5.4 Cultural Resources

The archaeological resources of the proposed Project site are discussed in this section. The potential cultural resources impacts associated with the proposed Project are identified and associated mitigation, if required, is proposed. Information in this section is based on an Archaeological Inventory Survey (Archaeological Survey) prepared by Genesis Society (Sean Michael Jenson, M.A.) dated August 30, 2017. The report in its entirety is included herein as Appendix G.

5.4.1 Existing Conditions

The proposed Project is located within a portion of the Tulucay Ranch Land Grant as shown on Exhibit 5.4-1, USGS Napa, California, 7.5’ Series Quadrangle. The area of potential effect (APE) for the Archaeological Survey is the entire 11.5-acre Project site. The elevation within the APE averages 20 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) and no naturally occurring sources of surface water are located within the APE. The Project site is currently vacant but is surrounded by development within Napa Valley Commons corporate park. The site has been rough graded and consists of vegetation comprising grasses, weeds, and mature oak trees that are regularly groomed.

The area lies within the Coast and Interior Coast Ranges, near the terminal intersection of the southwestern terminus of the Vaca Mountains and the San Pablo Bay delta region. The APE is situated on relatively flat terrain adjacent to rolling hills that comprise the foothills that form the eastern margin of the Napa River.

Elevations rise to the east and short grasses and occasional valley oak dominate the local vegetation. The dominant plant communities of the area have evolved protective measures due to typical summer drought conditions such as thick, waxy cuticles on their leaves to reduce water loss. These plant communities dominated the vegetation surrounding the Project area prior to the 20th century and supplied the needed resources for a variety of fauna.

The APE is located within the Coast Ranges Geomorphic Province of California. This province is characterized by northwest trending topographic and geologic features and includes many separate ranges, coalescing mountain masses and several major structural basins. The province is bounded on the east by the Great Valley Geomorphic Province and on the west by the Pacific Ocean. The Coast Ranges region extends north into Oregon and south to the Transverse Ranges and Ventura County.

Outside of the valley setting, geology consists of Franciscan formation, undivided Cretaceous marine deposits, lower Cretaceous marine deposits and ultrabasic intrusive rocks (all formed during the Mesozoic era between 66 and 252 million years ago) and, therefore, does not have the potential to contain deeply buried archaeological resources.
Source: Figure 3, Archaeological Inventory Survey; Sean Michael Jensen, M.A.; August 30, 2017 (Appendix G)

Exhibit 5.4-1 USGS Napa, California, 7.5’ Series Quadrangle
Historic Background

The archaeological record of the San Francisco Bay Area has typically fallen into two systems:

- The Early-Middle-Late Period nomenclature known as the Central California Taxonomic System
- The Archaic-Emergent temporal structure

Due to established nomenclature for the North Bay area within which the Project is located, the terms Archaic-Emergent are used co-equally with the Early, Middle and Late Period terms. Within the general region, data recovery and observations revealed a pattern suggesting that Paleo-Indians initially foraged the lacustrine zones of the region. This group was followed by evidence of Lower Archaic and Middle Archaic forager residential camps along marshes and on grasslands which ultimately yielded to Upper Archaic (post-500 BC) people establishing forager residential camps and semi-permanent collector villages. After approximately 1000 AD, semi-permanent collector villages in oak woodlands and residential camps along marshes characterized the shift noted in the Emergent Period.

The Archaic period is divided into three sub-periods: the Lower Archaic (8,000 BP to 5,000 BP), the Middle Archaic (5,000 BP to 1,500 BP) and the Upper Archaic (2,500 BP to 1,000 BP). Overall, Archaic occupants continued to practice relatively high geographic mobility but with an increase in permanent/semi-permanent resource procurement bases. The range of resources increases during this period, as evidenced by the diversity of artifacts, including the addition of milling stone tools and obsidian and chert concave-based projectile points. The Middle Archaic witnesses the introduction of the bowl mortar, further supporting the intensification of across as a subsistence resource. The increase in geographical/resource diversity, along with an expanding population during the Upper Archaic, contributed to an increase in the number of permanent settlements and additional complexities in the cultural manifestations.

During the Emergent period, the archeological record became more complex as specialized adaptations to locally available resources were developed and populations expanded. Further, interactions with cultures from the Sacramento Valley, the Delta and the San Francisco Bay regions resulted in numerous cultural changes for the North Coastal region inhabitants. Many sites dated to this time period contain mortars and pestles and/or are associated with bedrock mortars implying the intense exploitation of the acorn. The range of subsistence resources utilized along with regional exchange systems expanded significantly. Archeological evidence of social stratification and craft specialization is indicated by well-made artifacts such as charmstones and beads, often found as mortuary items.

5.4.2 Regulatory Setting

California Environmental Quality Act

CEQA states that it is state policy to: “take all action necessary to provide the people of this state with . . . historic environmental qualities.” CEQA requires detailed studies that analyze the environmental effects of a proposed project. If a project is determined to have a potential significant environmental effect, the Act requires that alternative plans and mitigation measures be considered. CEQA includes historic, archaeological and paleontological
resources as integral features of the environment. If such resources are identified as being within the proposed Project study area, the sponsoring agency must take those resources into consideration when evaluating project effects. The level of consideration may vary with the importance of the resource.

California Register of Historical Resources

The Register is a listing of all properties considered to be significant historical resources in the state. These include all properties listed or determined eligible for listing on the National Register, including properties evaluated under Section 106, and State Historical Landmarks. The criteria for listing are the same as those of the National Register. The California Register statute specifically provides that historical resources listed or determined eligible for listing on the California Register by the State Historical Resources Commission, or resources that meet the California Register criteria are resources which must be given consideration under CEQA.

Resources eligible for listing include buildings, sites, structures, objects or historic districts that retain historic integrity and are historically significant at the local, state or national level under one or more of the following criteria:

- It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States;
- It is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California or national history;
- It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values; or
- It has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation.

Resources must retain enough of their historic character or appearance to be recognizable as historical resources and to convey the reasons for their significance. A resource that has lost its historic character or appearance may still have sufficient integrity for the California Register, if, under criterion 4, it maintains the potential to yield significant scientific or historical information or specific data.

California Public Resources Code §5097.5

No person shall knowingly and willfully excavate upon, or remove, destroy, injure or deface any historic or prehistoric ruins, burial grounds, archaeological or vertebrate paleontological site, including fossilized footprints, inscriptions made by human agency, or any other archaeological, paleontological or historical feature, situated on public lands, except with the express permission of the public agency having jurisdiction over such lands. Violation of this section is a misdemeanor. As used in this section, "public lands" means lands owned by, or under the jurisdiction of the state, or any city, county, district, authority or public corporation, or any agency thereof.
California Health and Safety Code

Human remains are sometimes associated with archaeological sites. According to CEQA, “archaeological sites known to contain human remains shall be treated in accordance with the provisions of California Health and Safety Code §7050.5.” The protection of human remains is also ensured by California Public Resources Code §5097.94, §5097.98, and §5097.99. If human remains are exposed during construction, California Health and Safety Code §7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the county coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to California Public Resources Code §5097.98. Construction must halt in the area of the discovery of human remains, the project proponent must assure that the area is protected, and consultation and treatment shall occur as prescribed by law.

Assembly Bill 52

In September 2014, legislation was enacted that imposes new requirements for consultations regarding projects that may affect a tribal cultural resource and includes a list of recommended mitigation measures. AB 52 states that tribal cultural resources must meet the following:

1. Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources
2. Included in a local register of historical resources
3. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in PRC Section 5024.1
4. A cultural landscape that meets one of the above criteria and is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape
5. A historical resource described in PRC 21084.1, a unique archaeological resource described in PRC 21083.2 or a non-unique archaeological resource if it conforms to the above criteria

Under AB 52, a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is defined as a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. Where a project may have a significant impact on a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency’s environmental document must discuss the impact and whether feasible alternatives or mitigation measures could avoid or substantially lessen the impact.

Lead agencies are to provide notice to tribes traditionally or culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed Project that may have expertise with regard to their tribal history and practices. Tribes can request consultation which may include discussing the type of environmental review necessary, the significance of the tribal cultural resources, the significance of the project’s impacts on the resource and the alternatives and mitigation measures recommended by the tribe.

Mitigation measures agreed upon during consultation must be recommended for inclusion in the environmental document. AB 52 also identifies mitigation measures that may be
considered to avoid significant impacts if there is no agreement on appropriate mitigation. Recommended measures include:

- Preservation in place
- Protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource
- Protecting the traditional use of the resource
- Protecting the confidentiality of the resource
- Permanent conservation easements with culturally appropriate management criteria
- Local regulations/ordinances

The City of Napa General Plan – Envision Napa 2020 – includes a chapter entitled Historic Resources which identifies policies for the preservation of archaeological resources as follows. The General Plan does not identify paleontological resources in the surrounding area. However, standard mitigation measures requiring consultation and preservation of resources found during development are applicable to the Project.

- HR-6.1 - The City shall enforce current federal and state and procedure for identifying, preserving and protecting prehistoric sites.
- HR-6.2 - The City shall require investigation during the planning process for all proposed developments in archaeologically sensitive areas in order to determine whether prehistoric resources may be affected by the project and, if so, require that appropriate mitigation measures be incorporated into the project design.
- HR-6.3 - Recognizing that Native American burials or archaeological artifacts may be encountered at unexpected locations, the City shall continue to enforce state mandates with its current mitigation requirement, applied to all development permits and tentative subdivision maps, that upon discovery of remains during construction, all activity will cease until qualified professional archaeological examination and reburial in an appropriate manner is accomplished.

**5.4.3 Thresholds of Significance**

Thresholds of significance for evaluation of the proposed Project’s impacts are based on the County of Napa Environmental Checklist and the CEQA Environmental Checklist (Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines). The Project would result in a significant impact if it would:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5,
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 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.
Per CEQA, an archaeological resource is considered “unique” (§21083.2(g)) when the resource not merely adds to the current body of knowledge, but when there is a high probability that the resource also:

- Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and 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.

A project may have a significant impact or adverse effect on cultural resources/historic properties if the project will or could result in the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance or values of the resource would be materially impaired.

Fossils are considered to be significant if one or more of the following criteria apply:

a) The fossils provide information on the evolutionary relationships and developmental trends among organisms, living or extinct,

b) The fossils provide data useful in determining the age(s) of the rock unit or sedimentary stratum, including data important in determining the depositional history of the region and the timing of geologic events therein,

c) The fossils provide data regarding the development of biological communities or interaction between paleobotanical and paleozoological biotas,

d) The fossils demonstrate unusual or spectacular circumstances in the history of life,

e) The fossils are in short supply and/or in danger of being depleted or destroyed by the elements, vandalism, or commercial exploitation and are not found in other geographic locations.

### 5.4.4 Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation

The Project, as proposed, will include grading and excavation to construct the hotel, winery, and office components identified. Preliminary earthwork calculations indicate that as much as 31,300 cubic yards of cut will occur. This ground disturbance has the potential to uncover archaeological or paleontological resources that have not previously been encountered during previous grading activities. The results of the archaeological survey, including extensive research regarding potential to uncover cultural resources on the Project site, are discussed below.

#### 1. Archaeological Resources

The Archaeological Survey includes a detailed explanation of the prehistoric and historic setting of the Project site and area generally. The entire report is included herein in Appendix G. The City’s General Plan does not identify paleontological resources on the Project site or within the immediate vicinity. Following is a summary of the historical information as well as the results of the pedestrian survey of the Project site conducted by
Sean Jensen of Genesis Society. The specific tasks performed by Genesis Society in compliance with CEQA requirements and guidelines follow.

- Conducted a records search at the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System and consulted with the Native American Heritage Commission. The goals of the records search and consultation were to determine: 1) the extent and distribution of previous archaeological surveys, 2) the locations of known archaeological sites and any previously recorded archaeological districts, and 3) the relationships between known sites and environmental variables.

- Conducted a pedestrian survey of the area of potential effect (APE) to record and evaluate any previously unidentified cultural resources. Based on map review, a complete coverage, intensive survey was conducted given the presence of moderate to high archaeological sensitivity within the property. The purpose of the pedestrian survey was to ensure that any previously identified sites are relocated and evaluated in relation to the present project/undertaking.

- Prepared a Final Report identifying Project effects and recommending appropriate mitigation measures for sites that might be affected by the undertaking and that are considered significant or potentially significant per CEQA and/or eligible or potentially eligible for inclusion on the California Register of Historical Resources.

All field survey work followed guidelines provided by the State Historic Preservation Office (Sacramento) and conforms to accepted professional standards.

2. **Ethnography**

The Project area is located within territory claimed by the Southern Patwin near the border shared with the Coast Miwok at the time of initial contact with European/American culture. The territorial boundaries of the Patwin are described as extending along the Sacramento River from the town of Princeton to the San Pablo and Suisun bays, abutting the Pomo and Wappo to the west.

The basic social unit for the Patwin was the family, although the village may also have functioned as a social, political, and economic unit. Villages were usually located near water sources, with major villages inhabited mainly in the winter as it was necessary for at least some of the population to relocate into the hills and higher elevation zones to establish temporary camps during food gathering seasons (i.e., spring, summer, and fall). Villages typically consisted of a variable number of bark houses, numbering from four or five to several dozen in larger villages such as the large village once situated to the north, in Napa, with each house containing a single family of from three to seven people.

As with all northern California Indian groups, economic life for the Patwin revolved around hunting, fishing, and collecting plant foods. Deer was an important meat source, and the animals were hunted by individuals by stalking or snaring, or by groups in community drives. Salmon runs and other food resources available along the Napa River and its major tributaries also contributed significantly to local economies. While much of the fish protein was consumed immediately, a significant percentage, particularly during the fall salmon run, was prepared for storage and consumed during winter months. Acorns represented one of
the most important vegetal foods and were particularly abundant within the Oak Park Woodland, which once dominated lands within the study area along the Napa River, and in association with higher ground and natural stream courses both east and west of Napa.

The ceremonial chief directed the entire tribelet’s Kuksu Cult, a religious cult and secret society that performed tribal initiations, ghost ceremonies, and curing ceremonies. The Patwin were documented by Asians and Europeans as early as the late 16th century, and their populations remained relatively stable until the incursion of Spanish settlers and missionaries during the latter portion of the 18th century. The indigenous populations at this time were “missionized” and relocated to various missions south of their traditional territory. Due to “missionization,” inter-tribal marriages became more common, and new missions were established throughout the tribe’s traditional lands.

Mexico gained independence from Spain in 1821, and the Mission Period officially ended in 1834. The newly established secular government resulted in the Patwin being freed from the Franciscan missionaries, only to find themselves serving new land-grant masters. In 1837, a smallpox epidemic resulted in the deaths of a substantial portion of the native population in Napa County, and subsequent epidemics continued to erode their population.

3. Historic Setting

Interior California was initially visited by Anglo-American fur trappers, Russian scientists, and Spanish-Mexican expeditions during the early part of the 19th Century. These early explorations were followed by a rapid escalation of European-American activities, which culminated in the massive influx fostered by the discovery of gold at Coloma in 1848. Early Spanish expeditions arrived from Bay Area missions as early as 1804, penetrating the northwestern San Joaquin Valley. By the mid-1820s, hundreds of fur trappers were annually traversing the Valley on behalf of the Hudson’s Bay Company. By the late 1830s and early 1840s, several small permanent European-American settlements had emerged in the Central Valley and adjacent foothill lands, including Ranchos in the interior Coast Range, and, of course, the settlement at New Helvetia (Sutter’s Fort) at the confluence of the Sacramento and American Rivers (Sacramento).

With the discovery of gold in the Sierra Nevada, large numbers of European-Americans, Hispanics, and Chinese arrived in and traveled through the Valley. The Valley’s east-side mining communities’ demands for hard commodities led quickly to the expansion of ranching and agriculture throughout the Great Central Valley and the interior valleys of the Coast Range. Stable, larger populations arose, and permanent communities slowly emerged in the Central Valley, particularly along major transportation corridors.

The current APE is located within Napa County, which is one of California’s original counties. The County’s first courthouse and seat of government was established in Napa in 1851. Napa itself was founded in 1847 by Nathan Coombs, who had received the future town site property from Nicolas Higuera, the original holder of the Rancho Entre Napa Mexican land grant.

The onset of the gold rush resulted in an influx of population to the region as miners and their families sought a refuge from the harsh Sierra Nevada winters. However, in 1858, the great
silver rush began in the Napa Valley, and miners flocked the region. Mining continued to expand throughout the 1860s, and by 1872, Napa was incorporated. The Napa State Asylum for the Insane, located north of the present APE, was opened in 1876, and the Napa Valley Opera House opened in 1880.

Early settlers into the county cultivated fruits and vegetables for local consumption, and grains were grown on a larger scale for exportation. Dry farm crops such as wheat and oats, used for cattle fodder, proved profitable in the area despite limited irrigation. Initially, agricultural products were transported via the waterways, but with the completion of the California Pacific Railroad, connecting directly with the Transcontinental Railroad in 1869, goods were transported by rail.

While agriculture dominated the northern portion of the county, banking and business enterprises intensified within the City of Napa. Among these businesses were leather workers and some of the early electronic technology efforts that ultimately led to the foundation of Magnavox Company in 1917. While these endeavors continued throughout the 20th century, concerns for regional flooding became an important theme that continues to the present day.

4. Record Searches/Sources Consulted

Several types of information were considered relevant to evaluating the types of archaeological sites and site distribution that might be encountered within the Project area. The information evaluated prior to conducting the pedestrian survey includes data maintained by the Northwest Information Center, and available published and unpublished documents relevant to regional prehistory, ethnography, and early historic developments.

Northwest Information Center Records

The official Napa County archaeological records were examined on August 15, 2017 (NWIC File No. 17-0316). These records document the following existing conditions for a one-eighth mile radius of the APE.

- According to the information center, the existing APE has been subjected to archaeological survey as a result of two previous investigations. A linear survey in 1978 included the eastern portion of the present APE (S-001200). An archaeological survey conducted for the Napa Industrial Park project (1981) involved approximately 246-acres, including the existing APE (S-2547). Five archaeological investigations have been conducted on lands within one-eighth mile of the present APE: S-21260, 47936, 38004, 13188 and 13025. However, there appears to be no overlap of these previous investigations with the present APE configuration. Additionally, 13 reports, located within the search radius, are classified as Other Reports. These reports involved little or no fieldwork, or are missing maps.

- According to the Information Center’s records, no cultural resources have been formally documented within the subject APE. One resource (P-28-001212), a rock wall fence, has been documented within the search radius, but outside of the
present APE. This site was recommended and determined not eligible/significant, and was subsequently destroyed.

**AB 52 - Native American Consultation**

The City of Napa initiated consultation communications with the Yocha Dehe Winton Nation on June 29, 2017, via letter, and the Tribe responded, via letter, on July 18, 2017, indicating that the Project is located within traditional Yocha Dehe lands, and requesting copies of any archaeological investigations prepared in conjunction with this Project.

Initial consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was undertaken by the City of Napa. On August 4, 2017, the NAHC responded to the City of Napa with a five-page letter outlining various laws, codes, and ordinances. The NAHC letter did not indicate that a search of their Sacred Lands Files (SLF) had been undertaken, nor was there an appended list of "Native American Contacts." The City of Napa has completed the requirements for Native American consultation per AB 52 and no additional consultation is required.

**Additional Sources**

Genesis Society also initiated consultation with the NAHC regarding sacred land listings for the property via an information request letter that was delivered to the NAHC on August 9, 2017. The NAHC responded on August 18, 2017, indicating that "Sacred Sites and Tribal Cultural Resources were identified in the project area provided." The NAHC advised contacting Chairman Scott Gabaldon of the Mishewal-Wappo Tribe of Alexander Valley to provide notice of the proposed Project and obtain additional information concerning this data. As noted herein, the Project is within traditional Yocha Dehe Winton Nation lands, and the City has sent Project information to the tribal contact for Yocha Dehe. The Mishewal-Wappo Tribe has not requested placement on the City’s contact list.

In addition to examining the archaeological site and survey records of Napa County maintained at the Northwest Information Center, the following sources were also included in the search conducted at the Information Center, or were evaluated separately:

- National Register of Historic Places (1986, Supplements)
- California Register of Historical Resources
- California Inventory of Historic Resources (State of California 1976)
- California Historical Landmarks (State of California 1996)
- California Points of Historical Interest (May 1992 and updates)
- Historic Property Data File (OHP 2014)
- California Place Names (Gudde 1969)
- Napa 7.5’ Quadrangle (1951, Photorevised 1980)
- 1859 Tulucay Rancho Map
- 1863 GLO, TSN, R4W
• 1895 O.H. Buckman Map
• 1916 USGS Mare Island Quadrangle
• Existing published and unpublished documents relevant to prehistory, ethnography, and early historic developments in the vicinity.

These sources, reviewed below, provided a general environmental and cultural context by means of which to assess likely site types and distribution patterns for the project area.

5. Survey Methods/Results

The entire APE was subjected to intensive pedestrian survey by means of walking systematic transects, spaced at 20-meter intervals. In searching for cultural resources, the surveyor considered the results of background research and was alert for any unusual contours, soil changes, distinctive vegetation patterns, exotic materials, artifacts, feature or feature remnants, and other possible markers of cultural sites.

Fieldwork was undertaken on August 27, 2017 by Sean Michael Jensen and Sutter Jensen. Mr. Jensen is a professional archaeologist with 31 years’ experience in archaeology, history, and architectural history. He meets the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Professional Qualification, as demonstrated in his listing on the California Historical Resources Information System list of qualified archaeologists and historians. No special problems were encountered, and all survey objectives were satisfactorily achieved.

Fieldwork identified the following general conditions within the APE. The majority of the APE has been subjected to intensive disturbance as a result of past demolition, grading, and re-contouring. Examination of the USGS and aerial images provided by NETR provided a visual historic context for the APE, which is listed and summarized below.

USGS Maps

• 1942 Two structures present in southeast corner (one residence, one barn), railroad present along eastern boundary
• 1952 Two structures present in southeast corner (one residence, one barn)
• 1958 Structure present in southeast corner
• 1963 Two structures present in southeast corner (one residence, one barn)
• 1966 Structure present in southeast corner
• 1967 Vacant
• 1969 Two structures present in southeast corner (one residence, one barn)
• 1975 Two structures present in southeast corner (one residence, one barn)
• 1980 Vacant
• 1982 Vacant
• 1984 Structure present in southeast corner
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Aerial Maps

- 1948 Structures present within the extreme southeast property corner
- 1968 Vacant, demolition scars evident within the southeast property corner
- 1993 Vacant
- 2002 Vacant
- 2005 Vacant
- 2009 Vacant
- 2010 Vacant
- 2012 Vacant

The evidence gleaned from the USGS quadrangles and aerial photographs demonstrates that a small complex, likely a family farm/ranch, existed within the southeastern portion of the present APE prior to 1949, and that by 1968 the entire complex had been razed. Over the subsequent decades, the entire APE and surrounding lands were subject to intensive disturbance associated with adjacent commercial development.

According to the Northwest Information Center, no prehistoric or historic-era sites have been documented within the APE. In addition, no prehistoric or historic-era sites were identified during the pedestrian survey conducted in August 2017.

6. Conclusion

The results of the Archaeological Survey analysis indicate there are no known archaeological or built environment historic resources within the Project area. The Project area is considered to have low sensitivity for prehistoric and historical archaeological deposits, because a records search and a pedestrian survey failed to identify any significant historical resources or unique archaeological resources within the APE. Mitigation Measures MM CR-2 and MM CR-3 and a standard mitigation measure from the City’s General Plan are included herein to ensure that if archaeological or historic resources are found during the construction of the proposed Project, appropriate measures are undertaken to ensure protection of the resources.

5.4.5 Mitigation Measures

1. Standard Mitigation Measures

The proposed Project would be subject to the following standard mitigation measures, as required by the City of Napa Policy Resolution 27.

| MM CR-1 | During site preparation and grading activities, the Project applicant shall ensure that, if any archaeological materials or objects are unearthed during Project construction, all work in the vicinity shall be immediately halted until a qualified archaeologist is retained by the City to evaluate the finds. The Project applicant shall comply with all mitigation recommendations of the archaeologist prior to commencing work in the vicinity of the archaeological finds. |
2. Special Mitigation Measures

Special Mitigation Measures MM CR-2 and MM CR-3 were included in the Archaeological Survey.

| MM CR-2 | During the construction phase, the Project applicant shall ensure that if any human remains are uncovered, work shall be halted within the immediate vicinity of the discovery and state law shall be followed, which includes immediately contacting the County Coroner’s office and a representative of the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation. |
| MM CR-3 | During the construction phase, the Project applicant ensure that if any unidentified cultural materials are encountered on or below the surface, archaeological consultation should be sought immediately. |

5.4.6 Level of Significance after Mitigation

Thresholds of significance identified in the CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G, state that a project would have a significant impact if it would:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource,

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource,

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

The Archaeological Survey concludes that based on the absence of any contributing components of any significant historical resources/unique archaeological resources within the APE, archaeological clearance is recommended for the Project as presently proposed including the mitigation measures identified herein. The proposed Project, with mitigation, is consistent with the Historic Resources Chapter of the City of Napa General Plan because any discovered cultural resources within the Project site will be identified, evaluated and preserved. In addition, no archaeological resources have been discovered on the Project site that are “unique” per California Public Resources Code §21083.2(g) and that contain important historic information, have a special or particular quality, or are directly associated with a recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person. No fossils have been found that meet the CEQA criteria for significance.

The Cultural Resources Assessment analysis responds to CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Checklist as follows.

The proposed Project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064 of the CEQA Guidelines because no cultural resources, including human remains, are known to exist within the Project site.
The proposed Project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource as defined in §15064 of the CEQA Guidelines, because no cultural resources, including human remains, are known to exist within the Project site.

The proposed Project will not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique feature, because no cultural resources, including human remains, are known to exist within the Project site.

The proposed Project will not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries, because no cultural resources, including human remains, are known to exist within the Project site.

However, a mitigation measures have been included to address unanticipated discovery of cultural resources during Project grading operations including the City’s Policy Resolution No. 27 mitigation (MM CR-3). With implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, any Project impacts to archeological resources, including human remains and cultural materials, will be reduced to a less than significant level.

5.4.7 Cumulative Impacts

With mitigation, development of the proposed Project is not anticipated to significantly impact cultural resources within or adjacent to the Project boundaries. Individual Project impacts are evaluated and mitigated on a project-by-project basis. The Project's individual contribution when combined with other area projects would not be cumulatively considerable. The proposed Project would not result in a cumulative impact on cultural, scientific, or historic resources because the area has not been identified as containing archaeological, paleontological or historic resources that could contribute to a significant cumulative impact.

5.4.8 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

With implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, impacts to cultural, scientific or historic resources will be reduced to a less than significant level. Therefore, there are no unavoidable adverse impacts to cultural resources associated with the development of the proposed Project.