EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

This summary is provided in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15123. As stated in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(a), "an environmental impact report (EIR) shall contain a summary of the proposed actions and its consequences. The language of the summary should be as clear and simple as reasonably practical." As required by the Guidelines, this section includes: (1) a summary description of the proposed project; (2) a synopsis of environmental impacts and recommended mitigation measures; (3) identification of the alternatives evaluated and of the environmentally superior alternative; and (4) a discussion of the areas of controversy associated with the project.

SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Oak Knoll Resort, LLC (the applicant) is proposing to construct a 50-room hotel and associated spa, plus other indoor and outdoor hotel guest amenities; a 100-seat restaurant; and retail space. Additional project elements include an on-site wastewater treatment system, underground water tanks, and site landscaping. The site is currently occupied by vacant commercial structures that would be demolished as part of the project.

Project Objectives

The project applicant has developed the following objectives for the project:

- design a project that is consistent with the Commercial Limited zoning;
- develop several distinct areas within the project site, connected by garden areas with comprehensive landscape planning;
- provide County-serving hospitality, retail, and restaurant uses within the project site;
- generate positive fiscal impacts for the County through redevelopment within the project site;
- develop a project that utilizes the Vine Trail to allow project patrons an alternative way to explore Napa Valley; and
- implement a sustainable project that maximizes reuse of water supplies and minimizes water demands.

Project Location

The project site is a 3.54-acre parcel located at 5091 Solano Avenue, north of the city limits of Napa and approximately 3 miles south of the town of Yountville, in unincorporated Napa County. The project site includes approximately 0.5 acre devoted to a road easement serving West Oak Knoll Avenue, a private road that connects Solano Avenue with the vineyards to the south and west and residences to the north and west of the project site.

Project Characteristics

The applicant has submitted a use permit request (P14-00215-UP) to demolish the existing structures and completely redevelop the site with a 50-room hotel and associated spa, plus other indoor and outdoor hotel guest amenities; a 100-seat restaurant; and retail space. Issuance of a use permit by Napa County is a discretionary action subject to CEQA.

A detailed description of the project components and operations is provided below.

DEMOLITION

Demolition activities would remove all existing buildings, asphalt, and concrete slabs. While 11 mature, perimeter trees would remain, 15 trees ranging from five inches diameter at breast height (dbh) to 28 inches dbh within the project site would be removed. Tree species to be removed include walnut, mulberry, sycamore, and fruit trees.

HOTEL, SPA, RESTAURANT, AND RETAIL

The proposed hotel would include 50 rooms, each approximately 400 square feet (sf), for a total of 20,000 sf of hotel room space. The rooms would be in several individual buildings within the project site. A row of two-story structures housing 26 hotel rooms would be located along the western boundary of the site. Six rooms would be in a two-story structure along the southern boundary of the site, located between the western row of buildings and the proposed pool. The remaining 18 rooms would be in two, three-story structures located near the center of the site.

The hotel would also include 1,100 sf for hotel reception and check-in, 1,280 sf for hotel lobby/lounge, a 1,500-sf fitness center, a 2,000-sf spa area, 1,050 sf for hotel administration, 1,180 sf for laundry facilities and linen closets, and 900 sf for storage and maintenance. These services and amenities would be housed in buildings near the center of the site.

Overall, the proposed hotel buildings would include approximately 29,010 sf of interior floor area, plus another, approximately 8,250 sf of outdoor area attached to the guest rooms as balconies or patios. Outdoor amenities proposed to be included with the project include a swimming pool and bocce court. Other surface improvements include a 109-stall parking lot, a vehicle entry court, and new landscaping along the perimeter of the site; landscaping would include at least 15 new trees to replace the trees proposed to be removed as part of site demolition.

The proposed 100-seat restaurant would occupy one of two buildings along the eastern property line and would encompass 4,750 sf, which would include space for the hotel and room service kitchen area. The restaurant would include primary indoor and outdoor dining areas, as well as an indoor casual café area for a total of 100 seats between all three areas. The outdoor area would include a 1,500-sf outdoor dining patio.

The applicant proposes to have periodic events with attendance of up to 100 people per event at the restaurant facility. The project application includes a request for a use permit that would allow the use of amplified sound (music and noise) at events held at the restaurant.

The restaurant building is located in the southeastern corner of the project site and would be a single-story structure with a rooftop terrace that would be available to patrons of the facility. The restaurant building also includes the hotel lobby/lounge area.

The project includes one retail space with a floor area of 1,280 sf to be located in the stand-alone single-story barn building. The retail space would be controlled and operated by the hotel and may be used as an art gallery.

The operations and maintenance of the project is expected to require up to 33 employees. Under Section 18.110.030 of the Napa County Code, the project is required to provide 109 parking spaces for all employees and guests. The project includes 109 parking spaces.

SITE ACCESS AND ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS

The hotel and associated uses would be accessible from one main vehicular entrance from Solano Avenue, approximately 80 feet south of West Oak Knoll Avenue.

A second access point would be located in the northwestern area of the project site and would provide emergency vehicle access from West Oak Knoll Avenue. The secondary access point would be gated and only used for emergency vehicles.

At the southeastern corner of the site, a driveway would permit access to the delivery area and trash enclosure. This driveway would include a turnout along southbound Solano Avenue to allow for vehicle deceleration.

Solano Avenue is currently an undivided two-lane roadway. The project would widen the roadway along the project site frontage to accommodate a left-turn lane for vehicles traveling northbound on Solano Avenue. The new center-turn lane would begin to taper south of the project site, providing an area for left-turning vehicles to queue to turn into the delivery driveway, main entrance, and West Oak Knoll Avenue. North of West Oak Knoll Avenue, the center-turn lane would become an acceleration area for vehicles making a left turn from West Oak Knoll Avenue onto northbound Solano Avenue.

A crosswalk across Solano Avenue is proposed to connect the project site to the Vine Trail, which runs parallel to Solano Avenue.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The project would include an on-site wastewater treatment system that would treat all wastewater generated on the project site. All effluent would be treated to meet Title 22 recycled water requirements. The majority of the treated effluent would be reused in landscaping irrigation and sanitary fixtures. Treated effluent that is not used for landscape irrigation or sanitary fixtures would be dispersed via a leachfield under the parking area. The wastewater treatment system would include an above-ground operator's shed, but most of the system would be underground, including storage tanks. Underground storage tanks would include one 30,000-gallon and two 40,000-gallon storage tanks to store treated water for fire suppression and irrigation.

The natural overland stormwater runoff pattern from the new and reconstructed areas on the site would remain unchanged from existing conditions, flowing from west to east. Stormwater would flow to the landscaped areas, with excess stormwater being routed to the underground storage tank for storage until it can be used for irrigation.

The project would receive potable water from the City of Napa water system through two existing connections along the eastern edge of the project site. These laterals from the main lines were installed initially to serve the restaurant space and are sized according to that use. To ensure provision of an adequate quantity of water on-site during peak demand of the additional hotel and retail uses, a 48,000-gallon fiberglass underground domestic water storage tank would be installed under the parking lot.

Potential Approvals and Permits Required

Several agencies will be involved in the consideration of project elements. As the lead agency under CEQA, Napa County is responsible for considering the adequacy of the EIR and determining if the overall project should be approved.

Permits and approvals for project construction may be required from the following state and local agencies:

STATE

- **Bay Area Air Quality Management District**: Authority to construct (for devices that emit air pollutants); permit to operate.
- **California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 2:** Permits for the on-site wastewater treatment system.

LOCAL

- **Napa County**: Approval of a use permit and various ministerial approvals, including but not limited to building permits and grading permits.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES

Table ES-1, at the end of this chapter, provides a summary of the environmental impacts of the project, the level of significance of the impact before mitigation, recommended mitigation measures, and the level of significance of the impact after the implementation of the mitigation measures.

SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

The following alternatives are evaluated in this Draft EIR.

- **Alternative 1: No Project–No Development Alternative** assumes no site demolition or construction of new buildings. The project site would remain in its current condition.
- **Alternative 2a: No Project–Existing Entitlement Alternative (Rehabilitation)** assumes that the approved use permits for operation of restaurant, retail, and office uses would be reinstated and minimal building rehabilitation would occur.
- **Alternative 2b: No Project-Existing Entitlement Alternative (Demolition)** also assumes the reinstatement of existing use permits but assumes that all buildings would be demolished, and new buildings would be constructed.
- **Alternative 3: No Special Events Alternative** assumes all physical project elements would be built, but that no special events would be permitted.

The following summary provides brief descriptions of the alternatives. For a more thorough discussion of project alternatives, see Chapter 6, “Alternatives.”

Alternative 1: No Project–No Development Alternative

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(1) requires that the no project alternative be described and analyzed "to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the project with the impacts of not approving the project." Under Alternative 1, the No Project–No Development Alternative, no actions would be taken by the County of Napa, and the project site would remain unchanged from current conditions. The buildings would remain vacant and the land would continue to have overgrown vegetation and be surrounded by a chain link fence. The No Project--No Development Alternative would not meet the project objectives. However, as required by CEQA, the No Project--No Development Alternative is evaluated in this Draft EIR.

Although it is acknowledged that with the No Project--No Development Alternative, there would be no discretionary action by the County, and thus no impact, for purposes of comparison with the other action alternatives, conclusions for each technical area are characterized as "impacts" that are greater, similar, or less, to describe conditions that are worse than, similar to, or better than those of the project.

Alternative 2a: No Project–Existing Entitlements Alternative (Rehabilitation) and Alternative 2b: No Project-Existing Entitlement Alternative (Demolition)

While the buildings on the project site are vacant and have not been used for many years, the existing entitlements remain valid. Alternative 2 assumes the restaurant, retail, and office uses would be reinstated on the project site as allowed by use permits dating back several decades. The specific assumptions of Alternative 2 include the restaurant with allowed live entertainment and outdoor dining (formerly the Red Hen Restaurant/Cantina), nearly 20,000 sf of retail (Red Hen Antiques and Fashions), and approximately 1,400 sf of office area in conjunction with permitted hot air balloon operations (Balloons Above The Valley).

In 1983, Napa County recognized the existing Red Hen Restaurant as a legal non-conforming use as it was in existence prior to enactment of the County Zoning Ordinance in 1955. At that time, the County recognized that some restaurant elements would constitute an expansion of the existing use and that a use permit would be required. The property owner applied for use permit (Permit Application Number U-308384) to expand the outdoor dining area, extend business hours, include live entertainment, and various building and site modifications. The use permit was approved and included conditions of approval limiting outdoor dining to daylight hours and no later than 9:00 p.m., requiring that live entertainment be within the restaurant structure, and limiting noise levels. A modification to the use permit was approved in 1984 and extended the hours of outdoor dining to 10:00 p.m.

In 2004, Napa County approved use permit modifications for the Balloons Above the Valley permits (Permits 91182-UP, 92406-MOD, and 96692-MOD). The scope of the modification allowed the launch of a maximum of four balloons per day between the hours of 6:30 a.m. and 9:00 a.m., with staff arriving no earlier than 5:00 a.m. and with parking of up to five vans or trailers as well as passengers on the site.

Permits related to the retail operations on the site include building permits dating back to the 1940s for the Red Hen Home & Garden, Red Hen Antiques, and Red Hen Fashions. More information on the retail use history can be found in Appendix C of this Draft EIR. Based on building sizes as they currently exist, this analysis assumes nearly 20,000 sf of retail area.

Because the reinstatement of the existing entitlements could be realized under a variety of scenarios, Alternative 2 includes two options for analysis. Alternative 2a assumes that some minimal building rehabilitation would be required to get the site ready for reinstatement of the uses. Alternative 2b assumes that, as allowed by the Napa County Code, all buildings on the site would be demolished and new structures would be constructed. The analysis below identifies the general impacts of reinstating the existing use

entitlements and identifies where the impacts of the rehabilitation alternative (2a) would differ from those of the demolition alternative (2b).

Alternative 3: No Special Events Alternative

One of the concerns voiced during the scoping meeting and included in NOP comment letters was that events at the project site could have noise impacts on nearby residents. As described above, the project would result in significant impacts related to onsite operations and noise associated with outdoor events. Mitigation Measure 3.7-3b was recommended to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level and would require speaker /amplification equipment to operate at noise levels that do not exceed County standards and would limit event hours. Thus, the potentially significant noise impact is triggered by amplified noise associated with special events. In order to avoid impacts related to amplified noise, Alternative 3 assumes the same physical elements as the project, but no special events with amplified sound would be allowed onsite. Hotel and restaurant size and capacity would be identical to the project and would include outdoor dining until 10:00 p.m. All other site amenities and operations would be the same as the project.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

Because the No Project–No Development Alternative would avoid all adverse impacts resulting from construction and operation of the Oak Knoll Hotel Project analyzed in Chapter 3, it is the environmentally superior alternative. However, the No Project–No Development Alternative would not meet the objectives the project and would have greater aesthetic impacts than the project.

When the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, the State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126[d][2]) require selection of an environmentally superior alternative from among the other action alternatives evaluated. Alternative 3 would be the environmentally superior action alternative among all other alternatives because this alternative would eliminate the special event noise impacts of the project and would result in similar impacts for all other issue areas.

AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

In accordance with Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21092 and CCR Section 15082, the County issued a notice of preparation (NOP) and initial study (IS) on June 16, 2017, to inform agencies and the general public that an EIR was being prepared and to invite comments on the scope and content of the document (Appendix A). County staff accepted comments on the scope of the EIR between June 16, 2017, and July 17, 2017. A noticed scoping session for the EIR occurred on June 26, 2017.

Based on the comments received during the NOP comment period, the major areas of controversy associated with the project are:

- noise generated by special events;
- parking; and
- building height relative to the surrounding area.

All the substantive environmental issues raised in the NOP comment letters and at the scoping meeting have been addressed or otherwise considered during preparation of this Draft EIR.

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
3.2 Aesthetics			
Impact 3.2-1: Affect scenic vistas or substantially damage scenic resources. Implementation of the project would include demolition of vacant, unused structures and would result in the construction of a modern hotel with spa and restaurant facilities. Though demolition and construction activities would occur, they would be temporary in nature. Proposed site design includes drought-tolerant, site and building perimeter landscaping and retention of mature walnut trees along the northern property line. Proposed building design incorporates cedar wood siding and corrugated metal roofing that is intended to reflect the natural setting as well as built features on adjacent property. While the project would be visible from SR 29, the project represents an improved aesthetic from the current dilapidated and overgrown condition of the site. Because construction impacts would be temporary, and the finished project would enhance the overall visual quality of the site, impacts on scenic vistas and resources would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.2-2: Substantially degrade the visual character or quality. Implementation of the project would include demolition of vacant, unused structures on the site and would result in the construction of a resort hotel. Though demolition and construction activities would occur, they would be temporary in nature, and operation of the project would enhance the overall visual character and quality of the site. Impacts would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.2-3: Create a new source of light or glare. The project would result in new structures on the project site. The design of the project includes windows where nighttime interior lights may be visible. Also, the site entrance, parking area, and pedestrian paths within the site would require lighting for safety. These project elements have the potential to result in emission of substantial amounts of light and skyglow that would have a potentially significant impact on views in the project area.	PS	**Mitigation Measure 3.2-3: Prepare a lighting plan.** Prior to issuance of any building permit pursuant to this approval, two 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. The plan shall detail, and commit to, project features intended to reduce potential effects from lighting, including: ◢ providing the minimum lighting needed for safety and wayfinding; ◢ shielding and down casting all exterior lighting; ◢ use of low level, indirect lighting wherever exterior lighting is installed at the buildings; ◢ locating all exterior lighting as low to the ground as possible; ◢ no use of flood lights or sodium lights; and	LTS

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
		◢ all project lighting will be compliant with the most recent update of the "Nonresidential Compliance Manual for California's Energy Efficiency Standards" and the most recent update of the California Building Code.	
3.3 Air Quality			
Impact 3.3-1: Short-term construction-generated emissions of ROG, NOx, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. The project would result in short-term construction-related emissions of ROG, NO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. Exhaust emissions would occur from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, material hauling, and construction worker trips. Fugitive dust emissions would occur from excavation, grading, and material movement; however, dust control measures are proposed and, therefore, construction-related dust emissions would not result in excessive dust at off-site receptors. Based on modeling conducted, ROG and NOx emissions would not exceed BAAQMD thresholds of 54 lb/day. Exhaust PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions would not exceed applicable thresholds of 82 lb/day and 54 lb/day, respectively. This would be a less than significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.3-2: Long-term operational emissions of ROG, NO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. The project would result in long-term operation-related emissions of ROG, NO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. Operation-related emissions would be associated with vehicle trips generated by the project, the use of natural gas for water and area heating as well as restaurant operations, and the use of landscaping equipment. Operational emissions of ROG, NO_X, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ would not exceed applicable BAAQMD daily thresholds of significance (i.e., 54 lb/day for ROG, NO_X and $PM_{2.5}$, and 82 lb/day for PM_{10}) and annual thresholds of significance (i.e., 10 TPY for ROG, NO_X and $PM_{2.5}$, and 15 TPY for PM_{10}). This would be a less than significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.3-3: Exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants. Short-term construction activities would not result in substantial emissions of diesel PM, would be temporary (i.e., 18 months for construction), and would not be located in close proximity to off-site sensitive receptors (i.e., nearby residences are located over 130 feet away from the project site). TACs associated with long-term project operation would be intermittent and would not be located in close proximity to off-site sensitive receptors. Therefore, levels of TACs from project-related construction and operations would not result in an increase in health risk exposure at off-site sensitive receptors. In addition, residents and workers at or near the project site would not be exposed to	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
a level of cancer, chronic, or acute risk from the combination of nearby TAC sources that exceed applicable thresholds. This impact would be less than significant.			
Impact 3.3-4: Exposure of sensitive receptors to odors. The project would not result in substantial odors in the area nor locate receptors where they would be exposed to substantial objectionable odors. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
3.4 Biological Resources			
Impact 3.4-1: Disturbance of special-status bat roosts. Implementation of the project involves demolition of existing abandoned buildings and tree removal. These buildings and trees provide potential roost structures for common and special-status bats. Demolition, and tree removal activities on the project site could result in disturbances to active bat roosts that could affect the survival of young or adult bats. Loss of an active bat roost would be considered a potentially significant impact.	PS	**Mitigation Measure 3.4-1: Avoid and minimize loss of special-status bats**. No more than 14 days prior commencement of tree removal, demolition, or construction activities associated with the project, suitable roosting habitat for bats on the project site shall be surveyed by a qualified biologist knowledgeable in bat biology and behavior. Surveys shall consist of a daytime pedestrian survey looking for evidence of bat use (e.g., guano) and a subsequent evening emergence survey. If no bat roosts are found, then no further mitigation is required. If roosts of pallid bats or any other special-status bat species are determined to be present and must be removed, the bats shall be excluded from the roosting site before demolition of the structure or tree removal occurs. A program addressing compensation, exclusion methods, and roost removal procedures shall be developed in consultation with CDFW before demolition occurs. Exclusion methods may include use of one-way doors at roost entrances (bats may leave but not reenter), or sealing roost entrances when the site can be confirmed to contain no bats. Exclusion efforts shall be restricted during periods of sensitive activity [e.g., when bats are found to be hibernating on site or while females in maternity colonies are nursing young (April – August for pallid bats)]. The loss of each roost (if any) may be replaced in consultation with CDFW and may require construction and installation of bat boxes suitable to the bat species and colony size excluded from the original roosting site. If determined necessary during consultation with CDFW, replacement roosts shall be implemented before bats are excluded from the original roost sites. Once the replacement roosts are constructed and it is confirmed that bats are not present in the original roost site, the structures containing roost sites may be demolished and/or trees removed.	LTS
Impact 3.4-2: Loss of migratory bird nests during demolition and vegetation removal. Existing vegetation and buildings on the project site provide suitable nesting sites for migratory birds. Removal of the vegetation and demolition of the buildings would result	PS	**Mitigation Measure 3.4-2: Avoid loss of migratory bird nests**. To avoid loss of migratory bird nests, vegetation removal and demolition of buildings within the project site shall occur outside of the nesting season for migratory birds, between September 1-March 1. If all suitable nesting habitat is removed during the nonbreeding season,	LTS

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
in the loss of nests should they be present. The loss of migratory bird nests, eggs, and young would be potentially significant.		no further mitigation will be required. If it is infeasible for vegetation removal and building demolition to occur outside of the nesting season, a qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys for nesting birds within the project site. The surveys shall be conducted no more than 15 days before vegetation removal or demolition commences. If active nests are located within the project site, a non-disturbance buffer shall be placed around the nest. Within this non-disturbance buffer, no vegetation removal or demolition shall occur until the young have fledged and the nest is no longer active. The radius of the non-disturbance buffer shall be determined by the qualified biologist, based on the species nesting, existing levels of disturbance at the nest, and any vegetative or other screening that may reduce the distance at which the nest would be disturbed.	
3.5 Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources			
Impact 3.5-1: Archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains. The Initial Study (IS) prepared for the project included mitigation that would protect any resources in the event of accidental discovery. That mitigation measure has been included herein and would ensure that the project would have a less-than-significant impact on previously undiscovered cultural resources.	LTS	**Mitigation Measure 3.5-1: Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-1.** ◢ In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Subsection 15064.5(f), should site contractors encounter cultural resources (including midden soil, artifacts, chipped stone, nonnative rock, or unusual amounts of baked clay, shell, or bone) during ground disturbing activities of the project, the permittee and his or her contractors shall halt work within 50 feet of the find and immediately contact a qualified archaeologist (36 CFR Part 61) to assess the significance of the find. If the find is determined to be Native American in origin, the qualified archaeologist shall notify the culturally affiliated tribe. Construction activities could continue in other areas. If the discovery proves to be significant, additional work, such as data recovery excavation, may be warranted and would be discussed in consultation with the applicant, Napa County, the culturally affiliated Native American tribe, and/or any other relevant regulatory agency, as appropriate. ◢ Should site contractors discover paleontological resources during ground disturbing activities of the project, the permittee and his or her contractors shall halt work in that area and within 50 feet of the find and immediately contact a qualified paleontologist to evaluate the find. Construction activities could continue in other areas. If the discovery proves to be significant under Society of Vertebrate Paleontology criteria, additional work, such as fossil recovery excavation, may be warranted and would be discussed in consultation with the applicant, Napa County, and/or any other relevant regulatory agency, as appropriate.	LTS

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
		◢ If site contractors encounter human remains during ground disturbing activities of the project, the permittee and his or her contractors shall immediately notify the Napa County Coroner of the find to determine if an investigation of the cause of death is required and/or if the remains are of Native American origin. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, if such remains are of Native American origin, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendent (MLD). The MLD shall complete the inspection of the site within 48 hours of notification and may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials. ◢ The permittee shall ensure that all persons working on-site shall be bound by contract and instructed in the field to adhere to these provisions and restrictions.	
Impact 3.5-2: Change in the significance of a historic resource. The five buildings on the project site were evaluated and found not eligible for listing in the CRHR or NRHP. As a result, they would not be considered historical resources for the purposes of CEQA. No other historic-age buildings or structures have been identified on the project site. Therefore, the project would have no impact on historical resources.	NI	No mitigation is required.	NI
Impact 3.5-3: Impacts to tribal cultural resources. Napa County sent notification for consultation to three tribes on June 15, 2017. One response was received during the 30-day response period for AB 52 as defined in PRC Section 21074. Middletown Rancheria had no specific comments regarding the project site; therefore, no resources were identified as tribal cultural resources (TCRs). However, the NAHC records search indicated that there are known Sacred Lands within the project site. Therefore, impacts to TCRs is considered to be potentially significant.	PS	**Mitigation Measure 3.5-3: Implement Mitigation Measure 3.5-1.**	LTS
3.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
Impact 3.6-1: Generation of greenhouse gas emissions. The project is estimated to generate 520 MTCO2e from construction activities and 886 MTCO2e operation-related emissions at assumed buildout of the project. Total emissions attributed to project would be 927 MTCO2e/year with combined amortized construction emissions. This mass of GHG emissions would be less than BAAQMD recommended mass emission	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
threshold of 1,100 MTCO2e/year; thus, project-related GHG emissions would not be considered cumulatively considerable. This impact would be less than significant.			
Impact 3.6-2: Impacts of climate change on the project. Climate change is expected to result in a variety of effects that would influence conditions on the project site. These effects include increased temperatures, increased wildfire risk and sea level rise, and changes to timing and intensity of precipitation, resulting in increased stormwater runoff. Not all of these impacts would directly affect the project. there are numerous State and County programs and policies are in place protect the project from and respond to wildland fire and erosion because of stormwater runoff. Further, the project has been designed consistent with County policies for building design standards, fire protection, stormwater impacts, etc. Therefore, the project would not exacerbate the impacts of climate change such that it would create adverse environmental impacts. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
3.7 Noise			
Impact 3.7-1: Construction-generated noise. Construction activity would be limited to Monday through Friday, during less noise-sensitive daytime hours. However, short-term construction-generated daytime noise levels associated with the project could expose nearby noise-sensitive receptors to levels that exceed applicable local standards. This impact would be potentially significant.	PS	**Mitigation Measure 3.7-1: Reduce exposure of existing sensitive receptors to noise generated by construction activities.** The project applicant shall prepare a plan for construction noise reduction and submit the plan to the County for review and approval. The plan shall include measures that demonstrate how the effect of noise levels generated by construction noise sources would be reduced so as not to exceed County noise standards. Noise-control measures shall include: ◢ Noise-reducing enclosures and techniques shall be used around stationary noise-generating equipment (e.g., concrete mixers, generators, compressors). ◢ Install temporary noise curtains as close as possible to the noise-generating activity such that the curtains obstruct the direct line of sight between the noise-generating construction activity and the nearby sensitive receptors. Temporary noise curtains shall consist of durable, flexible composite material featuring a noise barrier layer bounded to sound-absorptive material on one side. The noise barrier layer shall consist of rugged, impervious, material with a surface weight of at least one pound per square foot and result in a minimum of a 5 dB noise reduction at nearby sensitive receptors. Additional noise control measures could include, but are not limited to the following: ◢ All equipment shall be properly maintained and equipped with noise-reduction intake and exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with	LTS

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
		manufacturers' recommendations. Equipment engine shrouds shall be closed during equipment operation. ◢ Where available and feasible, equipment with back-up alarms shall be equipped with either audible self-adjusting backup alarms or alarms that only sound when an object is detected. Self-adjusting backup alarms shall automatically adjust to 5 dB over the surrounding background levels. All non-self-adjusting backup alarms shall be set to the lowest setting required to be audible above the surrounding noise levels. Heavy-duty equipment shall be operated at the lowest operating power possible.	
Impact 3.7-2: Exposure of existing sensitive receptors to excessive traffic noise levels. Traffic generated by the project would result in a traffic noise increase of approximately 0.1 dB on SR 29. This level of noise increase would not be perceptible to the human ear and, therefore, would not be considered a substantial increase in noise. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.7-3: Long-term increase in noise levels from operation of on-site stationary noise sources. The project would result in the addition of stationary noise sources on a site that is currently not in use. Noise sources would include parking lot–related noise, loading dock operations, and noise related to private events at the proposed restaurant. The noise sources associated with the loading area and outdoor activities at the restaurant could exceed applicable Napa County exterior noise standards at the surrounding existing sensitive land uses. This would be a significant impact.	S	**Mitigation Measure 3.7-3a: Reduce exposure of existing sensitive receptors to noise generated by commercial loading/unloading activity.** The project applicant shall submit final design and operation plans that include measures to reduce the effect of noise levels generated by on-site stationary noise sources. The applicant shall demonstrate through the plan how activities in the loading area would be reduced below applicable County noise standards. Measures could include, but are not limited to the following: ◢ Loading docks shall be located and designed such that noise generated by activity at the loading dock would not exceed the County's exterior noise standards (i.e., Exterior: 50 L_{50}/70 L_{max} during daytime hours [7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.] and 45 L_{50}/65 L_{max} during nighttime hours [10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.]; Interior: 45 L_{eq}) at any existing noise sensitive receptor. A specialized noise study shall be completed to evaluate the specific design and ensure compliance with Napa County noise standards. Reduction of loading dock noise can be achieved by locating loading docks as far away as possible from noise sensitive land uses, constructing noise barriers between loading areas and noise-sensitive land uses, or using buildings and topographic features to provide acoustic shielding for noise-sensitive land uses. Final design, location, and orientation shall be dictated by findings in the noise study.	LTS

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
		◢ Operation of loading docks shall not be permitted between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., seven days a week. **Mitigation Measure 3.7-3b: Reduce exposure of existing sensitive receptors to noise generated by special events on the project site.** The project applicant shall submit a speaker/amplification operation plan prepared by an acoustical engineer, that includes measures or siting and operation protocols that would be implemented to reduce the effect of noise levels generated by on-site stationary noise sources. The applicant shall demonstrate through the plan how the speaker/amplification system would not exceed applicable County noise standards. The plan at a minimum should include the following:: ◢ The applicant shall assess the level of noise generated by any proposed speaker/amplification system and model of the system chosen to determine the locations and settings so that they operate at noise levels that do not exceed County standards (i.e., Exterior: 50 L_{50}/70 L_{max} during daytime hours [7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.] and 45 L_{50}/65 L_{max} during nighttime hours [10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.]; Interior: 45 L_{eq}) for any existing sensitive receptor. The locations and settings of the speaker/amplification system shall be reviewed and approved by the County. The speaker/amplification system shall be recalibrated once a year to ensure that it continues to operate in compliance with County noise standards. The results of the calibration, including monitored noise levels, shall be provided to the County. If an exceedance of County standards occurs, the speaker system shall be recalibrated, volumes shall be lowered if necessary, and the system shall be re-reviewed by the County to demonstrate compliance with the County standards. ◢ Operation of amplified music and/or voices shall not be permitted in locations within the project site that are not fully enclosed between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., seven days a week. **Mitigation Measure 3.7-3c: Reduce exposure of existing sensitive receptors to noise generated by mechanical equipment.** The project applicant shall submit final design plans that include measures to reduce the effect of noise levels generated by mechanical equipment. The applicant shall demonstrate through the plan how noise from mechanical equipment would be reduced below applicable County noise standards. These measures could include, but are not limited to the following: ◢ Stationary source mechanical equipment (i.e., pump house, HVAC equipment, emergency generator) shall be located and designed such that noise	

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
		generated by the mechanical equipment would not exceed the County's exterior noise standards (i.e., Exterior: 50 L_{50}/70 L_{max} during daytime hours [7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.] and 45 L_{50}/65 L_{max} during nighttime hours [10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.]; Interior: 45 L_{eq}) at any existing noise sensitive receptor. A specialized noise study shall be completed by an acoustical engineer to evaluate the specific design and ensure compliance with Napa County noise standards. Reduction of mechanical equipment noise can be achieved by locating mechanical equipment as far away as possible from noise sensitive land uses, fully enclosing mechanical equipment, constructing noise barriers between mechanical equipment and noise-sensitive land uses, or using buildings and topographic features to provide acoustic shielding for noise-sensitive land uses. Final design, location, and orientation shall be dictated by findings in the noise study.	
3.8 Public Services and Utilities			
Impact 3.8-1: Impacts to fire services. Because the project would adhere to all applicable standards and fire codes and would not adversely impact or degrade existing fire response and performance, implementation of the project would not necessitate the construction of new or expanded fire services within the Napa County. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.8-2: Impacts related to police services. Because the project would adhere to all applicable standards and safety codes and would not degrade existing police response and performance, implementation of the project would not necessitate the construction of new or expanded police services within the Napa County. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.8-3: Impacts to water or wastewater treatment. Implementation of the project would include the construction of an on-site wastewater treatment and reuse system within the project site that would be for the private use of the project. Water would be treated to comply with Title 22 recycled water requirements and would be stored and utilized throughout the site. The project would not necessitate the construction of new or expanded City or County water treatment or wastewater facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.8-4: Impacts related to water supply and infrastructure. While implementation of the project would increase water demands at the project site, adequate water	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
supplies and infrastructure are available to accommodate the project. Water supply impacts would be less than significant.			
Impact 3.8-5: Impacts related to stormwater. The project would include stormwater storage facilities to serve the site and would not necessitate the need for new or expanded off-site stormwater infrastructure or facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
3.9 Traffic and Transportation			
Impact 3.9-1: Intersections. Implementation of the project would add an estimated 52 weekday p.m. peak hour trips and 64 weekend midday peak hour trips to the roadway network in the study area. Based on the traffic modeling and analysis, all study area intersections would operate at acceptable LOS with the addition of project-generated traffic to the existing and baseline conditions. Thus, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.9-2: Roadway Facilities. Implementation of the project would add an estimated 52 weekday p.m. peak hour trips and 64 weekend midday peak hour trips to the roadway network in the study area. Based on the traffic modeling and analysis, all study area roadway segments would operate at acceptable LOS with the addition of project-generated traffic to the existing and baseline conditions. Thus, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.9-3: Freeway facilities. Queue lengths at the study intersection of SR 29 and Oak Knoll Avenue under Existing Plus Project and Baseline Plus Project conditions would not exceed the existing available storage length. Thus, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.9-4: Bicycle facilities. The project would provide adequate bicycle access and would not conflict with existing plans and policies regarding bicycle facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.9-5: Pedestrian facilities. The project would not adversely affect existing or planned pedestrian facilities; however, it could result in unsafe conditions for pedestrians, or fail to adequately provide for pedestrian access. Therefore, this would impact would be potentially significant.	PS	**Mitigation Measure 3.9-5: Pedestrian facility improvements**. Prior to building permit approval, the following amendments shall be made to the final design of the project and be approved by Napa County: ◢ The permittee shall be responsible for design and installation of a pedestrian crossing of Solano Avenue at the intersection of Solano Avenue/Oak Knoll	LTS

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
		Avenue West, approximately 100 feet north of where the crosswalk is proposed on the conceptual plan (see Exhibit 3.9-2). Final design shall include the specification and installation of two high-visibility signs and advance yield lines in each direction given the high-speed nature of the roadway and potential for frequent pedestrian crossings. Subject to approval by the County Public Works Department, the permittee shall install the pedestrian crossing and related signage improvements prior to issuance by the County of a certificate of occupancy for any building on the property. ◢ Prior to installation of the pedestrian crossing and related signage improvements, the permittee shall design and construct a bicycle and pedestrian connection between the proposed pedestrian crosswalk described above, and the Napa Valley Vine Trail. This would require that the bicycle and pedestrian connection cross the drainage channel that runs parallel to, and between Solano Avenue and the Napa Valley Vine Trail. The applicant shall coordinate with the County to determine the necessary permits for, and design of the bicycle and pedestrian connection over the drainage channel. Crossing of the drainage channel may be subject to regulation by CDFW under Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code. If such a connection over the drainage channel is deemed to be infeasible due to permitting and/or construction constraints, the applicant shall coordinate with the County to identify and implement an appropriate alternative that will ensure adequate pedestrian access, connectivity, and safety for the project. ◢ The permittee shall install on-site pedestrian facilities that connect the relocated crosswalk to the main entrance of the project site, prior to issuance by the County of a certificate of occupancy for any building on the property.	
Impact 3.9-6: Transit. There are no pedestrian facilities along Solano Avenue near the site; and therefore, the project would not adequately provide access to transit. Thus, this impact would be significant.	S	**Mitigation Measure 3.9-6: Pedestrian facility improvements.** See Mitigation Measure 3.9-5 detailed above.	LTS
Impact 3.9-7: Emergency Access. The project would be designed according to County standards; and thus, would provide adequate emergency access. This is impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Impact 3.9-8: Transportation hazards. Roadway hazards may be associated with the project driveway or internal project roadways, based on a review of concept plans. The project's access driveway and internal roadways would be designed to County	PS	**Mitigation Measure 3.9-8: Traffic safety improvements to site plans.** Prior to building permit approval, the following amendments shall be made to the final designs of the project and approved by Napa County:	LTS

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
standards (including width and turning radius requirements for safe access by emergency vehicles). This would avoid the potential for the driveway to impede emergency access. However, traffic safety hazards may be associated with project landscaping if it limits views of oncoming traffic on Solano Avenue, with the design of the proposed left-turn lane on Solano Avenue into the project site, and with the on-site design of the proposed loading dock. Thus, potential roadway conditions could result in potentially significant traffic hazard impacts.		◢ The project applicant shall ensure that the proposed landscaping does not encroach into the sight distance triangle (a triangle formed between the location where the driver makes the decision to exit the driveway [decision point], the location of the approaching vehicle on Solano Avenue, and the location where the two vehicles would intersect). ◢ The left-turn lane proposed on the conceptual plan shall be designed in accordance with the current Napa County Road and Street Standards at the time of submittal of final design. ◢ The project applicant shall redesign the southeastern corner of the property, in the vicinity of the loading area, to include a turnaround that would allow large vehicles to turn around on-site and to make forward movements both off of and onto Solano Avenue. The redesigned site improvements in this portion of the property shall be subject to approval by the County Engineering and Roads Divisions prior to the Public Works Director's issuance of an encroachment permit to construct the driveway from Solano Avenue into the loading area.	
Impact 3.9-9: Construction-related traffic impacts. Construction would generate new temporary daily trips to and from the project site. The number of construction generated trips would be fewer than that generated by operation of the project. Operation of the project does not result in any LOS impacts; and thus, the addition of construction trips to the roadway network would not result in any intersection or roadway segment impacts. However, right-of-way improvements could impede travel along Solano Avenue during construction hours. Thus, this impact would be potentially significant.	PS	**Mitigation Measure 3.9-9: Traffic Control Plan/Detour Plan.** Prior to construction, a detailed Traffic Control Plan/Detour Plan shall be submitted to the County that takes into account the safety of all modes of travel during construction in the County's right-of-way. The requirements of the Traffic Control Plan/Detour Plan shall be dictated, reviewed, and approved by the Napa County Public Works Department. At a minimum, the plan shall include: ◢ Description of street closures and/or bicycle and pedestrian facility closures including: duration, advance warning and posted signage, safe and efficient access routes for existing businesses and emergency vehicles, and use of manual traffic control. ◢ Description of driveway access plan including: provisions for safe vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle travel, minimum distance from any open trench, special signage, and private vehicle accesses.	LTS
3.10 Energy			
Impact 3.10-1: Wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, during project construction or operation. The project would increase electricity and natural gas consumption at the site relative to existing conditions. However, the Napa County General Plan would require the project to meet the California Code of	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance after Mitigation
Regulations Title 24 standards for building energy efficiency which are more stringent than those at the time the existing site was built, resulting in increased energy efficiency. Additionally, per Policy CON-72 of the Napa County General Plan, the County would provide information to the public and builders on available energy conservation techniques, products, and methods available to exceed the Title 24 standards by 15 percent or more. Construction energy consumption would be temporary and not require additional capacity or increased peak or base period demands for electricity or other forms of energy. The project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy. Thus, the impact would be less than significant.			
Impact 3.10-2: Demand for energy services and facilities. Adequate infrastructure and capacity exists adjacent to the project area that can meet the project's energy needs. No new facilities or services would be required. Thus, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

NI = No impact, LTS = Less than significant, PS = Potentially significant, S = Significant, SU = Significant and unavoidable

This page intentionally left blank