This section considers and evaluates the potential impacts of the proposed project on cultural and paleontological resources. Cultural resources include historic buildings and structures, historic districts, historic sites, prehistoric and historic archaeological sites, and other prehistoric and historic objects and artifacts. Paleontological resources include vertebrate, invertebrate, or plant fossils.

4.12.1 EXISTING SETTING

PREHISTORY

Nels Nelson conducted the first recorded archaeological work in Napa County and many Bay Area communities in 1909. He conducted extensive surveys and recorded several large shellmounds in the area. Nelson noted that the shellmounds in Napa County exhibited large concentrations of ash and earth, which suggest a broad subsistence base, unlike the shellmounds in the East Bay and on the coast, which contained primarily shellfish remains (Stewart 1982). Subsequent to Nelson's early work in the area, only minimal archaeological work was conducted in the Napa region until the 1940s. Beginning in the 1940s the Napa area became the focus of research for the University of California (UC), Berkeley.

Early archaeological investigations in Napa County in the 1940s concentrated on excavation of large habitation sites. At this time, UC archaeologists conducted extensive survey and large-scale excavations. Heizer's (1953) Archaeology of the Napa Region presents a comprehensive summary of this work and remains the definitive document for early work in Napa County. Some of the earliest and most prominent sites excavated in the Napa County are CA-Nap-1 (the Goddard site), CA-Nap-16 (the Suscol Creek site), CA-Nap-14 (the Las Trancas site), CA-Nap-39 (the Tulukai site), CA-Nap-131 (the Hultman site), and CA-Nap-129 (the Merriam site). This work provided data to construct local and regional cultural chronologies. For example, Beardsley (1948, 1954) used this and other data to expand his Central California Taxonomic System (CCTS) and correlate archaeological cultures in the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta with those in the Bay. The CCTS proposed a linear and uniform chronological sequence of cultural succession that included three horizons, Early, Middle and Late for the archaeological cultures in central California and the San Francisco Bay region.

The CCTS and other early archaeological research concentrated on material culture and the development of chronologies based on differences in the composition of assemblages. Issues related to subsistence, settlement strategies, social organization, and trade received minimal or no attention. The CCTS was designed to provide a means of ordering archaeological cultures in central California, but the model, particularly the creation of widespread sequences of cultural succession, was immediately questioned in a series of papers by Gerow (1954, 1974a, 1974b; Gerow with Force 1968). He suggested that two distinct cultures or traditions existed in Central California and the Bay area during the Early and Middle Horizons, and that these two cultural groups gradually converged.

Frederickson (1973, 1974) also questioned aspects of the CCTS, and proposed a new taxonomic system for central California. Frederickson (1973) defined a series of patterns or modes of adaptation (i.e., Post, Borax Lake, Houx, and Augustine) for the North Coast Ranges, the San Francisco Bay and the lower Sacramento Valley, and assigned them to six periods: Paleo-Indian (10,000 to 6,000 B.C.); Lower, Middle, and Upper Archaic (6,000 B.C. to A.D. 500); and Upper and Lower Emergent (A.D. 500 to 1800).
The Post Pattern (12,000-8,000 B.P. [Before Present]) represents the earliest occupation of the area and is characterized by fluted, concave-base projectile points and crescents (Basgall 1993). The Borax Lake Pattern (8,000-2,500 B.P.) highlights a combined generalized hunting and collecting subsistence pattern that is characterized by heavy, wide-stemmed points (Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984; Basgall 1993). The Houx Pattern (2,500-1,500 B.P.) highlights the expansion of collecting and the incorporation of other resource acquisition strategies (e.g., fishing and exploitation of other aquatic resources). Artifacts typically associated with this Pattern include: bipoints and shouldered lanceolate projectile points; mortars and pestles; and bone tools (Frederickson 1984, 1994; Basgall 1993). The Augustine Pattern (1,500-200 B.P.) is characterized by a change in technology and subsistence strategies. These changes include: introduction of bow and arrow technology, as evidenced by small projectile points; acorns becoming the staple food resource; and the use of fish harpoons. This time period also is marked by an intensification of trade and an increase in sociopolitical complexity and social stratification. In addition, the Augustine Pattern is associated with Wappo, Lake Miwok, and Patwin occupation of the area and is the cultural pattern encountered by Russians, Spanish, and subsequent Euroamericans that entered the area.

Research in the 1970s and 1980s generally focused on refining local cultural sequences using new dating methods (e.g., obsidian hydration) (cf., Origer 1982 and Fredrickson 1984). This research presented new temporal sequences for projectile points from Sonoma, Marin, and Napa counties. Research interests also changed from an emphasis on defining cultural and chronological sequences to the investigation of subsistence and settlement systems. Regardless of a shift in research orientation, cultural chronology remains an important question in central California archaeology.

Recent archaeological investigations in Napa County are primarily conducted to comply with the regulatory requirements of CEQA and NEPA for specific development projects. Consequently, there has been scant comprehensive archaeological research in Napa County. Archaeological investigations have been limited in scope and focused on management goals and site-specific mitigation measures. Regardless, research questions continue to focus on cultural chronology and changes in patterns of settlement and subsistence through time in various areas across Napa County.

Recent archaeological investigations have expanded our understanding of the prehistoric populations who inhabited the Napa region and their use of it. These investigations have advanced our knowledge of the climate, natural environment, and adaptive strategies used by prehistoric cultures. Archaeological investigations in the region, however, are primarily the result of specific projects and have not usually addressed regional patterns of prehistoric and/or historic use of the Napa region. Consequently, archaeological research in Napa County and the region still has the potential to yield important information about prehistory and history.

For a more detailed description of the prehistoric background of Napa County please refer to the Background Data Report for the Napa County General Plan EIR (Jones & Stokes 2005).

ETHNOGRAPHY

The ethnographic information presented in this document is based on the work of several researchers. Sources include Kroeber (1925), Heizer (1953), Sawyer (1978), Johnson (1978), and Milliken (1995). The archaeological and ethnographic record shows that primarily the Wappo, Lake Miwok, and Patwin tribal groups inhabited the Napa region. The major differences between the Native American groups who inhabited the region were their specific languages and territorial boundaries. The technology, subsistence strategies, and settlement patterns of the groups, however, were very similar.
4.12 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

For a more detailed description of the ethnographic background of Napa County please refer to the Background Data Report for the Napa County General Plan EIR (Jones & Stokes 2005).

Wappo

Wappo is a dialect of the Yukian language, which also includes Yuki, Coast Yuki, and Huchnom. Wappo is the name given to Wappo-speaking people by the Spanish. According to Sawyer (1978), Wappo is derived from the Spanish word guapo, which may be translated as brave or handsome. The Spanish considered Wappo to be brave because of their resistance to Euroamerican incursion in Napa Valley during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Heizer 1953). Wappo dialects were spoken in a territory that consisted of two divisions. The smaller division existed in a 5-square-mile territory south of Clear Lake. The larger division extended from just north of Napa and Sonoma in the south to Cloverdale and Middletown in the north.

Wappo may have been among the first groups to occupy the Napa Glass Mountain area beginning around 2000 B.C. (Heizer 1953; Elmendorf 1963). The sociopolitical unit of Wappo was the village, which was generally located along a creek or another water source and included either one or two sweat houses, depending on the size of the village. Kroeber (1925) claims that the population of the Wappo never exceeded 1,000 people, but more recent evidence suggests that it may have been significantly larger (cf., Sawyer 1978).

Mission records reveal that Wappo unsuccessfully battled the Spanish and Wappo from villages at Canjolmano, Caymus, Chemoco, Hui luc, Locoma, Mayacama, and Napa were brought to the mission at Sonoma between 1823 and 1834 to be used for labor (Milliken 1995). In 1854, the Wappo of the Russian River Valley, whose population likely included Wappo from territories within Napa County, were moved to a reservation in Mendocino. The population of Wappo in Napa Valley in 1855 is estimated to be 500 (Sawyer 1978). By 1856, nearly half the Wappo moved to Mendocino had died (Sawyer 1978). The reservation was closed in 1867.

Patwin

Patwin, who occupied an extensive area within north-central California, inhabited portions of Napa County. Patwin territory included the lower portion of the western Sacramento Valley, west of the Sacramento River from about Princeton in the north to Benicia in the south (Kroeber 1925). Patwin have traditionally been divided geographically into River, Hill, and Southern groups, although a more complex set of linguistic and cultural differences actually existed than is indicated by these divisions. Regardless, Patwin are believed to have reached the Carquinez/Suisun area by about 1,500 B.P. and occupied the southern end of Napa County (McCarthy et al. 1985). When Powers surveyed the state gathering ethnographic information in 1871–1872, however, Patwin culture appeared virtually extinct, particularly in the Napa County area.

Lake Miwok

Lake Miwok spoke a Penutian language, and their native territory was geographically isolated from other Miwok groups located to the south. The Lake Miwok language is related to that of the Coast Miwok of Marin County and coastal Sonoma County and the Eastern Miwok of the Sierra Nevada. Miwok groups are also related to Costanoan (Ohlone) groups that occupied the area from San Francisco to Monterey County.
Lake Miwok inhabited an area that extended south from Clear Lake to Pope Valley, west to Cobb Mountain in Lake County (where they shared borders with the Pomo and Wappo) and east to Patwin territory (including Jerusalem Valley, Soda Creek, and Putah Creek). The primary village for the northern part of Lake Miwok territory was located just south of Lower Lake, and the central village in the southern part of Lake Miwok territory was located in Coyote Valley along Putah Creek (Levy 1978). Kroeber estimates that the population of Lake Miwok was no more than 500 individuals prior to Euroamerican settlement of the region. During the early nineteenth century many Lake Miwok were either killed or taken from their villages to work as laborers on ranches in the area. In 1841 the U.S. Census identified only 41 people of Lake Miwok descent and the 1910 U.S. Census identified only seven individuals (Levy 1978).

Wappo and Patwin Culture

Group Organization

The 50-150-person “tribelet” was the basic social and political unit of both Wappo and Patwin. Typically, a tribelet chief would reside in a major village in which ceremonial events were usually held. The position of chief was inherited through the male line in Patwin groups, but village elders had considerable power in determining who actually succeeded to particular positions. Apparently, a Patwin chief had more authority than his counterparts in many of the other central California groups (McKern 1922; Kroeber 1925). A Wappo village chief was either elected or appointed, and generally rejected the tendency to impose authority over other members of the group. Whether the chief was man or woman, the chief’s main functions in both groups included: maintaining relationships with other villages and neighboring groups; overseeing internal operations of the village; directing ceremonies and dances; and disseminating and receiving information (Sawyer 1978). Such individuals often decided when and where various fishing, hunting, or gathering expeditions would occur and similarly made critical decisions concerning ceremonial activities. The chief also played a central role in resolving conflicts within the community or during wars, which occasionally broke out with neighboring groups.

Subsistence

The acorn was the primary plant food, along with a variety of roots, bulbs, grasses, and other plant resources. Deer, elk, and antelope were the primary animal resources, but smaller mammals such as rabbits, squirrels, and birds were also important. Fish supplemented the diet, but may not have been as important as terrestrial animals, which were abundant in the grassy valleys (Bean and Theodoratus 1978).

A variety of raw materials were available for the manufacture of hunting, gathering, and processing implements. Wappo and Patwin used stone in almost every aspect of their lives. Napa Glass Mountain, a regionally important obsidian site and quarry, and other local obsidian sources are located within Wappo territory. Other major obsidian sources are near Wappo and Patwin territory (i.e., Borax Lake, Mount Konocti, and Annadel).

Technology

Obsidian was used for projectile points, knives, scrapers, drills, and many other tool types. Chert, found naturally throughout the north Coast Ranges, was also used for a wide range of tools, including projectile points, knives, scrapers, and cobble tools. Basalt was also used for tool manufacture, but it was not the preferred material. Bone tools were also used for awls, needles, whistles, and perforators.
Trade and Travel

Wappo and Patwin traded with their neighbors for a variety of goods such as marine shells, fish, and salt. Wappo in particular had access to Napa Glass Mountain obsidian, which was known for its high quality. It was a valuable commodity in regional trade networks, and provided Wappo with a resource that could be traded for a variety of resources.

Lake Miwok

Group Organization

Lake Miwok were organized into tribelets under the leadership of a hereditary male chief, but sociopolitical organization did not extend beyond the village. Other important leaders included an assistant chief and a female leader known as má-yen (Callaghan 1978).

Subsistence

Lake Miwok subsistence strategy primarily focused on the oak woodlands that formed the prevalent vegetation type in their territory. Deer, elk, and grizzly bear were the primary animal resources, but smaller mammals such as rabbits, squirrels, and birds were also important. Fish caught using weirs and basketry traps supplemented the diet. In addition to animal resources, acorns and other plant resources, such as buckeye and pine nuts, formed a large part of the diet of Lake Miwok.

Technology

Lake Miwok technology consisted of a variety of items made from wood, bone, and stone. Obsidian was obtained from Wappo was used for knives and arrow points and basketry (i.e., both utilitarian and ceremonial) was made from a variety of plant products (e.g., willow, grass roots, and pine roots) (Callaghan 1978).

Trade and Travel

Lake Miwok traveled across the Coast Range as far as Bodega Bay to trade for a variety of goods such as marine shells. They were very familiar with their neighbors and a wide range of ecological zones both within and surrounding their territory.

History

The first recorded European explorers in the upper Napa Valley, Don Francisco Castro and Franciscan Friar José Altimira, traveled through the area in 1823 in search of a site for a new mission. They explored present-day Petaluma, Sonoma, and Napa before eventually settling on Sonoma as the new mission site (Hoover 1990). The Spanish attempted to convert the Native American population to Catholicism and incorporate them into the “mission system.” The process of missionization disrupted traditional Native American cultural practices, and Native American groups were generally slow to adapt to the mission system. Spanish, however, were intent on implementing it, and most Native Americans in the area were either incorporated or relocated into local missions. This factor, coupled with exposure to European diseases, virtually ended the traditional life of Native Americans in and around Napa County.
The Mexican period (ca. 1821-1848) in California is an outgrowth of the Mexican Revolution, and its accompanying social and political views affected the mission system. In 1833 the missions were secularized and their lands divided among the Californios as land grants called Ranchos. These ranchos facilitated the growth of a semi-aristocratic group that controlled the larger ranchos. Owners of ranchos used local populations, including Native Americans, essentially as forced labor to accomplish work on their large tracts of land. Consequently, Native American groups across California were forced into a marginalized existence as peons or vaqueros on the large ranchos. Ranchos in the general project area include: Rancho Entre-Napa; Rancho Caymus; Rancho Came Humana; Rancho Catacula; and Mallacomes Rancho (Beck and Haase 1974). These ranchos are also associated with early settlers in the region.

George C. Yount was the first pioneer to settle in Napa County. He came to California in 1831 to hunt and trap sea otters, and eventually settled in San Rafael. Initially, he held a number of odd jobs at various locations across the region, including the Sonoma Mission and General Vallejo’s residence in Sonoma. In 1836, Yount was baptized as Jorge Concepcion Yount and became a Mexican citizen. Subsequently, he received the Rancho Caymus land grant in the Napa Valley from the Mexican government, which included more than 11,000 acres. From 1836 to 1846, most of the rancho was used as grazing land for horses, cattle, and sheep, but a small portion was used for cultivation of wheat. Yount built an adobe house and later a Kentucky-style blockhouse and gristmill on his property (Hayes 2004). Yount also laid out a town grid on his property in 1855. He called the town Sebastopol, which was renamed Yountville after his death (Hayes 2004).

Dr. Edward Turner Bale was another early settler in Napa County. He served as surgeon-in-chief of the Mexican army in Alta California. Bale was granted 18,000 acres, just north of Yount’s property, after he married General Vallejo’s niece Maria Ignacia Sobrantes in 1839. The property was called Rancho Came Humana. Bale commissioned the building of a gristmill just north of Mill Creek to grind corn and wheat for farmers in the area. Indeed, wheat became an important crop in the area during the latter half of the nineteenth century.

Joseph Ballinger Chiles obtained title to Rancho Catacula in 1844. The rancho is located in a valley, which was named for Chiles. He built an adobe house on Rancho Catacula in 1846 and began to farm the land and raise Missouri mules and Durham cattle, for which he became well known. Chiles also built a gristmill on the rancho in 1846, which was in operation until the 1880s. Chiles also manufactured whiskey until the late 1870s under the Catacula label, touted as a sign of excellence (Hayes 2004).

Jose de los Santos Berryessa, former Alcalde of Sonoma under General Vallejo was given the Mallacomes Rancho in 1843 as a reward for serving the Mexican governor (Hayes 2004). Berryessa, however, returned to Mexico in 1850 after California became part of the United States. In 1853, Thomas B. Knight purchased a large portion of Berryessa’s rancho and named it Rancho Muristood. Knight had participated in the Bear Flag Revolt, and his rancho eventually became known as Knights Valley (Hayes 2004).

The commencement of the Mexican-American War in 1846 also affected the exploration and development of California. The discovery of gold at Sutter’s Mill in Coloma in 1848, however, was the catalyst that caused the most dramatic alteration of both Native American and Euroamerican cultural patterns in California. Once news of the discovery of gold spread, a flood of EuroAmericans entered the region, and gravitated to California. Initially, the Euroamerican population grew slowly, but soon exploded as the presence of large deposits of gold was confirmed in the Sacramento area. The population of California quickly swelled from an estimated 4,000 EuroAmericans in 1848 to 500,000 in 1850. Conversely, the discovery of gold in
California marked the beginning of a relatively rapid decline of both Native American populations and culture.

Various population estimates attest to the rapid and almost total decline of indigenous people. Diseases introduced by Euroamericans resulted in the annihilation of nearly 75% of the native population (Heizer 1960). The former character and the decline of local Native American culture is illuminated by Princess Isidora Solano (Princess Isidora Solano is identified as Patwin), wife of Chief Francisco Solano, who dictated her memoirs in 1874 at the age of 90 (Sanchez 1930). She recounts the exploits of Francisco Solano, chief of the Suisunes, Topaytos, Yoloitos and Chuructos and an important ally of General M. Guadalupe Valdejo, and describes the abundance of resources (e.g., salmon) in the region prior to the arrival of “the white man”; and also highlights the effects of the “white man” on Patwin culture (Sanchez 1930). By 1870, Euroamericans had inhabited the Napa Valley and the Native Americans who once roamed freely were virtually wiped out by smallpox and other introduced diseases.

Napa County

Nathan Coombs laid out Napa City on property he acquired from Nicholas Higuera’s Rancho Entre-Napa in 1848. When California was granted statehood in 1850, Napa became one of the original 27 counties of California with Napa City (later shortened to Napa) as the county seat. The Gold Rush facilitated the growth of Napa City, which attracted miners seeking alternative occupations. There was plenty of work in the Napa area on cattle ranches and in the lumber industry.

Viticulture Industry

The mission system is credited with beginning the wine industry in the region. Grapevines were initially planted for sacramental wine, but soon after were also planted for the general production of wine. The first grape vines grown in the Napa Valley are credited to George Yount, who in 1838 planted table grapes. Production increased between 1845 and 1847, when William Nash and F. E. Kellogg planted orchards and vines near Bale Mill and sold their products in San Francisco. Little effort was made, however, to improve the variety of mission grapes, growing techniques, or winemaking processes until the mid-1850s. At this time, Agoston Haraszthy is credited with introducing zinfandel into California, planting additional European varietals in Napa Valley in the 1860s, and improving overall winemaking in the region (Feneau et al. 2000).

In 1865, France and Spain experienced an outbreak of phylloxera, a parasite infestation that destroys grapevines, and it reduced wine production by half. Vineyards in the United States were initially unaffected and for a brief time profited from Europe’s misfortune. The California legislature removed the tax from wines in 1866 to encourage the industry and provide opportunities for those abandoning unprofitable gold mining ventures. In addition, the construction of the Napa Valley Railroad in 1868 increased the marketing potential for grape growers because it provided an easy means of shipping their crops to Napa and then via steamer to San Francisco and other countries. These circumstances facilitated the expansion of the Napa Valley wine industry and settlement in the region (Feneau et al. 2000).

The 1870s marked a period of tremendous growth in the Napa Valley wine industry, with the number of wineries between Calistoga and Oakville doubling from 15 to 30. Wine production employed more workers than any other form of California agriculture, leading to an increase in the use of Chinese laborers. Dozens of Chinese laborers arrived in the valley to build the Napa Valley Railroad and remained to work in viticulture (Feneau et al. 2000). Napa Valley growers
also started focusing on improving the taste of their product, which was enhanced by the use of underground wine cellars that provided constant temperature. An economic depression in the mid-1870s and a phylloxera outbreak in the Napa Valley, however, forced many struggling wine businesses to close.

By the late 1870s and early 1880s, overproduction of wine, the poor quality of the product, and a tax on brandy posed serious challenges for winemakers in Napa Valley. To face these challenges, wine growers gradually replaced old or diseased vines with the best European varietals. With experience, growers extended their vineyards into hillier terrain, where vines were less affected by hard valley frost, and planted other varieties, such as cabernet sauvignon, cabernet franc, and merlot. While total output varied over the years, California saw a relatively steady increase in wine production, with 4 million gallons of wine production in 1877 increasing to 17 million in 1888. Indeed, Napa County was producing as much wine as the United States was importing from other countries (Ferneau et al. 2000).

In the early 1890s, a phylloxera infestation seriously affected half of the vineyards in Napa County. Wine production fell from roughly 5 million gallons in 1890 to 2 million gallons in 1892. To counteract the infestation a native grapevine from the eastern United States that was resistant to phylloxera was used as rootstock for grafting European varietal vines. The planting of new phylloxera resistant grapevines was successful and by the mid-1890s the wine industry was beginning to re-establish itself as an important agricultural industry in the region (Ferneau et al. 2000).

While viticulture remained the dominant agricultural activity in the valley in the late 1800s, the development of other crops increased in response to the problems (i.e., a phylloxera infestation that devastated the wine industry) recently faced by the wine industry. Consequently, fruit growing became a major enterprise in the Napa Valley during the late nineteenth century. Initially, apples and peaches were the primary crop, but by the late 1880s, olives and prunes also became important crops. Prunes soon became the main fruit crop in Napa Valley.

The wine industry had another setback in 1906 associated with the San Francisco earthquake. San Francisco was California's center for shipping, trading, and cellaring of wine. The California Wine Association lost more than 9 million gallons of wine in the earthquake and it destroyed regional transportation facilities leaving Napa Valley wine producers without a means of distributing their wine (Ferneau et al. 2000). The wine industry rebounded from this catastrophe only to be dealt another more serious blow in 1920. Prohibition, established by the 18th Amendment to the Constitution, was enacted in January 1920 and resulted in the collapse of the California wine industry. A few viticulturists survived by producing limited amounts of wine for medicinal, sacramental, or cooking purposes. These individuals devised creative ways to continue to produce and sell their wine. For example, winemaking, which was still legal if a family annually produced 200 gallons or fewer, continued in individual households and local doctors prescribed wine to cure ills. Regardless, Prohibition stifled the wine industry in California and the Napa Valley and it did not recover until the 1950s. The recovery of the regional wine industry has been dramatic, with wine production and tourism steadily increasing in the Napa Valley and surrounding region. Today, Napa Valley is known for its vineyards and premier wines.

**Known Cultural Resources in the County**

Jones & Stokes (2005) prepared the Baseline Data Report for Napa County, which provided most of the data used in preparation of this section of the EIR. This report and other archival research identified 1,138 previously recorded archaeological sites and 1,635 historic architectural features in the County (see Table 4.12-1). The prehistoric and historic Native American occupation of
Napa County is generally related to the Houx and Augustine Patterns. Historic sites are primarily associated with the early Euroamerican settlement of Napa County and the development of cities and towns across the County. Historic sites include agricultural complexes, ranch complexes, and vineyard/winery complexes that consist of a variety of buildings/structures and features such as rural residences, wine processing and storage facilities, barns, corrals, and rock walls. Other historic architectural features (e.g., buildings and structures) are also present across the County and include 82 buildings or structures that are listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). In addition, there are 238 buildings or structures that are determined eligible for inclusion in the NRHP and/or the CRHR and it appears that additional historic architectural features would be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP and/or the CRHR if they were subjected to research to formally determine their historic significance. Table 4.12-2 lists state and federally listed historic resources in the County (unincorporated County plus the incorporated cities and town). Figure 4.12-1 is based on BDR Map 14-3 and is a sensitivity analysis for determining areas of the County that have high potential for cultural resources. This analysis consisted of GIS mapping involving the identification of known cultural resource sites and their relationship with soil conditions, slopes, elevation and distance to water features.

### Table 4.12-1
**PREVIOUSLY RECORDED ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL SITES IN NAPA COUNTY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prehistoric Archaeological Site</th>
<th>Prehistoric/Historic Archaeological Site</th>
<th>Historic Archaeological Site</th>
<th>Architectural Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>839</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>1,635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Jones & Stokes/EDAW 2005 and PMC 2006*

### Table 4.12-2
**STATE AND FEDERALLY LISTED HISTORIC RESOURCES IN NAPA COUNTY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Located Near</th>
<th>Listing</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Located Near</th>
<th>Listing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aetna Springs Resort</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Pope Valley</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Litto's Hubcap Ranch</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Pope Valley</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria Hotel</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Manasse House</td>
<td>1905/1917</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews House</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Manasse Mansion</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson House</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Migliavacca Mansion</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of Napa</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Mount View Hotel</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Calistoga</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behlow Building</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Napa Abajo and Fuller Park Historic Districts</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beringer Brothers Winery</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Napa County Courthouse Plaza</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beringer Winery Historic District</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Napa Opera House</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Year Built</td>
<td>Located Near</td>
<td>Listing</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Year Built</td>
<td>Located Near...</td>
<td>Listing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brannan Cottage</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>Calistoga</td>
<td>National &amp; California</td>
<td>Napa Post Office</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brannan Store</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Calistoga</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Napa Valley Railroad Depot</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>Calistoga</td>
<td>National &amp; California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buford House</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Nichelini Winery</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Krug Winery</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>National &amp; California</td>
<td>Noyes Mansion</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chateau Chevalier</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Oakville Grocery</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Oakville</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiles Mill Site</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Chiles Valley</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Old Bale Grist Mill</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>National &amp; California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill Manor</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Old Napa Register Building</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl House</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Palmer House</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Calistoga</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliza G. Yount House</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Pinkham House</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmshaven</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Pope Street Bridge</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eshcol Winery</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Rhine House</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far Niente Winery</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Oakville</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Robert Louis Stevenson State Park</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Calistoga</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First National Bank</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Rovegno House</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National &amp; California</td>
<td>Sam Kee Laundry Building</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis House</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Calistoga</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Schramsberg Vineyard</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Calistoga</td>
<td>National &amp; California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Laundry</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Semorile Building</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodman Library</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Smith House</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodman Mansion</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Soscol House</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodman, Jr. House</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Southern Pacific Railroad Depot</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Building</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>St. Helena Catholic Church</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greystone Cellars</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>St. Helena High School</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groezinger Wine Cellars</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>St. Helena Historic Commercial District</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackett House</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>St. Helena Public Library</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Located Near</th>
<th>Listing</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Located Near...</th>
<th>Listing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hatt Building</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Taylor, Duckworth and</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helios Ranch</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Veterans Home of</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennessey House</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Veterans Home of</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>California Chapel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson Cabin Site</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Calistoga</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Webber House</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imrie House</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>William Tell Saloon and</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRS Bonded Warehouse</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Winship-Smeres Building</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelsey House Site</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>Calistoga</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Wulff House</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kreuzer Ranch</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>York Cabin Site</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkmead Winery</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Calistoga</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Yount Blockhouse Site</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>Calistoga</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisbon Winery</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Yount Grave</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Paleontology is defined as a science dealing with the life of past geological periods as known from fossil remains. Paleontological resources include fossil remains, as well as fossil localities and formations, which have produced fossil material in other nearby areas. This resource can be an important educational resource for the reasons mentioned before, and are nonrenewable once destroyed. CEQA offers protection for these sensitive resources and requires that they be addressed during the EIR process.

A search of the University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP) collections database identified eight locations in Napa County where paleontological resources have been identified. A total of fifty-two specimens, primarily plants (i.e., 38 specimens) where identified at eight paleontological sites in the County.

4.12.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

STATE

California Environmental Quality Act

Under CEQA, public agencies must consider the effects of their actions on both “historical resources” and “unique archaeological resources.” Pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 21084.1, a “project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.” Section 21083.2 requires agencies to determine whether proposed projects would have effects on “unique archaeological resources.”
“Historical resource” is a term with a defined statutory meaning (Public Resources Code, Section 21084.1 and State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5 [a], [b]). The term embraces any resource listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). The CRHR includes resources listed in or formally determined eligible for listing in the NRHP, as well as some California State Landmarks and Points of Historical Interest.

Properties of local significance that have been designated under a local preservation ordinance (local landmarks or landmark districts) or that have been identified in a local historical resources inventory meeting certain criteria, may be eligible for listing in the CRHR and are presumed to be “historical resources” for purposes of CEQA unless a preponderance of evidence indicates otherwise (Pub. Resources Code, Section 5024.1 and California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 4850). Unless a resource listed in a qualified survey has been demolished, lost substantial integrity, or there is a preponderance of evidence indicating that it is otherwise not eligible for listing, a lead agency should consider the resource to be potentially eligible for the CRHR.

Following CEQA Guidelines Section 21084.5 (a) and (b) an historical resource is defined as any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that:

- a) Is historically or archeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political or cultural annals of California; and

- b) Meets any of the following criteria:

  1) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;

  2) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

  3) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or

  4) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history.

Potential eligibility also rests upon the integrity of the resource. Integrity, following 14 California Code of Regulations Section 4852(c), is defined as the retention of the resource’s physical identity that existed during its period of significance. Integrity is determined through considering the setting, design, workmanship, materials, location, feeling and association of the resource.

Archaeological resources may also qualify as “historical resources”. California Public Resources Code 5024 requires consultation with the Office of Historic Preservation when a project may impact historical resources owned by the State.

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, subdivision (b)(3) and Section 15126.4 subdivision (b) provide mitigation measures related to impacts on historical resources. By following these mitigation measures, including preservation in place, data recovery through excavation, and application of the United States Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (1995), a project’s impact on any historical resources shall generally be considered mitigated to a level of less than significant.
Cultural resources sensitivity in the BDR is measured using a scoring system ranging from 1-20, with the highest score possible being 20. The higher the score the more sensitive an area is for the potential identification of cultural resources.
As noted above, CEQA also requires lead agencies to consider whether proposed projects will impact “unique archaeological resources.” Public Resources Code Section 21083.2, subdivision (g), states that “unique archaeological resource” means an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

- Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
- Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
- Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

Treatment options under Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 include activities that preserve such resources in place in an undisturbed state. Other acceptable methods of mitigation under Section 21083.2 include excavation and curation or study in place without excavation and curation (if the study finds that the artifacts would not meet one or more of the criteria for defining a “unique archaeological resource”).

Advice on procedures to identify cultural resources, evaluate their importance and estimate potential effects, and consult with Native Americans is given in several agency publications such as the Technical Assistance Series produced by the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) and the Tribal Consultation Guidelines produce by the Office of Planning and Research (OPR). The technical assistance series and the consultation guidelines strongly recommend that Native American concerns and the concerns of other interested persons and corporate entities, including but not limited to, museums, historical commissions, associations and societies, be solicited as part of the process of cultural resources inventory. In addition, California law protects Native American burials, skeletal remains and associated grave goods regardless of their antiquity and provides for the sensitive treatment and disposition of those remains (Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Public Resources Code 5097.9).

When human remains are discovered, the protocol to be followed is specified in California Health and Safety Code, which states:

In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the coroner of the county in which the human remains are discovered has determined, in accordance with Chapter 10 (commencing with Section 27460) of Part 3 of Division 2 of Title 3 of the Government Code, that the remains are not subject to the provisions of Section 27492 of the Government Code or any other related provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner and cause of death, and the recommendations concerning treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.
State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, subdivision (e), requires that excavation activities be stopped whenever human remains are uncovered and that the county coroner be called in to assess the remains. If the county coroner determines that the remains are those of Native Americans, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) must be contacted within 24 hours. At that time, the lead agency must consult with the appropriate Native Americans, if any, as timely identified by the NAHC. Section 15064.5 directs the lead agency (or applicant), under certain circumstances, to develop an agreement with the Native Americans for the treatment and disposition of the remains.

In addition to the mitigation provisions pertaining to accidental discovery of human remains, the State CEQA Guidelines also require that a lead agency make provisions for the accidental discovery of historical or archaeological resources, generally. Pursuant to Section 15064.5, subdivision (f), these provisions should include “an immediate evaluation of the find by a qualified archaeologist. If the find is determined to be an historical or unique archaeological resource, contingency funding and a time allotment sufficient to allow for implementation of avoidance measures or appropriate mitigation should be available. Work could continue on other parts of the building site while historical or unique archaeological resource mitigation takes place.”

Senate Bill 18 (Cal. Gov. Code Sections 65352.3, 65352.4) requires that, prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan proposed on or after March 1, 2005, a city or county must consult with Native American tribes with respect to the possible preservation of, or the mitigation of impacts to, specified Native American places, features, and objects located within that jurisdiction. As part of the NOP process, the County initiated the consultation process as required under these provisions of the Government Code. Further consultation is anticipated concurrent with public review of the General Plan’s Draft EIR.

Paleontological resources are classified as non-renewable scientific resources and are protected by state statute (e.g., Public Resources Code Section 5097.5 (a), Removal or Destruction; Prohibition), and Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines. No state or local agencies have specific jurisdiction over paleontological resources. No state or local agency requires a paleontological collecting permit to allow for the recovery of fossil remains discovered as a result of construction-related earth moving on state or private land in a project site in a limited fashion.

4.12.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Following Public Resources Code Sections 21083.2 and 21084.1, and Section 15064.5 and Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, the County considers cultural resource impacts to be significant if a project would:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource or an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code section 21083.2 and CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5, respectively;

- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature; or

- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.
State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 defines “substantial adverse change” as physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource is materially impaired.

**METHODOLOGY**

The BDR prepared by Jones & Stokes (2005) was the primary source for this section of the DEIR. The BDR and other archival research identified 1,138 previously recorded prehistoric and historic archaeological sites and 1,635 historic architectural features in the County (see Tables 4.12-1 and 4.12-2 and Figure 4.12-1 that depicts the archaeological and historical sensitivity of Napa County). The potential for other, unidentified, resources in the County has also been taken into consideration.

**PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

**Archaeological (Prehistoric & Historic) Resources, Human Remains, and Paleontological Resources**

**Impact 4.12.1** Implementation of the land uses and development under the proposed Napa County General Plan Update could result in the potential disturbance of archaeological resources (i.e., prehistoric and historic sites), paleontological resources and human remains. (Significant and Mitigable - All Alternatives)

Future development in the County could impact archaeological resources, human remains, and paleontological resources whether or not the General Plan is updated. Parts of Napa County have been subject to archaeological and historical investigations, but the entire County has not been subjected to detailed investigation. Nonetheless, the presence of 1,138 known archaeological sites in Napa County suggests that the County should be considered sensitive for prehistoric and historic cultural resources. Areas of the County along rivers and creeks and within valleys are particularly sensitive for prehistoric and historic resources, and exhibit a long history of use by Native Americans and Euroamericans. A search of the University of California, Berkeley Museum of Paleontology collections database identified eight paleontological sites and a total of fifty-two paleontological specimens in Napa County. Nearly all of these specimens have been identified in the Sonoma Formation with a few specimens being identified in the Cierbo, San Pablo, Venabo, and Teham Formations. Consequently, the scope and distribution of development anticipated in the County could cause potentially significant impacts to either known or as yet to be discovered archaeological resources, human remains or paleontological resources. Potential impacts to these resources would be mitigated by taking precautions prior to excavation and development, and by reacting appropriately when resources are discovered.

Potential impacts specific to each of the three alternatives are further described below:

**Alternative A**

As identified in Section 3.0 (Project Description), this alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map as well as the policy guidance set forth under the existing General Plan. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units and 16,014,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County. This development (when compared to Figure 4.12-1) could impact cultural and paleontological resources. This impact is considered significant and would require the implementation of the mitigation measures identified below.
Alternative B

This alternative would generally retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map. However, this alternative would provide for additional growth within currently General Plan designated areas for rural and urban development (such as within the unincorporated community of Angwin) as well as re-use of the Pacific Coast/Boca site and Napa Pipe site. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units and 14,636,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County. In addition to the proposed land use map, Alternative B would include roadway improvements (associated with the proposed General Plan Update Circulation Element), extension of recycled water to Coombsville and Cameros, as well as policy provisions for trails and public open space (proposed Recreation and Open Space Element in the General Plan Update). This development (when compared to Figure 4.12-1) could impact cultural and paleontological resources. This impact is considered significant and would require the implementation of the mitigation measures identified below.

Alternative C

Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 7,635 dwelling units and 12,990,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County under this alternative. Alternative C would involve some additional land use changes beyond Alternative B that would allow for additional development/redevelopment (e.g., redesignation of Napa Pipe and Pacific Coast/Boca sites, potential expansion of the rural and urban uses in Angwin and establishment of a new RUL for the City of American Canyon). However, this Alternative would have similar infrastructure and trail/recreation provisions as Alternative B. This development (when compared to Figure 4.12-1) could impact cultural and paleontological resources. This impact is considered significant and would require the implementation of the mitigation measures identified below.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure shall apply all three alternatives:

**MM 4.12.1**

The County shall provide a policy in the General Plan that requires all discretionary projects involving ground disturbing activity to comply with the following standards:

- Retain the services of a qualified archaeologist to conduct archival research and/or pre-construction cultural resource investigations on sites identified as having cultural resource sensitivity in Baseline Data Report Map 14-3, which may be updated from time to time. Where archaeological resources are discovered that are determined to be eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources, implement measures for the protection of the identified archaeological resources consistent with the provisions of Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. These measures may include, but are not limited to: excavation of the archaeological resource by qualified archaeologists leading to curation of recovered materials and publication of resulting information and analysis, and avoidance or capping of the cultural resource site. The results of archival research and/or pre-construction investigations shall be provided to the County for review, along with recommendations regarding construction measures (e.g. excavation and recovery or avoidance), prior to the commencement of construction.
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- The Napa County Planning Department shall be notified immediately if any prehistoric or historic artifacts or paleontological resources (e.g., fossils) are uncovered during construction. All construction shall stop in vicinity of the discovery and a qualified archaeologist shall be retained to evaluate the finds and recommend appropriate action prior to re-commencement of construction. Appropriate action may include data collection, and/or recovery of significant artifacts, project redesign to avoid the resource, and shall always include preparation of a written report documenting the find and describing steps taken to evaluate and protect significant resources.

- The Napa County Planning Department shall be notified immediately if any human remains are uncovered during construction. All construction shall stop in vicinity of any uncovered human remains, and the County Coroner shall be notified according to Section 7050.5 of California’s Health and Safety Code. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the procedures outlined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 (d) and (e) shall be followed.

- If the project area is determined sensitive for paleontological resources, a qualified paleontologist shall be retained to recommend appropriate actions. Appropriate action may include avoidance, preservation in place, excavation, documentation, and/or data recovery, and shall always include preparation of a written report documenting the find and describing steps taken to evaluate and protect significant resources.

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would identify significant archaeological resources, human remains, and paleontological resources prior to implementation of a project and would ensure appropriate actions when resources are encountered. Therefore, this impact is considered significant and mitigable for all alternatives.

Historic Architectural Resources

Impact 4.12.2 Projected development under the proposed Napa County General Plan Update could result in the substantial alteration or demolition of significant historic architectural resources (e.g., buildings, structures, and/or stone walls). (Significant and Unavoidable- All Alternatives).

Future development in the County could impact historic architectural resources. Table 4.12-2 identifies known historic resources in the County that are listed under the California Register of Historic Resources and/or the National Register of Historic Places. In addition, it appears that additional historic architectural features could be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP and/or the CRHR if they were subjected to research to formally determine their historic significance. The scope and distribution of development assumed under all alternatives could cause potentially significant impacts to identified and as yet unidentified historic and architectural resources.

Potential impacts specific to each of the three alternatives are further described below:
Alternative A

As identified in Section 3.0 (Project Description), this alternative would retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map as well as the policy guidance set forth under the existing General Plan. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 2,235 dwelling units and 16,014,000 square feet of non-residential uses as well as between 10,000 and 12,500 acres of new vineyard development in the unincorporated portion of the County. While most of this development is expected to occur in previously-disturbed areas, and is not likely to affect historic resources, nothing in the General Plan would preclude damage or removal of historic resources and structures. This impact is considered significant and unavoidable and would require the implementation of the mitigation measures identified below.

Alternative B

This alternative would generally retain the existing land use designations under the current General Plan Land Use Map. However, this alternative would provide for additional growth within currently General Plan designated areas for rural and urban development (such as within the unincorporated community of Angwin) as well as re-use of the Pacific Coast/Boca site and Napa Pipe site. Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 3,885 dwelling units and 14,636,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County (as well as vineyard development identified above under Alternative A). In addition to the proposed land use map, Alternative B would include roadway improvements (associated with the proposed General Plan Update Circulation Element), extension of recycled water to Coombsville and Cameros, as well as policy provisions for trails and public open space (proposed Recreation and Open Space Element in the General Plan Update). While most of this development is unlikely to affect historic resources, nothing in the General Plan would preclude damage or removal of historic resources and structures. This impact is considered significant and unavoidable and would require the implementation of the mitigation measures identified below.

Alternative C

Between the year 2005 and 2030, it is projected that there would be an additional 7,635 dwelling units and 12,990,000 square feet of non-residential uses in the unincorporated portion of the County under this alternative (as well as vineyard development identified above under Alternative A). Alternative C would involve some additional land use changes beyond Alternative B that would allow for additional development/redevelopment (e.g., redesignation of Napa Pipe and Pacific Coast/Boca sites, potential expansion of the rural and urban uses in Angwin and establishment of a new RUL for the City of American Canyon), as well as incentives for the reuse of historic buildings in agricultural areas such as Pope Valley. This Alternative would have similar infrastructure and trail/recreation provisions as Alternative B. While most development under this alternative would be unlikely to affect historic resources, nothing in the General Plan would preclude damage or removal of historic resources and structures. This impact is considered significant and unavoidable and would require the implementation of the mitigation measures identified below.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure shall apply to all three alternatives:
MM 4.12.2 The County shall provide a policy in the General Plan that requires all discretionary projects involving potential historic architectural resources meet the following requirements prior to issuance of any permits:

- Require an evaluation of the eligibility of potential architectural resources for inclusion in the NRHP and the CRHR by a qualified architectural historian. When historic architectural resources that are either listed in or determined eligible for inclusion in the NRHP or the CRHR are proposed for demolition or modification, require an evaluation of the proposal by a qualified preservation architect to determine whether it complies with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Preservation Projects. In the event that the proposal is determined not to comply with the Secretary of the Interior's standards, the preservation architect shall recommend modifications to the project design for consideration by the County and for consideration and possible implementation by the project proponent. These recommendations may include modification of the design, re-use of the structure, or avoidance of the structure.

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would identify significant historic architectural resources prior to implementation of a project and would afford an opportunity to take appropriate action to protect a resource. However, it cannot be determined at this time whether all significant historic resources and structures could be feasibly avoided or fully mitigated in all circumstances. Therefore, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable for all alternatives.
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