

## Initial Study/Negative Declaration

# COUNTY OF NAPA PLANNING, BUILDING AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT 1195 THIRD ST., SUITE 210 NAPA, CA 94559 (707) 253-4416

### Initial Study Checklist (form updated October 2016)

- Project Title: Taylor Industrial Development/Camino Dorado Project, Use Permit P17-00075
- 2. **Property Owner/Project Sponsor Name and Address:** Ron Taylor; 10 S Grant Street, Roseville, CA 95678
- 3. Representative Name and Address: Jeremy Layton, Golden Property Development, LLC; 10 S Grant Street, Roseville, CA 95678
- 4. County Contact Person, Phone Number, and Email: Sean Trippi; (707) 299-1353; sean.trippi@countyofnapa.org
- 5. **Project Location and APN:** The proposed facility is on a 1.05 acre parcel on the northeast corner of Camino Dorado and Camino Oruga, approximately 560-feet west of North Kelly Road. APN: 057-152-001. Napa.
- 6. **General Plan Description**: Industrial
- 7. **Zoning:** General Industrial: Airport Compatibility (GI:AC)
- 8. **Description of Project:** Approval of a use permit to allow the construction of a new light industrial building with approximately 15,257 square feet of floor area which includes office, warehousing, and distribution. Initial perspective tenants include a chocolate production use, production kitchen (no on-site retail sales are proposed) and wine storage. Access would be provided from new driveways on Camino Dorado and Camino Oruga. On-site parking for 25 vehicles and landscaping are also included with the proposal. The request also includes a variation to the development regulations of the Napa Valley Business Park Specific Plan which requires a 50-foot setback where a lot is across the street from a business/industrial park use where the proposed building is setback a minimum of 20-feet. The project will connect to municipal water and sewer services provided by the City of American Canyon and the Napa Sanitation District, respectively.

Exterior building materials include metal siding, an aluminum and glass storefront system with metal awnings, and metal lattice. The east elevation, perpendicular to Camino Oruga includes five roll-up doors for shipping and receiving. There are an additional two inset loading docks at the northwest corner of the building. Proposed hours of operation are from 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday with an estimated 11-24 full-time employees.

#### 9. Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses:

The site is currently vacant, has been previously graded and is located within a developed industrial area. The site has been designated for industrial development for over 30 years. The site is relatively flat with gentle slopes ranging from 0-5 percent from southeast to the northwest and includes non-native grasses. There are existing office/light industrial/warehousing complexes to the west and south, across Camino Dorado and Camino Oruga, respectively, including a cooperage facility. Adjoining the property to the north is an office building and adjoining the property to the east is a wine storage and bottling facility. The project site is in close proximity to the Napa County Airport, and is located in Zone D, the Common Traffic Pattern. This is an area of frequent aircraft overflight at low elevations.

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

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

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

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies
None Required.

Other Agencies Contacted

11. Tribal Cultural Resources. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1, invitation for tribal consultation was completed and no responses were received within the prescribed review period.

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

#### **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:

$\boxtimes$	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the	ne environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be
	prepared.  I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the elecause revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project	environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case t proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will
	be prepared.  I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an ear has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as dear REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.	or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the lier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) scribed on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the en been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including proposed project, nothing further is required.	nvironment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have suant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or
	2 DE	7/10/2017

Sean Trippi, Principal Planner

County of Napa Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department

ı	۸Ε	STHETICS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	AL	STILLIOS. Would the project.				
	a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			$\boxtimes$	
	b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			$\boxtimes$	
	c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			$\boxtimes$	
	d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			$\boxtimes$	

Less Than

#### Discussion:

- a/b. The proposed project would not be located within an area which would damage any known scenic vista, or damage scenic resources, trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings. The proposed project site has been previously graded, contains no vegetation and is currently vacant. The site does back-up to State Highway 29; however, the highway is not considered a scenic highway, nor is this portion of the highway on the State's list of eligible scenic routes.
- c. The project is located within a developed portion of the Napa Valley Business Park Specific Plan (NVBPSP), within an area designated as General Industrial and as such there are no minimum design requirements, unlike areas designated Industrial Park. On-site and common improvement requirements in areas designated General Industrial are generally less stringent than in the industrial/business park areas, where metal buildings, open storage and visible product manufacturing are allowable. Exterior building materials include metal siding, an aluminum and glass storefront system with metal awnings, and metal lattice. The east elevation, perpendicular to Camino Oruga includes five roll-up doors for shipping and receiving. There are an additional two inset loading docks at the northwest corner of the building. The overall design is equal to or greater in quality than other similar industrial projects approved and constructed within the industrial zoned areas within the Specific Plan boundaries. 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 operational and security needs. Light fixtures will be kept as low to the ground as possible and include shields to deflect the light downward. 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 overflown 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 create a significant impact from light or glare. 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.
  - 4.9 GENERAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE LIGHTING, LANDSCAPING, PAINTING, OUTDOOR EQUIPMENT STORAGE, MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT, AND TRASH ENCLOSURE AREAS
    - a. All lighting shall be permanently maintained in accordance with the lighting and building plans approved by the County.
  - 6.3 LIGHTING PLAN SUBMITTAL
    - a. 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 the CBC.
    - b. All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward; located as low to the ground as possible; the minimum necessary for security, safety, or operations; on timers; and shall incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. All lighting shall be shielded or placed such that it does not shine directly on adjacent properties or impact vehicles on adjacent streets. 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.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

II. AG	RICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.1 Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	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?				$\boxtimes$
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				$\boxtimes$
c)	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)?				$\boxtimes$
d)	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?				$\boxtimes$
e) Discussion:	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?				$\boxtimes$

- a/b. The project site is located within a developing industrial park. The project would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important as shown on the Napa County GIS map (*Department of Conservation Farmlands 2012 Napa County Farmlands* layer). According to Napa County GIS the property is categorized as Urban and Built-up Land as are the surrounding developed properties within the vicinity. The project site is not subject to a Williamson Act contract.
- c/d. The project site is zoned General Industrial (GI), which allows bakeries, light and heavy manufacturing, warehousing, and offices as an ancillary use, upon grant of a site plan approval or use permit, and is located within the Napa Valley Business Park Specific Plan. 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 would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production
- e. The project site is surrounded by developed industrial land. Although farming activities occurred on these lands in the past, the area has been designated for industrial development for over 30 years. The project will not result in the conversion of existing farmland.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> "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 Wildlife, water quality, or other environmental resources addressed in this checklist.

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III.		R QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the application to make the following determinations. Would the project:	le air quality manager	ment or air pollution	control district n	nay be relied
	a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			$\boxtimes$	
	b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			$\boxtimes$	
	c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			$\boxtimes$	
	d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			$\boxtimes$	
	e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			$\boxtimes$	

#### Discussion:

a-c. The project site lies within the Napa Valley, which forms one of the climatologically distinct sub-regions (Napa County Sub region) within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The topographical and meteorological features of the Valley create a relatively high potential for air pollution. 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). These 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. The court did not determine whether the Thresholds were valid on the merits, but found that the adoption of the Thresholds was a project under CEQA. The court issued a writ of mandate ordering the District to set aside the Thresholds and cease dissemination of them until the Air District had complied with CEQA. The Air District has appealed the Alameda County Superior Court's decision. The Court of Appeal of the State of California, First Appellate District, reversed the trial court's decision. The Court of Appeal's decision was appealed to the California Supreme Court, which granted limited review, and the matter is currently pending there.

In view of the trial court's order which remains in place pending final resolution of the case, the Air District is no longer recommending that the Thresholds be used as a generally applicable measure of a project's significant air quality impacts. Lead agencies will need to determine appropriate air quality thresholds of significance based on substantial evidence in the record. Although lead agencies may rely on the Air District's updated CEQA Guidelines (updated May 2012) for assistance in calculating air pollution emissions, obtaining information regarding the health impacts of air pollutants, and identifying potential mitigation measures, the Air District has been ordered to set aside the Thresholds and is no longer recommending that these Thresholds be used as a general measure of project's significant air quality impacts. Lead agencies may continue to rely on the Air District's 1999 Thresholds of Significance and they may continue to make determinations regarding the significance of an individual project's air quality impacts based on the substantial evidence in the record for that project.

Over the long term, emissions resulting from the proposed project would consist primarily of mobile sources, including deliveries and visitor and employee vehicles traveling to and from the facility. The Air District's 1999 CEQA Guidelines (p.24) states that projects that do not exceed a threshold of 2,000 vehicle trips per day will not impact air quality and do not require further study.

According to the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE), Trip Generation, 9th Edition, 2012, manufacturing uses, defined as primarily converting raw materials or parts into finished products that may include office and warehousing, are expected to generate 3.82 daily vehicle trips per 1,000 sq. ft. of gross floor area. By comparison, warehousing uses, defined as primarily the storage of materials that may include office and maintenance areas, are expected to generate 3.56 daily vehicle trips per 1,000 sq. ft. of gross floor area. Based on the proposed 15,257 sq. ft. of floor area, approximately 54 to 58 total daily vehicle trips would be generated based on warehousing or manufacturing trip generation rates, respectively. However, ITE also includes trip generation rates based on the number of employees for the uses identified above. Manufacturing and warehousing uses are expected to generate 2.13 and 3.89 trips per employee, respectively. Based on the anticipated 11 to 24 full and part time employees, total daily vehicle trips would range between 23 and 51 based on manufacturing trip generation rates or between 43 and 93 daily trips based on warehouse trip generation rates. The expected total vehicle trips per day is significantly below BAAQMD's recommended threshold of 2,000 vehicle trips/day for purposes of performing a detailed air quality analysis.

There are no projected or existing air quality violations in this area to which this project would contribute. Nor would it result in any violations of any applicable air quality standards. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plan. Light industrial, manufacturing (bakery) and ancillary office uses, as proposed, are not producers of air pollution in volumes substantial enough to result in an air quality plan conflict. Over the long term, emissions resulting from the proposed project would consist primarily of mobile sources, including employee vehicles and shuttle vans traveling to and from the site and deliveries.

As discussed above, the project is well below the thresholds of significance. The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plan.

d. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from earthmoving and construction activities required for project construction. 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 proposed grading plan has been designed to balance cut and fill resulting no off or on-haul of soils. If grading were to result in off or on-haul of soils, these potential construction impacts would be temporary in nature and subject to standard conditions of approval from the Engineering Division as part of the grading permit or building permit review process.

The Air District recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction impacts. If the proposed project adheres to these relevant best management practices identified by the Air District and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and are considered less than significant:

#### 7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENT

#### c. AIR QUALITY

During all construction activities the permittee shall comply with the most current version of BAAQMD Basic Construction Best Management Practices including but not limited to the following, as applicable:

- 1. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. The BAAQMD's phone number shall also be visible.
- 2. Water all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) two times per day.
- 3. Cover all haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site.
- 4. Remove all visible mud or dirt tracked onto adjacent public roads by using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- 5. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
- 6. 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.
- 7. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting off equipment when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five (5) minutes (as required State Regulations). 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. Any portable engines greater than 50 horsepower or associated equipment operated within the BAAQMD's jurisdiction shall have either a California Air Resources Board (ARB) registration Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) or a BAAQMD permit. For general information regarding the certified visible emissions evaluator or the registration program, visit the ARB FAQ <a href="http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/perp/perpfaq\_04-16-15.pdf">http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/perp/perpfaq\_04-16-15.pdf</a> or the PERP website <a href="http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/portable.htm">http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/portable.htm</a>

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:

#### 7.1. SITE IMPROVEMENT

b. DUST CONTROL

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 when average wind speeds exceed 20 mph.

e. While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, light industrial or manufacturing uses are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. Construction-phase pollutants 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
IV.	BIC	DLOGICAL 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?			$\boxtimes$	
	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?	П	П	$\boxtimes$	П
	c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			$\boxtimes$	
	d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				⋈
	e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources,	Ш	Ш		
	٥,	such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				
	f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				$\boxtimes$

- a/b. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers natural diversity data base, plant surveys, wetlands & vernal pools, biological critical habitat areas, sensitive biotic communities, and spotted owl habitat) no known candidate, sensitive, or special status species 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, as there are none identified in the project area. The properties surrounding the project are all developed. The project site has been disturbed over the years as part of necessary weed abatement. The proposed improvements will not require the removal of any native vegetation. The potential for this project to have a significant impact on special status species is less than significant.
- c. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers wetlands & vernal pools) there are no wetlands on or near the property that would be affected by this project. The project activities will not interfere with the movement of any native resident or

migratory fish or wildlife species or with their corridors or nursery sites, because no sensitive natural communities have been identified on the property.

- d. As there are no streams or creeks on the site, the project does not have the potential to 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. The project would not conflict with any local policies protecting biological species, such a tree preservation or the County's Conservation Regulations. The site is an improved industrial lot with no native vegetation. In accordance with the requirements of the specific plan, new landscaping will be provided on the site. The project does not conflict with any County ordinance or requirement to preserve existing trees, and therefore is considered as not having potential for 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 required.

V.	CUL	TURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?			$\boxtimes$	
	b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines§15064.5?				$\boxtimes$
	c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?				$\boxtimes$
	d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?				

#### Discussion:

a-c. The project site is vacant and does not contain any structures. Research into past uses has not identified historic resources that may be present at the site. A previous archaeological survey, entitled "A Cultural Resource Inventory of the Napa Airport Master Environmental Assessment Area," prepared by Archaeological Resource Service (ARS), dated September 1983, was conducted in the AIASP area and included the project site. The study did not indicate the presence of historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources. In addition, the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers –Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology sites and flags) do not identify any historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features on the project site. There is no information in the County's files that would indicate that there is a potential for occurrence of these resources. The site has been previously graded when public improvements were installed. It is therefore not anticipated that any cultural resources are present on the site, and the potential for impact is considered less-than-significant. However, if resources are found during 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 the following standard condition of approval that will be imposed on the project:

#### 7.2 ARCHEOLOGICAL FINDING

In the event that archeological artifacts or human remains are discovered during construction, work shall cease in a 50-foot radius surrounding the area of discovery. The permittee shall contact the PBES 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 project development, all work in the vicinity must be 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 permittee shall comply with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

d. No human remains have been encountered on the property during past grading activities when the public improvements were constructed and no information has been encountered that would indicate that this project would encounter human remains. However, if resources are found during 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 noted above.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

\ /I	050	21.04	NV AND COURS Would the resident	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.	GEC	JLUC	GY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
	a)		ose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including 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.			$\boxtimes$	
		ii)	Strong seismic ground shaking?			$\boxtimes$	
		iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			$\boxtimes$	
		iv)	Landslides?			$\boxtimes$	
	b)	Res	sult in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			$\boxtimes$	
	c)	uns	located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become table as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site deside, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				
	d)	Exp as	located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property? pansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and perials) D 4829.				
	e)	alte	re soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or rnative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for disposal of waste water?				

- a. i.) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed facility would result in a less than significant impact with regards to the rupturing of a known fault.
  - ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the facility 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.
  - 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 edition of the California Building Code for seismic stability would reduce any impacts to a less than significant level.
  - iv.) The Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) did not indicate the presence of landslides on the property.
- b. Based upon the Soil Survey of Napa County, prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the site is comprised of soils in the Haire Loam series which are characterized by slow to medium runoff with a slight hazard of erosion. This nearly level soil type is found mainly on old terraces and alluvial fans. This level soil type is found mainly on upland areas. Project approval 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, to ensure that development does not impact adjoining properties, drainages, and roadways.

- c/d. Early or mid-Pleistocene fan or terrace deposits underlay the site according to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Surficial Deposits layer). Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Liquefaction layer) the project site has low susceptibility for liquefaction. Development will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level. In addition, a soils report, prepared by a qualified Engineer will be required as part of the building permit submittal. The report will address the soil stability, potential for liquefaction, and will be used to design specific foundation systems and grading methods which will reduce potential impacts to less than significant.
- e. The project will connect to municipal water service provided by the City of American Canyon and sewer service by Napa Sanitation District. "Will Serve" letters have been provided by the affected jurisdictions indicating that they have sufficient capacity to accommodate the water and wastewater demand of this project.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

VIII	CDEENLIQUEE CAS EMISSIONIS. Would the project.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. a)	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:  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?			$\boxtimes$	
b)	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?			$\boxtimes$	

#### Discussion:

Napa County has been working to develop a Climate Action Plan (CAP) for several years. In 2012 a Draft CAP² (March 2012) was recommended using the emissions checklist in the Draft CAP, on a trial basis, to determine potential greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with project development and operation. At the December 11, 2012, Napa County Board of Supervisors (BOS) hearing, the BOS considered adoption of the proposed CAP. In addition to reducing Napa County's GHG emissions, the proposed plan was intended to address compliance with CEQA for projects reviewed by the County and to lay the foundation for development of a local offset program. While the BOS acknowledged the plan's objectives, the BOS requested that the CAP be revised to better address transportation-related greenhouse gas, to acknowledge and credit past accomplishments and voluntary efforts, and to allow more time for establishment of a cost-effective local offset program. The Board also requested that best management practices be applied and considered when reviewing projects until a revised CAP is adopted to ensure that projects address the County's policy goal related to reducing GHG emissions.

In July 2015, the County re-commenced preparation of the CAP to: i) account for present day conditions and modeling assumptions (such as but not limited to methods, emission factors, and data sources), ii) address the concerns with the previous CAP effort as outlined above, iii) meet applicable State requirements, and iv) result in a functional and legally defensible CAP. On April 13, 2016 the County, as part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP, released Final Technical Memorandum #1: 2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016<sup>3</sup>. This initial phase included: i) updating the unincorporated County's community-wide GHG emissions inventory to 2014, and ii) preparing new GHG emissions forecasts for the 2020, 2030, and 2050 horizons. Additional information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or <a href="http://www.countyofnapa.org/CAP/">http://www.countyofnapa.org/CAP/</a>.

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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> County of Napa, March 2012, Napa County Draft Climate Action Plan, Prepared by ICF International. Sacramento, CA

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Supersedes February 2, 2016, version.

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.

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.) For the purposes of this analysis potential GHG emissions associated with 'construction' and 'development' and with 'ongoing' business operations have been discussed.

GHGs are the atmospheric gases whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for the greenhouse effect, including carbon dioxide, methane, ozone, and the fluorocarbons, that contribute to climate change (a widely accepted theory/science that explains human effects on the atmosphere). Carbon Dioxide (CO2) gas, the principal greenhouse gas (GHG) being emitted by human activities, and whose concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity, also serves as the reference gas to compare other greenhouse gases. Typical sources of carbon emissions include land clearing, land use change, biomass burning, and motor vehicle and equipment. Equivalent Carbon Dioxide (CO2e) is the most commonly reported type of GHG emission and a way to get one number that approximates total emissions from all the different gasses that contribute to GHG (BAAMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2012). In this case, carbon dioxide (CO2) is used as the reference atom/compound to obtain atmospheric carbon CO2 effects of GHG. Carbon stocks are converted to carbon dioxide equivalents (CO2e) by multiplying the carbon total by 44/12 (or 3.67), which is the ratio of the atomic mass of a carbon dioxide molecule to the atomic mass of a carbon atom.

One time "Construction Emissions" associated with the project includes: i) the carbon stocks that are lost (or released) when existing vegetation is removed and soil is ripped in preparation for the new building, parking lot and associated infrastructure; and ii) emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area and construct the project, including construction equipment and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as Equipment Emissions). These emissions also include underground carbon stocks (or Soil carbon) associated with the existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed.

In addition to the one time Construction Emissions, "Operational Emissions" of the project are also considered and include: i) any reduction in the amount of carbon sequestered by existing vegetation that is removed as part of the project compared to a "no project" scenario (hereinafter referred to as Operational Sequestration Emissions); and ii) ongoing emissions from the energy used to maintain and operate the project, including vehicle trips associated with employee, delivery and visitor trips (hereinafter referred to as Operational Emissions). Operational Emissions from the proposed project would be the primary source of emissions over the long-term when compared to one time construction emissions.

Furthermore, the applicant has indicated that the project will incorporate the following voluntary best management practices: cool roofing; installation of roof top solar arrays, as well as skylights for daylighting, installation of electric vehicle charging stations; installation of water efficient and energy efficient fixtures; low impact development; bicycle incentives; and new vegetation/water efficient landscaping. Additional items are included in the Voluntary Best Management Practices Checklist for Development Projects form included with the Use Permit Application. Greenhouse Gas Emission reductions from local programs and project level actions, such as application of the Cal Green Building Code, vehicle fuel efficiency standards, and the project-specific on-site programs identified above would combine to further reduce emissions below BAAQMD thresholds.

As indicated above the County is currently preparing a CAP and as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP has released Final Technical Memorandum #1 (2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016). Table 1 of the Technical Memorandum indicates that 2% of the County's GHG emissions in 2014 were a result of land use change.

The increase in emissions anticipated as a result of the project would be minor and the project is in compliance with the County's efforts to reduce emissions as described above. Accordingly, the project's impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

\ au		ZADDO AND HAZADDONO MATERIALO W. LLII	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII.	HA	ZARDS 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?			$\boxtimes$	
	b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			$\boxtimes$	
	c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				$\boxtimes$
	d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				$\boxtimes$
	e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
	f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				$\boxtimes$
	g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				$\boxtimes$
	h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?			$\boxtimes$	

Loce Than

- a. The proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts normally used in construction of the building. 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 of construction activity, they will result in a less-than-significant impact.
- 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 two miles 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 Compatibility Plan. The project site is located within Zone D of the compatibility plan which is an area of common overflight and moderate risk. The proposed use of the building is highly compatible with the risk and noise impacts associated with properties within Zone D. The building has also been designed to comply with specific requirements regarding light and glare to ensure airport land use compatibility. County development regulations have been certified as meeting ALUC compatibility requirements, and consequently the project is not subject to separate ALUC review because it has been designed to comply with County airport compatibility land use requirements.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.

- g. The proposed driveway that would serve the project will be designed to comply with County standards and access to the building has been designed to accommodate fire apparatus and large trucks. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division and found acceptable as conditioned. Therefore, the design of the project will not negatively impact or hinder emergency vehicle access.
- 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 required.

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX.	HY	DROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
	a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			$\boxtimes$	
	b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			$\boxtimes$	
	c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			$\boxtimes$	
	d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			$\boxtimes$	
	e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
	f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			$\boxtimes$	
	g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			$\boxtimes$	
	h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			$\boxtimes$	
	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?				
	j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				$\boxtimes$

#### Discussion:

On January 14, 2014, Governor Jerry Brown declared a drought emergency in the state of California. That declaration was followed up on April 1, 2015, when the Governor directed the State Water Resources Control Board to implement mandatory water reductions in cities and town across California to reduce water usage by 25 percent. These water restrictions do not apply to agricultural users. However, on April 7, 2017, Governor Jerry Brown signed an executive order lifting California's drought emergency in all but four counties (Fresno, Kings, Tulare and Tuolumne). The County of Napa had not adopted or implemented any additional mandatory water use restrictions. The County requires all Use Permit applicants to complete necessary water analyses in order to document that sufficient water supplies are available for the proposed project and to implement water saving measures to prepare for periods of limited water supply and to conserve limited groundwater resources.

- a. The proposed project will not violate any known water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project will discharge into an approved 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 (RWQCB) which is administered in part by the County Engineering Services Division on behalf of the RWQCB. Given the essentially level terrain, and the County's Best Management Practices, which comply with RWQCB requirements, the project does not have the potential to significantly impact water quality and discharge standards.
- b. The project will receive water from the City of American Canyon. The project is located within an area designated for urban development by the City of American Canyon. The City has acquired water rights to provide adequate water for all areas within their service area. The City has reviewed the proposed project and determined that in order to comply with the City's Zero Water Footprint (ZWF) Policy the applicant shall contribute to the City's water conservation fund and has issued a Will Serve letter for the proposal. No groundwater wells are associated with this property. (see Section XVII Utilities and Service Systems (d), below.)
- c-d. The proposed project will not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off site. The project will incorporate erosion control measures appropriate to its maximum slope to manage onsite surface drainage and erosion of onsite soils during construction and winter months (October to April). As noted above, the project is required to comply with County Engineering Services Division requirements which are consistent with RWQCB standards. These established Best Management Practices have been successfully implemented on numerous previous projects within the NVBPSP area. By incorporating erosion control measures, this project would have a less than significant impact. No substantial alteration of existing drainage is anticipated to occur. There will be an increase in the overall impervious surface resulting from the new buildings, pavement and sidewalks. However, given the size of the drainage basin, the increase in impervious surfaces will not discernibly change the amount of groundwater filtration or discernibly increase surface runoff from that which currently exists on site. Project impacts related to drainage patterns and off-site flows are expected to be less than significant.
- e. The existing storm drainage system is designed to County standards and is sized to accommodate all drainage from this site.
- f. The project includes water quality detention and treatment basins which provide treatment of the stormwater by filtering pollutants prior to discharge into the storm drain system. There are no other factors in this project that would otherwise degrade water quality.
- g.-i. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Floodplain* and *Dam Levee Inundation* layers), 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. In coming years, higher global temperatures are expected to raise sea level by expanding ocean water, melting mountain glaciers and small ice caps, and causing portions of Greenland and the Antarctic ice sheets to melt. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change estimates that the global average sea level will rise between 0.6 and 2 feet over the next century (IPCC, 2007). However, the project area is located at approximately 65 to 68 feet above mean sea level. There is no known history of mud flow in the vicinity. The project will not subject people or structures to a significant risk of inundation from tsunami, seiche, or mudflow.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required

X. LAN	ND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) b)	Physically divide an established community? Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency				$\boxtimes$
	with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				$\boxtimes$
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				$\boxtimes$
Discussion					

<u>Mitigati</u>	on M	easure(s): None required.				
			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impac
XI.	MIN	IERAL 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?				$\boxtimes$
	b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				
Discuss	on:					
a/b. <u>Mitigati</u>	rece Cou loca	torically, the two most valuable mineral commodities in Napa County in eachtly, building stone and aggregate have become economically valuable unty Baseline Data Report ( <i>Mines and Mineral Deposits</i> , BDR Figure 2-2) ally important mineral resource recovery sites located on or near the project easure(s): None required.	. Mines and Minera indicates that there	Deposits mappin are no known mi	g included in	the Napa
			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII.	NOI	SE. Would the project result in:		incorporation	impact	
	a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				
	b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			$\boxtimes$	
	c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			$\boxtimes$	
	d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			$\boxtimes$	
	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?				
	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?				
		h - h - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				

The proposed project would not occur within an established community, nor would it result in the division of an established community. The

proposed project complies with the Napa County General Plan, the Napa County Zoning Ordinance, applicable County Code sections, the Napa Valley Business Park Specific Plan, and all other applicable regulations. There are no habitat conservation plans or natural

1!

The proposed project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during the construction of the building, parking areas, and associated improvements. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly mufflered vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. The proposed project would not result in long-term significant permanent construction noise impacts or operational impacts. Furthermore, construction activities would generally occur during the period of 7am-7pm on weekdays,

a/b.

a-c.

community conservation plans applicable to the property.

during normal hours of human activity. All construction activities will be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (N.C.C. Chapter 8.16).

- c/d. The anticipated level of noise to occur following the completion of construction including the operation of the facility would be typical of a light industrial/manufacturing/warehouse/distribution use in an existing industrial park. The project is located within an industrial park and is not in an area where noise increases resulting from additional industrial development will impact sensitive receptors. The design of the proposed project, together with adherence to the County Noise Ordinance, would ensure the proposed project would not result in adverse noise impacts.
- e. The proposed project site is located within compatibility Zone D of the Napa County Airport, which is an area of common aircraft overflight. As such, persons on the project site will be exposed to noise from regular aircraft overflight. The Napa County Zoning Code, section 8.16.070 Exterior noise limits, lists the maximum allowable level for Industrial areas as 75 dbA. Based on the County General Plan Community Character Element, figure CC-1: Napa County Airport Projected Noise Levels (dBA CNEL), the project site is located outside of the airport area projected to have levels of 55 dbA or less, which is less than the maximum allowed in the Industrial area. Therefore the location of the project within the airport land use area will have a less than significant impact on people working in the project area. The nature of the uses allowed in the Industrial Park (IP) zoning is not sensitive to increased noise levels from aircraft, and is considered compatible with aircraft operations.
- f. The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

XIII.	PO	PULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				$\boxtimes$
	b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				$\boxtimes$
	c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				$\boxtimes$

#### Discussion:

The Association of Bay Area Governments' *Projections 2003* figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase some 23 percent 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 percent. 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.

a. The project site is currently vacant and located in a developed industrial area. The project will increase the number of jobs within the industrial park. However, given the size of the project, the new jobs are considered to be relatively small compared to the overall business park and nearby communities; therefore this increase in jobs will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable increase in the demand for housing units within Napa County and the general vicinity. As noted above, the County has adopted a Housing Element which identifies locations for new affordable housing, and adopted a development impact fee. The fee provides funds for constructing affordable housing to off-set the cumulative existing affordable housing shortage in the County. The fee is paid at the time building permits are issued. This fee is

charged to all new non-residential developments based on the gross floor area of non-residential space multiplied by the applicable fee by type of use as required under Chapter 18.107, of the Napa County Code and is considered to reduce housing impacts to a less than significant level.

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

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact		
XIV.	PUI	BLIC 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?			$\boxtimes$			
		Police protection?			$\boxtimes$			
		Schools?			$\boxtimes$			
		Parks?			$\boxtimes$			
		Other public facilities?			$\boxtimes$			
a.	Discussion:  a. The proposed project will have a less than significant impact on public services. Fire protection measures are required as part of the development and there would be no expected impact to response time as the property has good public road access. School impact mitigation fees will be levied with the building permit application. Those fees assist local school districts with capacity building measures, and by law are considered full mitigation for any impacts. The project will have little impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from building permit fees, and property tax increases will help meet the costs of providing public services to the property.  Mitigation Measure(s): None required.							
				Less Than				
			Potentially Significant Impact	Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact		
XV.	RE	CREATION. 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?				$\boxtimes$		
	b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				$\boxtimes$		

Discussion:

a/b. This application proposes new light industrial/warehouse building and on-site employment. No portion of this project, nor any foreseeable result thereof, would significantly increase the use of existing recreational facilities. This project does not include recreational facilities that would have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

XVI. TR	ANSPORTATION/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 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?			$\boxtimes$	
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?			$\boxtimes$	
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?				$\boxtimes$
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			$\boxtimes$	
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?  Conflict with Congral Plan Policy CIP 33, which requires now uses to meet.				$\boxtimes$
f)	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?				$\boxtimes$
g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				$\boxtimes$

#### Discussion:

a-b. Weekday traffic volumes within the project vicinity consist primarily of commute traffic within the peak traffic periods, with residential flows from nearby communities and commercial, tourist, and industrial park traffic occurring throughout the day. Southern Napa County is characterized by two distinct commute traffic patterns: a Napa to Bay Area commute and a Solano County to Napa commute. The existing traffic congestion and potential cumulative impacts are primarily the result of regional growth impacts.

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) serves as the transportation planning, coordinating and financing agency for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. The MTC created and maintains the Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS), a multimodal system of highways, major arterials, transit service, rail lines, seaports and airports. MTS facilities within the vicinity of the project site include State Routes 12, 29, 121, and 221, and Airport Boulevard. The State routes are maintained and operated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans.) The MTS is incorporated into MTC's 2001 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and is used as a guideline in prioritizing for planning and funding of facilities in the Bay Area.

Major improvements to both Highway 29 and Highway 12 are necessary to address existing and cumulative regional traffic congestion. The RTP and the Napa County General Plan 2008 update identify roadway improvements in South Napa County to address potential cumulative impacts. These improvements include construction of a flyover ramp at SR 12/29/221 intersection, construction of a new interchange at SR 12/Airport Blvd/SR 29 intersection, widening Jamieson Canyon (SR 12) to four lanes (recently completed), widening SR 29 to six lanes between south Airport Blvd and the south County line (in coordination with the City of American Canyon), and extending Devlin Road south to Green Island Road. These improvements are not yet fully funded, except as noted above, but are expected to be in place by 2030 addressing potential cumulative impacts in the southern part of the County.

As mandated by Napa County, projects within the industrial park are responsible for paying "fair share" costs for the construction of improvements to impacted roadways within the NVBPSP. Since 1990, the County has imposed and collected traffic mitigation fees on all development projects within the NVBPSP area. A developer's "fair share" fee goes toward funding roadway improvements within the NVBPSP area including improvements designed to relieve traffic on State Highways. The traffic mitigation fee is further described in Board

of Supervisor's Resolution 08-20. For this project, a traffic mitigation fee based on PM peak hour vehicle trips will be imposed and collected prior to issuance of a building permit as determined by the Director of Public Works.

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 of travel. This threshold was directed by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency. This factor has been used consistently as the significance determination for all recent EIR and CEQA documents within the NVBPSP area.

According to the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE), Trip Generation, 9th Edition, 2012, manufacturing uses, defined as primarily converting raw materials or parts into finished products that may include office and warehousing, are expected to generate 3.82 daily vehicle trips and 0.73 PM peak period vehicle trips per 1,000 sq. ft. of gross floor area. By comparison, warehousing uses, defined as primarily the storage of materials that may include office and maintenance areas, are expected to generate 3.56 daily vehicle trips and 0.32 p.m. peak period vehicle trips per 1,000 sq. ft. of gross floor area. Light Industrial uses, defined as a free-standing single business, are expected to generate 6.97 daily vehicle trips and 0.97 p.m. peak period vehicle trips per 1,000 sq. ft. of floor area. Based on the proposed 15,257 sq. ft. of floor area, approximately 54, 58 or 106 total daily vehicle trips would be generated based on warehousing, manufacturing or light industrial trip generation rates, respectively. The proposed project would generate approximately 5, 11, or 15 trips during the p.m. peak period based on warehousing, manufacturing or light industrial p.m. peak trip generation rates, respectively.

According to information from the California Department of Transportation traffic counts taken in 2014 indicate the traffic volume at the State Highway 12/29 intersection was approximately 43,500 to 62,000 average annual daily vehicle trips. Peak hour trips were approximately 3,550 to 5,100 vehicles. Traffic generated by this project will contribute less than 1% to the traffic levels on local roadways and intersections and to deterioration in their level of service. This less than 1% increase is considered a less-than-significant level with the payment of the "fair share" development impact fee prior to issuance of a building permit as described in Board Resolution No. 08-20.

- c. The project does not have any impact on air traffic patterns.
- d/e. The project includes construction of new driveways on Camino Dorado and Camino Oruga. The new driveways have been designed to comply with all County standards. The project will not result in any changes to levels of service or cause any new safety risks.
- f. The project has been designed with 25 vehicle parking spaces to meet the requirements of the NVBPSP. The project will not result in inadequate parking.
- g. The proposed project does not conflict with any known policies or plans supporting alternative transportation.

Mitigation Measure(s): None Required.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII.	change Code se geograp	CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project cause a substantial adverse in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources ection 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is hically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
	a)	Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or				$\boxtimes$
	b)	A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.				

#### Discussion:

a-b. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Cultural Resources: Historical sites, Historical Sites – Lines, Arch sensitive areas, Arch sites, Arch surveys) no archaeologic or tribal resources have been identified on the property. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1, invitation for tribal consultation was completed and no responses were received within the prescribed review period. If any resources are found during earth disturbing activities, construction of the project would be required to cease and the appropriate individuals contacted in accordance with standard conditions of approval, as noted above in Section V. Cultural Resources.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII.	UTI	LITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:		oo.po.auo	past	
	a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			$\boxtimes$	
	b)	Require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			$\boxtimes$	
	c)	Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			$\boxtimes$	
	d) e)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?  Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves				
	9	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?			$\boxtimes$	
	f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			$\boxtimes$	
	g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			$\boxtimes$	

- a. The project will occur within an urbanized area and connect to a publicly maintained wastewater treatment system. The wastewater provider, Napa Sanitation District, has provided a Will Serve letter and has found the project to be in compliance with district master plans. The District's wastewater treatment plant complies with all water quality discharge requirements, and therefore the project will comply with regional water quality control standards and therefore has a less than significant impact.
- b. The project will not require construction of any new water or wastewater treatment facilities that will result in a significant impact to the environment. The project site is located in an area planned for industrial development and existing water and wastewater treatment facilities have been sized to accommodate the proposed project.
- c. The proposed project includes the construction of new drainage facilities. The new drainage system will be designed by a qualified engineer and is subject to review and approval by the Engineering Services Division. The Engineering Services Division has included conditions of approval requiring that the drainage system be designed to avoid diversion or concentration of storm water runoff onto adjacent properties.
- d. On January 14, 2014, Governor Jerry Brown declared a drought emergency in the state of California. That declaration was followed up on April 1, 2015, when the Governor directed the State Water Resources Control Board to implement mandatory water reductions in cities and town across California to reduce water usage by 25 percent. However, on April 7, 2017, Governor Jerry Brown signed an executive order lifting California's drought emergency in all but four counties (Fresno, Kings, Tulare and Tuolumne).

The project will receive water from the City of American Canyon. On October 23, 2007, the City of American Canyon adopted a Zero Water Footprint (ZWF) Policy which defines a ZWF as "no net loss of water service reliability or increase in water rates to the City of American Canyon's existing water service customers due to requested increase demand for water within the City's water service area." The City prepared a Water Supply Report (WSR), incorporated herein by reference, to determine if the requested water service is consistent with City ordinances, policies and practices; whether the City's water supply is sufficient to grant the request; and, establish a water allocation for the property. The WSR indicates the property has a baseline water footprint of zero gallons per day (gpd) because the project site is undeveloped and has no historic water use. The request includes an anticipated water demand of 886 gpd annualized average-day demand (AADD) and 1,245 gpd maximum day demand (MDD.) The City has determined that in order to comply with the City's Zero Water Footprint (ZWF) Policy the applicant must offset the new AADD. According to the WSR, the applicant has committed to a landscape conversion project, replacing turf and inefficient spray heads with drought tolerant landscaping served by a drip irrigation system. The landscape replacement project will offset the property's increased AADD. In accordance with the SWR, the City has issued a will-serve letter for water service subject the ZWF offset described above and other conditions outlined in the City's letter dated May 17, 2017, and incorporated as conditions of project approval.

- e. See response "a." above.
- f. The proposed project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the projects demands. A less than significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the proposed project.
- g. The proposed project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Mitigation Measure(s): None.

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

- a. The site has been previously 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. As discussed in Section IV above, all potential biological related impacts would be less than significant. As identified in Section V above, no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, sites of unique geological features have been identified within the project site. No historic or prehistoric resources are anticipated to be affected by the proposed project nor will the proposed project eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. In the event archaeological artifacts are found, a standard condition of approval would be incorporated into the project. Impacts would be less than significant.
- 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 analysis determined that all potential impacts were less than significant and would not contribute significantly to cumulative impacts. The project does not propose new development that

would have a significant impact on the environment or substantially change the existing conditions. With the imposition of standard and project specific conditions of approval, the project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

c. All impacts identified in this Initial Study are less than significant and do not require mitigation. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in environmental effects that cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s): None Required.