# COUNTY OF NAPA CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPARTMENT 1195 THIRD ST., SUITE 210 NAPA, CA 94559 (707) 253-4416

#### Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration

- Project Title: Busby Enterprises Industrial Condominiums, Use Permit (P08-00221-UP) and Parcel Map (P08-00222-PM).
- 2. Property Owner: Napa Valley Gateway Limited
- 3. Napa County contact person, phone number and e-mail: Sean Trippi, Principal Planner, 253-4417, strippi@co.napa.ca.us
- 4. **Project location and APN:** Located on a 2.4 acre parcel on the southwest corner of Devlin Road and Sheehy Court within an Industrial Park: Airport Compatibility (IP:AC) zoning district. APN: 057-250-037. Napa.
- 5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Busby Enterprises, Inc., 455 Technology Way, Napa CA, 94558 (David Busby)
- 6. **Hazardous Waste Sites:** The project is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

#### 7. Project Description:

Approval of a use permit to construct a 25-foot high concrete tilt-up building with 27,677 square feet of floor area for speculative warehouse and light industrial uses with ancillary office area. Access would be provided from two new driveways on Devlin Road and Sheehy Court. On-site parking for 62 vehicles, landscaping, and a free-standing monument sign are also included with the proposal. The project will connect to municipal water and sewer services provided by the City of American Canyon and the Napa Sanitation District, respectively. The request also includes a tentative parcel map to subdivide the proposed building into 10 industrial airspace condominiums ranging in size from 2,409 to 2,540 square feet with the balance of the property being common area.

#### PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION:

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

DATE: August 11, 2008

WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD: 8/15/2008 to 9/16/2008

Please send written comments to the attention of Sean Trippi at 1195 Third St., Room 210, Napa, California 94559, or via e-mail to <a href="mailto:strippi@co.napa.ca.us">strippi@co.napa.ca.us</a>. A public hearing on this project is tentatively scheduled for the Napa County Planning Commission on Wednesday, February 20, 2008. You may confirm the date and time of this hearing by calling (707) 253-4416.

# COUNTY OF NAPA CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPARTMENT 1195 THIRD ST., SUITE 210 NAPA, CA 94559 (707) 253-4416

#### Initial Study Checklist (reference CEQA, Appendix G)

- 1. Project Title: Busby Enterprises Industrial Condominiums, Use Permit (P08-00221-UP) and Parcel Map (P08-00222-PM).
- 2. Property Owner: Napa Valley Gateway Limited
- 3. Napa County contact person, phone number and e-mail: Sean Trippi, Principal Planner, 253-4417, strippi@co.napa.ca.us
- Project location and APN: Located on a 2.4 acre parcel on the southwest corner of Devlin Road and Sheehy Court within an Industrial Park: Airport Compatibility (IP:AC) zoning district. APN: 057-250-037. Napa.
- Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Busby Enterprises, Inc., 455 Technology Way, Napa CA, 94558 (David Busby)
- General Plan description: Industrial
- Zoning: Industrial Park: Airport Compatibility (IP:AC)
- 8. Project Description:

Approval of a use permit to construct a 27,677 square foot building for speculative warehouse and light industrial uses with ancillary office space. Access would be provided from two new driveways on Devlin Road and Sheehy Court. On-site parking for 62 vehicles, landscaping, and a free-standing monument sign are also included with the proposal. The project will connect to municipal water and sewer services provided by the City of American Canyon and the Napa Sanitation District, respectively. The request also includes a tentative parcel map to subdivide the proposed building into 10 industrial airspace condominiums ranging in size from 2,409 to 2,540 square feet with the balance of the property being the shared common area.

Exterior building materials include 25-foot high tex-coat concrete tilt-up wall panels, tile roofing, and glass storefronts on the front (north elevation) facing Sheehy Court. Windows and tile roofing are also provided on a portion of the side (east and west) building elevations. The rear elevation (south) includes 10 roll-up and man doors. The roll-up doors are generally perpendicular to Devlin Road and will be screened by existing and proposed landscaping. Each of the 10 units has the potential for 400 square feet of additional second story mezzanine floor area. The potential mezzanine floor area is included in the overall building floor area of 27,677 square feet. Proposed hours of operation are from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., seven days a week with an estimated 20 full-time employees.

#### 9. Environmental setting and surrounding land uses:

The site is currently vacant, has been previously graded and is located within a partially developed industrial park. The site has been designated for industrial development for over 20 years. The project site borders roads to the north and east, undeveloped property to the west and Sheehy Creek to the south. The site is relatively flat with slopes ranging from 0-5 percent running toward the north and east, and natural surface runoff flows away from the creek. The site includes non-native grasses and weeds. There is an existing office/light industrial complex on the south side of Sheehy Creek. Across Devlin Road to the east is vacant property. Across Sheehy Court to the north are a recently approved winery that has not been built and an existing light industrial complex. The southerly property line runs along the centerline of the creek. The area of the site from the centerline of the creek to a line that is 35-feet from the top of the creek bank and parallels the creek bank is encumbered with a conservation easement. No development, improvements or construction activities are allowed within the easement. The project site is in close proximity to the Napa County Airport, and is located in Zone D, the Common Traffic Pattern. This is an area of frequent aircraft overflight at low elevations.

10. Other agencies whose approval is required: Discretionary approval required by Napa County consists of a use permit and tentative parcel map. The proposed project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County including, but not limited to building permits, grading permits, and encroachment permits. Permits to connect to water and sewer utilities are required form the City of American Canyon and Napa Sanitation District, respectively. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is required to meet San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board standards and is administered by the County Public Works Department.

The proposed project does not involve modifications to a streambed, and thus does not require a streambed alteration agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game. The proposed project does not involve the fill of waters of the United States, and thus does not require a dredge-and-fill permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The proposed project does not involve the "take" of listed endangered or threatened species, and thus does not require a "take permit" from the Department of Fish and Game, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or the National Marine Fisheries Service.

### Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board City of American Canyon Napa Sanitation District Other Agencies Contacted City of Napa

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:**

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:	
I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a sign prepared.	nificant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be
I find that although the proposed project could have a signi	ficant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case ed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will
	t on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the e REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that I find that although the proposed project could have a signification been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE I	significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2 arlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT at remain to be addressed. Cant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided of ARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the
Signature	S/11/08  Date
Sean Trippi, Principal Planner	Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department

# **ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impac
I.	AE	STHETICS. Would the project:				
	a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				$\boxtimes$
	b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	П	<b>[</b>	П	$\boxtimes$
	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?		. <u> </u>		
Discu	ssion:					
a/b.	rock o	proposed project would not be located within an area which would damage outcroppings, or historic buildings. The proposed project site has been prest. The site is not visible from a scenic highway or any scenic routes.	e any known scenic eviously graded, con	vista, or damage s tains no native veg	scenic resource petation and is	es, trees, currently
C.	indust elevat loadin Court the m	project is located within a fairly developed portion of the Napa County Airp trial developments. The building is located on the southwest corner of tions include tenant storefronts, vertical elements that extend above the pag area for the building faces the south property line, generally perpendic. The overall design is equivalent to other similar industrial projects approximum design requirements for the AIASP's industrial park area. Therefore the content of the site and surrounding area.	Devlin Road and S arapet and tiled she cular to Devlin Road ved and constructed	heehy Court. The ed roofs over the te d, and would not l within the AIASP	e street facing enant entry do be visible from boundaries, ar	building ors. The Sheehy od meets
d.	minim deflect being	new facility will result in a minor increase in the nighttime lighting. In accourant necessary for operational and security needs. Light fixtures will be act the light down. Avoidance of highly reflective surfaces will be required, cast skyward. This is an area routinely overflown by low flying aircraft whis signed, and as subject to standard conditions of approval, the project will necessary.	kept as low to the g , as well as standar ch necessitates stro	round as possible d County conditior ng controls on sky	and include s is to prevent li ward nighttime	hields to aht from
Mitiga	tion M	easures: None required.				
		•	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II.	Cali	RICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining impacts to agricultural resources a fornia Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared be essing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:	re significant environ by the California Dept.	mental effects, lead	agencies may	refer to the del to use in
	a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				$\boxtimes$
	b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	П	П	П	$\boxtimes$
	c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	lummud	<u> </u>	<u></u>	<u> </u>
						$\boxtimes$

#### Discussion:

- a. The project site is located within a developing industrial park. The project would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Important as shown on the Napa County Important Farmland Map 2006 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency.
- b. The project site is not subject to a Williamson Act contract, and is zoned for industrial development.
- c. The project site is surrounded by developing industrial park land. Although farming activities occurred on these lands in the past, the area has been designated for industrial development for over 20 years. The project will not result in the conversion of existing farmland.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

III. ·	AIR	QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable to make the following determinations. Would the project.	Potentially Significant Impact le air quality manager	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation nent or air pollution	Less Than Significant Impact control district n	No Impac
	upo	n to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
	a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			$\boxtimes$	
	b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				
	с)	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)?			$\bowtie$	П
	d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			$\boxtimes$	
	e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			$\boxtimes$	

Discussion: The following analysis is based on the "BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines – Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans" (December 1999).

a. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plans. The project site lies at the southern end of the Napa Valley, which forms one of the climatologically sub regions (Napa County Sub region) within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The topographical and meteorological features of the valley create a relatively high potential for air pollution. Potential air quality impacts could result from construction activities. Construction emissions would have a temporary effect consisting mainly of dust generated during grading and other construction activities, exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles, and relatively minor emissions from paints and other architectural coatings. BAAQMD recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing such impacts. These measures are set forth in Table 2 of the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines. If the proposed project adheres to these measures, then BAAQMD recommends concluding that construction-related impacts will be insignificant. These measures will be incorporated into the proposed project as conditions of approval. In accordance with BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, these impacts are considered less than significant.

Over the long term, emission sources for the proposed project would consist primarily of mobile sources including deliveries and vehicles visiting the site. The Bay Area Air Quality Management Plan has determined that projects that do not exceed a threshold of 2,000 vehicle trips per day will not impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, p. 24.). According to the Institute of Traffic Engineers, Trip Generation, 7th Edition, 2003, Business Parks defined as a group of flex-type or incubator buildings are expected to generate 12.76 daily vehicle trips per 1,000 sq. ft. of gross floor area. Warehousing uses defined as primarily the storage of materials that may include office and maintenance areas, are expected to generate 4.96 daily vehicle trips per 1,000 sq. ft. of gross floor area. Based on the proposed 27,677 sq. ft. building, approximately 137 to 353 total daily vehicle trips would be generated based on warehousing or business park trip generation rates respectively. The total vehicle trips per day is significantly below BAAQMD's recommended threshold of 2,000 vehicle trips/day for purposes of performing a detailed air quality analysis. Given the number of vehicle trips and deliveries generated by this proposal when compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion, project related vehicles would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan.

b.-e. See (a) above. There are no projected or existing air quality violations in this area to which this proposal would contribute. Nor would the project result in any violations of any applicable air quality standards.

The BAAQMD defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact. The project site is not located in close proximity to any sensitive pollution-sensitive receptors. During project construction, the project has the potential to generate substantial amounts of dust or other construction-related air quality disturbances. As a standard practice for County development projects, application of water and/or dust palliatives are required in sufficient quantities during grading and other ground disturbing activities on-site to minimize the amount of dust produced. These Best Management Practices will reduce potential temporary changes in air quality to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

#### Discussion:

a-d. The site is part of the Gateway Business Park Industrial Subdivision approved for industrial development in 1989. The site has been previously graded and site improvements such as curb, gutter, sidewalk, sewer and water laterals, street lights, etc. were installed in the mid-1990's. The site has been graded over the years for weed abatement, and contains only seasonal grasses. There are no existing trees on the site. The project site is located on the north side of Sheehy Creek. According to the Sheehy Creek Enhancement and Realignment Project Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (Army Corps of Engineers file #24755N), prepared by Lucy Macmillan, dated January 2001, in the summer and fall of 1999, Sheehy Creek between Highway 29 and the eastern boundary of the realignment project was enhanced and revegetated, including the portion of the creek that borders the project site, as part of the enhancement project. The enhancement project involved the reconfiguration of the creek's banks to create a gentler slope to increase the creek's floodplain capacity. The newly created terraces were revegetated with native grasses and riparian trees and shrubs. A conservation easement, measured 35-feet from the top of the creek bank on both sides of the creek, was recorded to further protect the creek and the enhanced/created riparian areas. No development or construction activities are permitted within the easement. The creek was rehabilitated as part of the construction of the Gateway Business Park Industrial Subdivision after decades of damage to the creek banks by heavy cattle grazing and erosion.

The California Department of Fish and Game Natural Diversity Data Base indicates the potential presence of three special status animal species (Burrowing owl, Swainsons' hawk, and Ferruginous hawk) and one special status plant specie (dwarf downingia) within the vicinity of the project site. A preliminary Biological Resources Evaluation report, dated February 14, 2008, was prepared by Prunuske Chatham, Inc., to determine whether the site is likely to contain state or federally listed rare, threatened, or endangered plant or animal species, address potential impacts, if any, to protected species, and recommend mitigation measures as needed.

According to the report, nonnative grassland and ruderal habitats such as those found on the site provide limited wildlife habitat. Given highly compacted soils on the property, the site is not likely to support a large number of small vertebrates or subterranean foragers due to unfavorable soil conditions. Ground forgaging birds and other migratory birds may utilize the site for foraging. However, there are limited opportunities for nesting due to the low growing vegetation. Due to the lack of unique habitat features and plant communities, suitable habitat for special-status species is absent from the project site, and they are not likely to be impacted by development. The riparian habitat along Sheehy Creek is considered a sensitive biological resource area and should be protected during construction activities. Due to previous reported occurrences, there is low to moderate potential for burrowing owls and ferruginous hawks to be occupying the project areas region during the winter months. The mitigation measures, below, will reduce impacts to any special-status species, including migratory birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and the sensitive resources in the Sheehy Creek riparian habitat to a level of less than significant.

- e. The project would not conflict with any local policies protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation or the County's Conservation Regulations. The site is an improved industrial lot with little to no native vegetation. In accordance with the requirements of the AIASP, new landscaping will be provided on the site. The project does not conflict with any County ordinance or requirement to preserve existing trees, and therefore is considered as not having potential for a significant impact thereto.
- f. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans. No work will occur within the Sheehy Creek corridor or adjacent conservation easement.

#### **Mitigation Measures:**

1. Protective fencing shall be placed along the conservation easement setback adjacent to Sheehy Creek prior to the commencement of any construction or ground disturbing activities to protect the creek and riparian habitat. The fencing shall remain in place for the duration of construction.

Method of Mitigation Monitoring: The applicant shall submit a site plan showing the limits of construction and the location of protective fencing along the creek bank to the Director of the Conservation, Development and Planning Department for review and approval prior to any construction, grading, or earth moving activities on the site.

2. To avoid potential losses to nesting migratory birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, construction activities adjacent to Sheehy Creek shall occur outside the critical breeding period from mid-March to mid-August to the extent possible. If construction occurs during the breeding period, the site shall be surveyed for active nests by a qualified Biologist prior to commencing construction activities. If active nests are found, the nest location and a buffer area designated by the biologist shall be avoided until the nest has been vacated. The buffer should a minimum of 50-feet for small songbirds and 75-feet for larger birds, unless otherwise specified by the Biologist.

Method of Mitigation Monitoring: The project sponsor shall have a nesting bird survey completed prior to any construction activities scheduled to occur on the site from mid-March to mid-August. The survey results shall be provided to the Napa County Conservation Development and Planning Department. In the event any special-status or other protected nesting birds are found to occur on-site construction activities will be scheduled to avoid nesting and breeding periods.

V.	CU	LTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?			$\boxtimes$	
	b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines§15064.5?			$\boxtimes$	
	c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?				

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				
Discussi	on:					
a-c.	pre Ass the incl Nap are pro The are the	e project site is vacant and does not contain any structures. Research intesent at the site. Two previous archaeological surveys, entitled A Cultural I sessment Area, prepared by Archaeological Resource Service (ARS), date "Napa 218" Parcel in the Napa County Airport Area, prepared by ARS, of duded the project site. Neither study indicated the presence of historical, apa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers eas, and flags) do not identify any historical, archaeological, or paleontol oject site. There is no information in the County's files that would indicate the site has been previously graded when public improvements were installed present on the site, and the potential for impact is considered less-than-seproject, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualificordance with standard conditions of approval.	Resource Inventory ed September 1983 dated May 20, 1999 archaeological, or p—Historical sites pogical resources, se that there is a poed. It is therefore rignificant. However	of the Napa Airpord, and A Cultural Fig., were conducted valeontological resolutes & lines, Archites or unique geotential for occurrent anticipated thair, if resources are	t Master Envir Resources Eva in the AIASP burces. In add aeology sites, plogical feature nce of these re t any cultural re found during of	onmental luation of area and dition, the sensitive es on the esources, resources grading of
d.	and four	human remains have been encountered on the property during past gradid no information has been encountered that would indicate that this project nd during grading of the project, construction of the project is required estigate the site in accordance with standard conditions of approval.	would encounter hu	uman remains. Ho	wever, if resor	urces are
Mitigation	on M	leasures: None required.				
				Less Than		
VI.	GEO	OLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.	GE(	OLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:  Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:		With Mitigation	Significant	No Impact
VI.		Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including		With Mitigation	Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.		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		With Mitigation	Significant	No Impact
VI.		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.		With Mitigation	Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.		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?		With Mitigation	Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.		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?		With Mitigation	Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.	a)	<ul> <li>Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</li> <li>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.</li> <li>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</li> <li>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</li> <li>iv) Landslides?</li> </ul>	Significant Impact	With Mitigation Incorporation	Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.	a) b)	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?  Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?  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		With Mitigation	Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.	a) b) c)	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?  Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?  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?  Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform	Significant Impact	With Mitigation Incorporation	Significant Impact	No Impact

- a.
- i. There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed facility would result in a less than significant impact with regards to the rupturing of a known fault.
- ii. All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the facility must comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction, including the California Building Code which would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- iii. No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction.
- iv. The Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) did not indicate the presence of landslides on the property.
- b. Based upon the Soil Survey of Napa County, prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the soils in the area of development are Haire Loam, 2 to 9% slopes, which have slow to medium runoff and a slight erosion hazard. This soil type is found mainly on old terraces and alluvial fans. Given that the site is essentially flat, development on the site will be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance related to erosion control measures which would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- c/d. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Surficial Deposits layer) undifferentiated Holocene alluvium underlie the surficial soils on the project site. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Liquefaction layer) the project site has high susceptibility for liquefaction. Development will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level. In addition, a soils report, prepared by a qualified Engineer will be required as part of the building permit submittal. The report will address the soil stability, potential for liquefaction and will be used to design specific foundation systems and grading methods.
- e. The project will connect to municipal water service provided by the City of American Canyon and sewer service by Napa Sanitation District. "Will serve" letters have been submitted by the affected jurisdictions indicating that they have sufficient capacity to accommodate the water and wastewater demand of this project.

Mitigation Measure: None required.

НΑ	7ARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	and or the time and ord time to the project.				
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			$\boxtimes$	
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			$\boxtimes$	
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				$\boxtimes$
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?			П	$\bowtie$
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, 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?				$\boxtimes$
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			$\boxtimes$	
	a) b) c) d)	routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?  b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?  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, 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?  g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:  a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?  b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?  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, 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?	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:  a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?  b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?  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, 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?	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:  a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?  b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?  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?

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?				<b>1</b> 21
Discu	ssion:		L <b>.</b>		LJ	
a.	the braindus amou involv environduring	proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials other uilding. At this time, specific tenants are not known. It is anticipated that trial/manufacturing uses with ancillary office areas. A Business Plan with a stransportation of hazardous materials reach reportable levels for any future use assocites the use, storage or transportation of greater the 55 gallons or 500 promental assessment would be required in accordance with the Napa Conground of the project some hazardous materials, such as building a construction of the project some hazardous materials, such as building a construction and the limited duration, they will result in a lease.	subsequent tenants Il be filed with the I iated with occupanc ounds of hazardous ounty Zoning Ordinal coatings/ adhesives	s will be a mix of security of the security. However, in the materials, a use note prior to the estate, will be utilized.	small warehou alth Division s e event that a t permit and su stablishment o	sing, light hould the future use ibsequent f the use.
b.	The p	project would not result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment	onment.			
C.	There	are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project	site.			
d.	The p	roposed site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.				
e.	Comp locate highly with s certific	project site is located within two miles of the Napa County Airport, and is patibility Combination zoning district and the requirements of the Napa Coad within Zone D of the compatibility plan which is an area of common over compatible with the risk and noise impacts associated with properties with properties with properties with properties with properties of requirements regarding light and glare to ensure airport land used as meeting ALUC compatibility requirements, and consequently the properties of the comply with County airport compatibility land use requirements.	unty Airport Land U rflight and moderate thin Zone D. The bi e compatibility. Coi oject is not subject	se Compatibility F risk. The propose uilding has also be unty development	Plan. The project of the been designed to regulations he	ect site is ouilding is to comply ave been
f.	The p	roject site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.				
g.	desigr	roposed driveways that serve the project will be improved to comply with ned to accommodate fire apparatus and large trucks. The project has bee rtment and found acceptable as conditioned. Therefore, the design of the s.	n reviewed by the C	County Fire Depart	lment and Pub	lic Works
h.	The p	roject would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a signification to a signification of the contract of the co	cant loss, injury or d	eath involving wild	d land fires bed	ause the
<u>Mitiga</u>	tion M	easures: None required.				
, <u>,</u>			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII.	HYI	DROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:		•	•	
	a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			$\boxtimes$	
	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)?				$\boxtimes$
	c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			5-71	···

 $\boxtimes$ 

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			$\boxtimes$	
g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				$\boxtimes$
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area 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?				$\boxtimes$
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				$\boxtimes$

#### Discussion:

- a. The project site is located on the north side of Sheehy Creek, an environmentally enhanced and realigned drainage. The creek was rehabilitated as part of the construction of the Gateway Business Park Industrial Subdivision after decades of damage to the creek banks by heavy cattle grazing and erosion. Drainage on the site will be collected in new private on-site storm drains that will connect to existing storm drains in Sheehy Court designed to accommodate drainage from this site that will ultimately be conveyed to Sheehy Creek. No new improvements will be constructed in the creek or within the conservation easement. The proposed project will not violate any known water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The applicant is required to obtain a stormwater permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) which is administered in part by the County Public Works Department on behalf of the RWQCB. Given the essentially level terrain, and the County's Best Management Practices, which comply with RWQCB requirements, the project does not have the potential to significantly impact water quality and discharge standards.
- b. The project will connect to municipal water provided by the City of American Canyon. No groundwater wells are associated with this property.
- c-d. The proposed project will not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off site. The project will incorporate erosion control measures appropriate to its maximum slope to manage onsite surface drainage and erosion of onsite soils during construction and winter months (October to April). As noted above, the project is required to comply with County Public Works requirements which are consistent with RWQCB standards. These established Best Management Practices have been successfully implemented on numerous previous projects within AlASP area. By incorporating erosion control measures, this project would have a less than significant impact. No substantial alteration of existing drainage is anticipated to occur. There will be an increase in the overall imperious surface resulting from the new buildings, pavement and sidewalks. However, given the size of the drainage basin, the increase in impervious surfaces will not discernibly change the amount of groundwater filtration or discernibly increase surface runoff from that which currently exists on site. This project would therefore result in a less than significant impact with respect to drainage.
- e. The existing storm drainage system is designed to County standards and is sized to accommodate all drainage from this site.
- f. There are no other factors in this project that would otherwise degrade water quality.
- g-i. The project site is not located within a flood hazard area, nor would it impede or redirect flood flows or expose structures or people to flooding. The project site is not located within a dam or levee failure inundation zone.
- j. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows.

Mitigation Measures: None required

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX.	LA	ND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:		•		
	a) b)	Physically divide an established community?  Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				
	c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community			$\boxtimes$	
	c)	conservation plan?				$\boxtimes$
Discu	ission:					
a-c.	propo other prope	proposed project would not occur within an established community, nor would be project complies with the Napa County General Plan, the Napa County applicable regulations. There are no applicable habitat conservation planty. No work will occur within the conservation easement along Sheehy Creesures: None required.	unty Code, The Airp ns or natural commi	oort Industrial Are	a Specific Plar	n, and all
			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Х.	MIN	IERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:			mpaot	
	а)	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?				$\boxtimes$
	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?				$\boxtimes$
Discu	ssion:					
a/b.	The (	Conservation Element of the General Plan does not indicate the present state. The proposed project would not result in a loss of a mineral resource.	ce of valuable or lo	cally important mi	neral resource	s on the
Mitiga	ation M	easures: None required.				
XI.	NO	SE. Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Λι.	NO.	• •				
	а)	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?			$\boxtimes$	
	c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			$\boxtimes$	
	d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			$\boxtimes$	

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impa
	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?		Incorporation	Impact	
Disc	f) ission:	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?				$\boxtimes$
a/b.	impro not ar opera	roposed project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during the vements. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using proposed to be significant. The proposed project would not result in lotional impacts. Furthermore, construction activities would generally occur of human activity. All construction activities will be conducted in complian	operly mufflered veh ing-term significant period or during the period	icles. Noise gene permanent constru of 7am-7pm on w	rated during thuction noise in eekdays, durin	nis time is npacts or normal
c/d.	indust noise	nticipated level of noise to occur following the completion of construction rial/warehousing/office uses in an existing industrial park. The project is increases resulting from additional industrial development will impact sens dherence to the County Noise Ordinance, would ensure the proposed proj	located within an in sitive receptors. The	dustrial park and edusing design of the pro	is not in an ar	ea where
e)	As su	roposed project site is located within compatibility Zone D of the Napa C ch, persons on the project site will be exposed to noise from regular a sed noise levels from aircraft, and is considered compatible with aircraft o	aircraft overflight. T	is an area of cor The nature of the	nmon aircraft ouse is not se	overflight. nsitive to
f)	The p	roject is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.				
Mitig	ation M	easures: None required.				
XII.	POI	DIN ATION AND HOUSING Mould the project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impa
VII.		PULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
	a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				
	b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				$\boxtimes$
	c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				$\boxtimes$
Discu	ssion:					
a.	emplo is contrib the Co for ne	roject site is currently vacant and located in an industrial area. The facil yees. The project will increase the number of jobs within the industrial particles and sidered to be relatively small compared to the overall business park and oute to a cumulatively considerable increase in the demand for housing under the state Housing and summary has adopted a Housing Element (certified by the State Housing and adopted a development impact fee, included ucting affordable housing to off-set any cumulative existing affordable housing the set of the control of the set of the set of the set of the control of the set of the	rk. However, given to the communitient its within Napa Court Community Develoyed as a mitigation	the size of the projes; therefore this in the and the general pment Agency) who measure, below	ect, the number ncrease in job all vicinity. Furth hich identifies to provide f	er of jobs s will not hermore, locations unds for

b/c. There are no existing homes on, or adjacent to, the project site. The project will not result in the displacement of any housing units or people.

building permits are issued. This fee is charged to all new non-residential developments based on the gross square footage of non-residential space multiplied by the applicable fee by type of use as listed in Chapter 15.60.100, Table 1, and is considered to reduce housing

inducement impacts to a less than significant level.

# Mitigation Measures:

		issuance of a building p	permit.		
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impa
XIII.	PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in:				
	a) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significal environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratio response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services	ed nt s,			
	Fire protection?			$\boxtimes$	
	Police protection?			$\boxtimes$	
	Schools?				
	Parks?			$\boxtimes$	
	Other public facilities?			$\boxtimes$	
Discus	ssion:				
	proposed project would not increase the demand on those public services. Find there would be no expected impact to response time as the property has levied with the building permit application. Those fees assist local school dis	Fire protection measure s good public road acc	ess. School impa	part of the dev ct mitigation fe	elopment es will be
	proposed project would not increase the demand on those public services. Find there would be no expected impact to response time as the property has levied with the building permit application. Those fees assist local school disting have little impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from building process of providing public services to the property.  Setion Measures: None required.	Fire protection measure s good public road acc stricts with capacity buil	es are required as ess. School impai Iding measures. T	part of the dev ct mitigation fe he proposed p	elopment es will be roiect will
Mitigat	and there would be no expected impact to response time as the property ha levied with the building permit application. Those fees assist local school dis have little impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from building posts of providing public services to the property.	Fire protection measure s good public road acc stricts with capacity buil	es are required as ess. School impai Iding measures. T	part of the dev ct mitigation fe he proposed p	elopment es will be roject will meet the
	and there would be no expected impact to response time as the property ha levied with the building permit application. Those fees assist local school dis have little impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from building posts of providing public services to the property.  Ation Measures: None required.  RECREATION. Would the project:	Fire protection measure s good public road acc stricts with capacity buil permit fees, property to Potentially Significant Impact	es are required as ess. School impail ding measures. Tax increases and the session of the sessio	part of the dev ct mitigation fe he proposed p axes will help Less Than Significant	elopment es will be roject will meet the
Mitigat	and there would be no expected impact to response time as the property ha levied with the building permit application. Those fees assist local school dis have little impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from building posts of providing public services to the property.	Fire protection measure s good public road acc stricts with capacity buil permit fees, property to Potentially Significant Impact	es are required as ess. School impail ding measures. Tax increases and the session of the sessio	part of the dev ct mitigation fe he proposed p axes will help Less Than Significant	elopment es will be roject will meet the
Mitigat	and there would be no expected impact to response time as the property ha levied with the building permit application. Those fees assist local school dis have little impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from building posts of providing public services to the property.  Ition Measures: None required.  RECREATION. Would the project:  a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities.	Fire protection measure s good public road acc stricts with capacity buil permit fees, property to  Potentially Significant Impact  er ty	es are required as ess. School impail ding measures. Tax increases and the session of the sessio	part of the dev ct mitigation fe he proposed p axes will help Less Than Significant	relopment es will be project will meet the
Mitigat	and there would be no expected impact to response time as the property ha levied with the building permit application. Those fees assist local school dis have little impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from building posts of providing public services to the property.  Increase:  None required.  RECREATION. Would the project:  a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?  b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction of expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	Fire protection measure s good public road acc stricts with capacity buil permit fees, property to  Potentially Significant Impact  er ty	es are required as ess. School impail ding measures. Tax increases and the session of the sessio	part of the dev ct mitigation fe he proposed p axes will help Less Than Significant	relopment es will be vroject will meet the
Mitigat  XIV.  Discuss a/b.	and there would be no expected impact to response time as the property ha levied with the building permit application. Those fees assist local school dis have little impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from building posts of providing public services to the property.  Increase:  None required.  RECREATION. Would the project:  a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?  b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction of expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	Fire protection measures good public road acceptricts with capacity built permit fees, property to Potentially Significant Impact erectly the permit fees all the protection of the protection o	es are required as ess. School imparied in greasures. Tax increases and for the significant with Mitigation Incorporation	part of the devet mitigation fees the proposed p	relopment es will be roject will meet the

XV.	TRA	ANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impa
	a)	Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				
	b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				
	c) d)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?  Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or			$\boxtimes$	
	e)	dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?  Result in inadequate emergency access?	. 🔲		$\boxtimes$	
Discussion	f) g)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?  Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			$\boxtimes$	
Discussion	m.					

a-b. Weekday traffic volumes within the project vicinity consist primarily of commute traffic within the peak traffic periods, with residential, commercial, tourist, and industrial park traffic occurring throughout the day. Southern Napa County is characterized by two distinct commute traffic patterns: a Napa to Bay Area commute, and a Solano County to Napa commute. The existing traffic congestion is primarily the result of regional growth impacts. Major improvements to both Highway 29 and Highway 12 are necessary to address regional traffic congestion. As mandated by Napa County, projects within the industrial park are responsible for paying "fair share" costs to the construction of improvements to impacted roadways within the AIASP area.

Since 1990, the County has imposed and collected traffic mitigation fees on all development projects within the AIASP area. A developer's "fair share" fee goes toward funding roadway improvements within the AIASP area including improvements designed to relieve traffic on State Highways. The traffic mitigation fee is further described in Board of Supervisor's Resolution 08-20. For this project, a traffic mitigation fee based on PM peak hour vehicle trips will be imposed and collected prior to issuance of a building permit as determined by the Director of Public Works and is included as a mitigation measure, below.

The County has established that a significant traffic impact would occur if increases in traffic from a project would cause intersections or twolane highway capacity to deteriorate to worse than LOS E, or at intersections or two-lane highway where base case (without project) is LOS F, a significant impact is considered to occur if a project increases the base volumes by more than one percent. Napa County utilizes a one percent significance threshold for the identification of significant adverse traffic impact during peak hours to travel. This threshold was directed by the Napa County Transportation Planning Agency. This factor has been used consistently as the significance determination for all recent EIR and CEQA documents within the AIASP area.

According to the Institute of Traffic Engineers, Trip Generation, 7th Edition, 2003, Business Parks defined as a group of flex-type or incubator buildings are expected to generate 12.76 daily and 1.29 p.m. peak period vehicle trips per 1,000 sq. ft. of gross floor area. Warehousing defined as primarily the storage of materials that may include office and maintenance areas are expected to generate 4.96 daily and 0.61 p.m. peak period vehicle trips per 1,000 sq. ft. of gross floor area. Based on the proposed 27,677 sq. ft. building, approximately 137 to 353 total daily vehicle trips would be generated based on warehousing or business park trip generation rates respectively. The proposed project would generate approximately 17 to 35 trips during the p.m. peak period based on warehousing or business park p.m. peak trip generation rates, respectively. According to information from the California Department of Transportation traffic counts taken in 2006 indicate the traffic volume at the Highway 12/29 intersection was approximately 48,500 to 67,000 average daily vehicle trips. Peak hour trips were approximately 3,950 to 5,100 vehicles. Traffic generated by this project will contribute less than 1% to the traffic levels on local roadways and intersections and to deterioration in their level of service. This less than 1% increase is considered a less-than-significant level with the payment of the "fair share" development impact fee described in Board Resolution No. 08-20, and included as a mitigation measure.

The project does not have any impact on air traffic patterns. C.

- d/e. The project includes construction of new driveways on Devlin Road and Sheehy Court. The new driveways have been designed to comply with all County standards. The project will not result in any changes to levels of service or cause any new safety risks.
- f. The project has been designed with 62 parking spaces to comply with Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan standards. The project will not result in inadequate parking.
- g. The proposed project does not conflict with any known policies or plans supporting alternative transportation.

#### **Mitigation Measures:**

4. Prior to County authorization of a Building Permit, the applicant shall submit payment of the Napa County's traffic mitigation fee in accordance with Board Resolution 08-20, as may be amended, of the equivalent of the vehicle trips generated by the project in the PM peak traffic period.

Method of Mitigation Monitoring: Payment of fee is required prior to the issuance of a building permit.

XVI.	117	ILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No impact
/\ <b>V</b> 1.	011	ETTIES AND SERVICE STOTEING. Would the project.				
	a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				$\boxtimes$
	b)	Require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			$\boxtimes$	
	c)	Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			$\boxtimes$	
	d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	П	П	$\boxtimes$	П
	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?		_	_	
	n	The appeal has a local Cill with a self-sized assertional assertion in the self-sized			$\boxtimes$	
	f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			$\boxtimes$	
	g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	. 🗆			$\boxtimes$

#### Discussion:

- a. The project will occur within an urbanized area and connect to a publicly maintained wastewater treatment system. The wastewater provider, Napa Sanitation District, has provided a will serve letter and has found the project to be in compliance with district master plans. The District's wastewater treatment plant complies with all water quality discharge requirements, and therefore the project will comply with regional water quality control standards.
- b. The project will not require construction of any new water or wastewater treatment facilities that will result in a significant impact to the environment. The project site is located in an area planned for industrial development and existing water and wastewater treatment facilities have been sized to accommodate the proposed project.
- c. The proposed project includes the construction of new drainage facilities. The new drainage system will be designed by a qualified engineer and is subject to review and approval by the Department of Public Works. The Department of Public Works has included conditions of approval requiring that the drainage system be designed to avoid diversion or concentration of storm water runoff onto adjacent properties.

- d. The project will receive water from the City of American Canyon which has sufficient water supplies to serve projected needs. The project is located within an area designated for urban development by the City. The City has acquired water rights to provide adequate water for all areas within their service area, and has issued a will serve letter for the proposal.
- e. See response "a." above.
- f. The proposed project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the projects demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the proposed project.
- g. The proposed project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

#### Discussion:

- a. A portion of the project site is encumbered by a conservation easement that is intended to protect Sheehy Creek and its enhancement area. The balance of the property was been previously disturbed and graded over the past several years. The Biological resources section indicates that there is a possibility of state or federally protected species occurring within the vicinity of the site. Mitigation measures are proposed to protect both Sheehy Creek and any protected species that may be affected by the proposed project. No further effects are expected with the implementation of the mitigation measures. No historic or prehistoric resources are anticipated to be affected by the proposed project. The project will not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable as mitigated. Potential traffic and housing impacts are discussed in their respective sections above. The project would also increase the demands for public services to a limited extent, increase traffic and air pollution, all of which contribute to cumulative effects when future development along Highway 29 is considered. Cumulative impacts of these issues are discussed and mitigated in previous sections of this Initial study (e.g. traffic and housing).
- c. The project does not pose any substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

# **BUSBY ENTERPRISES INDUSTRIAL CONDOMINIUMS**

Use Permit (File #P08-00221-UP) Parcel Map (File #P08-00222-PM)

APN: 057-250-037

# MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring/Reporting Action and Schedule	Monitoring Compliance Complete (Name / Date)
Biological Resources (IV)			
Protective fencing shall be placed along the conservation easement setback adjacent to Sheehy Creek prior to the commencement of any construction or ground disturbing activities to protect the creek and riparian habitat. The fencing shall remain in place for the duration of construction.	Planning Department	The applicant shall submit a site plan showing the limits of construction and the location of protective fencing along the creek bank to the Director of the Conservation, Development and Planning Department for review and approval prior to any construction, grading, or earth moving activities on the site.	
2. To avoid potential losses to nesting migratory birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, construction activities adjacent to Sheehy Creek shall occur outside the critical breeding period from mid-March to mid-August to the extent possible. If construction occurs during the breeding period, the site shall be surveyed for active nests by a qualified Biologist prior to commencing construction activities. If active nests are found, the nest location and a buffer area designated by the biologist shall be avoided until the nest has been vacated. The buffer should a minimum of 50-feet for small songbirds and 75-feet for larger birds, unless otherwise specified by the Biologist.	Planning Department	The project sponsor shall have a nesting bird survey completed prior to any construction activities scheduled to occur on the site from mid-March to mid-August. The survey results shall be provided to the Napa County Conservation Development and Planning Department. In the event any special-status or other protected nesting birds are found to occur on-site construction activities will be scheduled to avoid nesting and breeding periods.	
			valenda alaman a
Population & Housing (Section XII)			
3. Prior to County authorization of a Building Permit the applicant shall pay the Napa County Affordable Housing Mitigation Fee in accordance with No. 1243, or as may be amended, for any additional building square footage constructed.	Building Department	Payment of fee is required prior to the issuance of a building permit.	
Transportation/Traffic (Section XV)			
4. Prior to County authorization of a Building Permit, the applicant shall submit payment of the Napa County's Traffic Mitigation fee in accordance with Board Resolution 02-029, as may be amended, of the equivalent of the vehicle trips generated by the project in the PM peak traffic period.	Public Works Department	Payment of fee is required prior to the issuance of a building permit.	

AUG 12 2008

NAPA CO. CONSERVATION DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPT.

### PROJECT REVISION STATEMENT

**Busby Enterprises Industrial Condominiums** 

Use Permit (File #P08-00221-UP) Parcel Map (File #P08-00222-PM)

APN: 057-250-037

Napa County Environmental Review

#### I hereby revise my request to include the measures specified above.

I understand and explicitly agree that with regards to all California Environmental Quality Act, Permit Streamlining Act, and Subdivision Map Act processing deadlines, this revised application will be treated as a new project, filed on the date this project revision statement is received by the Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department. For purposes of Section 66474.2 of the Subdivision Map Act, the date of application completeness shall remain the date this project was <u>originally</u> found complete.

DAVID BUSBY- PRES

Print Name

Signature of Owner(s)

Interest

5-12-08