center and large B&B does not preserve the "rural lifestyle" but rather impairs it, as has been testified to in hearings and letters to the Commission. The project does not stimulate the agricultural economy as no agriculture exists on the site and it will retard ongoing agricultural operations of the surrounding farms and ranches. Moreover, if agriculture was truly the aim of this project the property would have retained its Williamson Act contract. Further, the project does not meet the County's own definition of Agritourism as it is not a working farm or ranch, nor was it a working farm or ranch at the time of application. It is irrelevant that applicants "intend" or "hope" to restore agriculture to the site. Amorphous hopes cannot be the basis for finding that the project meets the zoning code definitions. As such the project is incompatible with the County's zoning codes. This cannot be mitigated and therefore a significant impact is present.

To show the negative and substantial impacts of the Project on current nearby working farms what follows is a partial synopsis of the farm related operations that will be affected by the Project's proposed increase in traffic onto Road 29. My fields along Road 29 are all certified organic. Work continues year round, even in the winter as the fields are repeatedly tilled whenever weather permits in order to keep weeds under control. This requires various tractors and other farm equipment to enter and exit from my sole entrance onto Road 29. Starting approximately February 15 field work begins at a vastly accelerated pace. There are harrows, chisels, allowsays, mulchers, bed shapers, planting tractors, workers with propane tanks burning weeds and various other operations too numerous to mention in and out of the entry point from sun-up to sun-down. Planting season follows immediately and requires approximately 20 truck loads of transplants

coming in and out of the exit. There are trucks moving transplants field to field. Depending on which field is being planted, there can be hundreds of water truck trips in and out of the same exit. There are 5 planter tractors with 10 people per machine. There are approximately 100 total workers involved who also enter and exit the same point daily during this time. Following planting, fields are watered, cultivated, vine-trained etc. with the accompanying necessary workers. There is a hoeing crew of approximately 50 people working every day in these organic fields. Because these fields are organic the sprays used are very ineffective so aerial spraying is sometimes done repeatedly during this time. Even though the sprays are considered organic many have the same restrictions as conventional sprays with respect to human contact.

From approximately July 1 to October 15, harvest takes place. There are two harvesters each running 24 hours a day with approximately 8 people working on each machine. There are 2 tractors per each harvester pulling the large tomato tubs being filled. From my fields on Road 29 there are approximately 1,400 tomato trucks carrying the filled loads out and the empty re-fills back from the cannery. There are also up to 100 trips moving empty trailers from field to field. Sometimes in a 24 hour period there might be 150 tomato loads in and out, sometimes only 10. However, I have no control over the amount of loads being sent to the cannery. The amount is set at the sole discretion of the canner. They are often changed hour to hour.

Following harvest, the organic fertilizer must be delivered and applied. There are up to 400 large semi-truck trips in and out of the entry point, delivering thousands of tons of fertilizer, working 24 hours a day. This work occurs in September and October. Next, tillage work begins for the following year. This is when the large tractors start working pulling discs, chisels, land planes etc. They are then followed by the tractors shaping the beds for next year.

As shown above, the pace of running my tomato operation is frenetic from February through November. It is not possible to procrastinate or reschedule work for another day. There is a constant peril of weather changes and pest threats. During harvest there is the continual 24 hour demand of canners to deliver loads when and from where they want them. As I testified before the Supervisors, when I asked canners' for relief from harvesting on Project event days I was bluntly denied that accommodation. The canner clearly stated that after 30 years of tomato growing I should be well aware of how tomato harvest works on a 24 hour schedule, and that if I cannot meet that schedule my contract would be terminated. Furthermore, the canner voiced that the trucking companies hauling my fruit had similar concerns with event center traffic on an already narrow and dead-end road.

All the above moving of equipment, people, and commodities would be substantially and negatively affected by the increased traffic from the Project's event center. Spraying of our fields will be negatively impacted. We will no longer be able to carry on the customary and well-established farming practices that my business has operated under for decades. Event center traffic will impede and prevent the movement of our tractors, harvesters and people as we have historically done. Concerns from canners and truckers regarding timely fruit delivery threatens the continuation of my operation. Losing these contracts would be devastating to my business and the hard-working employees who would have to be let go should I lose my tomato contracts. Because

of all stated above, the Project would have a clear and negative impact on my agricultural operation.

Project applicants knowingly chose to come to an area with entrenched farming practices and a well-established Right-to-Farm ordinance. Any mitigation must accommodate these deep rooted farming practices. Because these established farm practices are time, weather and pest sensitive, with no real ability to plan out months in advance whether they will occur, the only fair and effective mitigation is to require the project to accommodate these well-established and customary farming practices. The mitigations set out in the IS/MND approach the problem from the opposite angle as it requires the established businesses in the area to change in order to accommodate the Project.

Because of the significant negative effects on agricultural operations the Conditions of Approval and the Mitigation Measure AG-2 and AG-3 are completely ineffectual. The Condition of Approval found on page 17 of the IS/MND requires the project to notify attendees of the rural character of the area. To be effective this requirement must include a compulsory prerequisite that Project operators carry a \$5 million single incident or \$10 million umbrella policy to cover any loss of life, injuries or crop loss and to hold harmless the farming operations in the area from any suit arising from one of their events. Moreover, all attendees must sign a waiver of liability holding the farms and ranches in the area harmless.

The Condition of Approval then requires that the project notify those living along County Road 29 of pending scheduled events so that the project will "coordinate with adjacent agricultural operators when scheduling events." No real coordination occurs in this mitigation. Rather, it makes it incumbent on the farmers and ranchers in the area to coordinate their schedules to that of the Project. The Project books events months in advance, with weddings often booked more than a year in advance. The Project is to tell neighbors of an event happening in 3 weeks and what then? Farming practices cannot be scheduled in that way. In practice, just how is that a mitigation of the Project's events effects on the farming operations? A true mitigation would require that the project's booking of events must fit into the long established practices of the area and would therefore require events to be booked in the months when there are not intensive farming operations occurring.

Mitigation Measure AG-2 is insufficient to cure the significant impact the project will have on agricultural operations in the area. This Measure purports to limit events to 24. The Measure does not take into account the unlimited un-paid events that the project may hold. There is no mention of limits on the number attendees that might frequent such events. As such, the analysis is incomplete and any mitigation is useless. Applying just the allowed 24 events (20 at 150 attendees and 4 at 300 attendees) will increase the population of the area by approximately 4,200 people. That is approximately 140 times the number of persons currently living on County Road 29. The sheer volume of attendees will have the effect of impeding significantly the surrounding farming operations.

The Mitigation also sets out a requirement that shuttles be used for events that exceed 150 attendees. Use of shuttles is ineffective as the Project cannot legally force an attendee to take a

shuttle. What's more there is no requirement that the bridal party and vendors arrive in a shuttle. There are no limits on the number of vehicles that this group would be made up of, ostensibly they could be 5, 50 or 100. You could easily circumvent this mitigation simply by designating all guests as "the wedding party." What's more, shuttle buses will strand event guests at the site should an emergency occur. If a guest falls ill or has to leave due to an emergency at home, how will they be able to do so?

e). Changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

Mitigation Measure AG-3 claims to mitigate potential conflicts with agricultural activities such as the spraying of restricted or non-restricted materials by enforcing a 500 foot buffer from adjacent agricultural operations only for newly constructed buildings. The 500 foot barrier is ineffective and meaningless. The IS/MND at page 20 already states that the project's three residences, barns, two-acre pond, and other outbuildings are within 300 feet or closer to the nearest actively farmed parcel. Additionally, the project's new parking area is within approximately 50 feet of the orchard across the street. All the event activity will be in and around these facilities therefore the 500 foot border is rendered moot. What's more the mitigation is once again placed squarely in the lap of the farmer. He is immediately negatively impacted as he will be unable to continue his farming operation as it has been done for decades.

The Condition of Approval on page 21 requiring that foliage screening or fencing be provided where guests are likely to congregate to ensure attendees are not affected by spray or drift is also meaningless. A foliage barrier that would prevent sprays from penetrating into, through, around or over a barrier is ignores the very purpose of a spraying operation performed by either airplanes, helicopters or high-speed orchard sprayers. Sprays are meant to penetrate through, around and over the entire canopy of foliage. Materials will not stop at contact with the first leaf. What's more a fence could not be built adequately high enough to mitigate the negative effects on surrounding agricultural operations.

For the reasons stated above, the IS/MND is flawed, mitigations are ineffective and an EIR is necessary.

AIR QUALITY

The IS/MND merely guesses at how many vehicle trips per year the project would create with respect to air quality as it has absolutely no way of knowing how many such trips will be made. It fails to state how many truck deliveries are expected during a week. Moreover, what is disclosed appears to contradict what is stated on page 19 of the IS/MND. On page 19 the IS/MND states that for all events no more than 75 round trip vehicle trips will be permitted. However on page 25 of the IS/MND it states that not more that 100 round trip vehicle trips are allowed. It is unclear then what criteria is being used to analyze this project. Further, because non paid events are not accounted for there is no way for this project to be adequately reviewed and analyzed under CEQA.

Fatally, there is also no mention of how many tons per year of emissions the project is expected to emit. The analysis, such as it is, does not identify sensitive receptors but only states that there are relatively few. However, it is not the number of sensitive receptors that matters. It is whether they exist at all. Further, the Study does not appear to account for the farm workers who work daily in the area. Also, with respect to the construction aspects of the project, there is no mention as to the length of the construction period.

Moreover, the project has the ability to create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. There is no discussion as to the effects of a large amount of trash generated from an event center and B&B nor is there any discussion of the attendant fumes created by port-a-potties. It is not clear how the use of "licensed food vendors, which may include outdoor barbecue" will alleviate smells from trash and outdoor bathrooms.

For the reasons stated above, the IS/MND is incomplete, and an EIR is necessary.

Biological Resources

The project plans a parking area to accommodate 75 vehicles. This area, from the site plan map included in the IS/MND, is within close proximity to Chickahominy slough and Salt Creek. The IS/MND does not address nor analyze the project effects from this parking area on the slough or creek. The pollutants from the vehicles parked in the lot will run off into the slough and creek, thus having a substantial effect on those riparian habitats. Moreover, the County prohibits new construction or development within 100 feet of these waterways yet the IS/MND fails to mention whether the parking lot is outside of this prescriptive area.

Additionally, the IS/MND conducts no analysis as to whether the project will substantially interfere with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with the established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. The IS/MND purports that because the majority of the property is under a wildlife easement there cannot be an effect on these wildlife species. Not even asked or analyzed is whether the ongoing operations of a large event center and B&B will have such an effect. The IS/MND's finding of less than significant impact is conclusory and a more detailed analysis is warranted.

For the reasons stated above, the IS/MND is incomplete and an EIR is necessary.

Geology and Soils

The IS/MND with respect to onsite septic systems states that the project will be conditioned to require a site map and site evaluation review and approval prior to project implementation to ensure all proposed and/or use of existing onsite wastewater disposal systems can adequately serve the project. This is not analysis and in order for a proper analysis under CEQA to be conducted information regarding whether the project's soil can handle the current or proposed septic system

must be disclosed. A failure of a septic system can taint the groundwater supply.

For the reasons stated above, the IS/MND is incomplete and an EIR is necessary.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions/Climate Change

The IS/MND finds that the project will have a less than significant impact on generating greenhouse gas emissions either directly or indirectly. This is not supported by the facts presented. Because the County cannot know with any conviction the number of events that will be occurring at the project site it cannot adequately deduce what the emissions from the project will be. In fact, this section is completely lacking in any calculations of what the emission level of the project would be, even for the allowed events, other than conclusory statements. The County is required under CEQA to disclose all relevant facts about the project. Here it has not done so.

Under the topic addressing with increased wildfire dangers, the IS/MND states that the project is in an area of "moderate fire danger." Later, however, the IS/MND states that the project is located in a Fire Hazard Severity Zone (page 43 IS/MND.) It is unclear how this topic was then analyzed and the contradiction makes it difficult for informed public input on this matter.

For the reasons stated above, the IS/MND is incomplete and an EIR is necessary.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

As stated previously, notification regarding spraying is not an adequate mitigation and actually flips the mitigation burden onto the farmer or rancher. Because of this, the Mitigation Measure from Agricultural Resources and referenced here is not effective.

Relating to the project's impact of an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, the IS/MND concludes that there will be no affect. It is not clear on what this is based. It may be so but without any reference as to what this conclusion was based upon it is impossible to tell and therefore is incomplete.

The IS/MND makes note of residents concern for increased traffic incidences in the area due to the project's placement. ~~County Road 29 is a dead-end roadway. It is narrow with some stretches only 14 feet wide. There are several 90 degree turns. It is unlit and there are two severe dips in the road, one where your vision is obstructed as to oncoming traffic. The road is already used by heavy farm equipment year round. Bringing thousands of people each year who are unfamiliar with the road's conditions results in a severe safety hazard to attendees, residents and workers of County Road 29.~~

Besides the design flaws of the access road to the Project there is also a large, above-ground PGE/SMUD gas pipeline transmission station directly abutting Road 29. This facility is surrounded with a simple chain-link fence and with no other guard barriers. Allowing hundreds of drivers, many of whom may have been drinking alcohol, to navigate the danger of the above-ground

pipeline, is irresponsible at best. Project applicants should be required to bear the costs of rendering the pipeline facility safe, should the danger be found to be mitigable.

The proposed Mitigation Measure does nothing to actually mitigate the hazards. Notification of the roads conditions merely informs attendees that a problem exists; it does nothing to cure or lessen the real problem. Moreover there is nothing in the Mitigation Measure as to specifics of the notification. Does it merely need to state that these are country roads, there is farm equipment, there is no lighting and you might be slowed down a bit? Those are the only warnings mentioned in the IS/MND. How will attendees be notified? What font size is required? Can it be in one point font size at the bottom of an invite or contract? Will signage stating the roads conditions be posted on the project property? None of this, and other necessary information, is specified in the IS/MND. This renders the mitigation ineffectual. If the County decides to proceed with this notification requirement then the County should draft the notification and circulate it to all interested parties. The IS/MND is ineffectual until this is completed.

This section next addresses wildfire danger. The IS/MND, however, focuses mainly on fires in buildings and onsite and states the Project's requirement to comply with Fire Code safety requirements such as sprinklers (though it is not stated whether the project actually meets the Code's parameters for requiring said sprinklers) and onsite water storage to mitigate the threat to people or structures of wildfire. The threat of wildfire in the project area is severe according to the IS/MND. Defensible space, sprinklers in buildings, water storage can all be effective in combatting fire but the IS/MND fails to show how these will lessen exposure to wildfire. What's more the IS/MND fails to account for the very real reactions of attendees should they be confronted with a raging wildfire sweeping down the hill toward them. Most attendees' first reaction will be to jump in their vehicles and leave. This will impede the fire and rescue vehicles attempting to arrive at the project site. Moreover, should shuttles be required, those attendees are now stranded in place. Both situations carry significant negative impacts and neither are addressed or analyzed in the IS/MND and they are therefore not mitigated by the Conditions of Approval laid out in this section.

For the reasons stated above, the IS/MND is incomplete, the mitigations are ineffective and an EIR is necessary.

Hydrology

The project will violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The current parking area is adjacent to Chickahominy Slough and pollutants from vehicles parked in the lot will runoff into the Slough and/or contaminate ground water. This parking issue is not addressed in the IS/MND.

The project will deplete groundwater supplies and interfere with groundwater recharge. The project's water use estimate for the projected crops alone is grossly underestimated. Project applicants state, according to the IS/MND (page 45,) that their planned 50 acres of nut tree and vegetable crops, together with the needs of the event center and B&B will use approximately

179,000 gallons of water annually, with only 30,000 gallons allocated for the crops and trees. This claim is preposterous and wholly without merit. It testifies to the applicants lack of even a basic knowledge of farming requirements, as accurate water usage could have been found with a quick online search. A crude rule of thumb is that trees or row crops require roughly 3 to 3.5 acre feet per acre of irrigation water annually to produce a crop. Using this yardstick the Project's water requirements for the crops alone would be closer to 49,000,000 - 57,000,000 gallons of water. This is without counting the massive amounts of waster needed to keeping the project's lake filled or to support the needs of the large event center and a B&B and swimming pool.

For the reasons stated above, the IS/MND is incomplete and an EIR is necessary.

Land Use and Planning

The project conflicts with an applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project. The project does not meet the County's definition of agritourism and the IS/MND states this fact. This fatal defect is unable to be mitigated. The definition grants the code's benefits on those who meet the definition. The project does not and therefore cannot claim the rights under the codes sections that were drafted to foster agritourism in the County.

Troublingly, the IS/MND is replete with references to what the project "intends", "hopes" or "estimates". The IS/MND must be based in reality, on the facts as they occur today. It cannot be based on guestimates and desires. It is well and good that the project applicants intend to start up a farming operation but until that operation is up and running it is merely conjecture (though it is telling that they have expended considerable amounts of time and money to establish their event center and chose to put off the farming operations.)

For these same reasons, the project is not consistent with the General Plan.

For the reasons stated above, the IS/MND is incomplete and an EIR is necessary.

Noise

The IS/MND is bereft of any sound study to establish a baseline noise level at the project and surrounding areas. ~~As such any analysis is purely conjectural.~~ The IS/MND states that amplified music will be included at events and then goes on to offer mitigation of keeping outdoor noise levels to 60dB. It fails to state who will be responsible for monitoring this thus rendering the mitigation ineffective. To ensure that amplified music does not interfere with the tranquil nature of the surrounding area such music should be limited to occurring only in buildings that have undergone noise reduction measures from an acoustics specialist. Moreover, any music should terminate at 9:00 p.m.. Operational hours for all event activities should terminate at 10:00 p.m., with all attendees and vendors to be gone from the premises by that time in order to ensure that neighbors are not annoyed by noise created by event attendees leaving the area.

For the reasons stated above, the IS/MND is incomplete and an EIR is necessary.

Population and Housing

The project will induce substantial population growth in the area. This growth, while temporary with each event, is exponentially larger than the population of the area. The matter does not hinge on whether that growth is permanent or temporary. The topic matter is silent as to temporariness and so should be read to require it be analyzed in this document. Currently approximately 35 people reside in the project area of County Road 29. Using the 24 recommended allowed events in the IS/MND, during the months of March through November 4,200 more persons will come to the area. That is 140 times the amount of persons residing in the area. This amount does not include the people who will participate in the project's urban youth program (left unspecified) or the potentially thousands of people who will attend unpaid events at the project site. This means the project will be importing a population bigger than the current size of Winters or Esparto onto the area of County Road 29. These impacts need to be addressed and mitigated if they are able.

For the reasons stated above, the IS/MND is incomplete and an EIR is necessary.

Transportation/Traffic

The IS/MND transportation analysis is invalid because it is based on ephemeral assumptions. The project will substantially increase hazards due to the design features of County Road 29 and incompatible uses by neighboring farmers and ranchers.

County Road 29 is a dead-end roadway. It is narrow with some stretches only 14 feet wide. There are several 90 degree turns. It is unlit and there are two severe dips in the road, one where vision is obstructed as to oncoming traffic. The road is already used by heavy farm equipment year round. The County has not measured the road for level of service yet considers sending thousands of new drivers down the road every year. Based on the IS/MND Condition of Approval allowing 24 events over a 9 month period and parking space for 75 vehicles that is potentially 1,800 additional vehicle trips. Furthermore, the above numbers cannot be relied upon as the County has not limited the vehicle trips by event center attendees and vendors because unpaid events and urban youth program events are not tallied in the estimate. Again, the IS/MND then contradicts itself by claiming to allow 100 vehicle trips per event where earlier it claimed to limit trips to 75 plus 10 "vendor" vehicle trips. It is not clear which number is the basis for the IS/MND calculations.

The County's mitigation measures are wholly ineffective and cannot, using a modicum of common sense, be believed to reduce the substantial impact thousands of vehicle trips will have on County Road 29. Notification as to the roads conditions do not reduce the hazards. It simply notifies potential victims that the County is aware that the road is dangerous. It does nothing to cure the hazards. Moreover, requiring a "parking attendant or security guard" at the site similarly does nothing to address the road's dangerous conditions. It is unclear how a parking attendant in any way lessens the dangers of County Road 29. Moreover a security guard at the event center may control fighting or other similar nuisances that will arise but it will in no way mitigate the roads dangers.

For the reasons stated above the project will also substantially increase hazards due to a design feature of County Road 29. The Mitigation Measure of requiring signage is ineffectual to address the roads hazards, especially when leaving in darkness on an unlit road where wildlife frequently crosses. The IS/MND does not state where the signage is to be placed or what it is to say. Again, merely advising that hazards exist in no way mitigates the actual hazard.

The project would also result in inadequate emergency response. The condition of County Road 29, it's width and highly crowned surface already impedes emergency access. Permitting thousands of vehicles with their attendant passengers, all trying to flee a wildfire or house fire at the same time would substantially impair arrival of oncoming emergency vehicles. County Road 29 in several places is not wide enough to allow two vehicles to pass each other and stay on the roadway. Oncoming emergency response vehicles will be hindered by the projects fleeing attendees.

For the reasons stated above, the IS/MND is incomplete and an EIR is necessary.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Joe Rominger", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Joseph Rominger

Ms. Cormier:

April 6, 2016

I oppose the Field and Pond Bed and Breakfast and large event center proposed for County Road 29 north of Winters.

Winters is a small town surrounded by working family farms ... some new and some who have farmed here for generations. I have lived in Winters all my life, and I know that without the surrounding farmland, it wouldn't be the special small town that it is. Agriculture is really the heart of Winters and Yolo County.

Yolo County has benefited greatly from our farming operations, all of which are family owned and operated. This new event center, Field and Pond, negatively impacts those family farms which have been farming around Road 29 for generations.

Please do not permit Field and Pond to open a Bed and Breakfast and large event center in the middle of such rich, productive farmland. It's just a bad idea.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bill O'Neil

April 7, 2016

Stephanie Cormier, Senior Planner

Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department

292 W. Beamer Street

Woodland, CA 95695

Dear Ms. Cormier:

I am very concerned with the negative impact that the proposed Field and Pond project will have on local farmers, farming families and farmland. (Initial Study Zone File #2015-0018)

I am part of the fifth generation of family members who has worked on our family farm. Starting at a young age, I hoed weeds in the tomato fields and later worked in the farm office helping with accounting. Throughout my life, it has been clear to me that farming is a demanding business with many challenges: unpredictable weather, drought, rigorous county, state and federal regulations, Cal/OSHA worker safety concerns and long hours every day of the year. I've watched my father and my uncles work the land with pride and a true sense of stewardship. I have watched my mother keep our employees safe on the job and comply with the myriad of government regulations facing farmers. I have watched my grandparents dedicate their lives to the preservation of farming and farmland.

Having grown up with a beautiful vista of our fields leading up to the Berryessa mountains, I am saddened to think that our farms, our way of life, and our farmland is under threat from commercialization and urbanization. Large event centers, such as Field and Pond, are better suited for locations where the preservation of agricultural lands and surrounding agricultural operations are not at risk.

The location of Field and Pond, as well as their business plan to host multiple non-ag-related events per month, is not conducive to the agriculture that surrounds their property. I am concerned about the future of our family's farm and my generation's ability to continue farming because of the following negative impacts that Field and Pond would have on our farming operation:

1. Those of us who grew up here understand the realities of farming: large equipment, noise, dust, aerial spraying, ground spraying and around-the-clock harvest operations. Party goers and Bed and Breakfast guests often do not understand or appreciate the realities of farming. I am concerned that we will not be able to spray either non-restricted or restricted materials needed to protect our crops because of the liabilities involved. Even though we have a Right to Farm Ordinance, people unfamiliar with the realities of agriculture will complain about noise, dust and spraying. The liabilities become too great for us to do our work. I'm very concerned that the long-term impact will be that we will either go out of business or have to sell out because farming does not mix with parties and events. I want to see the 6th, 7th and 8th generation of Romingers farming this same land!
2. I am also concerned that if our farming operation had to shut down because of Field and Pond, our employees would be out of work. I worked side by side in the field with several of our employees. I practiced my Spanish and got to know them. Many of them had young families.

Many of the employees depend on their livelihood to help put their children through college, many of whom I attended school with from kindergarten through high school. If we had to quit farming, all of those families and their children would be hurt, not to mention the chance to allow many first generation children to attend college. They work so hard. They don't deserve that.

3. I'm also concerned with safety on Road 29. Growing up in the country surrounded by numerous working farms, I learned how to share the road safely with harvesters, gravel trucks, tomato machinery, deer and loose cattle. When my mother taught me to drive, she taught me to run off the side of the road onto the gravel shoulder and not over correct, thus rolling the car. I learned that the large double-trailer tomato trucks could not move over quickly or slow down quickly. My mother taught me how to get off the pavement and go onto the gravel shoulder in the case that a large truck came uncontrollably into my lane. She taught me to do that safely. Field and Pond guests will likely be unfamiliar with driving conditions and hazards on these narrow, uneven country roads. They certainly won't realize that tomato trucks cannot quickly overcorrect. Having party guests drive up and down Road 29 is inviting accidents and fatalities. I already witnessed the accident where our neighbor died when he launched his car into one of our fields. I don't want to see those bad memories replayed for anyone. Road 29 is just not suitable for a large event center like Field and Pond.

I grew up watching my family work long hours on the farm, day in and day out. So long, that my family has a rule – before you decide to work on the family farm in the long-term, you have to try something else for at least a year. Farming is a tough, demanding and rarely a lucrative business. The desire to care for the land and cultivate food for others has to come from a very, very deep place. What do you want Yolo County to look like in 50 years? 100 years? 150 years? Protecting farmers and farmland is a long-term strategy to sustain healthy communities for the generations to come. Our farm has operated for 150 years. I don't know how many event centers will last 150 years, but with your support I am convinced our farm could last another 150+ years.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Katherine Rominger

23756 County Road 89

Winters, CA 95694

Dear Mrs. Cormier:

April 6, 2016

We are opposed to the Field and Pond proposed project on County Road 29 in Winters.

Winters has always been a farming town and we want it to stay that way. These large event centers, like Field and Pond, develop our farmland into commercial businesses that have no place on agricultural land.

We do not need another event center in Winters. We already have Park Winters, which hardly anyone in Winters can even afford anyway. More event centers bring more traffic, noise and congestion. And these event centers make it difficult for the farmers who have to farm around them to stay in business. Why would we compromise farmers who have been farming these fields for generations for another event center which could be built anywhere?

Allowing another large event center into rural, western Yolo County is a bad idea for Winters, for farmers and for keeping our farmlands in farming. We want to stay the friendly small town that we have always been, not become a hub for tourism!

Sincerely,

Jaci Guerrero & Steve Roehrs

Stephanie Cormier
Yolo County Planning Department
292 W. Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695

Dear Ms. Cormier,

We are writing this comment letter regarding the Field and Pond Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration. We would like to express our opposition to the proposed development based on 1) inappropriate use of the Ag Tourism classification for Agricultural Zoning, 2) the large size of the development and 3) the potential impact on neighboring farm operations.

My wife and I live outside the city limits of Winters, just one mile west from the town center. We farm 130+ acres of prunes and olives, our farm has been planted with orchards since 1960. I have actively been involved in the Yolo Land Trust and my family for several generations has been committed to agricultural preservation and conservation.

The agritourism business, is defined as existing farmers and ranchers who are **supplementing** their income with tourism activities. The main income of the agricultural property should come from the sale of agricultural products produced on the land. The applicants have proposed a large bed and breakfast as well as an event center. This enterprise will be the main source of income on the property. While the project will retain 60+ acres as agricultural land, the income from this acreage will be minimal by comparison to the event center. Clearly this agritourism project has it backwards and the Use Permit should not be issued. We encourage the county to hold firm to its original intent, where agritourism is permissible only when it is a supplemental income generator.

The Field and Pond, with 35 events per year and a large bed and breakfast is a significant non-ag use in an agricultural setting. The number of people who will be brought to the site, even by shuttle, will increase pressure on limited resources. In a region threatened by frequent wildfires and little water perhaps this site is not the best location. It is a beautiful part of the county but, like other national treasures, perhaps it is this way because of land use limitations. We encourage the county to consider not only increased traffic issues but also the

impact to the land based on increased water usage, waste treatment, soil compaction, drainage and runoff water quality, noise, and operational supports needed to conduct a business where people are contained to a defined area.

The Field and Pond is located close to large agricultural operations. We sympathize with farmers who will be impacted by agritourism to such an extent that their farming operation may be compromised. Our farm location is relatively close to Winters. Our road, County Road 87D remains rural, however, we are constantly aware of our proximity to a larger population and the fact that it could adversely affect our right to farm. Noise, harvesting 24 hours a day, dust, heavy equipment use, pest control, and toxic sprays are often part of farming operations. The adjoining land to the Field and Pond is agricultural with all the aforementioned characteristics. The Field and Pond, marketing itself as a destination resort, seems incompatible with the surrounding businesses.

We believe this project would set a dangerous precedent and we encourage the county to continue their long standing support of agriculture by rejecting this project as proposed.

Peter and Deborah Hunter
28472 County Road 87D
Winters, CA
(530)305-1620

Re: Proposed Field & Pond Event Center; From Richard E. Rominger 4/7/16

Zoning, and the regulations and limitations that go along with it, is for the purpose of assuring compatibility of adjacent and nearby land uses. For example, hog farms are not permitted in cities. So why should large event centers be permitted in agricultural areas?

In order to co-exist, the surrounding farms have to alter their farming practices for the benefit of the event center. Farming operations are governed by crop cycles, weather, pest and disease infestations, and sometimes are not easily altered. Yet event centers schedule events weeks or months in advance and expect the surrounding farmers to not stir up dust, spray crops, or generate noise from tractors, trucks, or harvesting equipment during their events.

Farmers and ranchers are willing to co-exist with a few event centers, but that means event centers should be few and far between. And they should be sited where they cause the least disruption for farmers and other neighbors, and also where they cause the fewest problems for traffic and emergency vehicles.

The proposed Field and Pond large event center does not fit these criteria. It is on a dead end road that is very narrow with poor shoulders, with curves, corners and dips that are not easy to navigate. It will certainly pose hazards for drivers unfamiliar with the road leaving an event at night after they have been consuming alcohol. They will also be a hazard for the neighbors along the road. There is only one way to and from the proposed event center, approximately three miles west of Road 89.

In the event of a fire in the adjacent dry hills during a large event, it will be almost impossible for fire trucks and other emergency vehicles to access the area if hundreds of cars are trying to flee the area. The Field and Pond developers have proposed shuttles to bring people to events. Will they have enough shuttles standing by at the event to evacuate all attendees? And how will they force all attendees to use the shuttles to come to the event?

Park Winters is an example of siting that is accessible from three directions on good straight roads, and only one mile from a major county road. They have also restored a very historic Victorian home.

Agri-tourism is defined as existing farms and ranches, which get most of their income from their agricultural operations, inviting members of the public to come to their farm or ranch for an educational/recreational experience, and supplement the income of the farm or ranch.

Bed and Breakfasts and large event centers are something else, and should be few and far between, if we are going to continue protecting agriculture in Yolo County.

From: Evelyne Rominger
To: Stephanie Cormier
Subject: Fwd: event centers
Date: Thursday, April 07, 2016 12:50:48 PM

On Apr 4, 2016, at 2:28 PM, Evelyne Rominger
<evrominger@mac.com> wrote:

Subject: event centers

The Rominger family farms near two event centersone, Park Winters, has shown some consideration of the farming and fire situation, roads and history of the area. The newer proposed event center, Field and Pond, is a different situation. It is on a narrow dead end road with corners and curves with only one way in and out. It is holding events and building structures without proper permits in an area with 24 hour tomato truck traffic several months every year plus livestock moving plus poor fire truck access. Because the county hasn't the resources to enforce its own policies, it leaves the neighbors of new projects to be the "bad guys" to protest potential problems. This makes for trouble in welcoming new neighbors.

Evelyne Rominger

1989 Witham Drive
Woodland, CA 95776
April 1, 2016

Ms . Stephanie Cormier, Senior Planner
Yolo County Planning & Public Works Department
292 W. Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695

Dear Ms. Cormier:

In response to your memo of March 8, 2016 on Field & Pond Bed & Breakfast & Special Events Facility, we have the following comments on the:

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration
Zone File # 2015-00
Field & Pond Bed & Breakfast and Special Event Facility Use
Permit March, 2016. 69pp

P3 Number 12. Other Project Assumptions, paragraph 1. “...Such uses shall be compatible with agriculture...” Compatibility is questionable, for the reasons noted by the local opponents, i.e., road use by farm trucks, farm machinery, ag spraying.

P4. Project Description, paragraph 4. “...property is allowed “by right,” to host up to one small event per month or up to eight small events per year...” Seems clear enough, but then numbers seem to grow like topsy.

P4. Project Description, paragraph 5. “In December, 2015, the applicant was advised to cease the hosting of events until such time as the Planning Commission can hear the matter...changes have been resolved.” Have things been resolved?

P5 Project Details, Events, paragraph 1. “...for a total of 35 events per year. [Which is it going to be, 35 as mentioned here, or 45 as also mentioned here, or 72 as calculated on page 6, paragraph 3] ... after the first year of operations...” For a narrow country road that in 2003 was recorded to average 149 daily trips (page 61, paragraph 2), this will generate a large number of additional trips, creating more traffic hazards.

P6 paragraph 3. “...requesting up to 35 events for the first year... increase... up to two events per week for nine months of the year [2 per week x 4 weeks per month x 9 months per year= 72 events per year] thereafter...” This is development creep, starting small and growing ever larger!

P11 Noise box should be checked! See p 53 comment below.

P15 II. Agriculture and Forest Resources, item b. Conflict with existing zoning for ag use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract? Box for Potentially Significant Impact should be checked—see following notes re page 18, paragraphs 3, 4, 5.

P16 Zoning, paragraph 2. Project is incompatible with ag use of area, presents traffic hazard on narrow, winding road.

Page 17, paragraph 3. Fresh Start, what is this? How many urban youth, what age groups, how long?

P18, paragraph 2. Yolo County Farm Bureau opposes since the project does not expand an existing or future agricultural business. Self evident!

P18, paragraphs 3, 4, 5. Project in conflict with Williamson Act, no B&B expansion to be allowed before Williamson Act non-renewal in 2024. "In addition, the expansion of the event center may be incompatible with agricultural uses of the property and surrounding Williamson Act lands." Bringing as many as 5,000 annual guests/attendees per year "...may at times, hinder or impair adjacent agricultural operations, particularly since harvest, planting and wedding seasons may overlap."

P19 , paragraph 2 "...applicants may seek to increase number of events after one year of project implementation..." To 35, 45, or 72? What is it going to be?

P20, paragraph 1. "...to ensure the uses are compatible with existing and adjacent ag operations..." "...will require one-year review by Planning Commission..." Good idea, should be annual review.

P20, paragraph 6. Yolo County Ag Commissioner's Office "...strongly recommends maintaining a 500-foot buffer from adjacent agricultural operations." This is minimal, because of spray drift, applicator errors, etc.

P30 , paragraph 4. Future construction of cottages and pool. More development creep!

P48 , Discussion, a. Physically divide an established community? Potentially Significant Impact box should be checked. Project already has divided an established rural community of current residents of Road 29 versus the F & P applicants.

P50, paragraph 1 "...coordination efforts with local residents, farmers, and ranchers." This is an extra , unwanted burden upon the locals.

P52, XII. Noise, box d. should be checked as Potentially Significant Impact. See P53 remarks, below.

P53, paragraphs 3 and 4. Amplified music noise level, especially up to 10pm or most likely even later, probably is going to be worse than estimated! Annoying sounds travel farther late at night in open country like that.

P57, XIV Public Services, b. Police protection? Potentially Significant Impact box should be checked. Traffic safety/police attention undoubtedly will be huge problem along that narrow winding road, especially late at night when tired party-going drivers from the events hit the road home!

P 58. Mitigation Measure PS-1. Commendable, but the applicants should be required to file regular monitoring reports with some legal group, i.e., sheriff or county.

P60, XVI, Transportation/Traffic Box, item d. Potentially Significant Impact box should be checked. Lots of increased traffic hazards, due to sharp curves or dangerous intersections or farm equipment, on this narrow country road.

Thank you for the opportunity to make comments.

Sincerely,

Neil and Peg Rutger



To: Yolo County Planning Commissioners
C/o Mr. Taro Echiburu, Director
County of Yolo Planning and Public Works Department
292 West Beamer St.
Woodland CA 95695
Taro.echiburu@yolocounty.org

Re: Conditional use permit application filed by Dahvie James & Philip Watt, dba Field & Pond, LLC, File ZF #2015-0018

Date: Feb. 5, 2016

We are farmers and owners of a large agricultural processing facility who live and work on County Road 29 and County Road 89, in the vicinity of the proposed Field & Pond bed-and-breakfast inn and large event center. We strongly oppose any permit that allows them to hold weddings and other non-agricultural events.

We are concerned about the safety of our family members and employees who must use this narrow country road to get to and from work and move farm equipment. The increase in traffic from cars and buses accessing the event center would negatively impact our ability to safely farm the orchards we have in the area.

The county should not approve this conditional use permit because this non-agricultural hospitality business is incompatible with the agricultural businesses that are the lifeblood of our economy. It could also create a dangerous precedent for farmers throughout our county and beyond.

We strongly urge you to deny this application.

Sincerely,

Dennis Mariani Sr.
Dennis Mariani Jr.
Mark Mariani

Ms. Stephanie Cormier
Yolo County Planning Department
292 W. Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695

29 March 2016

Dear Ms. Cormier:

RE: Proposed Field and Pond B&B/large event center on County Road 29

I am writing to express my deep concern and strong opposition to the proposed Field and Pond B&B / large event center on County Road 29 in Winters. Field and Pond's proposal, if accepted, sets a poor precedent for Yolo County. Developments – essentially commercial in nature – bring a very heavy risk of driving up the price of agricultural land and pushing out our remaining family farms.

Yolo County has an exemplary record through decades of effort to preserve one of this county's most precious resources: agricultural land. I am writing this as a concerned private citizen. However, it is relevant that I have the good fortune of having worked my entire career on food and agriculture globally, including the pressing challenges to vitality of California agriculture for future generations. Yolo county's extraordinary soils (which are world famous) combined with adequate irrigation water (at least for the time being), the skill of its experienced and superbly innovative and entrepreneurial farmers and ranchers, its research institutions, and access to buoyant market opportunities for its agricultural products makes our county an inspiration to others, with significance for the global food system.

Authentic agricultural landscapes are hard to preserve and easy to lose. As evidence for this assertion, one only needs to cross the causeway to Sacramento County, which has a poor record on agricultural land conservation. My family began farming in northeastern Sacramento County in 1897. While this is not as long as some of Yolo County's family farmers and ranchers, almost 120 years has been more than sufficient for the surrounding area to completely lose its agricultural character. My parents are essentially the last farm operation holding on in Orangevale. Indeed, much of this transformation happened since the 1960s. The "incremental" development dynamic ("we will just approve this one") risks a slippery slope. If Yolo County Supervisors want a glimpse of a plausible future arising from such a process, I suggest you visit Orangevale or Citrus Heights. Is that the future you want?

For these reasons, I believe the "Field and Pond project" should not be permitted to go forward at the proposed County Road 29 location.

Sincerely,



Thomas P. Tomich, PhD
1112 Bucknell Drive
Davis, CA 95616
thomastomich@comcast.net
530 574-2503

3/30/16

To Yolo County Planning, Public works and Environmental services.

From Doug Rominger

I live on Road 29 about 1 and 1/2 miles from where the Field and Pond facility would be. I'm against the event facility because.

① The county road is way to small and there is way more traffic already.

② It will make driving on the road dangerous.

③ The headlights from the cars at night shine right into my bedroom.

④ It will change the intire dynamic of the area.

Its going to be like The Indian casino up Capay Valley. but these people are not Indians.

Against event facility Doug Rominger

Stephanie Cormier
Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department
292 W. Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695

Dear Ms. Cormier:

March 29, 2016

Re) the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Field & Pond project:

As an employee of Rominger Brothers Farms, Inc., and as a County Road 29 resident, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Field & Pond bed-and-breakfast inn and large event center on County Road 29 in Winters, because it infringes on our Right-to-Farm and would set a dangerous precedent for Yolo County.

The proposed Field & Pond project is commercial development of agricultural lands, and there are several specific reasons why I urge the planning commissioners to deny this application for a conditional-use permit, as follows:

Regulatory Non-compliance:

Page 4, paragraph 4:

The applicants have displayed a disregard for existing county regulations. They held parties in the unpermitted main house and barn, and then were issued a cease-and-desist notice on 12-4-15 by the County Department of Planning and Public Works.

As noted on page 4, paragraph 4, “the applicant has hosted a number of non-profit events as well as a couple of for-profit events while the Use Permit application is pending...” The Initial Study failed to mention that the structures did not meet code and were not permitted at the time of those events; thus, when the applicants held those events in the unpermitted main house and barn, (which took place in June, August, October {2 events} and November {Thanksgiving holiday} 2015) they were putting their guests’ health and safety at risk. How can the county guarantee that the applicants will follow the rules designed to protect public health and safety?

Incompatible with adjoining agricultural operations:

Page 5, paragraph 5:

“The project consists of hosting seasonal events such as weddings and corporate retreats, as well as non-profit events, approximately nine months out of the year (March through November), up to four to five times per month, for a total of 35 events per year.” We plant, cultivate, irrigate and harvest our crops, and move our livestock up and down the road, year-round. This frequency of visitors and traffic will undeniably interfere with our farming and ranching operations; thus, this proposal is incompatible with adjoining agricultural operations and must be denied. Even worse, the applicant has proposed “to increase the number of annual events to at least 45 after the first year of operations.” And since there is no enforcement of county regulations, the applicants are likely to hold more paid events than their permit even allows—after all, they have already demonstrated their disregard for county rules (see above, Regulatory Non-compliance, Page 4, paragraph 4). And they can have unlimited non-profit events, which equates to unlimited traffic

and other impacts. At the 3-8-16 Board of Supervisors meeting, there were representatives from several agricultural companies whom we do business with, who outlined the problems that Field & Pond would cause. One of these agricultural officials was Ms. Ivory of Pacific Coast Producers, who testified that this proposed project could lead to reduced contracts for our tomatoes, which is one of our primary crops. The trucking business representative said they may not be willing to operate on our road due to increased liability from the event-center traffic, and the owner of the crop-dusting business may no longer serve our area due to the proximity of the event center to our fields and the potential for the guests to complain about spray drift. Field & Pond will put us at a competitive disadvantage. This potential loss of contracts also equates to the loss of jobs that we provide and taxes we pay to the county. This proposal will infringe on our Right-to-Farm. This urban encroachment is a potentially significant impact. How will the county mitigate the potential loss of our farming and ranching business?

Page 16, b) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?

“In accordance with the relevant zoning regulations the discretionary review of large event centers must consider any agricultural, residential, vehicle access, traffic, or other compatibility issues that may result with implementation of the project.”

On page 18, this study says that the state Department of Conservation submitted comments on Aug. 18, 2015, indicating that Field & Pond “could hinder or impair agricultural operations in the area.”

Also on page 18, the Yolo County Farm Bureau stated in a comment letter dated Aug. 31, 2015, they “have stated their opposition to the project since the proposal does not expand an existing or future agricultural business.”

This proposed large B&B and special-events center is simply incompatible with surrounding agricultural businesses and should not be approved on that basis alone.

Notification is ineffective:

Page 17, paragraph 3: “The applicant will be required to coordinate with adjacent agricultural operators when scheduling events that will attract multiple non-residents to the area.”

This notification will not reduce any impacts. Does the county expect us to modify our farming schedule to accommodate a wedding or corporate event? Due to the fact that farming practices are dictated by the weather, we often have very small windows of opportunity to conduct certain activities such as applying fungicides to our crops before it rains. We already farm the property surrounding another event center, so we know what to expect from the proposed Field & Pond event center. Is the county going to require that Field & Pond cancel/postpone their scheduled wedding or other event because we have to spray herbicides on our crops or move a large flock of sheep down the county road during that time? How will the county compensate the bride/groom/party host? How will the county compensate our farming operation for crop losses due to interference by Field & Pond activities?

Page 43, paragraph 3: “The location of the lodging and event facility would not affect any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. However, the project site is

located in a rural and remote area of the county near the terminus of County Road 29...Yolo County Public Works engineering staff has recommended that the applicant bring attention to potential Field & Pond clients the nature of the project site's rural setting by noting in contracts, informational brochures, project website and other project information locations, so that guests are made aware of the rural conditions in transit to and from the project site...This extensive notification process...will ensure that impacts will be less than significant."

A fire would be a very significant impact. This notification is not going to change the simple fact that more people increases the risk of fire dangers. How is the county going to guarantee that impacts will be less than significant?

Page 62, d, last paragraph: "In order to reduce the possibility of traffic hazards...this notification also requires the applicant to establish a process by which to notify the residents and farmers/ranchers who share use of County Road 29, from its end to CR 89, of each planned, for-profit event no less than three weeks in advance..."

This notification requirement does not include the unlimited number of non-profit events.

How will the county guarantee that the applicant will notify us about for-profit events at least three weeks in advance? Will the applicant need to send a copy of the notification to the county too?

And how will the county require the applicant to notify us of the unlimited number of non-profit events?

Agriculture, then agritourism:

This proposed project will conflict with applicable land-use policy relating to the county definition (as well as statewide definition) of agritourism. It is not a working farm or ranch, so it does not qualify as agritourism.

Page 49:

"The County's zoning code defines agri-tourism as an income-generating activity conducted on a working farm or ranch, or other agricultural operation or agricultural facility, for the enjoyment and education of visitors, guests or clients..."

"Although the proposed large B&B and large event facility are conditionally permitted agricultural commercial uses in the A-X Zone, through the issuance of a Use Permit, the initial phase of the project cannot be characterized as meeting the County's definition of agritourism, even though later phases may meet the definition. The project will be subject to mitigation and other requirements through a set of adopted Conditions of Approval to ensure the activities proposed by the applicant will not significantly affect ongoing agricultural operations in the area."

If the county issues a Use Permit even though it will negatively impact the adjoining agricultural operations, how will the county compensate the farmers and ranchers for the reduction or loss of contracts for crops and livestock; and the possibility of losing business?

Page 48 b: “Although this is contrary to a typical agri-tourism venture that enhances an existing agricultural operation, the project’s ultimate outcome, as proposed by the applicant, will include agricultural operations that source the hospitality and agri-educational features of the project...”

There is no guarantee that Field & Pond will incorporate agriculture. They stated their intentions to the neighbors at a meeting we had with them in May 2015, that they are not interested in farming or ranching; rather, their “vision” is to have a hospitality business.

The applicants planted some trees, but those trees will not be in production for several years, and in fact, there is no guarantee that those trees will produce any crops. Yet it is clear that the applicants intend to establish their hospitality business, despite the fact that there is unanimous opposition by more than 50 surrounding property owners. The county needs to base its decisions on reality, not projections.

How will the county guarantee that the applicants will establish a productive farming and ranching business?

Page 4, paragraph 6: “The 80-acre A-X zoned property is under a Williamson Act contract (Agreement No. 13-47) that was recently non-renewed in August, 2015.” In May 2015, the applicants told about 18 of us during a meeting on their property that they did not want to be farmers or ranchers; their vision is to have a hospitality business. Then in August, they filed for a non-renewal of the Williamson Act contract, thus stripping the property of its farmland-protection status in about nine years from now. Later on, when the applicants realized that under the definition of agritourism, their operation must first and foremost be a working farm or ranch, they began to claim that they want to be farmers and ranchers. This is a transparent and desperate attempt to try to qualify as a farmer or rancher so they can have an agritourism operation and thus an increase in allowable events. They still intend to non-renew their Williamson Act contract and cancel the property’s existing farmland-protection status.

Page 17, paragraph 5: “The business plan for Field & Pond relies on an initial investment to procure lodging and events that will in turn fund the proposed agricultural ventures that will sustain its services for lodging and land-based learning.”

According to the county agritourism code, agriculture must be first and foremost; then agritourism activities are allowed. This proposal has it backwards; it puts the cart before the horse. Also, does this mean that Field & Pond will at some point stop holding events because they will be financially sustainable as an ag operation? This language is unclear and approval should not be based on projections, but on reality.

Number of Events is Unclear:

Page 6, paragraph 3:

It is unclear exactly how many events there will be, as they range from 8 to 72 paid events per year in the application.

“The proposal to increase the events up to 35 events per year nearly triples the number of allowed events per year. However, *more realistically*, most events would be occurring April through November, which could more than quadruple the frequency of events.” Without a specific number of events listed, it is impossible for the county to assess the potential impacts adequately. But it is clear that the increased frequency of events infringes on our right to farm to

an even greater degree, which will put our farming and ranching business at an even greater disadvantage. In addition to affecting our livelihood and that of other neighboring farmers and ranchers, this greater frequency could lead to more traffic accidents and greater risk of fires, and represents an increased threat to human and environmental health and safety.

Page 18, paragraph 6: “Hosting up to five events per month for nine months out of the year at 300 people per event could conceivably bring up to 10,500 additional visitors per year to the remote rural area which may, at times, hinder or impair adjacent agricultural operations...”

The county assumes that Field & Pond applicants will not exceed 300 people per event, but they advertise on various wedding websites that they can accommodate up to 1,000 people per event, and on their own website it states “perfect for entertaining groups of any size.” And the county planning director told us there is no enforcement mechanism, so it is up to the neighbors to enforce the rules. How can the county guarantee that there will not be more than 300 people per event? How will the county guarantee that it will enforce the rules that it makes?

Page 19, paragraph 2: “The applicants may seek to increase the number of events after one year of project implementation, upon review and approval by the Planning Commission.”

First of all, the number of events, as stated in this study, ranges from 8, 24, 35, 45, to 72 paid events per year. Secondly, there is no limit on the number of non-profit events; therefore, the applicants can have as many events as they want, conceivably every day of the year. So it is unclear exactly how many people there will be; thus, it is impossible to accurately assess the impacts of the guests.

The applicants *will* try to increase/expand their business; that’s stated on page 7 in their master plan that includes a 10-year phased approach.

How will the county mitigate the numerous impacts of the guests, when the county does not have an accurate number of people who will visit Field & Pond?

Traffic:

Page 4, paragraph 3:

“As an incentive, the applicant has proposed the use of shuttles for all for-profit events (regardless of size).” There is no guarantee that shuttles would be used for the for-profit events, or non-profit events. People are still going to drive their own vehicles to and from the site, guests as well as the caterers, bartenders, musicians, photographers and other vendors. And importantly, even if shuttles were used, the rural road, much of which is one-lane wide, was not designed for the amount of shuttle traffic that has been proposed.

At the end of March 2016, the applicant cancelled a large wedding scheduled for April 23rd. Apparently the wedding party had put down a deposit on the event center several months in advance. About three weeks before the scheduled wedding, the applicant told the wedding party they had to use shuttles. The wedding party did not want to use shuttles for their guests, and as a result, the wedding was moved to a new location. This is an indication of a poorly executed business plan.

If the county says a condition is that the applicant must require shuttles, how will the county guarantee that the shuttles will be used? How will the county enforce that requirement? Will the shuttles remain on the property throughout the duration of the event in case there is a fire and all the guests must be quickly transported away?

It is unclear how many round-trip vehicle trips will be allowed. Is it 75? 100?

Page 19, paragraph 5, Mitigation Measure AG-2:

“In all instances, the number of trips generated by attendees (car trips and van/shuttle trips) shall not exceed 75 round trips for a single event.”

Page 25, paragraph 5: “Vehicle trips would also be associated with guests and vendors accessing the facility, which may include up to 100-round trip vehicle trips (assuming single-car and multi-car passenger vehicles, use of shuttles for events that exceed 150 attendees, and that most events draw up to 150 attendees) between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 12 a.m. Friday through Sunday from March to November.”

Pages 39: “Long-term greenhouse gas impacts from the anticipated event center would be caused by truck deliveries up to four times per week and from guests and vendors attending events that may occur up to four to five times per month (Friday through Sunday, March through November). Traffic generated by the event facility is estimated at approximately 100 roundtrip vehicle trips per event, with five events per month, for a total of 500 roundtrip vehicle trips per month nine months out of the year, in addition to the four roundtrip truck trips per week. This is a worse-case scenario which assumes that five events per month (Fri-Sun) during March through November are booked for 150 attendees at each event.”

Truck deliveries 4 per week x 4.3 weeks/month x 9 months = 155 deliveries per year.

Guests and vendors attending events:

5 events per month x 9 months = 45 events per year.

45 events per year x 100 vehicle trips per event = 4500 vehicle trips per year

155 deliveries per year + 4500 vehicle trips per year = a total of 4655 vehicle trips per year

The number of events is unclear, as the number varies from 8-72 events per year, so how is the county going to guarantee that this volume of traffic (based on 45 events per year) is a worse-case scenario?

In addition, the number of vehicle trips does not include the traffic from unlimited non-profit events and the B&B guests who will drive back and forth to the B&B as often as they want, year-round.

Since the number of events allowed is unclear, then how can the county say what the impacts are?

And how will the county guarantee that the number of events will be adhered to? How will this requirement be enforced?

This paragraph also states: “Truck deliveries to the facility would occur approximately four days per week.”

How will the county guarantee truck deliveries would be limited to 4 days per week?

Furthermore, how will the county guarantee that events will be primarily Friday through Sunday when there is a trend for weekday weddings, and corporate events typically occur during the business week?

Page 40: “As a condition of project approval, shuttles will be required for events with more than 150 attendees but not exceed 300 people.”

How will the county guarantee that the number of attendees per event will not exceed 300 people?

The applicants have advertised that they can accommodate 1,000 guests per event:

150 people per event/100 vehicle trips = 1,000 people per event/X

X= 667 round-trip vehicle trips per event. Even if shuttles were used, that number of people and volume of traffic are very significant impacts.

How will the county guarantee that shuttles are used for events with more than 150 attendees?

Page 62, b: “The scope of the project will be reduced, through required mitigation in order to address compatibility and safety issues, event size, and shared use of the rural roadway. Thus, the peak road usage will not increase from the current uses at the project site...”

This is inaccurate. This conditional use would allow at least 75 round-trip vehicle trips per event, in addition to truck deliveries, vendors and part-time employees, and vehicle trips generated by the B&B guests—that would significantly increase the peak road usage from the current uses, which include traffic from the residents and agricultural employees. And since there is no county enforcement, that number of round-trip vehicle trips could be much larger.

How will the county guarantee that Field & Pond traffic will not exceed 75 round-trip vehicles per event?

Noise pollution:

The noise pollution levels are unclear.

Page 5, paragraph 6:

“Most events...are expected to include amplified music, which, according to the applicant, would not exceed 75dB at the property lines.”

Page 53: “As an adopted Condition of Approval, any associated amplified music, such as a wedding reception, would be required not to exceed 60 dB at any adjacent property line containing a residence. Additionally, amplified music will be required to terminate by 10:00 PM...”

Page 54: “Additional noise sources during events will be due to amplified music...expected to be in the range of 80 to 90 dBA measured 50 feet in front of the stage and amplifiers...and noise levels at 800 feet would be 66 dBA.”

“Thus, the projected Community Noise Equivalent Level noise levels generated by a 90 dBA sound system during the evening hours would be...71 dBA CNEL at 800 feet.”

There is no code enforcement, so there is no guarantee that the music will not exceed 90 decibels. Re) the sound equivalent of 90 decibels, according to the Industrial Noise Control website, it is the equivalent of a motorcycle at 25 feet; a quiet, rural area is one-sixteenth as loud as 70 decibels; and the upper 70s are annoyingly loud to some people. And sound carries the farthest in the evening when the temperatures drop, and that is when the nocturnal animals become active. The noise pollution from amplified music (as well as the numerous vehicles) will create an on-going nuisance for surrounding property owners in this rural locale. And the amplified music will scare away the wildlife in this wildlife corridor; thus, this project will damage the environment. We have already witnessed deer running away from the Field & Pond property when the applicants held an event in 2015.

How will the county mitigate the wildlife being scared away from their habitat by the noise pollution?

Our property is within 800 feet of the event center and this noise level would not only scare away the wildlife—it would disrupt and agitate the livestock that live on our property, and this is totally unacceptable. It is a violation of our Right-to-Farm.

How is the county going to mitigate the disruption of our livestock due to Field & Pond's noise pollution on our property, and protect our Right-to-Farm?

Environmental Factors are Significant:

Page 11, Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

There are several boxes that should have been checked, because the following environmental factors will be affected by this project:

Population/Housing: The applicants propose to build four cottages and a pool house, after their Williamson Act contract expires in nine years, which is simply leapfrog development. If we told the county that we want to build an additional five houses on our property, we would be denied. Why is the county, which states that its mission is to protect agriculture, willing to allow a hospitality business to build five additional houses on a rural parcel?

Also, there will be the potential for multiple events every week throughout the year and transient lodging every day, year-round, resulting in a frequent if not constant increase in human population.

Hazards & Hazardous Materials: Field and Pond will use hazardous materials on a regular basis including pesticides, industrial cleaning chemicals and swimming pool chemicals. These chemicals will be used, stored and disposed of. How will the county enforce the proper use, storage and disposal of these hazardous materials?

Air Quality: The vehicular traffic will cause air pollution and noise pollution. How will this pollution be mitigated?

Geology/Soils: There are vernal pools and a defined creek bed in the area where the applicants say they will plant an orchard. Has an environmental study been conducted to determine what species exist in the vernal pools? These areas are not allowed to be filled in and/or leveled. How will the county mitigate this environmental impact?

Hydrology/Water Quality: There will be pollution created by the vehicles in the parking lot and the increased traffic, including pollution runoff into the pond and Chickahominy Slough.

How will this vehicle pollution runoff be mitigated?

In terms of the environment, we are also concerned about the potential for increased litter from the multiple Field & Pond guests. Last October, after a wedding was held, some Field & Pond guests littered the road about 1.5 miles east of there with wedding bouquets and ribbons.

How will the county mitigate the increased litter along the roadway? Who will pick it up and properly dispose of it?

Page 11, Determination:

As noted above, the proposed project WILL have a significant effect on the environment, from construction as well as operational impacts; therefore, an environmental impact report is needed.

Page 14, d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?

There will be constant lighting from vehicle headlights, and it will shine into at least three bedrooms at night, which is a nuisance. How will the county mitigate this nuisance?

In addition, there are many nocturnal animals running across the road every night, and the constant nighttime traffic and “deer in the headlights” reaction will lead to increased road-kills and injured wildlife—and possibly human injuries and death, as is possible when hitting a deer--which is a significant environmental impact. How will the county mitigate the wildlife injuries and death?

Page 29, paragraph 1, Mitigation Measure BIO-2: “The Swainson’s hawk is a State-threatened species. The temporary disturbance of nesting habitat as well as noise and other construction-related disturbances could affect nesting raptors in the vicinity of the project area during breeding season (March 1-August 15), since suitable trees and other habitat are located on or adjacent to the project site.”

We have Swainson’s hawks on our property, which is adjacent to the Field & Pond property. Mitigation Measure BIO-2 only addresses construction noise—what about noise from the parties? How can the county guarantee that loud noise from the parties will not disrupt the Swainson’s hawks’ nesting habitat on our property and the Field & Pond property?

Page 30, paragraph 2: “Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including but not limited to marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?”

There are vernal pools south of Chickahominy Slough. What type of studies has the county conducted on the species in the vernal pools? How does the county plan to mitigate the applicants filling in and/or leveling of the vernal pools to plant their orchard?

Page 31, paragraph 3: “The project is located on a parcel where the majority of the land is permanently protected with a conservation easement that ensures the property will retain its scenic, wildlife, open space and agricultural features in its natural state...the project is not expected to interfere with the movement of any wildlife species...”

Loud music is unnatural; the music and traffic will scare the wildlife away. The loud music encroaches into the area covered by the Wildlife Heritage Foundation and thus is inconsistent

with the conservation easement. How does the county plan to mitigate this noise pollution within the conservation easement?

Public health and safety risks:

Fire:

Page 40: “The project is located in a moderate area of risk for fire and therefore could pose a potential risk of wildfire danger.”

There have been at least two recent grass fires on property next to the Field & Pond property: On August 9, 2014, a farm employee ran off a dirt road and ignited a fire south of the Romingers’ property, which burned a total of 300 acres, including 100 acres of our property. The applicants came over to our house to see if the fire was headed towards their property, which it was—it was a nerve-wracking situation for all of us. My husband Bruce drove our bulldozer to the fire and created a firebreak between the fire and our house as well as the Field & Pond property. Cal-Fire prison-crews helped put out that fire.

Prior to that particular fire, there was a fire directly across the road from the Field & Pond property about 12 years ago, that started when a farm employee was mowing dry grass. Cal-Fire helicopters responded to that fire.

Furthermore, last summer there were several major fires in Yolo County and the surrounding counties that burned thousands of acres and even killed people.

How can the county guarantee that guests will not drive off the road and ignite the dry grass?

Page 42 g: “An adopted project Condition of Approval will require that the applicant develop a site-specific Field & Pond emergency plan that identifies, among other things...gathering or refuge locations...”

How can the county guarantee that guests will stay in the gathering and refuge locations when there is a fire, intense heat and heavy smoke? People will panic and attempt to leave Field & Pond en masse. And since there is only one way in, and one way out to the site, the road will become congested with people and their vehicles, and some people could get trapped and die as a result, and/or there could be property damage to the adjoining neighbors’ properties.

How will the county mitigate the risk of panicking people who risk getting trapped because the road is congested with people/vehicles trying to escape via the only way out?

How will the county mitigate the risk of people getting injured and/or killed?

Page 43 h: “Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?...impacts will be less than significant.”

That statement is absolutely untrue. This risk is very significant, as described above.

And the risk of fire-related injuries and death is even greater due to the fact that there is only one way in and one way out from the Field & Pond site.

Crime:

We are concerned about the increased potential for rural crime, due to the large numbers of non-residents who will spend time in our neighborhood. We are concerned about trespassers—we

have already experienced trespassers on our farm by the guests of another event center—and our personal safety, particularly that of our young children.

We established a Neighborhood Watch Program through the Yolo County Sheriff's Department in 2010 and know how frequently the Sheriff's Department patrols our neighborhood. The increased volume of visitors in our neighborhood will require more officers to patrol our neighborhood.

How will the county guarantee that more Sheriff's deputies will patrol our neighborhood to ensure our personal safety and protection of our properties?

The PG&E substation on County Road 89 north of County Road 23 was broken into on 3-25-16, so the PG&E/SMUD natural-gas facility on County Road 29 could be a crime target too. Even worse, a Field & Pond guest who has been drinking alcohol and/or is tired after an evening of partying could crash into the natural-gas facility, which has above-ground pipes and is located right next to the road that has an uneven road surface, and cause a huge explosion. This is a real concern to those of us living and working nearby the natural-gas facility.

How is the county going to mitigate the risks to the PG&E/SMUD natural-gas facility?

Road conditions:

There are many parts of County Road 29, west of County Road 89, that are dangerous due to blind curves, sharp turns, dips in the road, uneven road surfaces, and portions that are one-lane wide. There will be non-residents driving on this road who are unfamiliar with the road conditions. This will be compounded by the presence of large tractors and other agricultural machinery on the roads, coupled with impatient drivers going to and from Field & Pond. And there will be a number of people who drive after consuming alcohol at the event center.

How will the county ensure the protection of the people living and working on County Road 29 from the dangers posed by these drivers?

How will the increase in traffic incidents be mitigated?

How will the county guarantee that more Sheriff's deputies will patrol our neighborhood to ensure public safety?

Water issues:

Page 4: The project includes "a 2-acre fishing pond."

Shouldn't this pond be surrounded by a fence for safety, just like the requirement that applies to swimming pools?

Page 45 b: The applicants grossly underestimate the amount of water needed to irrigate the proposed orchard and vegetable garden. They plan to use "an anticipated 30,000 gallons for crops."

Page 65, d) "Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project...?"

"The applicant proposes drilling a new well for irrigation purposes, i.e., for up to 50 acres of orchards and crops..."

To irrigate 50 acres of trees and vegetable crops, about 150 acre-feet of water is needed for a growing season. Their annual water needs for crop production are actually 1,629 times greater than their estimate of 30,000 gallons.

325,850.925 gallons in one acre-foot X 150 acre-feet = 48,877,639 gallons divided by their 30,000 gallon estimate = 1,629.

Would the applicant's well be able to provide a sufficient water supply for their proposed crop production?

Page 46 f: "Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?"

Yes, vehicle pollution runoff will be significant.

Land-use planning:

Page 48 a: "Would the project physically divide an established community?"

Yes, it will divide it via the urban encroachment that will restrict our agricultural activities. Some parts of our rural community will get to apply pesticides as needed, whereas other parts adjacent to Field & Pond will not get to do that, for fear of liability in case Field & Pond guests complain about spray drift. We have already had to pay more for insurance due to the threat of the county approving the proposed Field & Pond project.

How will the county compensate us for our increased expense for insurance?

Furthermore, it will divide our established community, in the sense that the people living here unanimously oppose Field & Pond. We have a petition signed by more than 50 landowners who own properties surrounding the Field & Pond site.

How will the county mitigate the widespread opposition to the proposed Field & Pond project?

And due to the county's lack of enforcement and admitted "complaint-driven system," we have had to be the people who complain to the county, and try to get the county to enforce the laws that it created. This pits neighbors against neighbors, due to the county's flawed system.

How does the county intend to enforce its current laws?

Urban Youth Program:

Page 7, paragraph 3:

Under the master plan for Field & Pond, the applicants state they intend to include an agricultural-education pilot program that targets urban youth by the name of Fresh Start.

What are the population and the ages of the youth?

How will they arrive/depart, in busses?

How long will they stay? Our research indicates there is a program based in Oakland (where the applicants previously lived) called Fresh Start and that it serves at-risk urban youth. The mission of this Youth Employment Partnership-sponsored program "is to enhance the employment and educational opportunities of Oakland youth and young adults impacted by poverty, the foster care and criminal justice systems, school underachievement, and lack of work experience by

providing job training, job placement, hands-on education, and comprehensive support services. We strive to create meaningful work opportunities by partnering with local businesses.”
Is this Fresh Start program related to plans of the Field and Pond applicants?

Other concerns:

Page 67 a: “Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment...?”

Yes, but it is not limited to biological resources; the project has the potential to degrade the quality of life for the community of people living and working here. If this project is approved, it will change the neighborhood here forever, and not in a positive way. There are people who have lived their entire lives here (including our 98-year-old neighbor), invested everything they’ve worked for here, and who have retired here. The current residents who do not farm or ranch also have rights to enjoy their properties without the dangers and nuisances posed by Field & Pond. This is above and beyond the potential violations of the farmers’ and ranchers’ Right-to-Farm. We want to continue to farm and ranch in western Yolo County, where we have excellent soils and growing conditions that should not be taken for granted. If the county approves Field & Pond, it will set a dangerous precedent for our county, as there will be no end to the leapfrog development of our precious farmland. For all of these reasons and more, there is unanimous opposition to this proposal by more than 50 landowners surrounding Field & Pond.

In summary, this proposal is basically a zoning issue--the applicants want to obtain a variance to the zoning for their own benefit, but in the process, it would hurt the surrounding farms, ranches and residences, and set a dangerous precedent for our county.

The applicants have a poorly executed business plan and numerous county policies are flawed. In addition, this project would have numerous, significant environmental impacts, underscoring the need for an environmental impact report.

Sincerely,

Robyn Rominger
26981 County Road 29
Winters CA 95694



Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

28 March 2016

Stephanie Cormier
Yolo County Planning,
Public Works & Environmental Services
292 West Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695

CERTIFIED MAIL
91 7199 9991 7035 8420 1497

COMMENTS TO REQUEST FOR REVIEW FOR THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, FIELD & POND LARGE BED & BREAKFAST AND LARGE EVENT FACILITY PROJECT, SCH# 2016032024, YOLO COUNTY

Pursuant to the State Clearinghouse's 9 March 2019 request, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board) has reviewed the *Request for Review for the Mitigated Negative Declaration* for the Field & Pond Large Bed & Breakfast and Large Event Facility Project, located in Yolo County.

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

I. Regulatory Setting

Basin Plan

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

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

Control Board (State Water Board), Office of Administrative Law (OAL) and in some cases, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). Basin Plan amendments only become effective after they have been approved by the OAL and in some cases, the USEPA. Every three (3) years, a review of the Basin Plan is completed that assesses the appropriateness of existing standards and evaluates and prioritizes Basin Planning issues.

For more information on the *Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins*, please visit our website:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/.

Antidegradation Considerations

All wastewater discharges must comply with the Antidegradation Policy (State Water Board Resolution 68-16) and the Antidegradation Implementation Policy contained in the Basin Plan. The Antidegradation Policy is available on page IV-15.01 at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalleywater_issues/basin_plans/sacsjr.pdf

In part it states:

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

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

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

II. Permitting Requirements

Construction Storm Water General Permit

Dischargers whose project disturb one or more acres of soil or where projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities (Construction General Permit), Construction General Permit Order No. 2009-009-DWQ. Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, grubbing, disturbances to the ground, such as stockpiling, or excavation, but does not include regular maintenance activities performed to restore the original line, grade, or capacity of the facility. The Construction General Permit

requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).

For more information on the Construction General Permit, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/constpermits.shtml.

Phase I and II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permits¹

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

For more information on which Phase I MS4 Permit this project applies to, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/municipal_permits/.

For more information on the Caltrans Phase I MS4 Permit, visit the State Water Resources Control Board at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/caltrans.shtml.

For more information on the Phase II MS4 permit and who it applies to, visit the State Water Resources Control Board at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/phase_ii_municipal.shtml.

Industrial Storm Water General Permit

Storm water discharges associated with industrial sites must comply with the regulations contained in the Industrial Storm Water General Permit Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ.

For more information on the Industrial Storm Water General Permit, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/industrial_general_permits/index.shtml.

Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit

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

If the project will involve the discharge of dredged or fill material in navigable waters or wetlands, a permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act may be needed from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE). If a Section 404 permit is required by the USACOE, the Central Valley Water Board will review the permit application to ensure that discharge will not violate water quality standards. If the project requires surface water drainage realignment, the applicant is advised to contact the Department of Fish and Game for information on Streambed Alteration Permit requirements.

If you have any questions regarding the Clean Water Act Section 404 permits, please contact the Regulatory Division of the Sacramento District of USACOE at (916) 557-5250.

Clean Water Act Section 401 Permit – Water Quality Certification

If an USACOE permit (e.g., Non-Reporting Nationwide Permit, Nationwide Permit, Letter of Permission, Individual Permit, Regional General Permit, Programmatic General Permit), or any other federal permit (e.g., Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act or Section 9 from the United States Coast Guard), is required for this project due to the disturbance of waters of the United States (such as streams and wetlands), then a Water Quality Certification must be obtained from the Central Valley Water Board prior to initiation of project activities. There are no waivers for 401 Water Quality Certifications.

Waste Discharge Requirements – Discharges to Waters of the State

If USACOE determines that only non-jurisdictional waters of the State (i.e., “non-federal” waters of the State) are present in the proposed project area, the proposed project may require a Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) permit to be issued by Central Valley Water Board. Under the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, discharges to all waters of the State, including all wetlands and other waters of the State including, but not limited to, isolated wetlands, are subject to State regulation.

For more information on the Water Quality Certification and WDR processes, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/help/business_help/permit2.shtml.

Dewatering Permit

If the proposed project includes construction or groundwater dewatering to be discharged to land, the proponent may apply for coverage under State Water Board General Water Quality Order (Low Risk General Order) 2003-0003 or the Central Valley Water Board’s Waiver of Report of Waste Discharge and Waste Discharge Requirements (Low Risk Waiver) R5-2013-0145. Small temporary construction dewatering projects are projects that discharge groundwater to land from excavation activities or dewatering of underground utility vaults. Dischargers seeking coverage under the General Order or Waiver must file a Notice of Intent with the Central Valley Water Board prior to beginning discharge.

For more information regarding the Low Risk General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2003/wqo/wqo2003-0003.pdf

For more information regarding the Low Risk Waiver and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/waivers/r5-2013-0145_res.pdf

Regulatory Compliance for Commercially Irrigated Agriculture

If the property will be used for commercial irrigated agricultural, the discharger will be required to obtain regulatory coverage under the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program. There are two options to comply:

1. **Obtain Coverage Under a Coalition Group.** Join the local Coalition Group that supports land owners with the implementation of the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program. The Coalition Group conducts water quality monitoring and reporting to the Central Valley Water Board on behalf of its growers. The Coalition Groups charge an annual membership fee, which varies by Coalition Group. To find the Coalition Group in your area, visit the Central Valley Water Board's website at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/irrigated_lands/for_growers/apply_coalition_group/index.shtml or contact water board staff at (916) 464-4611 or via email at IrrLands@waterboards.ca.gov.
2. **Obtain Coverage Under the General Waste Discharge Requirements for Individual Growers, General Order R5-2013-0100.** Dischargers not participating in a third-party group (Coalition) are regulated individually. Depending on the specific site conditions, growers may be required to monitor runoff from their property, install monitoring wells, and submit a notice of intent, farm plan, and other action plans regarding their actions to comply with their General Order. Yearly costs would include State administrative fees (for example, annual fees for farm sizes from 10-100 acres are currently \$1,084 + \$6.70/Acre); the cost to prepare annual monitoring reports; and water quality monitoring costs. To enroll as an Individual Discharger under the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program, call the Central Valley Water Board phone line at (916) 464-4611 or e-mail board staff at IrrLands@waterboards.ca.gov.

Low or Limited Threat General NPDES Permit

If the proposed project includes construction dewatering and it is necessary to discharge the groundwater to waters of the United States, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Dewatering discharges are typically considered a low or limited threat to water quality and may be covered under the General Order for *Dewatering and Other Low Threat Discharges to*

Surface Waters (Low Threat General Order) or the General Order for Limited Threat Discharges of Treated/Untreated Groundwater from Cleanup Sites, Wastewater from Superchlorination Projects, and Other Limited Threat Wastewaters to Surface Water (Limited Threat General Order). A complete application must be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board to obtain coverage under these General NPDES permits.

For more information regarding the Low Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/general_orders/r5-2013-0074.pdf

For more information regarding the Limited Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/general_orders/r5-2013-0073.pdf

If you have questions regarding these comments, please contact me at (916) 464-4644 or Stephanie.Tadlock@waterboards.ca.gov.



Stephanie Tadlock
Environmental Scientist

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



YOCHA DEHE
CULTURAL RESOURCES

March 26, 2016

Stephanie Cormier, Senior Planner
Yolo County Planning and Public Works Department
292 W. Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695

RE: 26055 CR 29 Project

Dear Ms. Cromier:

Thank you for your project notification letter dated March 8, 2016, regarding cultural information on or near the proposed 26055 CR 29 Project, Yolo County, CA. We appreciate your effort to contact us and wish to respond.

The Cultural Resources Department has reviewed the project and concluded that it is within the aboriginal territories of the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation. Therefore, we have a cultural interest and authority in the proposed project area.

Based on the information provided, the Tribe has concerns that the project could impact undiscovered archaeological deposits. Additionally, Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation requests a site visit to the project area to evaluate our cultural concerns. Please send us the cultural resource study for this project.

Please contact the following individual to coordinate a date and time for the site visit.

Mr. Anthony Flores
Cultural Resources Site Protection Manager
Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation
Office: (530) 796-3400, Email: aflores@yochadehe-nsn.gov

Please refer to identification number YD -04232015-01 in any correspondences concerning this project.

Thank you for providing us with this notice and the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

James Kinter
Tribal Secretary
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer

March 23, 2016

Ms. Stephanie Cormier:

I am writing in response to the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration Zone File #2015-0018 regarding Field and Pond.

My sister and I both grew up on our family's farm in Winters. We both also worked on the farm, hoeing weeds in tomato fields and helping to keep the shop and my Dad's office neat. Later on in high school, I kept track of our filter inventory and our harvested hay bales. I valued the opportunity to work alongside my Dad and my uncles and their employees, and learn more about agriculture in the county I grew up in. It wasn't until I worked on the farm in high school that I truly appreciated the amount of time, work, and love that goes into the land to produce nourishment for others.

When I moved to Berkeley after high school, other young people were amazed to meet someone who had grown up on a farm. It is rare, a novelty, a mysterious existence – farms and farm lands are disappearing. I feel lucky to have grown up in a rural area, where values of land preservation are deeply instilled. My Berkeley friends preached sustainability, organic produce, conservation, but few of them really understood the people, land, and lifestyle behind those words as I did. I was raised to appreciate and value agriculturally productive land, and to care for it.

The Field and Pond proposal is not caring for the land. The parcels are located on Williamson Act Property, which means they are protected from development or conversion to any use other than agriculture. There is also a conservation easement protecting the land and all the unique plants and wildlife that call that space home.

Having an event center on Williamson Act land is in direct conflict with the spirit and intention of the Act. Having crowds of visitors, loud party music, and unnatural lighting are laughable standards for a piece of acreage under a conservation easement. This piece of land is not meant for such use – there are other areas where event centers are welcome and more accessible, without having to jeopardize attempts to preserve a natural setting. There are fewer and fewer acres of undeveloped land in Yolo County each year, and fewer still that harbor such unique wildlife – why risk tainting such an environment for an event center which could easily exist elsewhere?

Animals frequent Chickahominy Slough, which runs through the property in question. It is a wildlife corridor attracting many different kinds of animals and birds, plus native fresh water newts and turtles. As a child, spotting a newt or a turtle was a treat; it meant that the creek was healthy and clean, and could provide a good habitat to many different species. With an event center along the creek, I can't imagine it would still provide a healthy habitat. With unnatural lighting, potential for trash and waste, and loud music and conversation, no animal will stay near for long.

Another concern I must voice is the traffic that an event center would cause. Growing up on County Rd. 89, which is a wide and straight road, I have seen all kinds of traffic, car trouble, and navigation mistakes from people who weren't from the area, and weren't used to driving in a rural setting. It ranged from easy fixes (out of gas, lost) to seriously dangerous situations (drunkenly crashing into our yard.) County Rd. 29, unlike 89, is narrow, windy, and further from rescue services such as ambulances and fire trucks. If you're unfamiliar with the area, it is easy to drive too fast when there is a one-lane bridge or a tight turn ahead, or to get lost, or to hit an animal you may not expect to see, such as a deer or a turkey, or livestock from the many small farmers in the area. County Rd. 29

is simply not equipped to handle a constant flow of heavy traffic, let alone drivers coming from events where alcohol may be served.

I mentioned firetrucks. As I'm sure you know, wildfires are a huge concern each summer in California, and many of them are started by cars parking in dry grass and cigarettes – two things that would likely be a part of an event center in this area. You need only to look at the coastal range around Berryessa to see how serious wildfires can become quickly; the hills there are still brown and scarred from the Wragg fire last summer, which burned over 8,000 acres. It started from an idling car. A wildfire in this area would not only threaten countless animals, but also the many families that live along County Rd. 29 and nearby.

It is clear from my concerns that wildlife in the area would be threatened by an event center being built in their habitat. I would like to know how the county intends to mitigate the negative impact of Field and Pond's events on surrounding wildlife, and how such a proposal was ever accepted for Williamson Act and conservation easement land.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Sarah Rominger

Stephanie Cormier
Yolo County Planning Department
292 W. Beamer Street
Woodland, CA 95695

Dear Ms. Cormier:

March 19, 2016

We are writing to express our opposition to the proposed Field and Pond Bed and Breakfast and large event center on Road 29 in Winters.

The proposed Field and Pond project is outright commercial development of agricultural lands. Yolo County has worked hard for decades to preserve our county's most precious asset — our agricultural land. Field and Pond's proposal, if accepted, sets a poor precedent for Yolo County. It would encourage more non-ag businesses to purchase agricultural lands...driving up the price of ag land, pushing out our family farms, and destroying our rural, agricultural landscape.

Farms can only be located where the soil is farmable. Those lands are limited. Event Centers like Field and Pond should not be located on agricultural lands. They are better suited for land that is not suitable for farming.

For these reasons alone, the Field and Pond project should be prohibited from having their proposed business at the County Road 29 location.

Sincerely,



Ann & Nathan Bohl
122 Midway Drive
Woodland CA 95695