

TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES (“AB 52”)

Compliance Checklist

(Initial Study Attachment)

Note: Prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report for a project, this checklist must be completed and attached to the Initial Study.

Procedural Compliance

1. **Has a California Native American Tribe (s) requested formal notification of proposed projects in the geographic area that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the tribe?**

Yes Tribe(s) to notify: Fernandeano Tataviam Band of Mission Indians

No (End of process)

2. **Notification letter (s) informing the California Native American Tribe (s) of the proposed project was mailed on August 4, 2015, which was within 14 days when project application was determined complete or the County decided to undertake a project.**

3. **Did the County receive a written request for consultation from the California Native American Tribe(s) within 30 days of when formal notification was provided?**

Yes Date: August 4, 2015

No (End of process)

4. **Consultation process with the California Native American Tribe(s) consisted of the following:**

A letter was sent to Caitlin Gulley, Cultural Preservation Officer for the Fernandeano Tataviam Band Of Mission Indians, on August 4, 2015 via email. Ms. Gulley responded via email on August 4, 2015, stating that she would submit comments the following week. On August 17, 2015, Ms. Gulley submitted comments via email requesting that language be incorporated into the amendment that required that Tataviam be notified when a ground breaking or soil disturbing project is officially declared to take place. On August 20, 2015, Department of Regional Planning (DRP) staff followed up with Ms. Gulley via telephone to explain that under the new ordinance requirements (if passed), all new vineyards would require a discretionary review, and would therefore be subject to CEQA. Per CEQA requirements, tribes are required to be notified whenever a ground breaking or soil disturbing

project is proposed. DRP staff explained that Ms. Gulley's suggested language would not be incorporated into the amendment, however, per CEQA requirements, tribes, including the Tataviam, would be notified whenever a vineyard project was proposed that involved ground breaking or soil disturbance. Ms. Gulley indicated her acceptance of this explanation. Follow-up correspondence was sent to Ms. Gulley via email on August 20, 2015 to confirm this agreement.

5. Consultation process concluded on August 20, 2015 by either of the following:

- The parties concluded that no mitigation measures are necessary
- The parties agreed to measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect on a tribal cultural resource (see attached mitigation measures)
- The County acted in good faith and after reasonable effort, concluded that mutual agreement cannot be reached.