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: Satish & Surekha Chohan / Turnkey Technologies Use Permit # P08-00557-UP
- 2. **Request:** Use Permit to allow construction of an approximately 39,000 square foot light industrial, manufacturing and warehouse facility including about 18,972 square feet of warehouse, about 15,528 square feet of manufacturing space, and about 4,500 square feet of offices divided between the first floor and a mezzanine, with up to 25 employees and 71 parking spaces.
- 3. Property Owner: Satish & Surekha Chohan
- 4. Napa County contact person, phone number and e-mail: Ronald Gee, Project Planner, 707-253-4417, rgee@co.napa.ca.us
- 5. **Project location and APN:** Located on a 2.41 acre parcel on the northeast corner of the T-intersection at Technology Way and Gateway Road West, about 1,000 feet west of Devlin Road, within an Industrial Park: Airport Compatibility (IP:AC) zoning district and Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone D (Common Traffic Pattern), APN: 057-250-032. Napa County, California.
- 6. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Satish M. Chohan & Surekha S. Chohan, 4650-A East 2nd Street, Benicia, CA 94510
- 7. **Hazardous Waste Sites:** The project is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.
- 8. Project Description:

Approval of a use permit to construct an approximately 39,000 square foot light industrial building with 18,972 square feet of warehouse, 15,528 square feet of industrial, and 4,500 square feet of ancillary office space. Up to 25 employees would occupy the building during a single shift, Monday-Friday from 7:00 AM – 5:00 PM. Access would be provided from two new driveways on Technology Way and Gateway Road West property frontage. On-site parking for 57 spaces initially will be provided; 14 additional spaces, including 6 compact spaces, are shown as future parking (71 total). Perimeter and building frontage landscaping and a free-standing monument sign are 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 structure consists of a 35-foot high, metal-framed building with an insulated exterior panelized finish system, raised-seam metal roofing system, covered loading bays, screened refuse and building equipment areas. The rounded, front entry will contain 2,400 square feet of office space on the main floor and 2,100 feet on a mezzanine. The north, rear elevation includes two roll-up doors and a loading area; the east side would have 6 man and 3 roll-up doors; the west side will have 6 man and 3 roll-up doors. All sides will be screened by landscaping except for the north, rear elevation which is set back from Sheehy Creek and will face the rear of a 5.90 acre and 2.18 acre industrial site located on the west end of the Sheehy Court cul-de-sac.

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: February 10, 2009 By: Ronald Gee

WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD: February 11, 2009 to March 3, 2009

Please send written comments to the attention of Ronald Gee at 1195 Third St., Room 210, Napa, California 94559, or via e-mail to rgee@co.napa.ca.us. A public hearing on this project is tentatively scheduled for the Napa County Planning Commission on Wednesday, March 4, 2009. 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)

- Project Title: Satish & Surekha Chohan / Turnkey Technologies Use Permit # P08-00557-UP
- 2. **Property Owner**: Satish & Surekha Chohan
- 3. Napa County contact person, phone number and e-mail: Ronald Gee, Project Planner, 253-4417, rgee@co.napa.ca.us
- 4. Project location and APN: Located on a 2.41 acre parcel on the northeast corner of the T-intersection at Technology Way and Gateway Road West, about 1,000 feet west of Devlin Road, within an Industrial Park: Airport Compatibility (IP:AC) zoning district and Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone D (Common Traffic Pattern) APN: 057-250-032. Napa County, California.
- 5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Satish M. Chohan & Surekha S. Chohan, 4650-A East 2nd Street, Benicia, CA 94510
- 6. General Plan description: Business/Industrial Park, Napa County Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan.
- 7. **Zoning**: Industrial Park: Airport Compatibility Combining (IP:AC) District
- 8. Project Description:

The application is a use permit request to construct an approximately 39,000 square foot light-industrial building with 18,972 square feet of warehouse, 15,528 square feet of manufacturing, and 4,500 square feet of ancillary office space. Up to 25 employees would occupy the building during a single shift, Monday-Friday from 7:00 AM – 5:00 PM. Access would be provided from two new driveways on Technology Way and Gateway Road West property frontage. On-site parking for 57 spaces initially will be provided; 14 additional spaces, including 6 compact spaces, are shown as future parking (71 total). Perimeter and building frontage landscaping and a free-standing monument sign are 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 structure consists of a 35-foot high, metal-framed building with an insulated exterior panelized finish system, raised-seam metal roofing system, covered loading bays, screened refuse and building equipment areas. The rounded, front entry will contain 2,400 square feet of office space on the main floor and 2,100 feet on a mezzanine. The north, rear elevation includes two roll-up doors and a loading area; the east side would have 6 man and 3 roll-up doors; the west side will have 6 man and 3 roll-up doors. All sides will be screened by landscaping except for the north, rear elevation which is set back from Sheehy Creek and will face the rear of a 5.90 acre and 2.18 acre industrial site located on the west end of the Sheehy Court cul-de-sac.

9. Environmental setting and surrounding land uses:

The vacant site is located within a partially developed industrial park. The site has been designated for industrial development for over 20 years. The project site borders Sheehy Creek to the north, Technology Way and Gateway Road West to the southwest and southeast. There is an existing warehouse structure to the east and undeveloped properties to the west. The site is relatively flat with slopes ranging from 0-5 percent running toward the north and east with natural surface runoff flows towards the creek. The site includes non-native grasses and weeds. Across Technology Way is vacant property. Gateway Road West is an existing light industrial complex. The north 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 Land Use Compatibility Zone D, the Common Traffic Pattern, 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. 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 from 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:	
		nificant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be
		ficant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case eed 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	significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the y analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) arlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT It remain to be addressed.
	I find that although the proposed project could have a signification been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE I	cant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or ARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the
Signat	ure	February 10, 2009 Date
Ronald	d Gee, Project Planner	Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

			Potentially Significant Impact	Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
l.	AES	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?				\boxtimes
	c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			\boxtimes	
	d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			\boxtimes	
Discu	ssion:					
a/b.	rock c	proposed project would not be located within an area which would damage butcroppings, or historic buildings. The proposed project site contains no e from Highway 29, a scenic highway and scenic route, but is located within	native vegetation ar	nd is currently vac		
C.	indust mezza faces The cominim	project is located within a fairly developed portion of the Napa County Airpatrial developments. The street facing building elevation includes a two anine. Vertical elements extend above the parapet and tiled shed roofs of the north property line, generally perpendicular to Devlin Road, and would overall design is equivalent to other similar industrial projects approved a num design requirements for the AIASP's industrial park area. Therefore of comparison of the site and surrounding area.	o-story entry with of over the tenant entry I not be visible from and constructed with	ffices on the first y doors. The load Technology Way in the AIASP bou	floor and sec ing area for the or Gateway Ro ndaries, and n	ond-level e building and West. neets the
d.	minim deflect being	new facility will result in a minor increase in the nighttime lighting. In account necessary for operational and security needs. Light fixtures will be at 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 reference.	kept as low to the g , as well as standar ich necessitates stro	ground as possible of County condition ong controls on sky	e and include s ns to prevent ward nighttime	shields to light from
<u>Mitiga</u>	ation M	easures: None required.				
			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II.	Cal	RICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining impacts to agricultural resources a ifornia Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared essing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
	a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				\boxtimes
	b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				\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?			Ш	
		or nature, could result in conversion or Familiana, to non-agricultural use:				\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.		R QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicabon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact lle air quality manager	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation ment or air pollution	Less Than Significant Impact control district n	No Impac
	upo	in 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?			\boxtimes	
	c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			\boxtimes	
	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 are 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.

According to the attached George Nickelson, Focused Trip Generation Analysis for a Development on Technology Way in the Napa Airport Industrial Area (NAIA), September 25, 2008, the proposed 39,000 sq. ft. building would generate 24 peak commute hour trips based on warehousing and manufacturing 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 guality 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?		\boxtimes		
	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?				\boxtimes
	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?		_		
	e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources,				
		such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	Ш			\boxtimes
	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 south side of Sheehy Creek.

A conservation easement, measured 35-feet from the centerline of the creek 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.

According to the Lucy MacMillan, *Biological Constraints Analysis*, *Lot 3, Unit 4 (APN 057-250-024) Napa Valley Gateway, Napa California, September 25, 2008*, based on habitat conditions, it was determined that the site is unlikely to provide habitat for special-status plants and that no potential jurisdictional wetlands were identified. Seasonally-timed surveys for rare plants known to occur in grassland habitats were recommended to be conducted in the spring months, between March and July, and identified mitigation measures to minimize and/or avoid impacts to these species. Based on habitat conditions, it was determined that the site provides potential foraging habitat for a variety of birds and raptors. Due to the site's proximity to Sheehy Creek, if construction is to occur between February 1 and August 31, pre-construction nesting surveys should be conducted within 500 feet of all potential nesting habitats and mitigation measures implemented as necessary.

Non-native 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.

<u>Method of Mitigation Monitoring:</u> 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.	CUI	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?				
	b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines§15064.5?			\boxtimes	

				Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	c)		ectly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or que geological feature?			\boxtimes	
	d)		turb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal neteries?			\boxtimes	
Discuss	ion:						
a-c.	pres Ass the incl Nap area proj The are the	sent sessr «Napuded oa Co as, a ject s pres proj	ject site is vacant and does not contain any structures. Research in at the site. Two previous archaeological surveys, entitled <i>A Cultural ment Area</i> , prepared by Archaeological Resource Service (ARS), dat pa 218" Parcel in the Napa County Airport Area, prepared by ARS, of the project site. Neither study indicated the presence of historical, ounty Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers and flags) do not identify any historical, archaeological, or paleonto site. There is no information in the County's files that would indicate has been previously graded when public improvements were install sent on the site, and the potential for impact is considered less-thansiect, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualificate with standard conditions of approval.	Resource Inventory ed September 1983 dated May 20, 1999 archaeological, or p – Historical sites pr logical resources, s e that there is a po led. It is therefore r significant. Howeve	of the Napa Airpo 8, and A Cultural II 9, were conducted aleontological res- pints & lines, Arch ites or unique gen tential for occurrent not anticipated that r, if resources are	rt Master Envir Resources Eva in the AIASP ources. In add aeology sites, ological feature nce of these re t any cultural re found during of	ronmental aluation of area and dition, the sensitive es on the esources. resources grading of
d.	and foui	l no i nd d	an remains have been encountered on the property during past grad information has been encountered that would indicate that this projecturing grading of the project, construction of the project is required ate the site in accordance with standard conditions of approval.	t would encounter h	uman remains. Ho	owever, if reso	urces are
<u>Mitigati</u>	on M	easu	ures: None required.				
					Less Than		
				Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.	GEO	OLO(GY AND SOILS. Would the project:		Significant With Mitigation	Significant	No Impact
VI.	GEO a)	Ехр	GY AND SOILS. Would the project: pose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving:		Significant With Mitigation	Significant	No Impact
VI.		Ехр	pose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including		Significant With Mitigation	Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.		Exp the	cose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving: 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		Significant With Mitigation	Significant	No Impact
VI.		Exp the i)	cose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving: 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.		Significant With Mitigation	Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.		Exp the i)	cose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving: 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. Strong seismic ground shaking?		Significant With Mitigation	Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.		Exp the i) ii) iii) iv)	cose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving: 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. Strong seismic ground shaking? Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		Significant With Mitigation	Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.	a)	Exp the i) ii) iii) iv) Ress Be uns	cose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving: 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. Strong seismic ground shaking? Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? Landslides?		Significant With Mitigation	Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.	a) b)	Exp the i) ii) iii) iv) Res Be uns land Be	cose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving: 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. Strong seismic ground shaking? Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? Landslides? sult in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become stable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site dslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform		Significant With Mitigation	Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.	a) b) c)	Exp the i) ii) iii) iv) Res Be uns land Be	cose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving: 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. Strong seismic ground shaking? Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? Landslides? sult in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become stable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site delide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?		Significant With Mitigation	Significant Impact	No Impact

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are r the disposal of waste water?				

Discussion:

a.

- . 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 along the north 20% of the site, adjacent to Sheehy Creek; the balance of the site, where the proposed structure will be located, has very low liquefaction potential. 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.

VII.	НА	ZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	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?				
	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
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?			\boxtimes	
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	
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?				\boxtimes
Discussion:					
the bu	proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials other uilding. A Business Plan will be filed with the Environmental Health Division for any future use associated with occupancy. However, in the event the	on should the amour	nt of hazardous ma	iterials reach r	eportable

D

- а greater the 55 gallons or 500 pounds of hazardous materials, a use permit and subsequent environmental assessment would be required in accordance with the Napa County Zoning Ordinance prior to the establishment of the use. During construction of the project some hazardous materials, such as building coatings/ adhesives/ etc., will be utilized. However, given the quantities of hazardous materials and the limited duration, they will result in a less-than-significant impact.
- b. The project would not result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site.
- d. The proposed site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.
- The project site is located within two miles of the Napa County Airport, and is therefore subject to the requirements of the County's Airport e. Compatibility Combination zoning district and the requirements of the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The project site is located within Zone D of the compatibility plan which is an area of common overflight and moderate risk. The proposed use of the building is highly compatible with the risk and noise impacts associated with properties within Zone D. The building has also been designed to comply with specific requirements regarding light and glare to ensure airport land use compatibility. County development regulations have been certified as meeting ALUC compatibility requirements, and consequently the project is not subject to separate ALUC review because it has been designed to comply with County airport compatibility land use requirements.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.
- The proposed driveways that serve the project will be improved to comply with County standards and access around the building has been designed to accommodate fire apparatus and large trucks. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Public Works Department and found acceptable as conditioned. Therefore, the design of the project will not negatively impact or hinder emergency vehicle access.
- The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires because the project is located within an urbanized area.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

Datastalla	Less Than	Lace There	
Potentially Significant Impact	Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

			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)?		П		\boxtimes
	c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including	Ш	Ш	Ш	
	0)	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?			\boxtimes	
	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?			\boxtimes	
	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?			\boxtimes	
	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
D.	j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				
Discuss	cion.					

Discussion:

- a. The project site is located on the south 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, along a 15 feet wide storm drain easement across the adjacent parcel to the west (APN 057-250-31), that will be designed to accommodate drainage from this site to 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 AIASP 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.

iviitig	ation iv	<u>leasures:</u> 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:		co.po.auo	past	
	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?			\boxtimes	
	c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				
Discu	ssion:					
a-c.	propo applio	proposed project would not occur within an established community, nor woosed project complies with the <i>Napa County General Plan</i> , the Napa Councable regulations. There are no applicable habitat conservation planserty. No work will occur within the conservation easement along Sheehy Cr	ty Code, the <i>Airport</i> or natural commur	Industrial Area Sp	<i>ecific Plan</i> , and	d all other
<u>Mitig</u>	ation M	leasures: None required.				
			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X.	MII	NERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:		Significant		No Impact
X.	MII a)	NERAL RESOURCES. Would the project: 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?		Significant With Mitigation	Significant	No Impact
X.		Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of	Significant Impact	Significant With Mitigation	Significant Impact	·
	a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? 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	Significant Impact	Significant With Mitigation	Significant Impact	\boxtimes
	a) b) ssion:	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? 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	Significant Impact	Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Significant Impact	
Discu a/b.	a) b) ssion: The (projec	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? 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? Conservation Element of the General Plan does not indicate the present	Significant Impact	Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Significant Impact	
Discu a/b.	a) b) ssion: The (projection M	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? 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? Conservation Element of the General Plan does not indicate the presenct site. The proposed project would not result in a loss of a mineral resource.	Significant Impact	Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Significant Impact	

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			\boxtimes	
	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?				
	d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			\boxtimes	
	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?			\boxtimes	
	f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				\boxtimes
Discus	ssion:					
c/d.	opera hours The a indust noise with a	nticipated 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 inticipated 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 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	r during the period ce with the Napa Co including the operal located within an insitive receptors. The ect would not result ounty Airport, which	of 7am-7pm on we bunty Noise Ordina tion of the facility widustrial park and ite design of the proin adverse noise in its an area of com	eekdays, durin nce (Chapter would be typic is not in an ar posed project mpacts.	g normal 8.16). al of light ea where together, together
£)	increa	sed noise levels from aircraft, and is considered compatible with aircraft of				
f)	·	roject is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.				
wiitiga	LION IVI	easures: None required.		Less Than		
XII.	POI	PULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?		\boxtimes		
	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
Discus	sion:					

	for new affordable housing, and adopted a development impact fee, incluconstructing affordable housing to off-set any cumulative existing affordable building permits are issued. This fee is charged to all new non-residential residential space multiplied by the applicable fee by type of use as listed in Ch	housing shortage in developments base	the County. The	fee is paid a square footag	t the time e of non-
b/c.	inducement impacts to a less than significant level. There are no existing homes on, or adjacent to, the project site. The project wi	ll not result in the dis	placement of any l	nousina units a	or people
	ation Measures:		pracomonico amy i	iouenig unite c	л роор.о.
	Prior to County authorization of a Building Permit the applicant shall pay the in County Code, and as may be amended.	ne Napa County Affor	rdable Housing Mi	tigation Fee as	s set forth
	Method of Mitigation Monitoring: Payment of fee is required prior to the iss	suance of a building p	permit.		
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impac
XIII.	PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in:		oo.po.auo		
	a) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
	Fire protection?			\boxtimes	
	Police protection?			\boxtimes	
	Schools?			\boxtimes	
	Parks?			\boxtimes	
	Other public facilities?			\boxtimes	
Discu	ssion:				
a.	The proposed project will have a less than significant impact on public service proposed project would not increase the demand on those public services. Wil service and the Napa Sanitation District for sanitary sewer service have beer equired as part of the development and there would be no expected impact to School impact mitigation fees will be levied with the building permit application measures. The proposed project will have little impact on public parks. Co increases and taxes will help meet the costs of providing public services to the	Il-serve letters from been submitted by the oresponse time as to Those fees assist lunty revenue resultire.	oth the City of Am applicant. Fire p he property has good school distric	erican Canyon rotection mea ood public roa ts with capacit	for water sures are d access. y building
Mitiga	ation Measures: None required.				
		Potentially	Less Than Significant	Less Than	

RECREATION. Would the project:

XIV.

No Impact

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impac
	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?				\boxtimes
	b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				
Discu	ssion:					
a/b.		proposed project would not significantly increase the use of existing realitional facilities that may have a significant adverse effect on the environm		, nor does the pr	roposed projec	ct include
Mitig	ation M	easures: None required.				
			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impac
XV.	TRA	ANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:		·	•	
	a)	Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (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)?			\boxtimes	
	b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?		\boxtimes		
	c)	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?			\boxtimes	
	d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			\boxtimes	
	e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?	Ш			
	f) g)	Result in inadequate parking capacity? Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative				
Discu	ission:	transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				
a-b.	comm traffic of reg As m impro Since "fair s State fee ba	day traffic volumes within the project vicinity consist primarily of compercial, tourist, and industrial park traffic occurring throughout the day. So patterns: a Napa to Bay Area commute, and a Solano County to Napa county in impacts. Major improvements to both Highway 29 and High andated by Napa County, projects within the industrial park are responents to impacted roadways within the AIASP area. 1990, the County has imposed and collected traffic mitigation fees on all hare" fee goes toward funding roadway improvements within the AIASP Highways. The traffic mitigation fee is further described in Board of Superinged on PM peak hour vehicle trips will be imposed and collected prior to a Works and is included as a mitigation measure, below.	uthern Napa County ommute. The existing nway 12 are necess onsible for paying I development proje Parea including impervisor's Resolution	r is characterized to any traffic congestion arry to address regularized in the state of the sta	by two distinct on is primarily gional traffic contour to the construction of the cons	commute the result ingestion. ruction of eveloper's traffic on mitigation

The County has established that a significant traffic impact would occur if increases in traffic from a project would cause intersections or two-lane 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, warehousing, defined as primarily the storage of materials that may include office and maintenance areas are expected to generate 0.47 p.m. peak period vehicle trips per 1,000 sq. ft. of gross floor area; manufacturing use would generate 0.74 p.m. peak period vehicle trips per 1,000 sq. ft. of gross floor area. Based on the proposed 39,000 sq. ft. building, the proposed project would generate approximately 24 trips during the p.m. peak period based on warehousing (8 trips) and manufacturing (16 trips) 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 with peak hour trips of 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.

- c. The project does not have any impact on air traffic patterns.
- d/e. The project includes construction of new driveways on Technology Way and Gateway Road West. 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 71 parking spaces to comply with Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan standards (68 minimum). 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.	UTI	LITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	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?				

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impac
	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
Discu	ission:					
a.	Napa Distric	project will occur within an urbanized area and connect to a publicly maintal Sanitation District, has provided a will serve letter and has found the pot's wastewater treatment plant complies with all water quality discharged water quality control standards.	roject to be in com	pliance with Distri	ct's master pla	ns. The
b.	enviro	project will not require construction of any new water or wastewater tre comment. The project site is located in an area planned for industrial developed been sized to accommodate the proposed project.				
C.	and is	proposed project includes the construction of new drainage facilities. The s subject to review and approval by the Department of Public Works. aval requiring that the drainage system be designed to avoid diversion or convergence.	The Department of	Public Works has	s included con	ditions of
d.	locate	project will receive water from the City of American Canyon which has suffed within an area designated for urban development by the City. The Cit within their service area, and has issued a will serve letter for the proposa	ty has acquired wat			
e.	See r	esponse "a." above.				
f.		proposed project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to mee sposal of solid waste generated by the proposed project.	t the projects dema	nds. No significar	nt impact will o	ccur from
g.	The p	proposed project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regu	lations related to so	lid waste.		
Mitig	ation M	leasures: None required.				
			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impac
XVII.	MA	NDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
	a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			\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	

- 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.