

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:** Pedro Teixeira / Camino Dorado Associates Warehouse (Use Permit #P05-0382-UP)
2. **Property Owner:** Camino Dorado Associates
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Ronald Gee, Planner III, 707.253.4417, rgee@co.napa.ca.us
4. **Project location and APN:** Located on a 2.55 acre site at 152 Camino Oruga, northeast side, approximately 475 feet southeast of Camino Dorado, designated Assessor's Parcel Number 057-152-006
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Pedro Teixeira, Community Development Consulting Services (CDCS), 167 Camino Dorado, Napa, CA 94558
6. **General Plan description:** Business/Industrial Park area of the *Napa County Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan, April, 2004*.
7. **Zoning:** GI:AC – General Industrial : Airport Compatibility Combination District
8. **Project Description:**

The proposal will allow reconstruction of an existing warehouse building and construction of two new, free-standing industrial warehouse buildings that will be 15,200 square feet, 8,775 square feet and 12,500 gross square feet in size (36,475 square feet total). Building A, located close to North Kelly Road frontage, will be 125 feet square with an inset 28 feet by 15 feet loading dock (about 15,200 square feet net); Building B, the reconfigured center structure, will have a staggered, three-section design with 40-foot, 35-foot and 30-foot wide sections as a 8, 775 square foot building with up to three potential tenant spaces; and the front, Building C, located close to Camino Oruga frontage, will be 100 feet by 125 feet (12,500 gross square feet). As stated by the applicant, 95% of each structure will be general warehouse and storage; the remaining 5% of building area will be office space.

Access to the site will be from a two-way driveway on the northwest corner of the lot and a new a one-lane exit on the southwest corner of the site. The northwest corner will have two-way circulation along a 30-foot wide access driveway; a 16-foot wide, one-way driveway and egress will exit at the southwest corner driveway

The development plan shows 53 on-site parking including 4 handicap and 7 compact spaces with two additional loading docks. Standard parking spaces will be located along the west side property line, behind Camino Oruga landscape frontage, on the east and west sides of Building B and the east side of Building A. Single handicap spaces will be located on the east side of Building A, the east and west sides of Building B and along Camino Oruga frontage. No estimate of the number of potential employees has been provided.

Landscape improvements in a minimum 20-foot wide strip consisting of a mix of groundcover, shrubs and trees will be installed along both Camino Oruga and North Kelly Road property frontage. A 25-foot long by 5-foot wide, detached trash enclosure will be located in the northeast corner of the site.

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

The approximately 2.55-acre, near-rectangular lot is generally level. slopes down gently from east to west. To the north, south and west, the site is bordered by light-industry, principally warehouse uses. To the east, across North Kelly Road, is open, agricultural land. To the southwest, across Camino Oruga and about 100-feet away, is the designated Sheehy Creek riparian zone.

10. **Other agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).

Regional Water Quality Control Board – Storm Water Pollution Prevention Permit
Napa Sanitation District – Sewer Connection
City of American Canyon – Water Connection

JURISDICTIONAL BACKGROUND: Public Plans and Policies

Based on an initial review, the following findings have been made for the purpose of the Initial Study and do not constitute a final finding by the County in regard to the question of consistency.

	YES	NO	N/A
Is the project consistent with:			
a) Regional and Subregional Plans and Policies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) LAFCOM Plans and Policies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) The County General Plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Appropriate City General Plans?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Adopted Environmental Plans and Goals of the Community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Pertinent Zoning?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

N/A

Other Agencies Contacted

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils
<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning
<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing
<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic
<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance	

MITIGATION MEASURES:

- ☐ None Required
☐ Identified By This Study - Unadopted (see attached Draft Project Revision Statement)
☒ Included By Applicant As Part of Project (see attached Project Revision Statement)
☐ Recommended For Inclusion As Part of Public Project (see attached Recommended Mitigation Measure List)

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.

AGENCY STAFF PARTICIPATING IN THE INITIAL STUDY:

Resource Evaluation: Ronald Gee

Date: July 19, 2006

Site Review: Ronald Gee

Date: July 19, 2006

Planning/Zoning Review: Ronald Gee

Date: July 19, 2006

PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION:

 X No reasonable possibility of environmental effect has been identified, and a Negative Declaration should be prepared.

 A Negative Declaration cannot be prepared unless all identified impacts are reduced to a level of insignificance or avoided.

DATE: July 21, 2006

By: Ronald Gee

FINAL DETERMINATION. (by Napa County)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Ronald Gee, Planner III
Printed Name

Date

Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department
For

PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

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. Documentation supporting this determination is on file for public inspection at the Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department Office, 1195 Third St., Suite 210, Napa, California 94559. For further information call (707) 253-4416.

Project Title: Pedro Teixeira / Camino Oruga Associates Warehouse (Use Permit # P05-0382-UP)

10. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Pedro Teixeira / Commercial Development Consulting Services (CDCS), 167 Camino Dorado, Napa, CA 94558

8. **Property Owner:** Camino Oruga Associates

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Use Permit request to allow reconstruction of an existing warehouse building and construction of two new, free-standing industrial warehouse buildings that will be 5,200 square feet, 8,775 square feet and 12,500 gross square feet in size (36,475 square feet total). Building A, located close to North Kelly Road frontage, will be 125 feet square with an inset 28 feet by 15 feet loading dock area (about 15,200 square feet net); Building B, the reconfigured center structure, will have a staggered, three-section design with 40-foot, 35-foot and 30-foot wide sections as a 8,775 square foot building with up to three potential tenant spaces; and the front, Building C, located close to Camino Oruga frontage, will be 100 feet by 125 feet (12,500 gross square feet). As stated by the applicant, 95% of each structure will be general warehouse and storage; the remaining 5% of building area will be office space.

Access to the site will be from a two-way driveway on the northwest corner of the lot and a new one-lane exit on the southwest corner of the site. The northwest corner will have two-way circulation along a 30-foot wide access driveway; a 16-foot wide, one-way driveway and egress will exit at the southwest corner driveway

The development plan shows 54 on-site parking including 4 handicap and 7 compact spaces with two additional loading docks. Standard parking spaces will be located along the west side property line, behind Camino Oruga landscape frontage, on the east and west sides of Building B and the east side of Building A. Single handicap spaces will be located on the east side of Building A, the east and west sides of Building B and along Camino Oruga frontage. No estimate of the number of potential employees has been provided.

Landscape improvements in a minimum 20-foot wide strip consisting of a mix of groundcover, shrubs and trees will be installed along both Camino Oruga and North Kelly Road property frontage. A 25-foot long by 5-foot wide, detached trash enclosure will be located in the northeast corner of the site.

WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD: July 21, 2006 through August 21, 2006

HEARING DATE and LOCATION: September 6, 2005, 9:00 a.m., Napa County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 1195 Third Street, Napa, CA 94559.

DATE: July 21, 2006

BY THE ORDER OF

Hillary Gitelman
Director
Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department

PROJECT REVISION STATEMENT

Pedro Teixeira / Camino Dorado Associates Warehouse Project

Use Permit # P05-0382-UP

I hereby revise my request to include the measure specified below:

***Mitigation Measure XV. Transportation/Traffic (a-b)** – Prior to County authorization of any individual tenant occupancy, the proposed tenant shall provide a the Director of Conservation, Development and Planning a written description of the proposed tenant (i.e. - narrative) describing the type of business, primary method of operation, number of full-time and part-time employees, hours of operation, frequency of deliveries and any other truck/auto generating trips. The Director of Conservation, Development and Planning shall evaluate the proposed tenant for consistency with the requirements of the specific plan and the project use permit (P05-0382-UP), such that cumulative p.m. peak traffic from all tenants in the project shall not exceed 50 two-way trips on a weekday afternoon during any one-hour period between 4:00 and 6:00 p.m.*

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 originally found complete.

Signature of Owner(s)

Print Name

Interest

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would not be located within an area which would damage any known scenic vista.
- b. The proposed project is not located within sight of a state scenic highway. The proposed project would not result in damage to scenic resources and is consistent with the goals and policies of the Scenic Highways Element in the Napa County General Plan.
- c. The project is located within a largely developed portion of the Napa County Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan which requires high quality design for the industrial developments allowed within the park. The project features construction of new concrete tilt-up buildings with a variety of decorative elements and perimeter landscaping in accordance with the requirements of the specific plan. Dual-property frontage landscaping along both Camino Oruga and North Kelly Road will provide substantial screening upon its maturation. The project meets all building and landscape setbacks from roadways. The design is equal to or greater in quality than other similar buildings approved and constructed within the specific plan boundaries, and appears consistent with the design quality requirements of the specific plan. Therefore, the project will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and surrounding area.
- d. The new facility will result in a minor increase in the nighttime lighting. In accordance with County standards, all exterior lighting will be the minimum necessary for the operational and security needs. Light fixtures will be kept as low to the ground as possible and include shields to deflect the light down. Avoidance of highly reflective surfaces will be required, as well as standard county conditions to prevent light from being cast skyward. This is an area routinely overflowed by low-flying aircraft which necessitates strong controls on skyward nighttime lighting. As designed, and as subject to standard conditions of approval, the project will not have a significant impact from light or glare.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. – c. The project site is located within an urbanized industrial park. No prime farmlands or lands under agricultural contracts are located on the project site or within the vicinity of the project site. One purpose of this surrounding Airport Industrial Area is to provide an industrial support resource for the wine industry. As evidenced by the majority of other warehouse buildings in the industrial park, the proposed bottling facility conversion of an existing warehouse building will support the Napa Valley wine and vineyard industry. The project is considered to have a less-than-significant impact on agricultural resources.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable dust or odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed facility and associated earthwork would not result in significant adverse impacts to air quality.

a-c. The project site is located in Napa County, which forms one of the climatological sub-regions (Napa County Subregion) within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin, and is consequently subject to the requirements of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The project would not be in conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Ozone Maintenance Plan, Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan or the Bay Area 1991 Clean Air Plan, under the Federal Clean Air Act. BAAQMD regard emissions of PM-10 and other pollutants from construction activity to be less than significant if dust and particulate control measures are implemented, which are included in this project.

The BAAQMD has determined that land uses that generate fewer than 2,000 trips per day do not generally require detailed air quality analysis, since these land uses would not generally be expected to have potentially significant air quality impacts (specifically, they would not be expected to generate over 80 pounds per day of Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)). Although the buildings have a relatively large amount of overall floor area, the project is primarily designated for warehouse uses which typically have very low traffic generation rates per square foot under roof. Given the relatively small amount of traffic generation, and consequent auto/truck emission when compared to the size of the affected air basin, the incremental increase in vehicles emissions from this project will not effectively change existing conditions. Therefore, the project's potential to impact air quality is considered less-than-significant.

d-e. 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 noise-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 Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Natural Diversity Database) do not designate the site or immediate vicinity as a location for any known candidate, sensitive or special species. Due to the lack of presence of any candidate, sensitive, or special status species or any recognized biologically critical habitats, it is anticipated that this project would result in less than significant impacts on any special-status species, and will not effectively result in any changes from what presently exists.
- b. Sheehy Creek, a designated riparian zone, flows about 100 feet southwest of the project site on the west side of Camino Oruga and will not be affected by the project. Drainage on the project site will be collected in new private storm drains that will connect to existing storm drains discharging to Camino Oruga and Camino Dorado. No new improvements will be constructed in the creek or within the vicinity of the creek, and therefore, the project would result in no substantial adverse impacts on riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities, and will not effectively result in any changes from what presently exists.
- c. County Environmental Sensitivity Maps do not indicate the presence of any wetlands or potential wetlands within the project boundary. The project would result in no substantial impacts to federally protected or potentially sensitive wetlands.
- d. The project would not 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. There are several ornamental trees along North Kelly Road frontage of the project site in varying states of health. Some of these trees may need to be removed as a result of poor health. In accordance with the requirements of the specific plan, a large number of new trees will be planted. The project does not conflict with any County ordinance or requirement to preserve existing trees, and therefore is considered as not having potential for significant impact.
- 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. There are no plans applicable to the subject parcel.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. There are no known historically sensitive sites or structures located within the project site.
- b. There are no known archaeological resources in the development area. In the event archaeological artifacts are encountered during construction of the project, all work would cease to allow a qualified archaeologist to record and evaluate the resources. This is considered a less-than-significant impact because the project site has been previously graded.
- c. The subject site does not contain any known paleontological resources or unique geologic features and therefore is not anticipated to result in any significant adverse impacts to such resources.
- d. The presence of any formal cemeteries is not known to occur within the project area and therefore the proposed project is not anticipated to result in any significant adverse impacts on any such resources.

Mitigation Measure(s): None

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project is not located within any Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zone. The site is relatively level with slopes less than 5%, typical of Haire loam soils that are generally found within 2%-9% slopes. There is essentially no landslide or soil creep and this soil type has very low liquefaction potential. While seismic activity is endemic to the Bay Area, these structures will be constructed to UBC requirements and result in a less than significant risk.
- b. The project will occur on slopes ranging from 1% to 3%. The soils on site are characterized by medium runoff with moderate erosion potential. The project is required to submit a site development plan, including implementation of storm water and erosion control Best Management Practices under the standards developed in the County's NPDES Phase II Stormwater Permit, which is required by County Code and is a standard practice on all County development projects. Therefore, the potential for impacts is considered less than significant.
- c. The project site is not known to 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 or collapse.
- d. The soil type is not considered to be expansive, as defined in table 19.1B of the UBC creating substantial risks to life or property.
- e. The project will connect to American Canyon City water and Napa Sanitation District sewer, so there will be no impact to soils relative to septic tanks or waste water disposal systems.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials. Any future tenant that uses substantial amounts of hazardous materials will be subject to review and approval by the County, including the Environmental Management Department that regulates all hazardous material uses. A Business Plan will be filed with the Environmental Management Department should hazardous materials reach reportable levels.
- b. The project would not result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- c. 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.
- e. The project site is located within one mile of the Napa County Airport, and is therefore subject to the requirements of the County's Airport Compatibility Combination zoning district and the requirements of the Napa County Airport Land Use Commission. The project is located within Zone D of the compatibility plan, which is an area of common overflight and moderate risk. As warehouse buildings, the general use of the facilities is highly compatibility with the risk and noise impacts

associated with properties within Zone D. The buildings have also been designed to comply with specific requirements regarding light and glare to ensure airport land use compatibility.

- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.
- g. The access driveway that serves the project is being improved to comply with County road standards. Therefore, the design of the project will not negatively impact or hinder emergency vehicle access. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Public Works Department and found acceptable as conditioned.
- h. 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 Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not violate any known water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project will discharge into an existing storm drainage system designed to accommodate the drainage from this site. The applicant is required to obtain a Stormwater Permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board because the project disturbance exceeds one acre. Therefore, 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). By incorporating erosion control measures, this project would have a less than a significant impact. No substantial alteration of existing drainage is anticipated to occur. There will be an increase in the overall impervious surface resulting from the new building, 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 existing on site. This project would therefore result in a less than significant impact.
- e. The project will use private storm drain facilities that will connect to a storm drain that discharges towards Airport Road, a County roadway. The existing storm drain 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. - h. The project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain.
- i. - j. The project site is located on gently sloping land approximately 70 ft. above mean average sea level (MSL). Potential for tsunami is considered less-than-significant. The project is located many miles from San Francisco bay, and in the unlikely event that a tsunami enters the bay, any surge would dissipate well before reaching Napa.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. – c. The project would not result in adverse land use impacts. The County has designated the site for industrial development, and as proposed the project is consistent with both the general plan designation and the specific plan.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The proposed project would not result in impacts to mineral resources per the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity maps.

- a. The project site does not contain any known mineral resources.
- b. The project site is not designated as a locally important mineral resources recovery site.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	---	---------------------------------------	--------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant t Impact	No Impact
XI. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during the construction of the facility. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant with the implementation of County standard practices.

- a. There are no residential uses within close proximity to the project. Temporary construction noise will be in compliance with both County and City noise standards.
- b. Construction activities may result in groundborne vibrations and noise levels. However, given the lack of proximity of the construction site to existing residences, the potential for impact is less-than-significant.
- c. - d. The anticipated noise levels following the completion of construction would be minimal, typical of urban uses, and are considered less-than-significant.
- e. The project site is located within an airport land use plan of a public airport, but is located well outside approach/departure path where noise impacts are greatest. Aircraft overflight is a regular occurrence, however annoyance from such overflights is not considered a significant impact because the future industrial uses on the site are not noise sensitive.
- f. The project site is located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than 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
XII. POPULATION 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. – c. The project will involve reconstruction of an existing building and construction of two new industrial warehouse buildings with a total 36,475 square feet gross floor area. There is no existing housing at or near the project site; the project will not displace any housing or divide any established communities. Given the size of the project, the number of jobs is expected to be relatively small compared to the overall business park and nearby communities. Therefore, this increase in jobs will not contribute significantly to a cumulatively considerable increase in the demand for housing units within the communities of Napa County and the general vicinity. Furthermore, the County has adopted a development impact fee to provide funds for constructing affordable housing. This fee is charged to all new non-residential development based on the gross square footage of building area multiplied by the applicable fee by type of use listed in Chapter 15.60.100 Table A and is considered to reduce housing inducement impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The proposed project would not result in potentially significant adverse impacts on public services.

- a. The project will reconstruct one building and construct two new industrial warehouse buildings within an established industrial park. Public services were planned for this area approximately 20 years ago. The project will not result in any additional demand on public services beyond what has already been planned for, and therefore potential impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts on recreation facilities.

- a-b. The project would not significantly increase the use of existing recreational facilities.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-b. Weekday traffic volumes within the project vicinity consist primarily of commute traffic within the peak traffic periods with 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 smaller 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 industrial park.

Since 1990, the County has imposed and collected traffic mitigation fees on all development projects within the Airport Industrial Area. A developer's "fair share" fee goes toward funding roadway improvements within the specific plan area including improvements designed to relieve traffic on State Highways. The traffic mitigation fee is further described in Board of Supervisor's Resolution 02-39. 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.

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 Airport Industrial Area.

Peak period traffic generated from the project will contribute less than 1% to 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 traffic impact fee. With payment of the *Board Resolution 90-152, Traffic Mitigation Fee Upon Development Within the Area Subject to the Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan*, the project does not have a potential to significantly contribute to local or regional traffic congestion.

- c. The project does not have any impact on air traffic patterns.
- d-e. The project includes construction of two new driveways onto Camino Oruga, one 30-foot wide, two-way curb-cut and the other a 16-foot wide, one-way egress point. The new driveway curb cuts 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 53 parking spaces to comply with Airport Industrial Area standards. Most of these spaces are not anticipated to be used on a daily basis since anticipated employee counts and designated work shifts with the bottling facility use are less than the number to be provided. According to County Code requirements, for 36,475 square feet of gross floor area, a total of 23 parking spaces would be required for warehouse/storage uses. With the proposed 5% gross area dedicated to office space/use, 9 additional spaces would be required. The project should not result in inadequate parking.
- g. The proposed project does not conflict with any known policies or plans supporting alternative transportation.

Mitigation Measure(s):

Mitigation Measure XV(a-b) – Prior to County authorization of a Building Permit, the applicant shall submit payment of Board Resolution 90-152, Traffic Mitigation Fee Upon Development Within the Area Subject to the Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan for the equivalent of 11 vehicle trips in the PM peak traffic period. The Director of Conservation, Development and Planning shall evaluate any proposed tenants for consistency with the requirements of the specific plan and the project use permit (P05-0382-UPGEN), such that cumulative p.m. peak traffic from all tenants in the project shall not exceed 50 two-way trips on a weekday afternoon during any one-hour period between 4:00 and 6:00 p.m.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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 that project to be in compliance with district master plans.
- 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. New, private storm drain lines will be constructed as part of the project, and will connect to an existing storm drain discharging to Camino Oruga, a County street.. The storm drain lines have been sized to accommodate all runoff from the project. The project will not cause a significant impact to the environment.
- 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.-g. The project will be served by a waste-transfer and out-of-state landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the projects demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the project. The project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The project site has previously been disturbed and does not contain any known listed plant or animal species. 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. Potential air quality, traffic and housing impacts are discussed in their respective sections above.
- c. The project does not pose any substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.