

COUNTY OF NAPA
CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND PLANNING DEPARTMENT
1195 Third Street, Suite 210
Napa, Calif. 94559
707.253.4417

Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration

1. **Project Title:** Landmark Historic Preservation Zoning Ordinance, County-initiated Zoning Code Text Amendment No P10-00377-ORD
2. **Property Owner:** The proposed ordinance would apply to all parcels in Napa County and contains sections directly relevant to properties owned by: Executive Committee of Rutherford Grange Number 371; Tucker Farm Center Corporation; Welcome Grange Number 791 & Unity Church of Napa; Rene DiRosa Trust; Pope Valley Farm Center; Bradley Kirkpatrick Trust & Jeffrey Parady; and Napa Valley Wine Train Inc, Hacienda Architectural & Design, and Chet Halsey.
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Linda St. Claire, Project Planner, (707) 299-1348, Linda.StClaire@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project location and APN:** The proposed ordinance would apply to all parcels in Napa County and contains sections directly relevant to the properties referenced above with the following APNs: 030-180-009-000; 020-282-001-000; 052-112-016-000; 047-110-004-000; 018-100-001-000; 018-310-023-000; & 027-210-008.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Planning Director Hillary Gitelman for the Napa County Board of Supervisors, 1195 Third Street, Suite 210, Napa, Calif. 94558, (707) 253.4805, hillary.gitelman@countyofnapa.org
6. **Hazardous Waste Sites:** This project is applicable to all parcels in Napa County, some of which (including one of the above listed parcels) are included on the lists of hazardous waste sites enumerated under Government Code §65962.5. (See section VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Material for more detail).

Project Description: The proposed project consists of adoption of an ordinance updating Napa County Code sections related to the designation and disposition of historic landmarks. The ordinance would update the procedures and standards for the preservation and appropriate rehabilitation of historic buildings when property owners voluntarily apply for landmark designation. The ordinance also contains incentives for the rehabilitation and reuse of a limited number of historic buildings which are considered significant to the County's agricultural heritage by (1) allowing farm centers and grange halls to be used as a matter of right as meeting halls and special event venues (APN #s 030-180-009, 020-282-001, 052-112-016, 047-110-004 & 018-100-001), and (2) by allowing the Pope Valley Store and Rutherford Train Station (APN #s 018-310-023 & 027-210-008) to be rehabilitated and adaptively reused for uses allowed in the Commercial Limited (CL) zoning district upon issuance of a use permit project specific environmental review under CEQA. The proposed ordinance would implement action items included in the General Plan Update of 2008.

PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION:

The Napa County Director of Conservation, Development, and Planning has tentatively determined that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment and the County intends to adopt a **negative declaration**. Documentation supporting this determination is contained in the attached Initial Study Checklist and is available for inspection at the offices of the Napa County Conservation, Development, and Planning Department, 1195 Third St., Suite 210, Napa, CA 94559 between the hours of 8:00 AM and 4:45 PM Monday through Friday (excepting holidays).

February 6, 2011

DATE:

BY: Linda St. Claire

WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD: February 6, 2011, 2011 through February 25, 2011, 2010.

Please send written comments to the attention of Linda St. Claire at 1195 Third St., Suite 210, Napa, CA. 94559, or via e-mail to linda.stclaire@countyofnapa.org. A public hearing on this project is tentatively scheduled for the Napa County Conservation, Development, and Planning Commission at 9:00 AM or later on Wednesday, March 2, 2011. You may confirm the date and time of this hearing by calling (707) 253.4417.

COUNTY OF NAPA
CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND PLANNING DEPARTMENT
1195 Third Street, Suite 210
Napa, Calif. 94559
707.253.4417

Initial Study Checklist

1. Project Title

Landmark Historic Preservation Zoning Ordinance, County-initiated Zoning Code Text Amendment № P10-00377-ORD.

2. Property Owner

The proposed ordinance would apply to all parcels in Napa County and contains sections directly relevant to properties owned by: Executive Committee of Rutherford Grange Number 371; Tucker Farm Center Corporation; Welcome Grange Number 791 & Unity Church of Napa; Rene DiRosa Trust; Pope Valley Farm Center; Bradley Kirkpatrick Trust & Jeffrey Parady; and Napa Valley Wine Train Inc, Hacienda Architectural & Design, and Chet Halsey.

3. Contact person and phone number

Linda St. Claire, Project Planner, (707) 299-1348, Linda.StClaire@countyofnapa.org

4. Project location and APN

The proposed ordinance would apply to all parcels in Napa County and contains sections directly relevant to the properties referenced above with the following APNs: 030-180-009-000; 020-282-001-000; 052-112-016-000; 047-110-004-000; 018-100-001-000; 018-310-023-000; & 027-210-008.

5. Project Sponsor's name and Address

Planning Director Hillary Gitelman for the Napa County Board of Supervisors, 1195 Third Street, Suite 210, Napa, Calif. 94558, (707) 253.4805, hillary.gitelman@countyofnapa.org

6. General Plan Description

The proposed ordinance would apply throughout the County in all General Plan land use designations. Specific parcels referred to in the ordinance are designated Agricultural Resource (AR), Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space (AWOS), and Rural Residential (RR).

7. Current Zoning

The proposed ordinance would apply throughout the County in all zoning districts. Specific parcels referred to in the ordinance are zoned Agricultural Preserve (AP), Agricultural Watershed (AW), Residential Single (RS B-1), Residential Country (RC) and Commercial Limited (CL).

8. Project Description

The proposed project consists of adoption of an ordinance updating Napa County Code sections related to the designation and disposition of historic landmarks. The ordinance would update the procedures and standards for the preservation and appropriate rehabilitation of historic buildings when property owners voluntarily apply for landmark designation. The ordinance also contains incentives for the rehabilitation and reuse of a limited number of historic buildings which are considered significant to the County's agricultural heritage by (1)

allowing farm centers and grange halls to be used as a matter of right as meeting halls and special event venues (APN #s 030-180-009, 020-282-001, 052-112-016, 047-110-004 & 018-100-001), and (2) by allowing the Pope Valley Store and Rutherford Train Station (APN #s 018-310-023 & 027-210-008) to be rehabilitated and adaptively reused for uses allowed in the Commercial Limited (CL) zoning district upon issuance of a use permit project specific environmental review under CEQA. The proposed ordinance would implement action items included in the General Plan Update of 2008.

9. **Background and Scope of this Review**

Action Item CC-19.2, in the Community Character Element of the Napa County General Plan (adopted June 2008) calls on the County to improve the procedures and standards that provide for the preservation and appropriate rehabilitation of significant resources, to incorporate incentives for historic preservation, and to establish a discretionary process so that owners of historic structures may apply for permission to reuse their buildings for the historic use or a compatible use as long as it is rehabilitated and maintained in conformance with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Two important historic resources (the Pope Valley Store and the Rutherford Train Station) are referenced in the proposed ordinance to test the viability of this discretionary review process and are considered "at risk" due to long term vacancy. Farm centers and grange halls have played a significant role in the County's agricultural heritage and the proposed ordinance would accommodate their continued use. Napa County Ghost wineries are also referenced in the ordinance in order to consolidate discussions of preservation incentives in Napa County Code, although related standards and requirements are not proposed for change (Napa County Code Sections 15.52.035 & .040).

10. **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses**

Napa County is located north of the San Francisco Bay Area, California. Napa County is bounded on the north and northeast by Yolo County, on the south and southeast by Solano County, and on the west by Lake and Sonoma counties. Major cities in the neighboring counties (outside of Napa County) include the cities of Vallejo (Solano County), Benicia (Contra Costa County), Fairfield (Solano County), Vacaville (Solano County), and Santa Rosa (Sonoma County).

Napa County is comprised of approximately 506,000 acres, of which 23,000 acres is water (primarily in Lake Berryessa). Approximately 479,000 (94%) of the remaining acreage is included within the unincorporated areas of the County. The remaining area, approximately 6% (30,400 acres), is designated for urban uses and is distributed among the five incorporated areas in the County: City of American Canyon, City of Calistoga, City of Napa, City of St. Helena, and Town of Yountville. Ninety-one percent of the unincorporated county is rural land, designated for agricultural uses. Approximately 86,000 acres of land within the County is publicly owned. At the present time, there are approximately 50,000 acres of planted vineyard acres in the County.

11. **Other agencies whose approval is required:**

N/A

12. **Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies:**

N/A

13. **Other Agencies Contacted:**

While no other local or state agencies would have to approve the proposed ordinance, the County has provided a draft of the proposed ordinance to the State Historic Preservation Office for their review and information.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

The conclusions and recommendations contained herein are professional opinions developed in accordance with current standards of professional practice. They are based on a review of the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps, the Napa County Baseline Data Report, Napa County General Plan Environmental Impact Report, specific documents

referenced herein, other sources of information included or referenced in the record file, comments received, conversations with knowledgeable individuals, the preparer's personal knowledge of the area, and visits to the sites and surrounding areas. For further information, please see the permanent record file on this project, available for review at the offices of the Napa County Department of Conservation, Development, and Planning, 1195 Third Street, Napa, Calif.

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.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

BY: Linda St. Claire
Project Planner
Napa County Conservation, Development, & Planning

Date

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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:

- a.-d. The subject ordinance does not in itself cause specific new development to be undertaken. The proposed ordinance would improve procedures and standards to encourage and provide for the preservation and appropriate rehabilitation of significant resources thereby allowing them to remain as part of the County's important historic landscape. Further, the ordinance requires that any demolition or new construction affecting existing historic structures could only be allowed if deemed appropriate by a qualified preservation professional and approved through a public hearing process.
- Stabilizing, improving, protecting and enhancing the county's historic and cultural heritage will be encouraged through the incentives provided. The degradation of the existing visual character or quality of historic sites would more likely occur without this ordinance update and subsequent incentives. Properties that are eligible to apply for rehabilitation and/or reuse will be analyzed on a site specific basis for aesthetic impacts.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.¹ 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a.-e. Adoption of the proposed ordinance does not in itself cause a specific new development project to be undertaken or the conversion of agricultural land. Under the proposed ordinance, rehabilitation and/or reuse of two existing resources (i.e. Rutherford Train Station and Pope Valley Store) would be allowed with a use permit, provided that adaptive reuse is found to be compatible with agricultural uses and satisfies all of the other specific findings enumerated in the ordinance. Potential rehabilitation and/or reuse of historic farm centers and grange halls would be allowed as matter of right and would be compatible with agricultural uses because their operation as meeting halls and event venues derive from the early days of agriculture in Napa County and has mostly continued since their inception. Under the proposed ordinance other existing historic resources could be recognized and modified following appropriate project specific reviews in conformance with County zoning requirements. For these reasons, the proposed ordinance would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland or timberland zoned timber production areas. Also, given that historic buildings are existing, the update would not lead to the conversion of mapped farmland under the State's FMMP and the impact would be less than significant.

¹ "Forest land" is defined by the State as "land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits." (Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) The Napa County General Plan anticipates and does not preclude conversion of some "forest land" to agricultural use, and the program-level EIR for the 2008 General Plan Update analyzed the impacts of up to 12,500 acres of vineyard development between 2005 and 2030, with the assumption that some of this development would occur on "forest land." In that analysis specifically, and in the County's view generally, the conversion of forest land to agricultural use would constitute a potentially significant impact only if there were resulting significant impacts to sensitive species, biodiversity, wildlife movement, sensitive biotic communities listed by the California Department of Fish and Game, water quality, or other environmental resources addressed in this checklist.

The reuse of a limited number of historic buildings (the farm centers/grange halls, the Rutherford Depot, and the Pope Valley Store & Roadhouse) for commercial purposes would not require voter approval pursuant to Measure P (2008). Measure P extended the life of Napa County's agricultural preservation initiative (Measure J, passed in 1990) and prevents the Board of Supervisors from re-designating agricultural land without voter approval unless certain narrow conditions apply. Similarly, the measure also prevents the Board from unilaterally modifying the "intent" and "maximum building intensity" sections of Policies AG/LU-20 and -21, which relate to lands designated Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space (AWOS) and Agricultural Resource (AR) in the General Plan. The currently proposed ordinance would not require re-designation of any AWOS or AR designated land and would not amend the "intent" and "maximum building intensities" identified for AWOS and AR designated lands. Also, as an action called for in the General Plan itself (Action Items CC-19.2 & CC-28.1), the ordinance would be consistent with the General Plan, and would not require amendment of any General Plan policies. Finally, under the terms of the proposed ordinance reuse of the Rutherford Train Station and Pope Valley Store would be subject to further in-depth site-specific review under CEQA, and could only be approved if County decision makers find that the proposed reuse is compatible with agriculture and all of the other findings enumerated in the ordinance.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

		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:

- a.-c. While the topographical and meteorological features of Napa County, and of the Napa Valley in particular, create a relatively high potential for air pollution, adoption of the ordinance, related to the designation and disposition of historic landmarks, will not create air pollution in volumes substantial enough to result in an air quality plan conflict. The proposed ordinance, establishing regulations and standards regarding the preservation, rehabilitation and incentives for the preservation of historic structures would not significantly increase traffic volumes. Uses that would be allowed at the Rutherford Train Station and the Pope Valley Store would be limited

in size as provided in the Commercial Limited (CL) zoning district and rehab reuse proposals will be evaluated upon receipt of a site specific application. As a result, the County foresees no significant increase in air pollution emissions. The subject project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plan.

Adoption of the proposed ordinance would not in itself cause a specific new development project to be undertaken although it could facilitate reuse of existing buildings. Nonetheless, the proposed ordinance is not expected to result in any violations of applicable air quality standards, vehicles, increased PM₁₀ emissions, or a failure to fully support Clean Air Transportation Control Measures. The proposed ordinance establishes regulations and standards regarding the preservation, rehabilitation and incentives for the reuse of historic structures. Additionally, all site specific projects will require the issuance of a building permit and as such strict adherence to Napa County's Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (NCSPPP), per the requirements of County Code Chapter 16.28. Adherence to the NCSPPP requires the implementation of standard practices to manage erosion and control dust to ensure that the proposed development does not impact adjoining properties, drainages, and roadways. Therefore impacts would be less-than-significant.

- d.-e. Adoption of the proposed ordinance will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. The preservation, rehabilitation and incentives of historic structures will generate little, if any, such pollutants.

Mitigation Measure(s): None are required.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a.- f. Adoption of the proposed ordinance does not in itself cause specific new development projects to be undertaken, although it could facilitate the reuse of existing historic resources. Historic structures are existing and their locations have been heavily developed. For this reason, this ordinance is not likely to affect 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. Nor would there be any substantial effect upon riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified, to include wetlands; and the movement of migratory fish or wildlife. A use permit would be required for any possible rehabilitation and/or reuse of the two historic sites called out in the ordinance, and will be subject to appropriate CEQA review to ensure that the project does not substantially adversely impact the environment. Therefore, any impacts to biological resources associated with adoption of the ordinance would be less-than-significant.

Mitigation Measure(s): None are required.

	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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:

- a.- d. Adoption of the proposed ordinance would not in itself cause a specific new development project to be undertaken although it could facilitate the rehabilitation and reuse of existing historic structures. The intent of the ordinance is multifaceted and includes: updating the historic preservation provisions of County Code; improving procedures and standards to provide for the preservation and appropriate rehabilitation of significant resources; and incorporating incentives for historic preservation such as the establishment of a discretionary process whereby owners of qualified historic buildings within agricultural areas of the County may apply for permission to reuse their buildings for their historic use or a compatible new use as long as it is compatible with agriculture and the historic building is rehabilitated and maintained in conformance with the U. S. Secretary of Interior's Standards. The effect will be to stimulate reuse of resources as long as the use is compatible with agriculture and the buildings are rehabilitated and maintained.

Substantial changes to a historic resource, according to CEQA Guideline Section 15064.5, are defined as: physical demolition, destruction, relocation or alteration of the resources or its immediate surroundings. Under the County's normal business procedures, any proposed changes to a site which meets the definitions in Section 15064.5, are analyzed on a site specific basis. Site specific analysis with the submittal of a project application ensures that project impacts are less than significant and/or that site specific environmental review is undertaken. The adoption of the proposed ordinance update, related to the designation and disposition of historic landmarks, will ensure the further protection and/or reuse of historic structures.

No changes to archaeological or paleontological resources, to include any disturbance of human remains, will occur with the ordinance update nor will the ordinance directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature. Potential site specific projects resulting from the adoption of this ordinance will be required to review/analyze and/or mitigate for any possible archaeological or paleontological resources.

Mitigation Measure(s): None are required.

	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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), 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:

- a,i-iv. Adoption of the proposed ordinance would not in itself cause a specific new development project to be undertaken. Utilizing Napa County geographical information systems, none of the parcels specifically referenced in the ordinance are in sensitive areas, including fault zones, landslide areas, and areas of high liquefaction potential, as well as those areas identified on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. Rehabilitation and/or preservation under the proposed ordinance would not create significant impacts relative to any earthquake fault zone, soils with a high liquefaction potential, landslides, or any soil creep area. While seismic activity is endemic to the Bay Area, applicable building codes have been developed to address related risks. Depending upon the rehabilitation proposed, a lateral analysis and retrofitting may be required, which functions to reduce seismic-related risks to a less than significant level.
- b. All site specific projects must also meet most all requirements established by other chapters of the Napa County Code, including the County's Conservation Regulations, which limit winter earth disturbing/grading activities and provide protective measures to conserve soil and prevent soil loss. All preservation projects and/or new construction will require the issuance of a building permit and as such strict adherence to Napa County's Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (NCSPPP), per the requirements of County Code Chapter 16.28. Adherence to the NCSPPP requires the implementation of standard practices to manage erosion and loss of topsoil, control dust and ensure that the proposed development does not impact adjoining properties, drainages, and roadways. Therefore impacts would be less-than-significant.
- c. Please see "a." above. This project will not result in significant impacts on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that may become unstable, or which could potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. Therefore impacts would be less-than-significant.
- d. Please see "a." above. Any preservation and/or rehabilitation provided for under the proposed ordinance which require building permits will necessitate standard drawings and engineering analysis of the structure and associated accessory structures, showing compliance with applicable codes, including the State Historic Building Code and any required certification by professional mechanical, structural, or civil engineers licensed by this State. Risks to life and property will therefore be less than significant.

- e. Site specific proposed projects will be reviewed and analyzed to ensure the soils are capable of adequately supporting a septic system or alternative waste water disposal system. Thus, the proposed ordinance will have a less than significant impact with regard to wastewater flows on incapable soils.

Mitigation Measure(s): None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a) Generate a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions in excess of applicable thresholds adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District or the California Air Resources Board which may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with a county-adopted climate action plan or another applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. - b. 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 the meantime, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has proposed compliance with a “qualified climate action plan” as a threshold of significance, along with a quantitative threshold of 1,100 MTCO₂e/yr (metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents per year) for land use projects. (See Table 2.1 and Appendix D. of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Air Quality Guidelines)

Overall increases in green house gas (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.

Consistent with these General Plan action items, Napa County participated in development of a community-wide GHG emissions inventory and “emission reduction framework” for all local jurisdictions in the County in 2008-2009. This planning effort was completed by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency (NCTPA) in December 2009 and was used as the foundation for development of a refined inventory and emission reduction plan for unincorporated Napa County. This plan – referred to as a “Climate Action Plan” – is currently available for public review in draft form.

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines §15183, because this initial study assesses a project that is consistent with an adopted General Plan for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was prepared, it appropriately focuses on impacts which are “peculiar to the project,” rather than the cumulative impacts previously assessed. Adoption of the proposed ordinance would not in itself cause a specific new development project to be undertaken or change the General Plan findings. The preservation and/or rehabilitation allowed under the proposed ordinance would have to be consistent with any county-adopted climate action plan and CEQA

analysis will occur with any discretionary preservation application. Project impacts related to GHG emissions are therefore considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s): None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The Pope Valley Store has been identified to have a hazardous waste site although at this time remediation is occurring (see d. below). An automobile repair and storage garage is located at the Pope Valley Store parcel. Additional land on the parcel is utilized to store vehicles which have been involved in accidents. Storage and use of potential hazardous materials is also present. The proposed ordinance will not itself stimulate the transport, use or dispose of hazardous waste, and would not exacerbate any existing hazards.
- b. Monitoring of the Pope Valley Store site continues at this time (see d. below). The proposed ordinance update, again, will not create upsets or accidental conditions involving release of hazardous waste.
- c. No new schools are proposed within two miles of any parcel in this study. The Pope Valley School is located 0.10 mile to the north of the store/roadhouse. The hazards discovered at the Pope Valley Store site are under remediation and do not pose any known current or foreseeable future emissions, substances or materials to be emitted, thus impacts are less than significant.
- d. The Pope Valley Store, located at Assessor's Parcel Number 018-310-023-000, was the only parcel, among those listed in this initial study, identified through Geographical Information Systems, to have a hazardous waste site. The State Water Resources Control Board has determined the site to be a Leaking Underground Tank Cleanup Site (LUST). The groundwater on this site was discovered to have been contaminated with petroleum hydrocarbons (gasoline) in 1999. Napa County Environmental Management and HDR E2M (a private contract remediation company) have been working with the property owner to remediate the leak. Remediation consists of ozone sparging of the site, (a process of injecting ozone into the groundwater-which acts to eliminate the contaminant) through six wells and monitoring the wells quarterly, which, according to the most recent quarterly report (December 2010), has successfully removed the contaminants. Readings from the monitoring program have indicated levels of contaminant to be near zero, an allowable limit to discontinue monitoring. At this time, the Napa County Environmental Management department has recommended the site continue with the remediation for an additional quarter to prevent any rebound of contaminants. Additional site specific analysis will occur with the submittal of a specific project application.
- e./f. None of the specific parcels referenced in the ordinance are located within two miles of a public or private airport or airport compatibility zones.
- g. Emergency response and evacuation plans currently exist. This ordinance update and reuse of historical resources will not interfere with their continuation.
- h. Adoption of the proposed ordinance will not expose people and/or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. The seven test parcels included in this initial study are located on fire hazard severity areas ranging from non-existent to moderate, according to geographical information systems maps. All of the parcels have been heavily developed.

Mitigation Measure(s): None are required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a.- f. The proposed ordinance does not in itself cause a specific new development project to be undertaken although it may stimulate reuse of existing buildings. The proposed ordinance, related to the designation and disposition of historic landmarks, establishes regulations and standards regarding the preservation, rehabilitation and incentives for the preservation of historic structures. Any earth disturbing activities associated with the rehabilitation of the structures would be reviewed as part of the building and/or use permit processes.

All preservation and/or rehabilitation provided for in the proposed ordinance must meet requirements established by other chapters of the Napa County Code, including the County's Conservation Regulations, which limit winter earth disturbing/grading activities, provide protective measures to conserve soil and prevent soil loss, call for setbacks from streams commensurate with slope, and require vegetation retention standards within the County's sensitive domestic water supply drainages. Furthermore, all projects will require the issuance of a building permit and as such strict adherence to Napa County's Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (NCSPPP), per the requirements of County Code Chapter 16.28. Adherence to the NCSPPP requires the implementation of standard practices to manage erosion and loss of topsoil, control dust and ensure that the proposed development does not impact adjoining properties, drainages, and roadways. Compliance with the County's groundwater ordinance and provision of adequate water supplies will also be required, and increased water use at the Pope Valley Store or Rutherford Train Station will require project-specific analysis.

- g.-j. The proposed ordinance does not in itself cause a specific new development project, nor cause the placement of 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. The Welcome Grange is the only parcel among the seven, specifically called out in the ordinance which is located in the 100 year flood zone. The remaining parcels are not located in a flood zone nor are they located in the floodplain. The Flood Plain Management regulations will be reviewed upon submittal of building permits or use permit applications. These regulations assist to reduce any potential floodway or flooding impacts arising from the adoption of the ordinance to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. 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"/>
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:

- a. The designation and disposition of historic landmarks, preserved, in conformance with the proposed ordinance's standards, will not physically divide an established community.
- b. Action Item CC-19.2, in the Community Character Element of the Napa County General Plan (adopted June 2008) calls on the County to improve the procedures and standards to provide for the preservation and appropriate rehabilitation of significant resources, to incorporate incentives for historic preservation and to establish a discretionary process so that owners of historic structures may apply for permission to reuse their buildings for

the historic use or a compatible use as long as it is rehabilitated and maintained in conformance with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

The proposed ordinance, in Chapter 15.52, allows for preservation and/or rehabilitation to structures and creates incentives so they do not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The proposed ordinance furthers the County's goal of improving procedures and standards to provide for the preservation and appropriate rehabilitation of significant resources, and incorporates for reuse of historic buildings. The proposed ordinance furthers the following goals and policies of the Napa County General Plan: Goals CC-4 and CC-5; Policies CC-17-20, 24, and CC-26-28.

- c. The County has no applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plans that would conflict with the proposed ordinance adoption.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. 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:

- a. - b. Adoption of the proposed ordinance related to the designation and disposition of historic landmarks, will not result in the loss of any known mineral resources or mineral resource recovery sites. Specific projects will be analyzed on a site by site basis.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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:

a. - f.

The intent of the ordinance is to preserve historical and cultural heritage, stabilize and improve property values, foster civic pride, protect and enhance attractions, serve as a stimulus to business, protect assets, and promote the use of historic sites and landmarks for the education, pleasure and welfare of the people of the county. Temporary noise is to be expected during rehabilitation historic buildings and would not be considered significant because of its temporary nature. Reuse of existing resources could also result in increase in noise levels within the vicinity; however, compliance with Napa County noise ordinance would ensure that impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. POPULATION and HOUSING. Would the project:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>
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:

- a. - c. Adoption of the proposed ordinance, related to the designation and disposition of historic landmarks, does not involve the proposal of new homes or businesses, although it may lead to reuse of existing buildings and associated employment (i.e. jobs). Given the number and scale of buildings included, the employment increase would not be considered substantial population growth. It is not expected that the historic structures will displace any existing housing stock or populations. Therefore, impacts to population and housing are either non-existent or less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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:

- a. Adoption of the proposed ordinance, related to the designation and disposition of historic landmarks, does not involve the provision or alteration of governmental facilities, nor the need for construction of new governmental facilities. Site specific analysis will be needed to ensure reuse of the Rutherford Train Station and can be accomplished without substantially affecting access to the Rutherford Fire Station. Review of any specific reuse proposed for the Pope Valley Store will also be required. Both reviews will occur as part of the use permit process required by the proposed ordinance.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. 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:

- a. – b. Adoption of the proposed ordinance, related to the designation and disposition of historic landmarks, does not increase the use of existing recreational parks, nor include any recreational facilities, or the construction thereof, which might have an adverse effect on the environment. There is no foreseeable impact to recreation facilities resulting from the adoption of the proposed ordinance.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system and/or conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-16, which seeks to maintain an adequate Level of Service (LOS) at signalized and unsignalized intersections, or reduce the effectiveness of existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-23, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a.-c. The program-level EIR prepared for the 2008 General Plan update concluded that increases in peak hour traffic associated with cumulative development between 2005 and 2030 would be significant and unavoidable. Adoption of the proposed ordinance, related to the designation and disposition of historic landmarks, would not itself generate traffic, but it could stimulate reuse of existing historic buildings, and therefore indirectly increase traffic in the immediate vicinity of the historic buildings. The buildings that may be reused are farm centers and grange halls, the Pope Valley Store, and the Rutherford Train Station. All are small scale structures, and their possible use as special event venues (the farm centers and grange halls) or as restaurants and lodging (the Pope Valley Store and the Rutherford Train Station), would mean that their most intensive use would occur outside of the peak hours when traffic conditions are at their worst. Also, reuse of the Pope Valley Store and the Rutherford Train Station will require site-specific environmental review under CEQA as part of the use permit process, allowing the County to quantify potential vehicle trips, and impose mitigation if needed to address congestion in the vicinity. For these reasons, the potential indirect traffic impacts of the proposed ordinance are not considered significant, and would not constitute a "considerable" contribution to the significant impact identified in the General Plan EIR.

- d.- e. The proposed ordinance requires site specific analysis of proposals to reuse the Rutherford Train Station and the Pope Valley Store. This review will be particularly important at the Rutherford Train Station, where traffic accessing the site has to cross the railroad tracks and enter/exit from the State highway. Safety concerns will be addressed as part of this analysis prior to approval of a use permit.
- f.- g. The designation and disposition of historic landmarks as allowed under the proposed ordinance is not in conflict with General Plan Circulation Element Policy CIR-23 and site specific analysis will be required at the Pope Valley Store and the Rutherford Train Station during the use permit process. This analysis will determine how much parking is needed to serve the proposed use(s), the location of that parking, and required conditions/features to ensure safe access. The farm centers and grange halls are small scale structures, most of which are already in use for special events. To the extent that the proposed ordinance allows these structures to be reused, it could indirectly increase parking demand in areas where parking is constrained due to site conditions. The net result will be to constrain the size and frequency of events unless ample off-site parking can be identified.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. 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"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a.-b. Adoption of the proposed ordinance, related to the designation and disposition of historic landmarks, does not in itself cause a specific new development project to be undertaken although it may stimulate reuse of existing buildings which would require review by the County. Water and wastewater issues may constrain the reuse of both the Rutherford Train Station and the Pope Valley Store and careful site/infrastructure planning will be required. Site specific review of related proposals by the County's Department of Environmental Management and/or relevant State agencies would ensure there is no significant impact related to wastewater disposal or potable water systems.
- c. The proposed ordinance will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or an expansion of existing facilities which would cause a significant impact to the environment.
- d.- e. Adoption of the proposed ordinance, related to the designation and disposition of historic landmarks, does not in itself cause a specific new development project to be undertaken, it may result in reuse of existing buildings and will require the use of existing water entitlements. The Pope Valley Store & Roadhouse and the Rutherford Train Depot's water entitlements and future usage would be analyzed upon submittal of a use permit application. The Welcome Grange is located in a groundwater deficient area and any changes to the center will require analysis of the water use pursuant to the County's groundwater ordinance. As a result, foreseeable impact to water supplies or the capacity of any wastewater treatment facility will be less than significant.
- f.-g. Adoption of the proposed ordinance will not directly result in any substantially significant increases in solid waste generation. Napa County is served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the demands of foreseeable future development. Specific projects will be analyzed on a site by site basis. Impacts related to the disposal of solid waste will be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>

Discussion:

- a. Adoption of the proposed ordinance would have a less than significant impact on environmental resources, including fish and wildlife communities and their habitats, or significantly threaten or reduce rare or endangered plants or animals. Furthermore, the proposed ordinance would not result in a significant loss of important examples of California's history or pre-history and will only serve to protect California's history. (See the Cultural Resources discussion in Section V. above).
- b. Analyses conducted in this initial study considered both cumulative and individual potential impacts. Adoption of the proposed ordinance, preservation and/or reuse of historic structures does not in itself cause impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable.
- c. The proposed ordinance includes development standards, limitations and protective measures that avoid and minimize potential adverse impacts to the environment and human beings. A use permit will be required for reuse at the Pope Valley Store and the Rutherford Train Station and will be subject to appropriate CEQA review and findings to ensure that the proposed preservation and/or rehabilitation do not substantially adverse impacts. Any changes in the use or equipment at the farm centers/granges to accommodate meetings and special events are subject to permitting by the County and approval from the Department of Environmental Management to ensure standards related to food preparation and handling are met. Analyses conducted in this initial study considered both cumulative and individual potential impacts. There are no environmental effects caused by the adoption of this ordinance that would result in significantly substantial adverse effects on the environment, or human beings, whether directly or indirectly.

The analyses performed in this initial study did not identify any significant effects resulting from the proposed ordinance, nor did it discover any significant environmental impacts that require mitigation, and warrants approval of a Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.