Local Agency Formation Commission of Napa County
1700 Second Street, Suite 268
Napa, California 94559
http://napa.lafco.ca.gov

February 5, 2010

INITIAL STUDY OF ENVIROMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE

1. Project Title:	Big Ranch Road No. 4 Annexation to the Napa Sanitation District
2. Lead Agency:	Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) of Napa County 1700 Second Street, Suite 268 Napa, California 94559
3. Contact Person:	Keene Simonds, Executive Officer LAFCO of Napa County (707) 259-8645 ksimonds@napa.lafco.ca.gov
4. Project Location:	The project location consists of 1.1 acres of incorporated territory in the City of Napa. It includes one residential parcel located at 2047 Big Ranch Road (038-170-006) and a portion of the associated right-of-way, hereinafter referred to as the "project site." A map depicting the project site is depicted in Figure "A" on page three.
5. Project Sponsor:	Louis Russo, Property Owner c/o Rosemary Hafeli, Appointed Representative 447 Seymour Street Napa, California 94559
6. General Plan Designation:	The City of Napa designates the entire project site as *Single Family Residential – 33L*. This designation allows for a density range of three to six dwelling units for every acre.
7. Zoning Standard:	The City of Napa zones the project site *Residential Single 5*. This zoning standard requires a minimum lot size of 0.11 acres.
8. Background/ Project Description	Louis Russo has filed an application with LAFCO to annex the project site to the Napa Sanitation District (NSD). The purpose of the annexation is to establish permanent public sewer service to an existing single-family residence, which is already connected to NSD as a result of a recently approved outside service agreement (OSA). LAFCO approved the OSA to expedite sewer service to the project site given the affected residence's septic system had failed causing a public health threat. The OSA expires on May 1, 2010.
9. Surrounding Land Uses:	The project site is surrounded by existing incorporated residential uses to the north, west and south and within the City of Napa's "Big Ranch" neighborhood. Land to the east of the project site is unincorporated and comprise rural residential and agricultural uses.
10. Other Agency Approval:	NSD

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below potentially would be significantly affected by this project, as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

□ Aesthetics	□ Hazards/ Hazardous Materials	□ Public Services
□ Agricultural Resources	□ Hydrology/Water Quality	□ Recreation
□ Air Quality	□ Land Use and Planning	□ Transportation/Traffic
□ Biological Resources	□ Mineral Resources	□ Utilities/Service Systems
□ Cultural Resources	□ Noise	□ Findings of Significance
□ Geology and Soils	□ Population and Housing	

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of information analyzed in this initial evaluation:

■ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLATION 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 ENVIROMENTAL 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 described in the 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 ENVIROMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to the earlier ENVIROMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project. Nothing further is required.

February 5, 2010

Signature | Date

Keene Simonds | LAFCO of Napa County

Preparer's Name | Lead Agency

FIGURE ONE

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

The following is the environmental checklist form presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. The checklist form is used to describe the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project with respect to 17 factors prescribed for consideration. A brief discussion follows each environmental issue identified in the checklist. For this checklist, the following four designations are used:

- **Potentially Significant Impact**: An impact that may be significant, and for which no mitigation has been identified.
- **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated**: An impact that requires mitigation measures to reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level.
- **Less-Than-Significant Impact**: Any impact that may not be considered significant under CEQA relative to baseline conditions.
- **No Impact**. Baseline conditions remain unchanged.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS				
Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			■	
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?			■	
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			■	
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			■	

Discussion/Analysis:
The project will not directly impact aesthetics with regard to effecting scenic vistas, damaging scenic resources, degrading visual character, or creating new sources of light given no physical changes to the environment shall occur as a result of the annexation. The project does remove an obstacle in accommodating the future division and development of the site to include up to seven additional single-family lots as allowed under the City General Plan. This accommodation highlights the potential the project may generate future indirect impacts on aesthetics due to the construction of additional structures and facilities. An assessment on aesthetic impacts relating to planned citywide development was addressed in the FEIR prepared for the City General Plan on pages 3.6-1 to 3.6-5. Pertinent mitigating policies and implementation measures to manage citywide aesthetic impacts are outlined in the General Plan's Land Use, Housing, and Natural Resources Elements and include: LU-1.2; LU-1.4; LU-1.5; LU-1.8; LU-1.A; LU-1.B; LU-1.C; LU-4.10; LU-4.11; LU-4.A; LU-4.B; LU-10.1; LU.10.2; LU-10.3; LU-10.4; LU-10.5; LU-10.A; LU-10.C; H-3.1; H-3.2; H-3.3; H-3.A; H-3.C; H-3.I; H-3.J; NR-1.6; NR-1.7; NR-1.C; and NR-1.E. A more focused review of these impacts as it relates to the potential future development of the project site and surrounding area was addressed in the FEIR prepared for the Big Ranch Road Specific Plan on pages 197 to 211. Applicable mitigation measures identified in the Specific Plan's EIR include 4.10-2 and 4.10-4. These documents provide reasonable assurances any potential future indirect impacts on aesthetics associated with the project have been adequately assessed for purposes of avoidance and/or mitigation, and therefore deemed less than significant (a, b, c, and d).

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES				
Would the project:				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				■
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				■
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in loss of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				■

Discussion/Analysis:
The project will not have direct or indirect impacts on agricultural resources. The project site is identified as urban land by the California Natural Resources Agency (a). The project site is not subject to an agricultural zoning standard or a Williamson Act contract or involve any other changes that could result in prime, unique, or statewide important farmland losses (b and c).

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
3. AIR QUALITY				
Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			■	
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			■	
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)?			■	
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			■	
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			■	

Discussion/Analysis:
The project will not directly impact air quality with regard to conflicting with applicable air quality plans and standards or cause objectionable odors and pollutants given no physical changes to the environment shall occur as a result of the annexation. The project does remove an obstacle in accommodating the future division and development of the site to include up to seven additional single-family lots as allowed under the City General Plan. This accommodation highlights the potential the project may create future indirect impacts during construction phases as well as from additional vehicular emissions. An assessment on air quality impacts relating to planned citywide development was addressed in the FEIR prepared for the City General Plan on pages 3.10-1 to 3.10-5. Pertinent mitigating policies and implementation measures to manage citywide air quality impacts consistent with Bay Area Air Quality Management District standards are outlined in the General Plan's Natural Resources and Transportation Elements and include: NR-.5.1; NR-5.2; NR-5.3; NR-5.4; NR-5.5; NR-5.6; T-1.1; T-5.1; T-5.2; T-5.13; T-5.B; T-6.1; T-6.2; and T-6.10. A more focused review of these impacts as it relates to the potential future development of the project site and surrounding area was addressed in the FEIR prepared for the Big Ranch Road Specific Plan on pages 140 to 151. Applicable mitigation measures identified in the Specific Plan's EIR include 4.7-4. These documents provide reasonable assurances any potential future indirect impacts on air quality associated with the project have been adequately assessed for purposes of avoidance and/or mitigation, and therefore deemed less than significant (a, b, c, d, and e).

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adversely 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 State Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				■
b. Have a substantial adverse impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by State Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				■
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				■
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites?				■
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				■
f. Conflict with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				■

Discussion/Analysis:

The project will not have any direct or indirect impacts on biological resources. There are no endangered, sensitive, or special status species, riparian habitat, sensitive communities, or protected wetlands within the project site listed in federal, state, or local agency indices (a, b, and c). The project would not substantially effect in impeding the movement of any habitat within the project site (d). The project does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources or the provisions of a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan (e and f).

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES				
Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?				■
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?				■
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?				■
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.				■

Discussion/Analysis:
The project will not have direct or indirect impacts on cultural resources. No historical, archeological, or paleontological resources have been identified within the project site in state or local registries (a, b, c, and d).

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
6. 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.				■
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?				■
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				■
iv. Landslides?				■
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			■	
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?				■
d. Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				■
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				■

Discussion/Analysis:
The project will not directly impact geology and soils given no physical changes to the environment shall occur as a result of the annexation. The project does remove an obstacle in accommodating the future division and development of the site to include up to seven additional single-family lots as allowed under the City General Plan. This accommodation highlights the potential the project may create future indirect geology and soil impacts involving soil erosion and topsoil losses due to grading activities. An assessment on all geology and soil impacts relating to planned citywide development has been addressed in the FEIR prepared for the City

General Plan on pages 3.8-1 to 3.8-3. Pertinent mitigating policies and implementation measures to manage citywide impacts on soil erosion and topsoil losses are outlined in the General Plan's Health and Safety Element and include: HS-2.1; HS-2.2; and HS-2.A. A more focused review of these impacts as it relates to the potential future development of the project site and surrounding area was addressed in the FEIR prepared for the Big Ranch Road Specific Plan on pages 68 to 67. Applicable mitigation measures identified in the Specific Plan's EIR include 4.3-2, 4.3-3, and 4.3-4. These documents provide reasonable assurances any potential future indirect impacts on soil erosion and top soil losses associated with the project have been adequately assessed for purposes of avoidance and/or mitigation, and therefore deemed less than significant (b). The project site is not located within an Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, which protects against soil liquefaction, subsidence, and landslide (a). The project site is not located within a geological unit or soil deemed unstable or comprise expansive soils under the Uniform Building Code (c and d). Public sewer service is currently available and provided to the project site by NSD through an OSA (e).

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
7. HAZARDS & 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?			■	
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			■	
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			■	
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?				■
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?				■
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				■
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				■
h. Expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				■

Discussion/Analysis:
The project will not directly create impacts in terms of emitting or transporting hazards or hazardous materials. The project does remove an obstacle in accommodating the future division and development of the site to include up to seven additional single-family lots as allowed under the City General Plan. This accommodation highlights the potential the project may create future indirect impacts in creating, emitting, or transporting hazards or hazardous materials due to their handling during construction, such as storing diesel fuel for ancillary equipment. However, local and state regulations concerning the use and storage of these materials result in a less-than significant impact (a, b, and c). The project site is not included in a list of hazardous material sites compiled by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (d). The project site is not located within a high wildland fire risk area or near a private or public airstrip or physically interfere with an adopted emergency plan (e, f, g, and h).

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
8. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY				
Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				■
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)?			■	
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-offsite?				■
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?			■	
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems to control?			■	
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				■
g. Place housing within a 100-year floodplain, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				■
h. Place within a 100-year floodplain structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				■
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?				■
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				■

Discussion/Analysis:
The project will not directly or indirectly impact hydrology and water quality as it relates to violating or degrading water quality standards or waste discharge requirements (a and f). The project will also not directly or indirectly impact hydrology and water quality given it does not alter a stream or river, lie within 100 year floodplain, or located within reasonable distance of a dam or levee (c, g, h, i, and j). The project does remove an obstacle in accommodating the future division and development of the site to include up to seven additional single-family lots as allowed under the City General Plan. This accommodation highlights the potential the project may create future indirect hydrology and water quality impacts with regard to increasing groundwater withdraws, increasing surface runoff that could contribute to on or offsite flooding, and adding demands on the stormwater drainage system due to the construction of impervious surfaces. An assessment on all hydrology and water quality impacts relating to planned citywide development has been addressed in the FEIR prepared for the City General Plan on pages 3.9-1 to 3.9-3. Pertinent mitigating policies and implementation measures to manage citywide impacts on groundwater, runoff, and storm water drainage systems are outlined in the General Plan's Natural Resources and Community Services Elements and include: NR-4.1, CS-9.3, CS-11.1; CS-11.2; CS-11.3; CS-11.4; CS-11.5; CS-11.7; and CS-11.A. A more focused review of these impacts as it relates to the potential future development of the project site and surrounding area was addressed in the FEIR prepared for the Big Ranch Road Specific Plan on pages 78 to 97. Applicable mitigation measures identified in the Specific Plan's EIR include 4.4-2, 4.4-3, and 4.4-4. These documents provide reasonable assurances any potential future indirect impacts on groundwater, storm water drainage systems, and runoff tied to the project have already been adequately assessed for purposes of avoidance and mitigation, and therefore deemed less-than-significant (b, d and e).

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
9. LAND USE PLANNING				
Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?				■
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations 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 on environmental effect?				■
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?				■

Discussion/Analysis:
The project will not have direct or indirect impacts on land use planning. The project does not physically divide an established community (a). The project is consistent with the City's land use policies as well as LAFCO's adopted sphere of influence for NSD (b). The project does not conflict with any applicable conservation plan (c).

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
10. 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?				■
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?				■

Discussion/Analysis:
The project will not have direct or indirect impacts on mineral resources. There are no known mineral resources of value or locally important within the project site as delineated under the City or County General Plans (a and b).

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
11. 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?			■	
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			■	
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				■
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			■	
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?				■
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?				■

Discussion/Analysis:

The project will not directly create noise impacts given no physical changes to the environment shall occur as a result of the annexation. The project does remove an obstacle in accommodating the future division and development of the site to include up to seven additional single-family lots as allowed under the City General Plan. This accommodation highlights the potential the project may create future indirect impacts involving temporary or periodic increases in noise levels and groundborne vibrations. An assessment on all noise related impacts associated with planned citywide development has been addressed in the FEIR prepared for the City General Plan on pages 3.11-1 to 3.11-9. Pertinent mitigating policies and implementation measures to manage citywide impacts relating to noises are outlined in the General Plan's Health and Safety Element and include: HS-9.1; HS-9.2; HS-9.3; HS-9.4; HS-9.5; HS-9.6; HS-9.7; HS-9.8; HS-9.9; HS-9.10; HS-9.11; HS-9.12; HS-9.13; HS-9.14; HS-9.A; and HS-9.B. A more focused review of these impacts relating to the potential future development of the project site and surrounding area was addressed in the FEIR prepared for the Big Ranch Road Specific Plan on pages 152 to 167. Applicable mitigation measures identified in the Specific Plan's EIR include 4.8-1 and 4.8-3. These documents provide reasonable assurances any potential future

indirect impacts on creating noises and groundborne vibrations associated with the project have been adequately assessed for purposes of avoidance and/or mitigation, and therefore deemed less than significant (a, b, and d). The project site is surrounded by existing urban uses with typical residential noise environment, and therefore potential new permanent noises associated with its development would be considered non-substantial (c). The project is not located within an airport land use plan or in the vicinity of a private airstrip, and thereby negating any potential noises associated with aircraft (e and f).

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
12. POPULATION AND HOUSING				
Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial growth in an area, either directly or indirectly?			■	
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				■
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				■

Discussion/Analysis:

The project will not directly create impacts on population and housing given no physical changes to the environment shall occur as a result of the annexation. The project does remove an obstacle in accommodating the future division and development of the site to include up to seven additional single-family lots as allowed under the City General Plan. This accommodation highlights the potential the project may create future indirect impacts in terms of fostering new growth. An assessment on growth impacts associated with planned citywide development has been addressed in the FEIR prepared for the City General Plan on pages 3.2-1 to 3.2-8. Pertinent mitigating policies and implementation measures to manage growth impacts are outlined throughout the General Plan's Land Use and Housing Elements. A more focused review of these impacts as it relates to the potential future development of the project site and surrounding area was addressed in the FEIR prepared for the Big Ranch Road Specific Plan on pages 59 to 67, which does not identify any needed applicable mitigation measures. These documents provide reasonable assurances any potential future indirect impacts on growth associated with the project have been adequately assessed for purposes of mitigation, and therefore deemed less than significant (a). There is no evidence to suggest the project will displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people either in the short or long term (b and c).

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
13. PUBLIC SERVICES Would the project result in 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:				
a. Fire protection?			■	
b. Police protection?			■	
c. Schools?			■	
d. Parks?			■	
e. Other public facilities?			■	

Discussion/Analysis:
The project will not directly create impacts on public services given no physical changes to the environment shall occur as a result of the annexation. The project does remove an obstacle in accommodating the future division and development of the site to include up to seven additional single-family lots as allowed under the City General Plan. This accommodation highlights the potential the project may create future indirect impacts on public fire, police, schools, park, and emergency medical services. An assessment on public service impacts associated with planned citywide development has been addressed in the FEIR prepared for the City General Plan on pages 3.4-1 to 3-4-2, 3.4-5 to 3.4-6, and 3.4-16 to 3.4-17. Pertinent mitigating policies and implementation measures to manage impacts on these public services are outlined in the General Plan's Community Services Element and include: CS-1.1 through CS-1.7; CS-1.A through CS-1.B; CS-2.1 through CS-3.3; CS-4.1 through CS-4.4; CS-4.A through CS-4.D; CS-5.1 through CS-5.8; CS-5.A through CS-5.C; CS-6.1 through CS-6.8; CS-6.A through CS-6.B; CS-7.1 through CS-7.5; CS-7.A, and CS-8.1 through CS-8.3. A more focused review of these impacts as it relates to the potential future development of the project site and surrounding area was addressed in the FEIR prepared for the Big Ranch Road Specific Plan on pages 168 to 196. Applicable mitigation measures identified in the Specific Plan's EIR include 4.9-1, 4.9-2, 4.9-3, and 4.9-12. These documents provide reasonable assurances any potential future indirect impacts on these public services associated with the project have been adequately assessed for purposes of avoidance and/or mitigation, and therefore deemed less than significant (a, b, c, d, and e).

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
14. RECREATION				
a. Would the project 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?			■	
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?				■

Discussion/Analysis:
The project will not directly impact recreational resources given no physical changes to the environment shall occur as a result of the annexation. The project does remove an obstacle in accommodating the future division and development of the site to include up to seven additional single-family lots as allowed under the City General Plan. This accommodation highlights the potential the project may create future indirect impacts on recreational resources in terms of increasing the use of existing parks and related facilities. An assessment on all recreational related impacts associated with planned citywide development was addressed in the City General Plan's Parks and Recreation Element FEIR. Pertinent mitigating policies and implementation measures to manage citywide impacts on existing parks and related facilities are outlined in the General Plan's Parks and Resources Element and include: PR-1.1 through PR-1.24; PR-1.A through PR-1.G; PR-2.1 through PR-2.15; PR-2.A through PR-2.D; PR-3.1 through PR3.11; PR-3.A; PR-4.1 through PR4-17; PR-4.A through PR-4.C; PR-5.1 through PR5.19; PR-5.A; PR-6.1 through PR.6-23; PR-6.A through PR-6.D; PR7.1 through PR7.10; and PR7.A through PR-7.C. No specific significant impacts on existing parks and related facilities concerning the future development of the project site and surrounding area were identified in the FEIR prepared for the Big Ranch Road Specific Plan. These documents provide reasonable assurances any potential future indirect impacts on parks and related facilities associated with the project have been already adequately assessed for purposes of avoidance and/or mitigation, and therefore deemed less than significant (a). The project does not include any recreational facilities nor would it require construction or expansion of existing facilities (b).

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
15. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC Would the project*:*				
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system?			■	
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways?				■
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?				■
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design?				■
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?				■
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?				■
g. Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation?				■

Discussion/Analysis:
The project will not directly impact transportation or traffic given no physical changes to the environment shall occur as a result of the annexation. The project does remove an obstacle in accommodating the future division and development of the site to include up to seven additional single-family lots as allowed under the City General Plan. This accommodation highlights the potential the project may create future indirect impacts on roadway traffic in terms of increasing vehicle trips to and from the site over current conditions. An assessment on all transportation and traffic impacts relating to planned citywide development has been addressed in the FEIR prepared for the City General Plan on pages 3.3-1 to 3.3-15. Pertinent mitigating policies and implementation measures to manage citywide impacts on traffic trips and capacities are outlined in the General Plan's Transportation Element and include: T-1.1 through T-1.11; T-1.A through T-1.G; T-2.1 through T-2.7; T-3.1 through T-3.12; T-3.A; T-4.1 through T-4.5; and T-4.A through T-4.C. A more focused review of these impacts as it relates to the potential future development of the project site and surrounding area was addressed in the FEIR prepared for the Big Ranch Road Specific Plan on pages 115 to 139. Applicable mitigation measures identified in the Specific Plan's EIR include 4.6-2. These documents provide reasonable assurances any potential future indirect impacts on vehicle trips associated with the project have been already adequately assessed for purposes of avoidance and/or mitigation, and therefore deemed less than significant (a). The project would not result in traffic volumes exceeding the

current level of service standard for nearby roads nor alter air tariff patterns (b and c). The project would not create a design hazard, impede emergency access, generate inadequate parking capacity, or conflict with any policies promoting alternative transportation given the site is located within an existing urbanized area (d, e, f, and g).

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
16. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project:				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			■	
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			■	
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			■	
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			■	
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?			■	
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			■	
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			■	

Discussion/Analysis:
The project will not directly impact water, sewer, and solid waste service utilities given no substantive physical changes to the environment shall occur as a result of the annexation. The project does remove an obstacle in accommodating the future division and development of the site to include up to seven additional single-family lots as allowed under the City General Plan. This accommodation highlights the potential the project may create future indirect and cumulative impacts on water, sewer, solid waste, and storm drainage service utilities in terms of increasing uses. An assessment on water, sewer, and solid waste service utility impacts relating to planned citywide development have been addressed in the FEIR prepared for the City General Plan on pages 3.4-2 through 3.4-15. An assessment on impacts on storm drainage

service relating to planned citywide growth and development is addressed on pages 3.9-1 to 3.9-3 in the FEIR. Pertinent mitigating policies and implementation measures to manage impacts on water, sewer, solid waste, and storm drainage service utilities are outlined in the General Plan's Community Service Element and include: CS-9.1 through CS-9.10; CS-9.A; CS-10.1 through CS-10.3; CS-11.1 through CS-11.9; CS-11.A; CS-12.1 through CS-12.2; and CS-12.A. A more focused review of these impacts as it relates to the future development of the project site and surrounding area was addressed in the FEIR prepared for the Big Ranch Road Specific Plan on pages 78 to 97 and 168 to 184. Applicable mitigation measures identified in the Specific Plan's EIR include 4.4-2, 4.4-3, 4.9-1, 4.9-2, 4.9-4, 4.9-5, 4.9-6, 4.9-7, and 4.9-8. Further, NSD also has prepared a recent master plan to inform current and future capital improvement planning activities through 2030, which markedly contemplates serving the project site at its maximum assigned densities allowed under the City General Plan. These documents provide reasonable assurances any potential indirect impacts on the referenced service utilities tied to the project have been adequately assessed for purposes of avoidance, mitigation, and accommodation, and therefore deemed less-than-significant (a, b, c, d, e, f, and g).

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
17. 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 major periods of state history or prehistory?				■
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?				■
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				■

Discussion/Analysis:
The project will not have direct or indirect impacts on biological resources, such as fish or wildlife species, as analyzed on page eight of this initial study. The potential future development of the project site may result in individually limited impacts on humans as well as on aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, hydrology, noise, population, public services, recreation, traffic, and utilities. These individual impacts would not be substantial or cumulatively considerable given any future development of the project site will need to comply with previously approved mitigating policies and programs of the City as the legal land use authority, and therefore result in de minimis contributions (a, b, and c).

SOURCES

Documents

- City of Napa, *General Plan Policy Document*, December 1998
- City of Napa, *General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*, December 1998
- City of Napa, *Parks and Recreation Element Final Environmental Impact Report*, October 1993
- City of Napa, *Big Ranch Road Specific Plan*, August 1996
- City of Napa, *Big Ranch Road Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*, August 1996
- City of Napa, Municipal Code: Section 17.08, *Residential Zoning Districts*, 2008
- City of Napa, *Combined Historic Resources List,* January 2000
- LAFCO of Napa County, *Sphere of Influence Update: Napa Sanitation District*, August 2006
- LAFCO of Napa County, *Municipal Service Review and Sphere of Influence Update of the City of Napa,* June 2005
- LAFCO of Napa County, *Comprehensive Study of Sanitation and Wastewater Treatment Providers*, 2005-2006
- Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *CEQA Guidelines*, Prepared December 1999
- State of California, Natural Resources Agency, *Napa County Important Farmland Map*, July 2009.

These documents are available for review at the LAFCO administration office located at 1700 Second Street, Suite 268, Napa.

Websites

- State of California: California Environmental Resources Evaluation System; Environmental Information by Geographic Area; Napa County; Historical and Cultural Resources: "California Historical Landmarks in Napa County," http://ceres.ca.gov/geo_area/counties/Napa/landmarks.html
- State of California: California Environmental Projection Agency; Cortese List of Hazardous Material Sites, http://www.calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/default.htm
- State of California: California Geological Survey; Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones; http://www.consrv.ca.gov/CGS/rghm/ap/index.htm
- County of Napa GIS Parcel Mapping application http://2kgisweb/gisweb/InteractiveMap3.asp
- State of California: Department of Fish and Game, California Natural Diversity Database http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/ (Accessed through County of Napa)