Appendix C

COUNTY OF NAPA

**PLANNING, BUILDING & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT**

**1195 THIRD ST., SUITE 210, NAPA, CA 94559**

**(707) 253-4416**

#### Initial Study Checklist

**(form updated September 2010)**

1.**Project Title:** The Shed/Country Store & BBQ; File #P14-00110.

2.**Property Owner:** William K. Wilcoxson, 3106 Golden Gate Drive, Napa, CA 94558; wilcoxsonbill@gmail.com

3.**Project Sponsor’s Name and Address**: William K. Wilcoxson, 3106 Golden Gate Drive, Napa, CA 94558; wilcoxsonbill@gmail.com

4.**County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Wyntress Balcher; (707) 299-1351; Wyntress.balcher@countyofnapa.org

5. **Project Location and APN:** The project is located on a 4.2-acre parcel on the south side of Golden Gate Drive, the west side of Stanly Lane, north of its intersection with State Highway; 3106 Golden Gate Dr., Napa, CA 94558; APN: 047-230-034.

6.**General Plan description:** Agriculture, Watershed & Open Space (AWOS) Designation.

7.             **Zoning:** Agricultural Watershed: Agricultural Produce Stand (AW:PS) Zoning District

8. **Background/Project history:** The historical use on this parcel has been: a Halloween pumpkin patch; a Christmas tree lot; and a small store, the Stanly Lane Marketplace, selling agricultural produce, fruit, vegetables, coffee, beer, wine and other agriculture-related items. In addition, the property was also home to a farmer’s market four days a week and provides cold storage for grape rootstock. These activities were officially recognized by public vote in 1996 with the approval of “Measure Z”, by the adoption of Ordinance No. 08-01 on March 11, 2008, establishing the new “Agricultural Produce Stand” (PS) combination zoning district, and by the rezoning of this parcel to AW:PS County Code, Section 18.102.040 provides: The following uses may be permitted on a parcel within a :PS zoning district, when accessory to an agricultural produce stand lawfully existing thereon, upon grant of a use permit pursuant to Section 18.124.010, (A) Delicatessens with outdoor barbeque;(B) Wine tastings.

1. **Project Description:** Approval of Use Permit P14-00110 to allow the following:

Phased improvements to an existing commercial development consisting of a 5,280± sq. ft. market (Stanly Lane Marketplace), seasonal pumpkin patch, seasonal Christmas tree lot, 59-space parking lot, two business signs, and a cold storage building as indicated:

**Phase 1**

(a) Add a delicatessen with prep-kitchen, 49 seats indoor and 12 picnic tables (maximum 72 seats) for outdoor seating, an outdoor barbeque, an office, and a wine tasting bar within the existing 5280 sq. ft. Market Place structure;

(b) Install free-standing shade covers over the outdoor barbeque and picnic area; and,

(c) Employ a maximum 11-24 employees;

(d) Operate between 6:30am -9:00pm.

**Phase 2**

(a) Expand the existing wastewater system; and,

(b) Expand the rear existing structure (cold storage building) to add one (1) 80± sq. ft. unisex restroom.

1. **Environmental setting and surrounding land uses:** The property is relatively flat, at the 30’-35’ elevation above mean sea level, located on Golden Gate Drive, west of Stanly Lane and north of Stanly Lane’s intersection with State Highway 12/121. The intersection of Stanly Lane and State Highway 12/121 is signalized. The land has been developed with: a residence; two commercial buildings, each 5,280 sq. ft. with loading docks, paved driveway between the loading docks; a shed; a 59-space paved parking lot; and agriculture (vineyards, olive trees, vegetable garden). Native vegetation consists of grasses; some agricultural activity has historically occurred on the site. The geology of the land is early or mid-Pleistocene fan or terrace deposits. The soils on site are Haire loam series, 2-9 percent slopes, moderately well drained classification; a runoff classification of high. The surrounding land uses include agriculture (vineyards), residential development on large parcels, and vacant undeveloped land. The closest off-site residence is 300 feet to the north of the project. There is a proposed 245-unit destination resort hotel with associated infrastructure (St. Regis Napa Valley Project), including a 10,684± gallon/year winery, located on Stanly Lane, south of the project site and State Highway 12/121, within the Napa City Limits.
2. **Other agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).

The project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County, including but not limited to building permits, grading permits, and waste disposal permits, in addition to CalFire.

**Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies Other Agencies Contacted**

California Alcohol Beverage Control City of Napa (water service)

**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:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [x]  | 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. |

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_                               \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Wyntress Balcher, Planner II Date

Napa County Planning, Building, and Environmental Services

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

Discussion:

a.-c. The project site is located within view of a designated scenic highway or designated Viewshed road (State Highway 12/121), however there is no scenic vista located to the north of project from which views would be seen from State Highway 12/121. The project does not sit on a hillside and is therefore not subject to the County Hillside Viewshed Program. The property has been developed with commercial structures combined with the agricultural activities, and there are no forests or rock outcrops. The structures on the property are not historic. The existing structures will remain on the property with the proposed addition of a 80 sq. ft. restroom attached to the side of the existing cold storage building. The proposed addition is minor and would not have the potential to significantly affect the aesthetics of the site.

d. The proposed project will not introduce a significant number of additional light sources that would significantly impact daytime or nighttime views of the area. The increase in customers will not create substantial glare either during the day or nighttime. Pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approvals that are used for use permit applications, outdoor lighting will be required to be shielded and directed downwards, with only low level lighting allowed in parking areas. As designed, and as subject to the standard condition of approval, below, the project will not have a significant impact resulting from new sources of outside lighting.

*All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward, shall be located as low to the ground as possible, and shall be the minimum necessary for security, safety, or operations and shall incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. No flood-lighting or sodium lighting of the building is permitted, including architectural highlighting and spotting. Low-level lighting shall be utilized in parking areas as opposed to elevated high-intensity light standards. Lighting utilized during harvest activities is not subject to this requirement. Prior to issuance of any building permit pursuant to this approval, two (2) copies of a detailed lighting plan showing the location and specifications for all lighting fixtures to be installed on the property shall be submitted for Planning Division review and approval. All lighting shall comply with California Building Code.*

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

|  | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant****With Mitigation Incorporation** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.[[1]](#footnote-1)** Would the project:
 |
| 1. 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?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 1. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 1. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 1. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |

Discussion:

a/b/e. 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 2002 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. The proposed project will be located within existing commercial structures with a minor expansion to one of the structures. The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses, and the agricultural activities, the seasonal pumpkin patch, will continue. There is no Williamson Act contract associated with the parcel. There are no other changes included in this proposal that would result in the conversion of Farmland beyond the immediate project site.

c/d. The project site is zoned Agricultural Watershed: Produce Stand combination district (AW:PS), which allows a delicatessen with outdoor barbeque and wine tastings upon grant of a use permit. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers: Sensitive Biotic Oak Woodlands, Riparian Woodland Forest and Coniferous Forest) the project site does not contain woodland or forested areas. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

|  | **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: |
| 1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 1. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 1. 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)?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 1. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 1. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |

Discussion:

a-c. On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s Board of Directors unanimously adopted thresholds of significance to assist in the review of projects under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The thresholds were designed to establish the level at which the District believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA and were posted on the Air District’s website and included in the Air District's May 2011 updated CEQA Guidelines.

On March 5, 2012 the Alameda County Superior Court issued a judgment finding that the Air District had failed to comply with CEQA when it adopted the thresholds. On August 12, 2013, the Court of Appeal reinstates the District’s thresholds of significance provided in Table 3-1 (Criteria Air Pollutants & Precursors Screening Levels Sizes) and are applicable for evaluating projects in Napa County.

The existing commercial operation, outside the seasonal pumpkin patch and Christmas tree lot, included 3 employees and an average of 30 customers, generating about 32 trips on a typical day. The proposed project proposes a maximum of 11-24 employees with expected 200 customers per day, meaning that this project would account for 204 maximum daily trips on a typical day.

Over the long term, emission sources for the proposed project will consist primarily of mobile sources including vehicles visiting the site. The Air District’s threshold of significance provided in Table 3-1 has determined that similar projects such as a fast food restaurant without a drive-through that do not exceed a threshold of 8 ksf will not significantly impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2011 Pages 3-2 & 3-3). Given the size of the project, it would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan.

d. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from earthmoving and construction activities required for the expansion of the wastewater system. Earthmoving and 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. The Air District recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction impacts. If the proposed project adhere to these relevant best management practices identified by the Air District and the County’s standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts are considered less than significant:

*“The permittee shall comply during all construction activities with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Basic Construction Mitigation Measures as provided in Table 8-1, May 2011 Updated CEQA Guidelines.*

* *All exposed surfaces (e.g. parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access (road) shall be watered two times per day.*
* *All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.*
* *All visible mud or dirt tracked out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.*
* *All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.*
* *All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.*
* *Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.*
* *All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.*
* *Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.”*

*.*

Furthermore, while earthmoving and construction on the site will generate dust particulates in the short-term, the impact would be less than significant with dust control measures as specified in Napa County’s standard condition of approval relating to dust:

*“Water and/or dust palliatives shall be applied in sufficient quantities during grading and other ground disturbing activities on-site to minimize the amount of dust produced. Outdoor construction activities shall not occur during windy periods.”*

e. While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, this delicatessen and Barbeque are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. Construction-phase pollutants will be minimal and will be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. The project will not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

|  | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant****With Mitigation Incorporation** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. 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?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 1. 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?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 1. 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?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 1. 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?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 1. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 1. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |

Discussion:

a/b. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers - plants CNPS points & polygons, plant surveys, red legged frog core area and critical habitat, vernal pools & vernal pool species, Spotted Owl Habitat – 1.5 mile buffer and known fish presence) the American Badger, is the only known candidate, sensitive, or special status species to have been identified as occurring within the project boundaries. The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any special status species, or species of particular concern since the project will be located within existing structures, on previously disturbed lands, and the proposed bathroom addition to the building addition is significantly small and is located in an area previously disturbed by the existing development. The proposal and associated construction are minimal with no significant grading or tree removal required. Furthermore, there were no species or site conditions which would be considered essential for the support of a species with limited distribution or be considered to be a sensitive natural plant community. The potential for this project to have a significant impact on special status species is not very probable.

c/d. There are no wetlands on the property or on neighboring properties that would be affected by this project and the project will not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with their corridors or nursery sites, since no sensitive natural communities have been identified as existing on this disturbed property. The project, as proposed, would not have a significant impact on biological resources since the property has been previously disturbed by the commercial development and there are no proposals to grade the land except for a small area immediately adjacent to the existing structures for the wastewater system.

f. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans or other similar plans in effect for this area that would be affected by this project.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

|  | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant****With Mitigation Incorporation** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **CULTURAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines§15064.5?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| 1. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| 1. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |

Discussion:

a-c. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology surveys, sites, sensitive areas, and flags) no historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified on the property. Based on the proposed project plans, there would be no impact to cultural resources. However, if resources are found during the minor earth disturbing activities associated with expansion of the waste disposal system, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval:

*“In the event that archeological artifacts or human remains are discovered during any subsequent construction in the project area, work shall cease in a 50-foot radius surrounding the area of discovery. The permittee shall contact the Planning, Building, and Environmental Services Department for further guidance, which will likely include the requirement for the permittee to hire a qualified professional to analyze the artifacts encountered and to determine if additional measures are required. If human remains are encountered during the development, all work in the vicinity must be, by law, halted, and the Napa County Coroner informed so that the Coroner can determine if an investigation of the cause of death is required, and if the remains are of Native American origin. If the remains are of Native American origin, the nearest tribal relatives as determined by the State Native American Heritage Commission would be contacted to obtain recommendations for treating or removal of such remains, including grave goods, with appropriate dignity, as required under Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.”*

d. No information has been encountered that would indicate that this project would encounter human remains. However, if resources are found during any grading of the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard condition of approval as noted above.

**Mitigation Measures:**  None required.

|  | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant****With Mitigation Incorporation** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VI**. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.** Would the project: |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. 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.
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| 1. Strong seismic ground shaking?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| 1. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| 1. Landslides?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 1. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| 1. 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?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829. | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| 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? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |

Discussion:

a.

i.) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.

ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project 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.

iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Compliance with the latest editions of the California Uniform Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.

iv.) According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) there are no landslide deposits in the proposed development area.

b. The proposed development is minimal and will occur on slopes ranging less than 5%. Based upon the Soil Survey of Napa County, prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the soils on site are comprised of the Haire loam series, 2-9 percent slopes. The runoff is slow to medium with slight erosion potential. Although there will be minimal land disturbance with the construction of the building addition and expansion of the wastewater system, the project will require incorporation of best management practices and will be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable.

c/d. According to preliminary geologic mapping of the Napa Quadrangle performed by the California Geologic Survey (CGS-2004), the property is underlain by The geology of the land is early or mid-Pleistocene fan or terrace deposits. The soils on site are Haire loam series, 2-9 percent slopes, moderately well drained, with a high runoff classification. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the project site has a very low susceptibility for liquefaction. Any 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 the maximum extent possible.

e. An expansion of the existing septic system is proposed as part of the project. The system will be designed by a licensed engineer and will be reviewed and approved by the Division of Environmental Health. There does not appear to be any limitation on this parcel’s ability to support an on-site septic system which will be able to support the proposed project.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant****With Mitigation Incorporation** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| 1. **GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**. Would the project:
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Generate a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions in excess of applicable thresholds adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District or the California Air Resources Board which may have a significant impact on the environment?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| 1. Conflict with a county-adopted climate action plan or another applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |

Discussion:

a/b. Overall increases in Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions in Napa County were assessed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the Napa County General Plan Update and certified in June 2008. GHG emissions were found to be significant and unavoidable in that document, despite the adoption of mitigation measures incorporating specific policies and action items into the General Plan.

Consistent with these General Plan action items, Napa County participated in the development of a community-wide GHG emissions inventory and “emission reduction framework” for all local jurisdictions in the County in 2008-2009. This planning effort was completed by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency in December 2009, and served as the basis for development of a refined inventory and emission reduction plan for unincorporated Napa County.

In 2011, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) released California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Project Screening Criteria and Significance of Thresholds [1,100 metric tons per year (MT) of carbon dioxide and carbon dioxide equivalents (CO2e)]. This threshold of significance is appropriate for evaluating projects in Napa County.

During our ongoing planning effort, the County requires project applicants to consider methods to reduce GHG emissions consistent with Napa County General Plan Policy **CON-65(e)**. (Note: Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, because this initial study assesses a project that is consistent with an adopted General Plan for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was prepared, it appropriately focuses on impacts which are “peculiar to the project,” rather than the cumulative impacts previously assessed.)

The applicant proposes to incorporate GHG reduction methods including: limited grading, water efficient landscaping, local food production, recycling, and the education of staff and visitors regarding sustainability practices. The proposed project has been evaluated against the BAAQMD thresholds and determined that the project would not exceed the 1,100 MT/yr of CO2e.

GHG Emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the CalGreen Building Code, tightened vehicle fuel efficiency standards, and more project-specific on-site programs including those winery features noted above would combine to further reduce emissions below the Significance of Thresholds. The project is in compliance with the County’s efforts to reduce emissions as described above. For these reasons, project impacts related to GHG emissions are considered less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

|  | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant****With Mitigation Incorporation** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VIII**. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.** Would the project: |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| 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? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 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? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 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? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 1. 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?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 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? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |

Discussion:

1. The proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts normally used in restaurant operations. A Business Plan will be filed with the Environmental Health Division should the amount of hazardous materials reach reportable levels. However, in the event that the proposed use or a future use involves the use, storage or transportation of 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.
2. The project would not result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
3. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site.
4. The proposed site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.
5. The project site is not located within two miles of any public airport.
6. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.
7. The proposed project will not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan.
8. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

|  | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant****With Mitigation Incorporation** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IX**. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.** Would the project: |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| 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)? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| 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? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| 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? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| 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? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| 1. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| 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? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| 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? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| 1. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |

Discussion:

a/b. The project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project will be supplied with municipal water from the City of Napa. The City has provided the applicant with a letter stating that the property will continue to be served with water by the City, including any increase in demand that will result from the expansion of the business’s operations. High water use landscaping, will be replaced in the outdoor seating area with gravel, thus reducing the project’s water use. A copy of the water bill was submitted with the application showing current water use for two months of 29,000 gallons versus last year’s use of 141,000 gallons of use. The project will not impact the groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge since the project will not require the installation of a well to provide water to the project.

c/d. The project proposal will not alter any drainage patterns on site or cause an increase in erosion on or off site. The project will utilize the existing parking area and the proposed expansion of the waste disposal system would be required to incorporate an erosion control plan to manage onsite surface drainage and erosion of onsite soils during construction and during winter months (October to April). By incorporating a Standard Measures erosion control plan, this project would have a less than significant impact on drainage and siltation.

e/f. There are no existing or planned stormwater systems that would be affected by this project. The entire parcel is located within Napa River Watershed, and the proposed project will not require any significant change to the existing land, nor require a significant amount of earth movement for the installation of the expansion of the wastewater system and construction of the 80± sq.ft restroom. All earth disturbing activities will be subject to the Napa County Construction Site Runoff Control Requirements and compliance with the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance 1240 and the latest adopted state regulations, which reduce any potential water pollution impact and water degradation.

g-i. The project site is not located within a flood hazard area, nor would it impede or redirect flood flows or expose structures or people to flooding. The project site is not located within a dam or levee failure inundation zone.

j. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows.

**Mitigation Measures:** None.

|  | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant****With Mitigation Incorporation** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| X**. LAND USE AND PLANNING.** Would the project: |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Physically divide an established community?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 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? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |

Discussion:

a-c. The project would not occur within an established community, nor would it result in the division of an established community. The project complies with the Napa County Code and all other applicable regulations. There are no applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the property.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

|  | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant****With Mitigation Incorporation** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| XI**. 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? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 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? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |

Discussion:

a/b. The Conservation and Open Space Elements of the Napa County General Plan does not indicate the presence of valuable or locally important mineral resources on the project site. The project would not result in a loss of a mineral resource of any value.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

|  | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant****With Mitigation Incorporation** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| XII**. 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? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| 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? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 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? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |

Discussion:

a/b. The project will not result in a substantial increase in noise. The proposed use is an expansion of activities that are currently occurring at this commercial development, which also include a seasonal pumpkin stand in the fall and a Christmas tree stand in the winter. The majority of the activities will occur within the building with some picnicking in the patio.

The construction of the bathroom addition and waste disposal expansion will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during the brief construction of the project. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. The project would not result in potentially significant temporary construction noise impacts or operational impacts. Given the proximity to the neighbors, the closest of whom is located 300 feet away, there is a relatively low potential for impacts related to construction noise to result in a significant impact. Furthermore, construction activities would generally occur during the period of 7am-7pm on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity. All construction activities will be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). The proposed project will not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts.

c/d. Minimal amounts of noise may be generated during project construction. There would not be a significant increase in noise resulting from the proposed expansion of the existing commercial uses. Conditions of approval as described under Section a and b above would require construction activities to be limited to daylight hours, vehicles to be muffled, and backup alarms adjusted to the lowest allowable levels. Enforcement of Napa County’s Exterior Noise Ordinance is and will be provided the Napa County Sheriff address noise related issues including, but not limited to, prohibiting outdoor-amplified sounds and that mechanical equipment would be required to be kept indoors or inside acoustical enclosures.

e/f. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

|  | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant****With Mitigation Incorporation** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| XIII**. 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)? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |

Discussion:

a. The applicant states that there are usually three employees working throughout the year and one additional employee hired during the time when the Pumpkin Patch is in operation. The project description indicates a two phase project, commencing with 4 employees. The Phase 2 of the project will include the installation of the expanded waste disposal system and an additional restroom. Then the number of employees will be increased to the maximum proposed of 11-24 total employees. The Association of Bay Area Governments’ *Projections 2003* figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase some 23% by the year 2030 (*Napa County Baseline Data Report,* November 30, 2005). Additionally, the County’s *Baseline Data Report* indicates that total housing units currently programmed in county and municipal housing elements exceed ABAG growth projections by approximately 15%. The additional 7-20 new employees will most likely lead to some population growth in Napa County. However, relative to the County’s projected low to moderate growth rate and overall adequate programmed housing supply, that population growth does not rise to a level of environmental significance. In addition, the project will be subject to the County’s housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs.

Cumulative impacts related to population and housing balance were identified in the 2008 General Plan EIR. As set forth in Government Code §65580, the County of Napa must facilitate the improvement and development of housing to make adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community. Similarly, CEQA recognizes the importance of balancing the prevention of environment damage with the provision of a “decent home and satisfying living environment for every Californian.” (See Public Resources Code §21000(g).) The 2008 General Plan sets forth the County’s long-range plan for meeting regional housing needs, during the present and future housing cycles, while balancing environmental, economic, and fiscal factors and community goals. The policies and programs identified in the General Plan Housing Element function, in combination with the County’s housing impact mitigation fee, to ensure adequate cumulative volume and diversity of housing. Cumulative impacts on the local and regional population and housing balance will be less than significant.

b/c. This application will not displace a substantial volume of existing housing or a substantial number of people and will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

|  | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant****With Mitigation Incorporation** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| XIV**. 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? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| Police protection? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| Schools? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| Parks? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| Other public facilities? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |

Discussion:

1. Public services are currently provided to the project area, and except for sewer services, the project site is receiving all services. The change in use will require installation of Fire protection measures pursuant to Napa County Fire Marshall conditions. There will be no foreseeable impact to emergency response times with the adoption of such conditions of approval. The Fire Department and the Engineering Services Division have reviewed the application and recommend approval as conditioned. School impact mitigation fees, which assist local school districts with capacity building measures, will be levied pursuant to building permit submittal. The proposed project will have little to no impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from any building permit fees, property tax increases, and taxes from the sale of wine will help meet the costs of providing public services to the property. The proposed project will have a less than significant impact on public services.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

|  | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant****With Mitigation Incorporation** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| XV**. 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? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 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? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |

Discussion:

a/b. The project would not significantly increase the use of recreational facilities, nor does the project include recreational facilities that may have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

|  | **Potentially Significant Impact** | **Less Than Significant****With Mitigation Incorporation** | **Less Than Significant Impact** | **No Impact** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| XVI**. TRANSPORTATION/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 and/or conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-16, which seeks to maintain an adequate Level of Service (LOS) at signalized and unsignalized intersections, or reduce the effectiveness of existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities?  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency for designated roads or highways? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| 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? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| 1. Result in inadequate emergency access?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| 1. Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-23, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site’s capacity?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 1. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |

Discussion:

a/b. In the Traffic Information/Trip Generation Sheet accompanying the application, the applicant indicated an estimated total of 204 daily weekday trips (90 PM peak hour trips) and 187 daily weekend trips (136 PM peak hour trips). Access to the project will be from Stanly Lane and Golden Gate Road, west of the Stanly Lane intersection with State Highway 12/121, which is signalized. The 2008 Napa County General Plan EIR identified the stretch of the State Highway between Foster Road and Cuttings Wharf Road operating during Peak pm hours at an unacceptable level of service.

A traffic study was prepared for the City of Napa for the St. Regis Napa Valley Project EIR (SCH#2009032009) by Michael Brandman Associates, August 27, 2009, which proposed a resort hotel on Stanly Lane, south of its intersection with the State Highway 12/121 and the subject project. The St. Regis project includes the construction of a 245-unit resort hotel with a restaurant, bar, tasting room, ballroom/conference room, two pools, a fitness center, a spa, back of the house facilities for employees; and a winery.

The study area of that report included of State Route (SR) 12-121/Stanly Lane, SR 12-121/SR 29, and SR 29/SR 221-Soscol Ferry Road as well as the street segments of Stanly Lane along the project frontage (south of the Golden State Road project). The study reported that there has been an overall reduction in traffic volumes throughout Napa County compared to past years. The traffic volumes were collected while school was in session but not collected on holidays, days immediately prior to or after holidays, during the last two weeks in December, during heavy construction and during large special events.

The traffic report indicates the St. Regis project would be expected to generate an average 229 weekday PM peak hour trips and 245 weekend midday peak hour trips. It was noted that 10% of the pm peak hour trips were related to the winery

Traffic conditions on roads and at intersections are generally characterized by their “level of service" or LOS. LOS is a convenient way to express the ratio between volume and capacity on a given link or at a given intersection, and is expressed as a letter grade ranging from LOS A through LOS F. Generally the LOS Arepresents free-flowing conditions and LOS F represents forced flow or breakdown conditions. The traffic study intersections were analyzed using methodologies from the Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board, 2000 (HMC), where the intersection controls reviewed were related to a measurement of delay in average number of seconds per vehicle.

This study used a range of delays as follows:

LOS A – Delay of 0 to 10 seconds. Most vehicles arrive during the green phase, so do not stop at all.

LOS B – Delay of 10 to 20 seconds. More vehicles stop than with LOS A, but many drivers still do not have to stop.

LOS C – Delay of 20 to 35 seconds. The number of vehicles stopping is significant, although many still pass through without stopping.

LOS D -Delay of 35 to 55 seconds. The influence of congestion is noticeable, and most vehicles have to stop.

LOS E -Delay of 55 to 80 seconds. Most, if not all, vehicles must stop and drivers consider the delay excessive.

LOS F- Delay of more the 80 seconds. Vehicle may wait through more than one cycle to clear the intersection.

(2000 Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board)

The report indicated that the existing intersection Level of Service (LOS) for SR12-121/Stanly lane for weekday PM peak hours (4:00pm- 6:00pm) was LOS A; at weekend mid-day peak hours (11:00am-1:00pm) LOS A. Further, the study indicated that the existing levels of service at the intersection traffic plus the St. Regis Napa Valley project, the weekday PM peak hours would be LOS A, but the weekend mid-day peak hour would result in LOS B.

The subject project proposes a maximum of 11-24 employees and an projected average of 200 customers on a typical day. The ITE for a deli without drive through would be expected to generate about 26.15 trips/1000 sq. ft. Utilizing the Traffic Information/Trip Generation Sheet included with the application, the maximum number of employees, 11-24, and the average of 200 customers on a typical weekday, which would result in an estimated 204 daily trips. Utilizing the County trip generation formula for peak PM traffic generation (the number of full-time employees plus the number of part-time employees/ 2, plus the sum of visitor and truck trips multiplied by .38), there is an estimate of 90 PM peak trips (4pm-6pm) expected. Based upon the traffic study prepared for the hotel study, the projected LOS A would not be significantly degraded by the subject property during the PM peak hours.

With the completion of the hotel project and the expected resultant LOS B at the Stanly Lane intersection, the intersection would not be significantly impacted by the subject project, and the intersection would still be operating at an acceptable level during weekend mid-day peak hour. There will be no residual individually or cumulatively significant traffic impacts associated with this project as regards traffic congestion and levels of service.

c. This project would not result in any change to air traffic patterns, since no change in the existing structures is proposed.

d/e. Access to the site is by way of a controlled State Highway intersection and a county road, and the project will not require any design features that will impact traffic on Stanly Lane, Golden Gate Road, or State Highway 12/121. The Napa County Fire Marshall has reviewed this application and has identified no significant impacts related to emergency vehicle access provided that standard conditions of approval are incorporated. Project impacts related to traffic hazards and emergency access are expected to be less than significant.

1. There is currently sufficient parking for the existing commercial operations and for the proposed expanded operations existing on the site. The project will not conflict with General Plan Policy **CIR-23,** which states that new uses shall provide adequate parking to meet their anticipated parking demand, avoiding potentially significant adverse environmental impacts.

g. There is no aspect of this project that would conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

|  | **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? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 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? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 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? | **[ ]**  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| 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? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |

Discussion:

a. The project will be phased in terms of the number of customers to avoid exceeding the waste water capacity before completion of the expanded wastewater treatment system to meet the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board at build out, and will not result in a significant impact. Wastewater disposal facilities exist on-site, and the proposed Phase 2 expansion will be required to secure Environmental Health permits and will be required to comply with all Napa County regulations including Napa County Stormwater Ordinance 1240 and the latest adopted state regulations.

b. The project will not require construction of any new water treatment facilities and thus will not result in a significant environmental impact. Water will be provided by the city of Napa, which is currently providing water to the existing commercial operation. Notice has been given to the applicant that the city will serve the proposed expansion. An expanded septic system will be constructed on site. The system will be designed by a licensed engineer and will be reviewed and approved by the Division of Environmental Health

1. The project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, which will cause a significant impact to the environment.
2. The project has sufficient water supplies to serve projected needs, since the city of Napa has stated that water will continue to be provided for the proposed commercial operations.
3. Wastewater will be treated on-site and will not require a wastewater treatment provider.
4. The project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the projects demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the project.

g. The project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

**Mitigation Measures:** None required.

|  | **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? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| 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)? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  | [ ]  |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [x]  |

Discussion:

1. The project as proposed 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. The expansion of the commercial operations will occur within existing structures with a small addition for an additional restroom, and there will be minimal land disturbance.

b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology, and traffic impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The project would also increase the demands for public services to a limited extent, increase traffic and air pollutions, all of which contribute to cumulative effects when future development in Napa Valley is considered. Cumulative impacts of these issues are discussed in previous sections of this Initial Study and would not be of significant impact. The project will not result in a significant adverse traffic impact to SR 12-121, since the trips will have access to a controlled intersection at Stanly Lane and SR 12-121, which is currently operating at LOS A during peak weekday and at midday weekend peak hour. The midday weekend level of service at this intersection will be reduced to a LOS B with the opening of the proposed St Regis hotel Project south of the subject project, which is still an acceptable level of service. Under the Napa County General Plan, traffic volumes are projected to increase and will be caused by a combination of locally generated traffic and as well as general regional growth. The General Plan EIR indicates that much of the forecasted increased in traffic on the arterial roadway network will result from traffic generated outside of the county. The majority of the traffic generated in this area is through traffic from outside Napa County. The proposed project will contribute a small amount toward this general overall increase in traffic congestion. The General Plan EIR indicates that several roadway segments, including SR 29 and SR12-121, are presently operating at unsatisfactory levels and additional roadways segments will reach unsatisfactory levels in the future. SR 12-121 in the vicinity of the project is at a good level of service, LOS C at the intersection of SR12/121/SR29 during the peak hours. Although the project’s contribution to the known and forecasted cumulative traffic impacts are significant, the project impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

1. This project would not have any environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. All environmental effects from this project have been mitigated to a level of insignificance. No other environmental effects have been identified that would cause, either directly or indirectly, adverse effects on human beings.

**Mitigation Measures:** None Required.

1. “Forest land” is defined by the State as “land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest **resources**, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits.” (Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) The Napa County General Plan anticipates and does not preclude conversion of some “forest land” to agricultural use, and the program-level EIR for the 2008 General Plan Update analyzed the impacts of up to 12,500 acres of vineyard development between 2005 and 2030, with the assumption that some of this development would occur on “forest land.” In that analysis specifically, and in the County’s view generally, the conversion of forest land to agricultural use would constitute a potentially significant impact only if there were resulting significant impacts to sensitive species, biodiversity, wildlife movement, sensitive biotic communities listed by the California Department of Fish and Game, water quality, or other environmental resources addressed in this checklist. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)