

COUNTY OF NAPA
CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPARTMENT
1195 THIRD ST., SUITE 210
NAPA, CA 94559
(707) 253-4417

Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration

1. **Project Title:** Beckstoffer Vineyards II & VI Land Division
2. **Property Owner:** Beckstoffer Vineyards II & VI
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Kirsty Shelton, Planner, 299-1337, kshelton@co.napa.ca.us
4. **Project location and APN:** 8600 Conn Creek Road, Rutherford, CA APN's 030-200-070;-075;030-280-031 SFAP
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Chris Cordano, PO Box 405, Rutherford, CA 94573
6. **Hazardous Waste Sites:** The project is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

Project Description Request for approval of Parcel Map #P09-00182 to establish three new parcels: ± 48.19 acres, ± 50.91 acres, and ± 44.11 acres from two existing parcels that are approximately ± 72.95 and ± 74.30 acres. Currently approximately 122 acres are planted to vineyards, the property is accessed by an existing driveway and the remainder of the property consists of an existing single family dwelling, farm labor dwelling, two agricultural barns, and a farm management office (proposed to remain on Parcel 2). . There is no anticipated change in land use. The two new parcels will remain in vineyard. Though no construction is anticipated, there are two new building sites designated with access from Conn Creek Road and Ponti Road respectively. Also designated is an easement to access the parcels on the other side of Conn Creek to provide future access to the 2 building sites these designations are necessary requirements to complete the land division. There are existing wells for vineyard irrigation. Access to the parcel is an unpaved private access with future easements beginning at Conn Creek Road, which is a paved county road. No changes are anticipated to the existing conditions.

PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION:

The Conservation, Development and Planning Director of Napa County has tentatively determined that the above described project would:

- ☒ Not have a significant effect on the environment. The County intends to adopt a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**.
- ☐ have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. The County intends to adopt a **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**.

Documentation supporting this determination is contained in the attached Initial Study Checklist and is available for inspection at the Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department Office, 1195 Third St., Room 210, Napa, California 94559 between the hours of 8:00 AM and 4:45 PM Monday through Friday (except holidays).

DATE:

BY:

WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD:

Please send written comments to the attention of Kirsty Shelton at 1195 Third St., Room 210, Napa, California 94559, or via e-mail to kshelton@co.napa.ca.us. A public hearing on this project is tentatively scheduled for the

Napa County Planning Commission on **October 7, 2009**. You may confirm the date and time of this hearing by calling (707) 253-4417.

COUNTY OF NAPA
CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPARTMENT
1195 THIRD ST., SUITE 210
NAPA, CA 94559
(707) 253-4417

Initial Study Checklist
(Reference CEQA, Appendix G)

1. **Project Title:** Beckstoffer Vineyards II & VI Land Division
2. **Property Owner:** Beckstoffer Vineyards II & VI
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Kirsty Shelton, Planner, 299-1377
4. **Project location and APN:** 8600 Conn Creek Road, Rutherford, CA APN's 030-200-070;-075; 030-280-031 SFAP
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Chris Cordano, PO Box 405, Rutherford, CA 94573
6. **General Plan description:** Agricultural Resource (AR)
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Preserve (AP)
8. **Project Description**

Request for approval of Parcel Map #P09-00182 to establish three new parcels: ± 48.19 acres, ± 50.91 acres, and ± 44.11 acres from two existing parcels that are approximately ± 72.95 and ± 74.30 acres. Currently approximately 122 acres are planted to vineyards, the property is accessed by an existing driveway and the remainder of the property consists of an existing single family dwelling, farm labor dwelling, two agricultural barns, and a farm management office (proposed to remain on Parcel 2). There is no anticipated change in land use. The two new parcels will remain in vineyard. Though no construction is anticipated, there are two new building sites designated with access from Conn Creek Road and Ponti Road respectively. Also designated is an easement to access the parcels on the other side of Conn Creek to provide future access to the 2 building sites these designations are necessary requirements to complete the land division. There are existing wells for vineyard irrigation. Access to the parcel is an unpaved private access with future easements beginning at Conn Creek Road, which is a paved county road. No changes are anticipated to the existing conditions.
9. **Environmental setting and surrounding land uses:**

The parcel and surrounding area are producing vineyards, wineries, rural residential, limited natural habitat, and to the east Silverado Trail. The parcel terrain is relatively flat at less than 5% slope, Conn Creek dissects all three proposed parcels. The surrounding terrain ranges from less than 5% slope to 15% slope.
10. **Other agencies whose approval is/may be required, including Responsible and Trustee Agencies:** none

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils |

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

BASIS OF CONCLUSION and DETERMINATION:

The conclusions and recommendations contained herein are professional opinions derived in accordance with current standards of professional practice. They are based on a review of the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (BASELINE DATA REPORT, County GIS), the other sources of information listed in the file, and the comments received, conversations with knowledgeable individuals; the preparer's personal knowledge of the area; and, where necessary, a visit to the site. For further information, see the environmental background information contained in the permanent file on this project.

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

Signature

Date

Kirsty Shelton, Planner Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The existing two 146.95 acre parcels have about 122 acres planted in vineyard and an single family dwelling, farm labor dwelling, two agricultural barns, and a farm management office and that land use shall remain unchanged though in three parcels.

(References: General Plan, BDR, GIS-Viewshed roads/Historic sites)

a-d) The proposed project is not located nor will it have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or substantially damage a scenic resource. The subject parcels are not visible from Highway 29. The proposed project would not change the visual character of the existing surrounding area of rural residential, vineyards, and limited natural habitat of oak woodland and chaparral. There is no new lighting and no lighting is anticipated. No new substantial sources of light or glare would be created. Therefore, less than significant effects would be anticipated with respect to (a-d).

Mitigation Measures: none

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The existing two 146.95 acre parcels have about 122 acres planted in vineyard and that land use shall remain unchanged though in three parcels.

(References: General Plan, BDR/GIS layer Dept of Conservation Farmlands, Zoning Code Chapter 18.16, BDR/GIS layer: Viticultural areas, agriculture layer, potential productive soils, BDR/GIS layer Agriculture Contracts)

a-c) The proposed project will not convert any Farmland to a non-agriculture use. The proposed project would continue with agricultural uses, the existing vineyard as is, though in 3 parcels. The project site is zoned as agriculture, specifically Agriculture Preserve (AP). Therefore, no effects are anticipated with respect to (a-c).

Mitigation Measures: none

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The existing two 146.95 acre parcels have about 122 acres planted in vineyard and that land use shall remain unchanged though in three parcels. The project site is located in the northwesterly portion of Napa County within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin as designated by and in the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin is currently classified as nonattainment for both state and federal ozone precursors and standards.

(Reference: ARB/BAAQMD, General Plan, BDR & GIS, project file)

Green House Gas Emissions

In 2006, the State Legislature enacted Assembly Bill 32, requiring the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to design measures and rules to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions statewide to 1990 levels no later than 2020. The measures and regulations to meet the 2020 target are to be put in effect by 2012, and the regulatory development of these measures is ongoing. In August 2007, the Legislature enacted Senate Bill 97, which among other things, directed the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to propose new CEQA regulations for the evaluation and mitigation of GHG emissions.

SB 97 directs OPR to develop such guidelines by July 2009, and directs the state Resources Agency (the agency responsible for adopting CEQA regulations) to certify and adopt such regulations by January 2010. This effort is underway; however, to date no formal CEQA regulations relating to GHG emissions have been adopted. In September 2008, the Legislature enacted Senate Bill 375, which established a process for the development of regional targets for reducing passenger vehicle GHG emissions. Through the SB 375 process, regions throughout the state will develop plans designed to integrate development patterns and transportation networks in a manner intended to reduce GHG emissions. Neither the State nor Napa County has adopted explicit thresholds of significance for GHG emissions. While some might argue that *any* new emission would be significant under CEQA, pending amendments to the State CEQA guidelines suggest that agencies may consider the extent to which a project complies with requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions.

The Napa County General Plan calls on the County to complete an inventory of green house gas emissions from all major sources in the County by the end of 2009, and then to seek reductions such that emissions are equivalent to year 1990 levels by 2020. The General Plan also states that "development of a reduction plan shall include consideration of a 'green building' ordinance and other mechanisms that are shown to be effective at reducing emissions." Overall increases in GHG emissions in Napa County were assessed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the Napa County General Plan Update and certified in June 2008. GHG emissions were found to be significant and unavoidable despite adoption of mitigation measures that incorporated specific policies and action items into the General Plan.

Napa County is currently developing an emission reduction plan, and in the interim requires project applicants to consider methods to reduce GHG emission and incorporate permanent and verifiable emission offsets, consistent with Napa County General Plan Policy CON-65(e). The current project applicant is not proposing any construction, however if in the future a building permit is pulled it would need to conform with increasingly stringent Title 24 energy conservation requirements imposed as part of the building permit process.

Construction and operation of the proposed project analyzed in this initial study would contribute to the overall increases in GHG emission by generating emissions associated with transportation to and from the site, emissions from energy used within buildings, and emissions from the use of equipment. However, the project would positively affect carbon sequestration by maintaining vegetation on the site.

In light of these efforts, the relatively modest increase in emissions expected as a result of the project is considered less than significant. Also, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, because this initial study assesses a project that is consistent with and adopted General Plan for which an EIR was prepared, it appropriately focuses on impacts which are “peculiar to the project,” rather than the cumulative impacts previously assessed.

a-e) The proposed land division would not conflict with or obstruct any applicable air quality plans. No construction activities are anticipated. Vineyard operations and maintenance activities would remain as they currently exist. The proposed project would not result in a considerable net long-term increase of any criteria pollutants. It is anticipated this proposed project in its entirety would not contribute substantially to any air quality violation nor would it result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. There are no sensitive receptors located in the vicinity (1/2 mile) of the proposed project and the proposed project will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Therefore, less than significant effects are anticipated with respect to (a-e).

Mitigation Measures: none

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The existing two parcels totaling 146.95 acres have about 122 acres planted in vineyard and that land use shall remain unchanged though in three parcels. The designated building envelopes on the two newly configured parcels are accessed from Conn Creek Road and Ponti Road. A total of approximately 4 acres of vineyard would be removed should buildings be constructed. In reviewing the sensitive biotic groups, it was noted that the Northwestern Pond Turtle, a sensitive animal specie is present in Conn Creek. Conn Creek, a USGS blue-lined stream dissects all three parcel boundaries an existing bridge existing on Parcel Two and an access easement is includes for access to Parcel One.

(References: General Plan, BDR/GIS layers: sensitive biotic groups, vegetation, streams/fish presence, plant surveys, NDDDB & vernal pools)

a-e) Sensitive natural communities or wetlands are not located on the parcel. There are no plant species of concern to USFWS, migratory corridors nor are any Conservation Plans associated with this parcel this project or in the vicinity. The Northwestern Pond Turtle, sensitive animal specie is present in Conn Creek however, since the only potential construction is proposed over 550 feet from Conn Creek on Parcel One and 1784 feet on Parcel two so no impacts are anticipated. The project will not interfere with any movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species

or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Therefore, less than significant effects are anticipated with respect to (a-e).

f) There are no local or state conservation plans currently associated with the project or in the vicinity that the project as proposed will conflict with. Therefore, no effects are anticipated with respect to (f).

Mitigation Measures: none

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The existing two 146.95 acre parcels have about 122 acres planted in vineyard and a single family dwelling, farm labor dwelling, two agricultural barns, and a farm management office. That land use shall remain unchanged though in three parcels. A cultural resource survey report was prepared for the neighboring property to the west (Archeo-Tec, 1991) and included reference to this parcel with the conclusion of no cultural resources of note were found.

(Reference: General Plan, BDR/GIS layer: historic sties, parcel specific cultural resources report)

a-d) There are no known archaeological resources, sensitive areas or sites, no known paleontological resources or unique geologic features on or associated with the project site, though there are known sensitive areas in the vicinity. Research into past uses has not identified historic resources that may be present at the site. A cultural resource survey report was prepared for the neighboring property to the west (Archeo-Tec, 1991) and included reference to this parcel with the conclusion that no cultural resources of note were found. The site has been previously graded when vineyards were installed. It is therefore not anticipated that any cultural resources are present on the site, and the potential for impact is considered less-than-significant.

Building sites are designated but construction is not proposed, however if construction does occur, should a discovery of unknown cultural resources occur, the proposed project will include the following standard County imposed "condition of approval": In the event that cultural resources or prehistoric artifacts are discovered, uncovered, or otherwise detected during soil-disturbing activities, work on the immediately affected portion of the site shall cease immediately and Napa County be notified, and a qualified archaeologist shall be brought to the site to assess whether the resources at issue are either "historical resources" or "unique archaeological resources." The archaeologist shall recommend appropriate mitigation to Napa County, which shall determine what measures are appropriate and feasible. Such measures may include avoidance, removal and preservation, and/or recordation in accordance with accepted professional archaeological practice. California law recognizes the need to protect Native American human burials, skeletal remains, and items associated with Native American burials from vandalism and inadvertent destruction. The procedures for the

treatment of Native American human remains are contained in California Health and Safety Code §7050.5 and §7052 and California Public Resources Code §5097. The California Health and Safety Code requires that if human remains are found in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, work is to be halted in the immediate area, and the county coroner is to be notified to determine the nature of the remains. The coroner is required to examine all discoveries of human remains within 48 hours of receiving notice of a discovery on private or state lands (Health and Safety Code §7050.5[b]). If the coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American interment, then the Native American Heritage Commission shall be consulted to identify the most likely descendants and the appropriate disposition of the remains. Therefore, no effects are anticipated with respect to (a-d).

Mitigation Measure: none

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in the current California Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The existing two 146.95 acre parcels have about 122 acres planted in vineyard and a single family dwelling, farm labor dwelling, two agricultural barns, and a farm management office. That land use shall remain unchanged though in three parcels. The proposed project has been reviewed and approved with recommended conditions as set forth in the Department of Environmental Management's memo (dated September 17, 2009).

(Reference: General Plan, County Code Chapters 8, 13, 16 & 18, BDR/ GIS layers: geology, soils, landslides, dam levee inundation, liquefaction, flood zones, Floodplain Management, streams, water bodies, slope & Alquist-Priolo, California Building Code 2007 (Chapter 18, Section 1802.3.2))

a-e) The parcel is located in the seismically active San Francisco Bay Area. The terrain is relatively flat at 5% slope or less. There are no known faults that traverse the project site/parcel. No substantial loss of top soil is anticipated. The proposed project not located in an area of susceptible to ground failure or land slides, and in an area of a low risk factor for liquefaction. The soil types are considered Bale Clay Loam (2-5% slope). Therefore, less than significant effects are anticipated with respect to (a-e).

Mitigation Measure: none

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
	a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The existing two 146.95 acre parcels have about 122 acres planted in vineyard and a single family dwelling, farm labor dwelling, two agricultural barns, and a farm management office and that land use shall remain unchanged though in three parcels. The project as proposed has been reviewed by Environmental Management (memo dated September 17, 2009).

The project as proposed has been reviewed and conditioned by Public Works (see memo dated September 18, 2009) and CalFire (memo dated June 9, 2009). (All memos are in the project file and available for review.)

(References: General Plan, County Code Chapters 8, 13, 16 & 18, BDR/GIS layers: hazardous facilities, Napa Airport, roads, Fire & fire hazard zones-CDF, California Building Standards Code 2007, California Health and Safety Code Chapters 6.5 & 6.95)

a-f) The proposed project does not propose any new use or development and therefore is not anticipated to create significant hazard from releases of hazardous materials. Emergency vehicles will have same access as they currently do. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site. The proposed site is not a known hazardous materials site. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any public or private airports. Therefore, no effects are anticipated with respect to (a-f).

g-h) The proposed project is not anticipated to physically interfere with emergency response to or from the site or any evacuation plans for the area because this project doesn't impede any existing circulation patterns. Therefore, less than significant effects are anticipated with respect to (g-h).

Mitigation Measures: none

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The existing two 146.95 acre parcels have about 122 acres planted in vineyard and a single family dwelling, farm labor dwelling, two agricultural barns, and a farm management office. That land use shall remain unchanged though in three parcels. No change in water use is anticipated. The land division has been reviewed and conditioned by Public Works (memo dated September 18, 2009).

(References: General Plan, BDR/GIS layers: flood zones, water bodies, dam levee inundation, groundwater deficient areas, streams, geology, domestic water supply drainages, contours & slope, County Code Chapters 13, 16 & 18)

a-f) The source of water is an existing well. The proposed land division would not result in an increase in water use. The total threshold for the parcels combined is 147 af/yr. Upon the land division, the newly formed parcels will use the same amount of water. The proposed project is not anticipated to alter the drainage pattern to cause on or off site flooding. Therefore, less than significant effects would be anticipated with respect to (a-f).

g-j) The proposed project is located within a 100-year flood hazard area, FEMA flood zone AE. The Base Flood Elevation (BFE) is available in a detailed study and ranges from 143 ft. MSL to 159 MSL, (FEMA panel 06055C0385E, revision 9/26/08). This project is not proposing any development with the flood way and therefore it is not anticipated to impede or redirect flood flows. Parcels One and Two and portions of Parcel Three are located within the floodplain, a condition of project approval will include that an additional map sheet be approved by the County Surveyor and shall include clear and accurate location of the flood zone boundary and the location of all existing structures and building envelopes to be located outside of the flood hazard area. The site is not anticipated to be subject to significant risk from flooding due to dam or levee failure. The project site is not area known to be inundated by seiche, tsunami or mudflow. Therefore, no effects are anticipated with respect to (g-j).

Mitigation Measures: none

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The existing two 146.95 acre parcels have about 122 acres planted in vineyard and a single family dwelling, farm labor dwelling, two agricultural barns, and a farm management office. That land use shall remain unchanged though in three parcels.

(Reference: General Plan, County Code, BDR/GIS layers: Dept of Conservation Farmlands 2006, NDDDB F&G, & biological critical habitat areas, project associated plan)

a-c) The proposed project would not physically divide an established community. The parcel has a zoning designation of Agricultural Preserve, a General Plan designation of Agricultural Reserve and the proposed project would be in keeping with both designations. The proposed project will not conflict with any other applicable regulations, nor will the proposed project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans. Therefore, no effects are anticipated with respect to (a-c).

Mitigation Measures: none

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The existing two 146.95 acre parcels have about 122 acres planted in vineyard and a single family dwelling, farm labor dwelling, two agricultural barns, and a farm management office. That land use shall remain unchanged though in three parcels.

(Reference: General Plan, BDR/GIS)

a-b) The proposed project site is not in an area of a known valuable mineral of state, regionally or locally important resource or mineral resource recovery site nor would the project result in a loss of a known valuable mineral resource or loss of availability of any locally important mineral resource recovery plan. Therefore, no effects are anticipated with respect to (a-b).

Mitigation Measures: none

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The existing two 146.95 acre parcels have about 122 acres planted in vineyard and a single family dwelling, farm labor dwelling, two agricultural barns, and a farm management office. That land use shall remain unchanged though in three parcels. The nearest off-site residence is over 1,000 linear feet away from any proposed new development.

(Reference: General Plan, County Code Chapter 8 & 18, BDR/GIS layers: Napa Airport compatibility zones, city boundaries)

a-f) The proposed land division would not result in any short-term temporary increase in noise levels. No construction activities are anticipated to occur. The project would not result in the exposure of persons to or generate noise level in excess of Napa County standards. The proposed project would not result in any generation of excessive groundborne vibrations or groundborne noise levels. No substantial permanent increase in the ambient noise level will occur. Routine vineyard operation and maintenance activities will remain and no change is anticipated. The proposed project site is not located within an airport land use plan or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, no effects are anticipated with respect to (a-f).

Mitigation Measures: none

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The existing two 146.95 acre parcels have about 122 acres planted in vineyard and a single family dwelling, farm labor dwelling, two agricultural barns, and a farm management office. That land use shall remain unchanged though in three parcels.

a-c) The proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in population growth, either directly or indirectly. There will be no change in the vineyard as the land use. The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of housing or people. Any new construction is subject to the County Affordable Housing impact fee. Two building site have been designated, however, no construction is anticipated. Therefore, no effects are anticipated with respect to (a-c).

(Reference: General Plan, BDR/GIS layer: roads, County Code Chapters 8 & 16)

Mitigation Measures: none

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in:				
a) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The existing two 146.95 acre parcels have about 122 acres planted in vineyard and a single family dwelling, farm labor dwelling, two agricultural barns, and a farm management office. That land use shall remain unchanged though in three parcels.

(Reference: General Plan, County Code Chapters 8, 13 & 18)

a) The proposed project is not expected to change any existing level of public services or require any new facilities. Water is available from an existing well on the property. Services are already provided to the site, there will be no visual change. Property taxes and building permit fees will off set the cost of providing public services. Therefore, no effects are anticipated with respect to (a).

Mitigation Measures: none

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. RECREATION. Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The existing two 146.95 acre parcels have about 122 acres planted in vineyard and a single family dwelling, farm labor dwelling, two agricultural barns, and a farm management office. That land use shall remain unchanged though in three parcels.

(Reference: General Plan, BDR/GIS)

a-b) The proposed project is not anticipated to substantially increase the use of existing recreational facilities nor necessitate any new construction or expansion of any recreational facilities. Therefore, no effects are anticipated with respect to (a-b).

Mitigation Measures: none

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The existing two 146.95 acre parcels have about 122 acres planted in vineyard and a single family dwelling, farm labor dwelling, two agricultural barns, and a farm management office. That land use shall remain unchanged though in three parcels.

(Reference: General Plan, County Code)

a-g) The land division will not increase any level of traffic. The proposed project is not located in an area that would result in substantial safety risk due to air traffic, would not create a significant traffic hazard, or impede any emergency vehicle access. There are potential for new trips associated with the residential development, however this less than significant to the level of service. There no adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation that the proposed project would be in conflict with. Therefore no affects are anticipated with respect to (a-g).

Mitigation Measures: none

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The existing two 146.95 acre parcels have about 122 acres planted in vineyard and a single family dwelling, farm labor dwelling, two agricultural barns, and a farm management office. That land use shall remain unchanged though in three parcels.

(Reference: General Plan, County Code Chapters 8 & 13)

a-g) The proposed land division will not result in any expansion need to a wastewater system, would not exceed any wastewater treatment requirement. Water is available from the existing well on site. No expansion of any other service facilities is necessary to provide such service. Therefore, no significant effects are anticipated with respect to (a-g).

Mitigation Measures: none

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a-c) See the above discussion (I-XVI) less than significant effects are anticipated to occur with the proposed land division.