

“E”

Mitigated Negative Declaration

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

Initial Study Checklist
(Form updated February 2015)
[REVISED 7-12-16](#)

1. **Project Title:** Napa Vault Storage Facility Use Permit #P14-00296 and Tentative Parcel Map #P15-00298
2. **Property Owner:** Barnstable LTD, LLC/Storage Tech, LLC
3. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Erik Bedford, 2783 Napa Valley Corporate Drive, Napa, CA 94558; erik@cityvault.com
4. **Representative:** Beth Painter, Balanced Planning, Inc.; 10 Canopy Lane; Napa, CA 94558; beth@bpnapa.com
5. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Wynress Balcher; (707) 299-1351; wynress.balcher@countyofnapa.org
6. **Project Location and APN:** The project is located on a 10.32-acre parcel on the south side of Soscol Ferry Road, approximately 1400 feet west of its intersection with Napa-Vallejo Highway (State Route 12/29) within the Napa Valley Business Park Specific Plan (NVBSPS), and a GI:AC (General Industrial: Airport Compatibility) zoning district.(057-170-018), 1055 Soscol Ferry Rd. Napa, CA 94558
7. **General Plan description:** Industrial
8. **Specific Plan Designation:** General Industrial
9. **Zoning:** General Industrial: Airport Compatibility Combination District. (GI:AC).
10. **Background/Project history:** The subject property is currently vacant. A previous mitigated negative declaration (MND) for development on this property was adopted by the Planning Commission on May 3, 2006, in conjunction with a Use Permit (P05-0434-UP). The previous MND addressed the potential impacts related to the construction of the 200,000 gallon per year winery within a 61,281 sq. ft. building, 36 parking spaces, 21 full and part time employees, tours and tasting for up to 70 visitors a week, and a marketing plan. The approved marketing plan included two weekly trade tastings for up to five persons per event and two weekly catered lunches or dinners with up to 20 persons per event. Approved hours of operation are from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM, seven days a week. The previous approval also included an above ground wastewater treatment pond, associated improvements and modifications to the site development standards to allow the treatment pond, spray field and an access road within 75-feet of Suscol Creek instead of 150-feet, and environmental enhancement of the site area within 75-feet of the creek.

Subsequently, a modification (P08-00618-VMM) to the original Use Permit was approved by the Director of Planning, Building, and Environmental Services on February 10, 2009. Approval of the modification allowed the installation of an enclosed on-site winery wastewater treatment system instead of the approved open treatment pond, relocating the two project driveways, relocating the on-site parking areas (but not changing the number of approved parking spaces), relocating the location of the water storage tanks, mechanical equipment area, shop and storage area and other associated improvements. No changes to the previously approved operational characteristics or production capacity of the winery were modified by approval of the modification application.

Use Permit Modification (File #P09-00101) & Tentative Parcel Map (File #P09-00100-PM) was approved by the commission on June 17, 2009, to modify Use Permit #P05-0434-UP and Use Permit Modification #P08-00618-MOD to (a) increase production capacity from 200,000 gallons per year to 600,000 gallons per year; (b) increase the floor area of the previously approved winery building from approximately 61,281 sq. ft. to approximately 66,338 sq. ft.; (c) construct approximately 7,500 square feet of new floor area for a stand-alone wine-making/office building; (d) increase the number of full time employees from 13 to 25 and seasonal employees from 8 to 10; (e) increase average weekly visitors from 70 to 100 with the maximum on any given day increasing from 20 to 25 persons; (f) increase the number of on-site parking spaces from 36 to 55; (g) revise previously approved domestic and process wastewater systems; and (h) minor revisions to the covered winery process waste treatment area, covered solid waste storage area, water storage tanks and outdoor storage area. The request also included a tentative parcel map to subdivide the proposed project into 19 industrial airspace condominium units; 17 units in the main winery building, one unit within the 5,000 sq. ft. stand-alone winery building and one unit for the process wastewater spray

field. The balance of the property and hallways/walkways internal to the main winery building was common area. A subsequent mitigated negative declaration was adopted for the modification project.

Although the property is currently vacant, on May 31, 2011, a use determination was issued by the Department that Use Permit #P09-00101 had been used and the entitlements of the approved use permit are still valid.

In 2014, the property was purchased by Barnstable LTD, LLC and the new owner has opted not to develop the property into a winery. Instead, they have submitted a use permit application for a mini-storage facility.

11. **Project Description:** A request for approval of a ~~use permit modification to Use Permit #P05-0434-UP and Use Permit Modification #P09-00101, P14-00296~~ to allow the construction of 130 industrial storage units and common area contained in 11 buildings, where 128 units are to be sold as individual condominiums. The request also includes approval a modification of Tentative Parcel Map #P09-00100-PM to create 129 parcels. The building area in total will be 152,348 sq.ft., concrete tilt-up construction, 14 feet in height, with seven restrooms included, and 13 parking stalls, an on-site waste disposal system and a new well, water system and storage tank. Total coverage would be 309,465 sq.ft. The 63-foot wide aisles will allow parking in front of each storage unit. The site will be operated by an HomeOwners Association (HOA) with 128 owners. No employees are proposed. There will be covenants, conditions, and restrictions recorded on the property and enforced by the HOA. The project proposes to utilize the same setback from Suscol Creek as the originally approved project and requests consideration of the same exception to allow the 75-foot setback from Suscol Creek instead of 150-feet with environmental enhancement of the site area within the 75-foot setback corridor of the creek. [\[Revised consistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15073.5 \(c\)\(4\).\]](#)

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

The site is vacant and relatively level featuring annual grasslands over rolling terrain. The northern portion of the site drains to the northwest to an existing vegetated drainage channel that conveys water around the property to Suscol Creek. This drainage swale receives storm water from upstream properties via a culvert under Soscol Ferry Road. The southern portion of the property drains directly south to Suscol Creek. Slopes on the property range from 0-11%. Runoff from the site is conveyed via surface flows into Suscol Creek and ultimately discharge to the Napa River. Evidence presented by the applicant's biologist concludes that the unnamed drainage swale historically was a vegetated swale. However, it appears the widening and improvement of Soscol Ferry Road in the early 1980's resulted in the concentration of upslope drainage on the property through an under-road culvert. The swale currently shows signs of minor erosive channelization as a result and consequently are under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The southern boundary of the site is Suscol Creek. Napa County Environmental Resource maps indicate the presence of trout species upstream of the project site in Suscol Creek. This information was obtained from a locally performed study (Friends of the River, 2002) of creeks in the Napa River watershed. Consequently, there is potential that the creek is, or has historically been habitat for steelhead trout. The creek channel and the area immediately surrounding top of bank areas contain a mix of native and non-native vegetation. The most dominant plant species in this area are non-native blackberry bushes.

Subsequent to approval of the original Use Permit (P05-0434), the prior applicant had undertaken removal of invasive plant species within the creek channel and restoration of the disturbed areas pursuant to a Streambed Alteration Agreement with the California Department of Fish Wildlife (CDFW), dated October 3, 2007. According to CDFW, the project is currently in compliance with the existing agreement and there will be an ongoing process to remove the blackberries from the project area.

The property is located on the northern end of the County's NVBSP, in close proximity to State Route 29. North of the property across Soscol Ferry Road is vacant industrial land. East of the site is an existing self-storage facility containing a mix of enclosed and outdoor storage spaces. The self-storage facility also borders Suscol Creek and includes improvements constructed at 75 ft. from the top of the creek bank. South of the project site beyond Suscol Creek are vineyards but the land is zoned for future industrial development. West of the project site a vacant industrially-zoned site and beyond is vacant public land owned by the Napa Sanitation District. To the north of the self-storage facility, there is a cooperage company. The project site is in close proximity to the Napa County Airport and the primary approach patterns for the main runway. It is routinely overflown by aircraft on final approach.

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

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

California Department of Fish And Wildlife
San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

Other Agencies Contacted

City of Napa
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Napa Sanitation District
Native American

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a 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
Napa County Planning, Building, and Environmental Services

June 14, 2016/June 28,2016
Date/Date corrections made to document

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

Discussion:

- a-b The project site is not located within an area which would damage any known scenic vista, or damage scenic resources, trees, outcroppings, or historic buildings. The proposed project site is currently vacant and had been approved for the development of a 600,000 gallon per year winery and the construction of a 66,338 sq. ft. winery building.
- c. The project site is primarily visible from State Highway 12/29 in the vicinity of the Southern Crossing/Butler Bridge at the gateway to Napa Valley. The project is predominantly located below the level of the highway; is not located on a vista; and will be conditioned for landscaping to provide a more aesthetic view. The project is located within a partially developed portion of the NVBPS that allows heavy industrial developments. The project features concrete tilt-up buildings with a variety of decorative elements and substantial perimeter landscaping in accordance with the requirements of the specific plan. The design is equal to or greater in quality than other similar buildings approved and constructed within the specific plan boundaries, and exceeds the design quality requirements for the specific plan's general industrial area. Therefore, the project will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and surrounding area.
- d. The new facility will result in a minor increase in the nighttime lighting. In accordance with County standards, all exterior lighting will be the minimum necessary for the operational and security needs. Light fixtures will be kept as low to the ground as possible and include shields to deflect the light down. Avoidance of highly reflective surfaces will be required, as well as standard county conditions to prevent light from being cast skyward. This is an area routinely overflowed by low flying aircraft which necessitates strong controls on skyward nighttime lighting. As designed, and as subject to 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. 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
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. ¹ Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b/e. The project site does not contain any existing agriculture, is zoned industrial, and is not classified by the State as Prime, Unique, or Statewide Important farmland. 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. 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 Industrial. 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:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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 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
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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. Furthermore, 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.

The proposed project includes no employees, and it is estimated that this project would generate a maximum 34 daily trips. Over the long term, emission sources for the proposed project will consist primarily of mobile sources; vehicles visiting the site. The total vehicle trips per day is significantly below BAAQMD's recommended threshold of 2,000 vehicle trips/day for purposes of performing a detailed air quality analysis.

The Air District's threshold of significance provided in Table 3-1 has determined that similar projects such as a warehouse that do not exceed a threshold of 864,000 sq. ft. 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 is 152,348 sq.ft. compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 864,000 sq.ft.(warehouse) for NO_x,(oxides of nitrogen), the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan.

The proposed storage project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plan. Mini-storage units are not producers of air pollution in volumes substantial enough to result in an air quality plan conflict. 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. Over the long term, emissions resulting from the proposed project would consist primarily of visitor mobile sources traveling to and from the storage units. The resulting busiest day total is well below the threshold 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.

d. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from earthmoving and construction activities required for the construction of the facilities. 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:

During all construction activities, the permittee shall comply 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 when average wind speeds exceed 20 mph.

- e. While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, mini-storage facilities are not known 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. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. 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, known fish presence –

California Fish & Wildlife Natural Diversity Database, Stream and Fish Presence (Resource Conservation District); US Fish & Wildlife Critical Habitats) the only known special status species occurring within the project boundary is the Swainson's hawk. However, the Resource Maps indicate the presence of fish species within Suscol Creek, which is a potentially suitable habitat for steelhead trout. Presence of fish within Suscol Creek was determined from a snorkel study performed in 2002 by Friends of the Napa River. California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) commented that Swainson's hawk have been reported in the area and have been added to the natural diversity database for this region. Both steelhead trout and Swainson's hawk are listed as protected species by CDFW.

The mitigated negative declaration for the prior approved project on the project site evaluated three biological assessments of the property prepared by a qualified biologist. One of the three assessments specifically addresses Swainson's hawk, and concluded that the project site was not designated as Swainson's hawk habitat. However, also attached to this report is a letter from a local bird enthusiast who provides evidence of several Swainson's hawk sightings within two miles of the project site over the last 3 years including a past nesting site near the corner of Devlin Road and Soscol Ferry Road, approximately 1/4 mile from the project site. Although there is as of yet no formal confirmation of the presence of Swainson's hawk in the project vicinity, it is reasonable to conclude that the State-listed species may be present and, therefore, mitigation to ensure no impacts to the species is warranted. The mitigation measure requires consultation with CDFW prior to commencing construction of the project to 1) conclusively determine the presence or lack of presence of the species; 2) conclusively determine whether the project site is or is not suitable foraging habitat; and 3) based off of CDFW's final determination, implement compensating mitigation if determined necessary. Mitigation for the loss of foraging habitat includes preservation of other suitable habitat at a ratio prescribed by CDFW. See mitigation measure below. With this mitigation measure, potential for impacts to Swainson's hawk are considered less-than-significant.

A Biological Survey was conducted by Brunuske Chatham, Inc. (January 27, 2014) for due diligence for the purchase of the property. A field survey of the property was conducted, where an inventory of all plant and animal species observed was compiled. Previous assessments of the property were completed by PCI, which included formal wetland delineations and a biological resource evaluation (PCI 2006). Those reports were reviewed and referenced in this report as appropriate. According to the background literature, there are a number of reported occurrences for special-status plants within the project area's region. A single-day botanical inventory survey of the property was completed by Coast Range Biological LLC in April 2007, identifying 50 plant species on the site, none of which were special-status species.

An analysis of the biological mitigation measures that had been placed on the original project was prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. (dated August 28, 2015) and presented with this project since the project involves environmental enhancement and stewardship of Suscol Creek to eliminate non-native flora. The updated analysis, conducted by LSA biologist Richard Nichols and Eric Lichtwardt, included a site visit on July 15, 2015. During the field survey, three Swainson's hawks were observed flying over the project site and perching on trees and power poles on the site. The report states that the applicant has agreed that no large trees suitable for raptor nesting habitat will be removed. The report concluded that all the originally identified potential biological impacts were valid and the mitigation measures that were applied to the original use permits still apply for the proposed project. Studies conducted by LSA biologists have confirmed that the mitigation measures are still applicable and that the proposed 75-foot setback with habitat restoration would be adequate to preserve the biological values of Suscol Creek. As with the 2006 modification, this setback is contingent on habitat restoration being conducted along Suscol Creek setback by removing the Himalayan blackberry and planting native trees, shrubs, grasses and forbs. LSA has verified that the Himalayan blackberry removal has been successfully implemented. The restoration area will be planted, monitored and maintained until success criteria are attained. The restoration will also help stabilize the eroding stream banks of Suscol Creek. Swainson's hawk nesting habitat, steelhead passage habitat and wildlife movement along Suscol Creek will be preserved and/or enhanced within the setback by the following mitigation measures and suggest modifications for the proposed project.

This program will be implemented in consultation with the CDFW and is intended to have a positive effect of potential steelhead trout habitat. Any work within the channel must be performed in accordance with CDFW protocols and including consultation prior to commencing activities, best management practices to prevent unnecessary disturbance of creek areas, and timing of activities during appropriate low-flow seasonal periods. The proposed mitigation measures IV.a.11.3 and in the Hydrology Section VIII.c.1, and VIII.c.2, placed on the original project, were found to reduce the potential for impacts to steelhead trout to a less-than-significant level and are being incorporated into this project. (see mitigation measures IV.a.1, IV.a.2; IV.a.3, below);

b/d.. There are two jurisdictional water features on the project site consisting of Suscol Creek, the southern boundary of the project, and an unnamed drainage swale on the northwest corner of the site. No construction activities are proposed within the Suscol Creek channel. However, the applicant is proposing removal of non-native vegetation as an environmental enhancement to promote native flora and fauna. This work will occur primarily outside of the riparian channel but to completely eradicate the non-native bushes, some work will need to occur within the channel. In addition, the natural sheet flow drainage of the site drains to Suscol Creek and therefore, construction activities and grading practices will be employed and monitored to ensure both project construction and environmental enhancement activities do not impact Suscol Creek. See section "a" above concerning the project's potential impacts and mitigation to steelhead trout. With mitigation, the project will not have a significant impact on the Suscol Creek riparian channel.

Evidence presented by the biological report prepared for the original projects concluded that the unnamed drainage swale historically was a vegetated swale. However, it appeared that the widening and improvement of Soscol Ferry Road in the early 1980's resulted in the concentration of upslope drainage on the property through an under-road culvert. The swale currently shows a sign of minor erosive channelization as a result. The Army Corps of Engineers confirmed jurisdiction over the swale in a letter dated February 2, 2006. The drainage feature was found not to contain any State or Federally listed species. Prior to commencing grading the permittee is required to obtain a Nationwide Permit for grading and revegetation activities that will occur within the unnamed drainage channel, pursuant to the requirements of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and subject to authorization by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, included as a condition of approval of the original project. Mitigation consists of verifying Federal authorization prior to commencing construction activities within the swale. Nationwide Permitting is allowed for the proposed drainage and vegetation enhancements proposed with the project. Therefore, the project will not have a significant impact on any sensitive riparian areas.

- c. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – water bodies, vernal pools and vernal pool species), there are no wetlands on the property, or on neighboring properties that would be affected by this project, however in a report prepared by and the report prepared by PCI in 2006, there is a large drainage/wetland complex that runs from the center of the northern property line to the western property line. This was verified by the Army Corps of Engineers as a jurisdictional feature (Corps 2006 and 2007). The Corps determinations have since expired, they are only valid for 5 years; however, these features would still fall under the Corps jurisdiction. The mitigation measures proposed by LSA Associates (8/28/2015), submitted with the project, states approval of a Nationwide 24 Permit prior to grading approval provides for protection of this swale. Therefore, with the incorporation of the mitigation measure as proposed the project would have a less than significant impact on wetland resources. (see mitigation measures IV.c.1. below);
- e. This proposed project would not interfere with any ordinances protecting biological resources. The County's Conservation Regulations would normally trigger a 45 ft. setback from the creek, but because the project is located within the NVBPSP, a 150 ft. creek setback is prescribed by the Specific Plan. The specific plan allows for alternatives to this setback on a case-by-case basis when it can be found by the Planning Commission that a project with a lesser setback is environmentally superior. The Planning Commission approved a setback reduction as part of the approval of the original Use Permit (P05-0434) from 150-feet to 75-feet from the creek in return for environmentally upgrading the remaining 75 feet nearest the creek. The previously approved setback reduction resulted in roughly twice the setback required by the County's Conservation Regulations. Enhancement of the creek channel is consistent with County policies to protect and preserve riparian areas and the project will have a less-than-significant impact on local environmental regulations.
- 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:

Mitigation Measure IV.a.1. – To mitigate potential impacts due to the conversion of non-native grassland habitat, the following measure shall be implemented:

- A qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey to determine the presence or absence of Swainson's hawk nest on the project site. If nesting is determined, an adequate buffer zone around the active nest shall be established in consultation with CDFW. The buffer zone shall be maintained for the duration of the nesting season, typically February through August, and monitored weekly to assure compliance and success of this action.

Method of Monitoring: This mitigation measure is required by the use permit conditions and required prior to issuance of a grading permit.

Responsible Agency: Planning, Building and Environmental Services; California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)

Mitigation Measure IV.a.2 – To mitigate potential impacts due to removal/disturbance of possible active raptor nests, the following measure shall be implemented:

- Prior to grading and/or tree removal, a qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys to determine the presence or absence of all birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the California Fish and Game Code. If present, the habitat or trees should not be removed until the end of the breeding season, and an appropriate setback buffer from construction activities be defined, as determine in consultation with CDFW

Method of Monitoring: This mitigation measure is required by the use permit conditions and required prior to issuance of a grading permit.

Responsible Agency: Planning, Building and Environmental Services; CDFW

Mitigation Measure IV.a.3 –To ensure that the possible presence of steelhead trout in the creek is not adversely affected by restoration activities:

- Any work within the channel of Suscol Creek must be performed in accordance with CDFW protocols including consultation prior to commencing activities, best management practices to prevent unnecessary disturbance of creek areas, and timing of activities during appropriate low-flow seasonal periods.

Method of Monitoring: This mitigation measure is required by the use permit conditions and required prior to issuance of a grading permit.

Responsible Agency: Planning, Building and Environmental Services; CDFW

Mitigation Measure IV.c.1 – To mitigate possible impacts within the jurisdictional drainage swale:

- Prior to commencing grading, the permittee shall obtain a Nationwide 24 Permit for grading and revegetation activities that will occur within the unnamed drainage channel, pursuant to the requirement of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and subject to authorization by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers as stipulated in their letter of February 2, 2006. Nationwide permitting is allowed for the proposed drainage and vegetation enhancements proposed with the project.

Method of Monitoring: This mitigation measure is required by the use permit conditions and required prior to issuance of a grading permit.

Responsible Agency: Planning, Building and Environmental Services; Army Corps of Engineers.

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

Discussion:

a-c. The project site is currently vacant and does not contain any structures. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology surveys, sites, sensitive areas, and flags), the southerly portion of the project, adjacent to Suscol Creek is located within a culturally sensitive area. Research into past uses has not identified historic resources that may be present at the site. There are several well-documented, significant archaeological resources in the general vicinity of the project area. An archeological survey was previously required for the prior use permits, Archaeological Services, Inc., July 2, 2004, who refers to a May 23, 1988 survey previously prepared. The report concluded that the site does not likely contain any resources and based on the proposed project plans, there would be no impact to cultural resources. However, if resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with 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:

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 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 shall be contacted by the permittee 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 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:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
- 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 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 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. A geotechnical study report was included with the project application, RGH Consultants, June 12, 2014. The report states that geologic maps (Bexore et al., 2002) indicate the northwestern portion of the property is underlain by the Pliocene age Sonoma Volcanics and the remainder of the property is underlain by Holocene age alluvium. The Holocene age alluvium is described as alluvium which was deposited in fan, terrace or basin environments. Individual types of deposits within the Holocene age alluvium were not mapped due to complex interfingering of depositional environments and limited size of area. The Pliocene age Sonoma Volcanics is described as basalt to rhyolite flows, agglomerates and tuffs. In general, the ground surface is soft and spongy, generally associated with weak, porous surface soils. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (soil types), the majority of the project site has the Hambright-Rock outcrop complex soil series, on 2–30% slopes; the northwesterly portion of the site has Bale Clay loam soil series, 0-2% slopes; and the southeasternmost point of parcel, Coombs gravelly loam soils at 2-5% slopes. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the project site has a high potential 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 the maximum extent possible.

- e. The waste water disposal system will be designed by a licensed engineer and will be reviewed and approved by the PBES Environmental Health Division. 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
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. The construction and operation of the proposed project generally will contribute to overall increases in greenhouse gas emissions. The Bay Area Air Quality Air District (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines Updated May 2011 has established screening criteria related to greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) for new development, in order to provide lead agencies and project applicants with a conservative indication of whether the proposed project could result in potentially significant air quality impacts.

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: habitat restoration or new vegetation; energy conserving lighting; energy star roof, light in color, but non-reflective due to proximity to airport; installation of the Class I bike path along the frontage; install water efficient fixtures; bio-retention is incorporated into the storm water design; water efficient landscaping; and will make recycling bins available to the owners. The facilities are proposed for personal storage and would not be expected to generate frequent trips to the facilities. There are no employees proposed at the project, therefore the generation of vehicle emissions would not be significant. 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. 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:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The project proposes the storage of personal equipment and will not include the storage of hazardous materials, thereby reducing the concern of transport of hazardous materials to a level of insignificance.
- 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 project site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites. [Based on a search of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control Database and the Napa County Environmental Resource Map \(hazardous facilities \(Cortese List\), the project site does not contain any known EPA National Priority List sites, State response sites, voluntary cleanup sites. No impact would occur as the project site is not on any known list of hazardous materials. However, the site is located west of a mini-storage facility where a close site is listed. Search of aeriels show the project site to have been vacant farmland. \[Revised consistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15073.5 \(c\)\(2\) and \(4\).\]](#)
- 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 Commission. The project is located within Zones C and D of the compatibility plan, which are areas of common overflight and moderate to high risk. A storage facility is highly compatible with the risk and noise impacts associated with properties within Zones C and D. The buildings have also been designed to comply with specific requirements regarding light and glare to ensure airport land use compatibility. The proposed structures are designed to be less than 35 feet in height, the maximum allowed in the zones. The use will generate a minimal amount of visitation and there will be no large gatherings, reducing the potential hazard to people to a less than significant level.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.

- g. The proposed project will not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan.
- h. 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:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not violate any known water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. A new on-site domestic and a process wastewater system are proposed to accommodate the seven restrooms proposed on the site for visitation to the site by the owners. The PBES Environmental Health Division has reviewed the proposed domestic and process wastewater systems and recommends approval as conditioned. Additionally, any earth disturbing activities would be subject to the County's Stormwater Ordinance which would include measures to prevent erosion, sediment, and waste materials from entering waterways both during and after any construction activities. Given 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. Although this project is located within an industrial area and is located within the NVBPS, the project is located within an area that is difficult to be provided with municipal water. The project will, therefore, utilize on-site ground water. The proposed project would not result in a substantial demand of groundwater supplies or interfere with the recharge of groundwater supplies. The applicant has prepared a Tier 1 Water analysis (RSA, December 18, 2015) for the proposed project to evaluate water use for the project and landscape irrigation. The proposed project is located on the floor of the Napa Valley in an area that has an established acceptable water use criteria of one acre-foot

per acre per year on a ±10.32 acre project site resulting in a threshold for the property of 10.32 acre-foot per year (af/yr). However, the estimated water demand for this project is .63 acre-feet per year (af/yr), well below the threshold for the property. Therefore the project would not have a significant impact on groundwater supplies or neighboring wells.

- c-e. The project proposal will not significantly alter the sheet flow drainage patterns on site or cause an increase in erosion on or off site since the project would be required to incorporate an erosion control plan to manage onsite surface drainage and erosion of onsite soils during construction and winter months (October to April). A "Stormwater Control Plan for a Regulated Project" was prepared by RSA (September 9, 2015) and included with this project for review by the PBES Engineering Division. The report states that Stormwater treatment facilities have been integrated into the planning, design, construction, operation and maintenance of the proposed development. Opportunities for the site include landscaped areas and Bioretention facilities will be installed in these locations to treat stormwater runoff prior to discharge from the site. Runoff will be conveyed to Bioretention facilities via surface flows, trench drains, and storm drains. The PBES Engineering Division has reviewed this report and determined that sufficient information has been provided to do a complete evaluation of the project and supports this proposed development with the incorporation of the required condition of approval outlined in their memorandum of March 22, 2016. The conditions include required grading permit for site improvements; requirements for grading and drainage improvements to be constructed according to the current Napa County Road and Street Standards, Napa County Stormwater Quality Ordinance 1400, and the California Building codes; required implementation of Best Management Practices to minimize dust; and requirements for a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan in accordance with the regulations of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board for construction activities that equals or exceed one acre of total disturbed area. The required conditions regarding land disturbance and the proposed stormwater control plan reduce any potential adverse water runoff impacts to drainage and siltation to a less than significant level. Further, Best Management Practices will prevent any project-related impacts to steelhead trout which may be present in Suscol Creek, but the report indicates that the mitigation measure listed below will specifically mitigate construction-related impacts to downslope riparian areas to a less than significant level.
- f. There is nothing included in this proposal that would otherwise substantially degrade water quality. The PBES Environmental Health Division has reviewed the process and sanitary wastewater proposal and has found them to be adequate to meet the facilities' wastewater needs. The Department of Public Works has reviewed the estimated water usage of the current proposal, and found that there is adequate water to serve the proposed project. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality.
- g-i. The project site is not located within a flood hazard area, nor would it impede or redirect flood flows or expose structures or people to flooding. The project site is not located within a dam or levee failure inundation zone.
- j. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows.

Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation Measure IX.c.1 - To mitigate potential construction related impacts to downslope riparian areas, the following measure shall be implemented:

- Temporary high visibility fencing shall be used 50 feet away from the outside edge of the riparian habitat for the duration of construction activities in order to prevent inadvertent impacts from encroachment into this community. Where project improvement plans require construction activities to occur within that 50-foot buffer, fencing shall be placed at the limits of the required construction activity. Placement of the fencing should be determined by a qualified biologist prior to construction and monitored at least once a month by County staff during the construction period to assure the success of this action.

Method of Monitoring: This mitigation measure requires submission of a grading permit.

Responsible Agency: Planning, Building and Environmental Services.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Discussion:

a-c. The project would not occur within an established community, nor would it result in the division of an established community. The project is located within an industrial area and the use is consistent with the industrial general plan designation, the general industrial specific plan and zoning district designation. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. The proposed project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during the construction of the storage structures, parking areas, and associated improvements. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. The proposed project would not result in any long-term significant permanent construction noise impacts or operational impacts. Furthermore, construction activities would generally occur during the period of 7 AM-7 PM on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity. All construction activities will be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Chapter 8.16).
- c/d. The proposed storage facility will not generate a substantial permanent increase or substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above the levels existing without the project. The project is located within an industrial area and a major highway interchange. The ambient noise levels are very high and there will be minimal activities occurring at the individually-owned mini-storage facility. By the nature of the service being provided, (storage of recreational equipment such as boats, rv's, car collections, excess personal possessions, etc.) visitation by owners would be infrequent and limited. In addition, since the proposed storage facilities will be owned and not rented, there would not be the normal space turnover activities occurring. Thus, the noise generated at the storage facility would not be expected to exceed the ambient noise levels.
- e/f. The project site is located in close proximity to the primary landing pattern path to the Napa County Airport and is subject to frequent overflight by low flying aircraft. However, the project is not generally overflown by aircraft on takeoff due to prevailing winds, and is consequently well outside the cumulative noise contours established by the airport. As an industrial use (storage buildings) within an industrial park, the project is not a sensitive noise receptor and is considered highly compatible with noise intrusion resulting from frequent overflight. Visitation to the storage facility would be infrequent and limited in time. The project site is not located within two miles 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The project would not result in the inducement of substantial population growth, either directly or indirectly. No new homes or roads are proposed. The proposal does not include any employees. The property is vacant, therefore, no housing will be displaced and no people will be displaced.
- b/c. Since the project does not propose any employees and is located on vacant land, 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:				

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

Discussion:

- a. Public services are currently provided to the project area, and the storage facility would not place any additional demands on existing services. Fire protection measures are required as part of the development pursuant to Napa County Fire Marshall conditions and there will be no foreseeable impact to emergency response times with the adoption of standard conditions of approval. The Fire Department and the PBES 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 and property tax increases 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

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 specific plan area including improvements designed to relieve traffic on State Highways. The traffic mitigation fee is further described in Board of Supervisor's Resolution 02-39. For this project, a traffic mitigation fee based on PM peak hour vehicle trips will be imposed and collected prior to issuance of a building permit as determined by the Director of Public Works.

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

The project is not expected to cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. Crane Transportation Group prepared a report entitled "Trip Generation Projections-Soscol Ferry Road Storage Facility, dated August 8, 2014 and amended it with a report entitled "Trip Generation Projections and Required Mitigations-Soscol Ferry Road Storage Facility" dated May 19, 2015. The reports developed weekday daily, AM and PM peak hour trip generation projections for the project based upon the Institute of Transportation Engineer (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition (2012) with trip rates for mini warehouse facilities based upon the number of units. The traffic engineer utilized a total of 132 storage units which would be owned instead of rented. The expected weekday trip generation would be 34 daily two-way trips, 2 inbound trips and 1 outbound trip during the weekday AM peak traffic hour (7:00 AM-9:00 AM) and 1 inbound and 2 outbound trips during the weekday PM peak traffic hour (4:00 - 6:00 PM) on the local roadway network. The project proposes privately owned storage units instead of rented, resulting in a much lower unit turnover rate than a regular available mini warehouse. There is no office proposed or manager proposed at the facility, further reducing visitation at the site by the public. The report noted that the *County of Napa Left Turn Warrant Graph* shows that a left turn lane would be warranted for driveway connections to Soscol Ferry Road with 30 or more daily two-way trips. The report concludes that since the proposed project will have 34 daily two-way trips, split between two driveways, neither will likely meet warrant criteria for provision of a left

turn lane on the westbound Soscol Ferry Road intersection approaches; thus there is no potential impact. The County Department of Public Works reviewed the project and the reports and there was no requirement for a left turn lane placed upon this project.

Soscol Ferry Road currently has an average daily two-way traffic volume of 5,085 vehicles, based upon counts adjacent to the project site on April 28 to May 1 (Tuesday to Friday), 2015. Its intersection with State Highway 12/29 is controlled by traffic lights. There is a "T" intersection with Devlin Road, controlled by a stop sign.

The expected three PM peak hour trips generated from the project is anticipated to contribute significantly less than one percent to the traffic levels on local roadways and intersections and to deterioration in their level of service. This less than one percent increase is considered a less-than-significant level of traffic impact. The potential for any traffic is further reduced to a less than significant level with the payment of the "fair share" NVBPSP area development impact fee prior to issuance of a building permit as described in Board Resolution No. 08-20, and included as a standard condition of approval, as follows:

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

- c. This project would not result in any change to air traffic patterns. The project structures will not exceed the maximum 35 foot height restriction for the airport area.
- d/e. The project includes construction of two new driveways onto Soscol Ferry Road. Soscol Ferry Road is an urban collector street designed to accommodate high traffic volumes in a commercial land use setting. 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 to comply with NVBPSP area standards. The project will not result in inadequate parking
- 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and will not result in a significant impact. Wastewater disposal will be accommodated on-site in compliance with State and County regulations.
- b. The project will not require construction of any new water treatment facilities that will result in a significant impact to the environment. Water will be provided by an existing well. 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 PBES Environmental Health Division.
- c. The project will include on-site storm water drainage controls and bioretention facilities, and will not require or result in the construction of new public storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, which will cause a significant impact to the environment.
- d. The proposed project is located on the floor of the Napa Valley in an area that has an established acceptable water use criteria of one acre-foot per acre per year on a ±10.32 acre project site resulting in a threshold for the property of 10.32 acre-foot per year (af/yr). However, the estimated water demand for this project is .63 acre-feet per year (af/yr), well below the threshold for the property. Therefore, sufficient water supplies are available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources. Therefore, the project would not have a significant impact on groundwater supplies or neighboring wells.
- e. Wastewater will be treated on-site and will not require a wastewater treatment provider.
- f. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The project is believed to be possible habitat for two State-listed protected animal species. With the mitigation measures proposed in the Section IV Biological Resources and Section IX Hydrology & Water Quality, the project will not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable as mitigated. Potential air quality, traffic and housing impacts are discussed in their respective sections above.
- c. 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.