

“C”

Initial Study/Negative Declaration

Balloons Above the Valley Hot Air Balloon Launch Site
Use Permit P19-00303
Planning Commission Hearing September 2, 2020

**COUNTY OF NAPA
PLANNING, BUILDING AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT
1195 THIRD STREET SUITE 210
NAPA, CA 94559
(707) 253-4417**

**Initial Study Checklist
(form updated January 2019)**

1. **Project Title:** Balloons Above the Valley Balloon Launch Use Permit P19-00303
2. **Property Owner:** Robert Barbarick, (707) 258-8888, bob@balloonrides.com
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Emily Hedge, (707) 259-8226, Emily.Hedge@CountyofNapa.org
4. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number (APN):** 5360 Washington Street, Napa; 036-130-029-000
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Robert Barbarick, 603 California Boulevard, Napa, CA 94559
6. **General Plan description:** Agricultural Resources (AR)
7. **Zoning:** Agricultural Preserve (AP)
8. **Background/Project History:**

On June 6, 2019, the Zoning Administrator approved Administrative Permit P19-00235 to allow balloon launchings in compliance with County Code Section 18.126.060(O). The permit allows 50 or few launch days per year, from the approval date.

Application for this Use Permit (P19-00303) was received June 28, 2019, and is the project as described below.
9. **Description of Project:**

The Use Permit would allow daily launching of up to eight hot air balloons. Hours of operation would be 5:30 a.m. and 9:30 a.m. with launches starting no earlier than 7:00 a.m. Guests are picked up from pre-arranged locations such as lodging facilities or public sites (i.e. Oxbow Public Market) and driven to the site. Generally, there are two transport vehicles per balloon to transport guests and one vehicle per balloon carrying equipment. Equipment, including balloons, fuel, and safety equipment, is brought to the site from the business' offsite storage site and set up for launching. According to the applicant, preparing for a launch takes approximately 15 minutes for the crew to unload the equipment and approximately 20 minutes for inflation of the balloon. Passengers are then loaded into the balloons and given a briefing from the pilot. Multiple balloons can be launched simultaneously depending on the weather. Following the launch, the transport vehicle(s) and equipment truck follow the balloon to the landing site. Guests are taken back to their pick up location and equipment is returned to the equipment storage location. Vehicles do not return to the launch site. As proposed, the permit would allow daily launches, throughout the year, however the applicant has estimated that due to seasonal variability and weather, actual launch days are estimated to be closer to 229 days per year. Additionally, scheduling appointments varies and potentially not all eight balloons would launch every day of operation.
10. **Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses.**

The 2.03-acre parcel is located in the unincorporated County, approximately 1.4 miles north of the City of Napa and 1.75 miles south of the Town of Yountville. The site is accessed via a private driveway off of Washington Street. The parcel is currently developed with an approximately 1,500 square foot single family residence with an attached garage and a detached storage shed. The eastern 1.25 acres is undeveloped grass with some trees. At the closest location, Dry Creek is approximately 1,300 feet from the southeastern corner of the property.

The adjacent properties to the north and west are developed with residential structures. The property is bordered to the east and south by one parcel, developed with a residence, agricultural structures, and planted in vineyards. Residential neighborhoods are located approximately 950 feet to the south of the site and across State Highway 29 and Solano Avenue approximately 800 feet to the southwest.

The property and all adjacent parcels have a General Plan designation of Agricultural Resource (AR) and a Zoning designation of Agricultural Preserve (AP).

11. **Other agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).
None.

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

Other Agencies Contacted
None.

12. **Tribal Cultural Resources.** Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resource, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

On March 20, 2020, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. No responses were received.

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- 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.

Emily Hedge

August 11, 2020

Signature

Date

Name: Emily Hedge, Planner III

Napa County
Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department

| I. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? | <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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

a.-d. The project does not include any physical improvements on the site. The operations would utilize the existing driveway and paved areas on site for temporary parking of the pick-up vehicles and equipment trucks. Balloons would launch from the undeveloped, grass area of the property. Balloon launching is currently occurring at the site per Administrative Permit P19-00235, and would not be a new visible occurrence at the site. Views from Washington Street or Highway 29 would not be changed.

The project would not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista, substantially damage scenic resources, or degrade the existing public views of the site or its surroundings. No new lighting is proposed. The project would have no impact on aesthetic resources.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. ¹ Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as | <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.

defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)?

- 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?
- 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?

Discussion:

The parcel is currently developed with an approximately 1,500 square foot single family residence with an attached garage and a detached storage shed. The eastern 1.25 acres is undeveloped grass with some trees. Launches would occur on the undeveloped area. The project does not include any physical improvements on the site. The operations would utilize the existing driveway and paved areas on-site for temporary parking of the pick-up vehicle and equipment trucks. The continued use of the property for hot air balloon launching would not impact agricultural or forest resources.

- a. The FMMP Map designates the property as "Urban and Built up Land". The continued use of the property for hot air balloon launching would not convert farmland to another use. No impact would occur.
- b. The property is zoned Agricultural Preserve (AP). In 2006, the Napa County Board of Supervisors approved Ordinance #1276, permitting hot air balloon launchings in any zoning district upon grant of a Use Permit. The site is currently a residential property and conducts hot air balloon launchings in compliance with Administrative Permit P19-00235. There is no active agricultural use on the property at this time. As noted, the project does not include physical improvements that would prohibit future agricultural use. There are no agricultural contracts on the property. The project would not conflict with zoning or an agricultural contract. No impact would occur.
- c.-d. The property is zoned Agricultural Preserve (AP). The project would not impact forest land or timberland. No impact would occur.
- e. No physical improvements are proposed that would convert farmland to non-agricultural use. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None

| 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: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|------|--|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | b) 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) Board of Directors unanimously adopted thresholds of significance to assist in the review of projects under the California Environmental Quality Act. These Thresholds are designed to establish the level at which BAAQMD believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA and were posted on BAAQMD's website

and included in BAAQMD's updated CEQA Guidelines (updated May 2012). The Thresholds are advisory and may be followed by local agencies at their own discretion.

The Thresholds were challenged in court. Following litigation in the trial court, the court of appeal, and the California Supreme Court, all of the Thresholds were upheld. However, in an opinion issued on December 17, 2015, the California Supreme Court held that CEQA does not generally require an analysis of the impacts of locating development in areas subject to environmental hazards unless the project would exacerbate existing environmental hazards. The Supreme Court also found that CEQA requires the analysis of exposing people to environmental hazards in specific circumstances, including the location of development near airports, schools near sources of toxic contamination, and certain exemptions for infill and workforce housing. The Supreme Court also held that public agencies remain free to conduct this analysis regardless of whether it is required by CEQA.

In view of the Supreme Court's opinion, local agencies may rely on Thresholds designed to reflect the impact of locating development near areas of toxic air contamination where such an analysis is required by CEQA or where the agency has determined that such an analysis would assist in making a decision about the project. However, the Thresholds are not mandatory and agencies should apply them only after determining that they reflect an appropriate measure of a project's impacts. These Guidelines may inform environmental review for development projects in the Bay Area, but do not commit local governments or BAAQMD to any specific course of regulatory action.

BAAQMD published a new version of the Guidelines dated May 2017, which includes revisions made to address the Supreme Court's opinion. The May 2017 Guidelines update does not address outdated references, links, analytical methodologies or other technical information that may be in the Guidelines or Thresholds Justification Report. The Air District is currently working to revise any outdated information in the Guidelines as part of its update to the CEQA Guidelines and thresholds of significance.

- a-d. The mountains bordering Napa Valley block much of the prevailing northwesterly winds throughout the year. Sunshine is plentiful in Napa County, and summertime can be very warm in the valley, particularly in the northern end. Winters are usually mild, with cool temperatures overnight and mild-to-moderate temperatures during the day. Wintertime temperatures tend to be slightly cooler in the northern end of the valley. Winds are generally calm throughout the county. Annual precipitation averages range from about 24 inches in low elevations to more than 40 inches in the mountains.

Ozone and fine particle pollution, or PM2.5, are the major regional air pollutants of concern in the San Francisco Bay Area. Ozone is primarily a problem in the summer, and fine particle pollution in the winter. In Napa County, ozone rarely exceeds health standards, but PM2.5 occasionally does reach unhealthy concentrations. There are multiple reasons for PM2.5 exceedances in Napa County. First, much of the county is wind-sheltered, which tends to trap PM2.5 within the Napa Valley. Second, much of the area is well north of the moderating temperatures of San Pablo Bay and, as a result, Napa County experiences some of the coldest nights in the Bay Area. This leads to greater fireplace use and, in turn, higher PM2.5 levels. Finally, in the winter easterly winds often move fine-particle-laden air from the Central Valley to the Carquinez Strait and then into western Solano and southern Napa County (BAAQMD, *In Your Community: Napa County*, April 2016)

The impacts associated with implementation of the project were evaluated consistent with guidance provided by BAAQMD. Ambient air quality standards have been established by state and federal environmental agencies for specific air pollutants most pervasive in urban environments. These pollutants are referred to as criteria air pollutants because the standards established for them were developed to meet specific health and welfare criteria set forth in the enabling legislation. The criteria air pollutants potentially emitted by development, traffic and other activities anticipated under the proposed development include ozone, ozone precursors oxides of nitrogen and reactive organic gases (NOx and ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO2), and suspended particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5). Other criteria pollutants, such as lead and sulfur dioxide (SO2), would not be substantially emitted by the proposed development or traffic, and air quality standards for them are being met throughout the Bay Area.

BAAQMD has not officially recommended the use of its thresholds in CEQA analyses and CEQA ultimately allows lead agencies the discretion to determine whether a particular environmental impact would be considered significant, as evidenced by scientific or other factual data. BAAQMD also states that lead agencies need to determine appropriate air quality thresholds to use for each project they review based on substantial evidence that they include in the administrative record of the CEQA document. One resource BAAQMD provides as a reference for determining appropriate thresholds is the *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines* developed by its staff in 2010 and as updated through May 2017. These guidelines outline substantial evidence supporting a variety of thresholds of significance.

As mentioned above, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines thresholds of significance for air pollutants (Table 2-1 – Air Quality CEQA Thresholds of Significance), which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. Given the potential quantity of propane used during a balloon flight, 20-60 gallons per hour flight (estimate provided by applicant), the project would contribute fall below the threshold of 1,100 MT of CO2e/yr for “GHGs – Projects other than Stationary Sources”

(https://www.eia.gov/environment/emissions/co2_vol_mass.php). The project falls below the screening criteria and consequently will

not significantly affect air quality individually or contribute considerably to any cumulative air quality impacts.

Hot air balloon launching is already occurring on the site per Administrative Permit P19-00235 (up to 50 launch days per year). As proposed, the permit would allow launches daily, throughout the year, however the applicant has estimated that due to seasonal variability and weather, actual launch days are estimated to be closer to 229 days per year. Potential emissions associated with the activity of the launch are limited and the continued use of the property for hot air balloon launching would not have a significant impact on air quality.

Operational emissions - The balloon operates through the use of propane burners. The combustion of propane yields carbon dioxide and water. Given the potential quantity of propane used, 20-60 gallons per hour flight, the project would contribute fall below the threshold of 1,100 MT of CO₂e/yr for “GHGs – Projects other than Stationary Sources” (https://www.eia.gov/environment/emissions/co2_vol_mass.php).

In its gaseous form, propane is odorless. However, an odorant (a strong smelling chemical compound) is added to propane to indicate the leakage of even small quantities of gas. The odorant normally added to propane, ethyl mercaptan, loses its odor when burned (https://www.faa.gov/regulations_policies/handbooks_manuals/aircraft/media/FAA-H-8083-11.pdf).

Transportation emissions – The primary emissions associated with the project would be generated from vehicle trips to and from the site. As discussed in the Project Description, guests are picked up from pre-arranged locations such as lodging facilities or public sites (i.e. Oxbow Public Market) and driven to the site. Generally, there are two transport vehicles per balloon to transport guests (16 vehicles) and one vehicle per balloon carrying equipment (8 vehicles). Equipment, including balloons, trailers, fuel, and propane tanks, is brought to the site from the business’ offsite storage site and set up for launching. Following the launch, the transport vehicle(s) and equipment truck follow the balloon to the landing site. Guests are taken back to their pick up location and equipment is returned to the equipment storage location. Vehicles do not return to the launch site. A launch day completing the maximum of eight balloon launches could result in as many as 48 trips (24 vehicles arriving and departing the site).

Construction emissions – The project does not include any physical improvements on the site, therefore no construction related emissions would occur.

The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or result in other emissions or odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts to Air Quality would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| IV. | BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-----|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | 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 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (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?
- e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
- f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Discussion:

Review of the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (GIS maps) did not identify any biological resources on site. At the closest location, Dry Creek is approximately 1,300 feet from the southeastern corner of the property. The project does not include any physical improvements on the site. The operations would utilize the existing driveway and paved areas on site for temporary parking of the pick-up vehicles and equipment vehicles. The continued use of the property for hot air balloon launching would not impact biological resources.

- a. The project would not have a substantial effect on candidate, sensitive, or special status species. No impact would occur.
- b. There is not any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities on the site. No impact would occur.
- c. There are no wetlands on the site or in close proximity to the site. No impact would occur.
- d. There is no new proposed development that would interfere with the movement of wildlife species, impact wildlife corridors, or impeded wildlife nursery site. No impact would occur.
- e.-f. The parcel is not subject to a tree preservation policy or ordinance, or a local, regional, or state habit conservation plan. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| V. | CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|----|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to 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) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a.-c. Review of the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (GIS) did not identify any cultural resources on site. There are no records of human remains having been encountered on the property. The project does not include any physical improvements on the site; no construction or earth disturbing activities are proposed. The continued use of the property for hot air balloon launching would not impact cultural resources or human remains.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| VI. | ENERGY. Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-----|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project does not include construction of new structures or installation of new lighting. No impacts would occur.
- b. The site is not subject to a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| VII. | GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|------|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | a) Directly or indirectly cause 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial direct or indirect 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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?
- f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Discussion:

- a. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps, no faults identified on the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault map are located on the property. A portion of the West Napa Fault line runs over the driveway portion of the property. Use of this area is limited to vehicles dropping of guests or equipment. All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. The project would not increase the risk of this occurring. The parcel is very flat and has a low potential for liquefaction or landslides. The project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death related to rupture of an earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking or ground failure, or landslides. No impact would occur.
- b.-d. The project does not proposed any physical improvements on the site, that would be impacted by or result in landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or expansive soils. No impact would occur.
- e. The existing residential facilities and associated septic system will not be used by the hot air balloon launching operation. No impacts would occur.
- f. The project does not propose any physical improvements or ground disturbing activity that would destroy unique paleontological resource, site or feature. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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:

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

In July 2015, the County re-commenced preparation of the CAP to: i) account for present day conditions and modeling assumptions (such as but

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

- a-b. Overall increases in Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions in Napa County were assessed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the Napa County General Plan Update and certified in June 2008. GHG emissions were found to be significant and unavoidable in that document, despite the adoption of mitigation measures incorporating specific policies and action items into the General Plan. Consistent with these General Plan action items, Napa County participated in the development of a community-wide GHG emissions inventory and "emission reduction framework" for all local jurisdictions in the County in 2008-2009. This planning effort was completed by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency in December 2009, and served as the basis for development of a refined inventory and emission reduction plan for unincorporated Napa County.

In 2011, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) released California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Project Screening Criteria and Significance of Thresholds [1,100 metric tons per year (MT) of carbon dioxide and carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e)]. This threshold of significance is appropriate for evaluating projects in Napa County. During our ongoing planning effort, the County requires project applicants to consider methods to reduce GHG emissions consistent with Napa County General Plan Policy CON-65(e). (Note: Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, because this initial study assesses a project that is consistent with an adopted General Plan for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was prepared, it appropriately focuses on impacts which are "peculiar to the project," rather than the cumulative impacts previously assessed.) For the purposes of this analysis potential GHG emissions associated with winery 'construction' and 'development' and with 'ongoing' winery operations have been discussed.

GHGs are the atmospheric gases whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for the greenhouse effect, including carbon dioxide, methane, ozone, and the fluorocarbons, that contribute to climate change (a widely accepted theory/science explain human effects on the atmosphere). Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) gas, the principal greenhouse gas (GHG) being emitted by human activities, and whose concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity, also serves as the reference gas to compare other greenhouse gases. Agricultural sources of carbon emissions include forest clearing, land-use changes, biomass burning, and farm equipment and management activity emissions (http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/glossary/letter_c.html). Equivalent Carbon Dioxide (CO₂e) is the most commonly reported type of GHG emission and a way to get one number that approximates total emissions from all the different gasses that contribute to GHG (BAAMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2017). In this case, carbon dioxide (CO₂) is used as the reference atom/compound to obtain atmospheric carbon CO₂ effects of GHG. Carbon stocks are converted to carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e) by multiplying the carbon total by 44/12 (or 3.67), which is the ratio of the atomic mass of a carbon dioxide molecule to the atomic mass of a carbon atom (<http://www.nciasi2.org/COLE/index.html>)

Hot air balloon launching is already occurring on the site per Administrative Permit P19-00235 (up to 50 launch days per year). As proposed, the permit would allow launches daily, throughout the year, however the applicant has estimated that due to seasonal variability and weather, actual launch days are estimated to be closer to 229 days per year.

Operational emissions - The balloon operates through the use of propane burners. The combustion of propane yields carbon dioxide and water. Given the potential quantity of propane used, 20-60 gallons per hour flight, the project would contribute fall below the threshold of 1,100 MT of CO₂e/yr for "GHGs – Projects other than Stationary Sources" (https://www.eia.gov/environment/emissions/co2_vol_mass.php).

Transportation emissions – The primary emissions associated with the project would be generated from vehicle trips to and from the site. As discussed in the Project Description, guests are picked up from pre-arranged locations such as lodging facilities or public sites (i.e. Oxbow Public Market) and driven to the site. Generally, there are two transport vehicles per balloon to transport guests (16 vehicles) and one vehicle per balloon carrying equipment (8 vehicles). Equipment, including balloons, trailers, fuel, and propane tanks, is brought to the site from the business' offsite storage site and set up for launching. Following the launch, the transport vehicle(s) and equipment truck follow the balloon to the landing site. Guests are taken back to their pick up location and equipment is returned to the equipment storage location. Vehicles do not return to the launch site. A launch day completing the maximum of eight balloon launches could result in as many as 48 trips (24 vehicles arriving and departing the site). BAAQMD's 1999 CEQA Guidelines (p.24) states that the District generally does not recommend a detailed air quality analysis for projects generating less than 2,000 vehicle trips per day, unless warranted by the specific nature of the project or project setting.

Construction emissions – The project does not include any physical improvements on the site, therefore no construction related emissions would occur.

As indicated above, the County is currently preparing a CAP and as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the

CAP has released Final Technical Memorandum #1 (2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016). Table 1 of the Technical Memorandum indicates that 2% of the County's GHG emissions in 2014 were a result of land use change. The increase in emissions expected as a result of the project would be relatively modest and the project is in compliance with the County's efforts to reduce emissions as described above. For these reasons, project impacts related to GHG emissions are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| IX. | HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-----|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | 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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | f) 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"/> |
| | g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a.-c. The equipment, including fuel and propane tanks, is brought to the site from the business' offsite storage location and set up for launching. Following the launch, the equipment vehicle follows the balloon to the landing site and the equipment is returned to the equipment storage location. Equipment and fuel are not stored on site. A business plan for the offsite storage location would be filed with the Environmental Health Division should hazardous materials reach reportable levels. The parcel is not within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The project would not create a significant hazard to the public, environment, or school facility. No impact would occur.
- d. Based on a search of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control database, the project site does not contain any known EPA National Priority List sites, State response sites, voluntary cleanup sites, or any school cleanup sites. The project site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites. No impact would occur.
- e. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public or public use airport. No impact would occur.

- f. The site is not subject to an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. The project does not include physical development or changes to existing driveway that would interfere with emergency response or evacuation.
- g. The project does not include construction of new structures. As noted above, the project does not include physical changes to existing driveway that would interfere with emergency response or evacuation in a wild-land fire situation. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| X. | HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|----|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 or through the addition of impervious surfaces which would: | | | | |
| | i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | ii) 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | iii) 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | iv) impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a. During a launch day, equipment, including balloons, trailers, fuel, and propane tanks, is brought to the site from the business' offsite storage site and set up for launching. Launch preparation occurs and guests are then loaded into the balloons and given a briefing from the pilot. Following the launch, the transport vehicle(s) and equipment truck follow the balloon to the landing site. Guests are taken back to their pick up location and equipment is returned to the equipment storage location. Vehicles do not return to the launch site. Activities associated with a launch will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or degrade water quality. No impact would occur.
- b. The existing residential facilities (kitchen, restrooms, septic system) will not be used by the hot air balloon launching operation. The

operation would not utilize groundwater, therefore it will not interfere with groundwater recharge. No impact would occur.

- c. The project does not include any physical improvements on the site and therefore would not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site, increase erosion or siltation on or off the project site, increase surface runoff, create or contribute runoff water, or impede or redirect flood flows. No impact would occur.
- d. The site lies outside the boundaries of the 100 and 500 year flood hazard boundaries of Dry Creek, which is approximately 1,300 feet from the southeastern corner of the property. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. No impacts would occur.
- e. The operation would not utilize groundwater. Additionally, the project site is not subject to a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. The proposed project would not conflict with an adopted plan. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| XI. | LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-----|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | a) Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a. Launches would take place on the undeveloped area of the property. No physical improvements are proposed and no new development is proposed. The existing 1,500 square foot single family residence with an attached garage and a detached storage shed on the property would remain. No impact would occur.
- b. The property is zoned Agricultural Preserve (AP). In 2006, the Napa County Board of Supervisors approved Ordinance #1276, permitting hot air balloon launchings in any zoning district upon grant of a Use Permit. The site is currently developed with a residence and conducts hot air balloon launchings in compliance with Administrative Permit P19-00235. There is no active agricultural use on the property at this time. As noted, the project does not include physical improvements that would prohibit future agricultural use. The project would not conflict with zoning. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| XII. | MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|------|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | 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?

Discussion:

a.-b. Historically, the two most valuable mineral commodities in Napa County in economic terms have been mercury and mineral water. More recently, building stone and aggregate have become economically valuable. Mines and Mineral Deposits mapping included in the Napa County Baseline Data Report (Mines and Mineral Deposits, BDR Figure 2-2) indicates that there are no known mineral resources nor any locally important mineral resource recovery sites located on the project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| XIII. | NOISE. Would the project result in: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project 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) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

a. An outdoor sound study to assess the noise associated with the launch of a hot air balloon was prepared by RGD Acoustical. The report, dated December 31, 2019, evaluated the potential noise impacts and compliance with Napa County Code Section 8.16 Noise Control Regulations. To quantify the noise from the launch of a hot air balloon, noise measurements were made at four locations at and around the launch site on the morning of December 16, 2019. The closest monitor R-1 was set up along the parcel's southern property line, approximately 234 feet from the launch site. Two monitors R-2 and R-3 were set up near the potentially affected residences to the south of the project site, approximately 930 feet and 1,200 feet respectively. The fourth monitor S-1 was set up approximately 50 feet from the balloon to serve as a reference for further calculations. Ambient noise level in the area is generally dominated by vehicular traffic from Highway 29. Other noise sources included local traffic and occasional birds and aircraft flyover. The ambient noise levels were measured before and after the balloon launch. The balloon launch process from start of inflation to lift off lasted approximately 15 minutes. After lift-off the balloon drifted southerly, in the direction of the homes to the east of Washington Street, and directly over the noise monitor R-2. According to the pilot the balloon was approximately 600 feet above the ground when it was over the noise monitor.

At the time the study was prepared, the project description included launches starting at 6:00 a.m. so the study compared recorded noise levels to both the daytime hours (7 a.m. to 10 p.m.) and nighttime hours (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.). The study found that the noise level from the operation of multiple balloon launches (four balloons in one hour) would exceed the nighttime noise limitations at the closest receiver R-1. The noise level did not exceed daytime standards at any of the receiver locations. The project was then revised to not launch balloons until 7:00 a.m. Noise associated with the launch, occurring between the proposed hours of operation between 7 a.m. and 9:30 a.m., would do not conflict with County code.

Employees driving the pick-up vehicles and equipment vehicles are trained to minimize noise while driving on to the property and request guests to close and/or slide vehicle doors quietly. Employees and guests are instructed not to shout or call loudly while on site prior to

their balloon launch. The project would not exceed permitted County noise levels. Impacts would be less than significant.

- b. The type of noise generated by the launch does not include vibration or groundborne noises. No impact would occur.
- c. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Induce substantial unplanned 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 people or housing, 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 expand the operation of an existing business. While the business may expand from its current operations, it is unlikely that the approval would result in a substantial population growth. No new infrastructure or infrastructure improvements are proposed as part of this project. No impact would occur.
- b. The existing 1,500 square foot single family residence with an attached garage and a detached storage shed on the property would remain. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| XV. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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: | | | | |
| i) Fire protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) Police protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| iii) Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Parks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| v) Other public facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a. The project would expand the operation of an existing business. While the business may expand from its current operations, it is unlikely that the approval would increase the need for or impact existing service levels of local public services. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| XVI. RECREATION. Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 expand the operation of an existing business. While the business may expand from its current operations, it is unlikely that the approval would impact existing recreational facilities or necessitate the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| XVII. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-14, 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"/> |

Discussion:

Guests are picked up from pre-arranged locations such as lodging facilities or public sites (i.e. Oxbow Public Market) and driven to the site. Generally, there are two transport vehicles per balloon to transport guests (16 vehicles) and one vehicle per balloon carrying equipment (8 vehicles). Equipment, including balloons, trailers, fuel, and propane tanks, is brought to the site from the business' offsite storage site and set up for launching. Following the launch, the transport vehicle(s) and equipment truck follow the balloon to the landing site. Guests are taken back to their pick up location and equipment is returned to the equipment storage location. Vehicles do not return to the launch site. Equipment and transport vehicles would generally arrive at the site prior to 6:00 a.m. and would leave shortly after balloon launchings beginning at 7:00 a.m. Launches are required to end by 9:30 a.m. A launch day completing the maximum of eight balloon launches could result in as many as 48 trips (24 vehicles arriving and departing the site). As proposed, the permit would allow launches daily, throughout the year, however the applicant has estimated that due to seasonal variability and weather, actual launch days are estimated to be closer to 229 days per year. Additionally, scheduling appointments varies and potentially not all eight balloons would launch every day of operation, reducing the number of equipment vehicles and guest transport vehicles.

- a. The additional trips would not conflict with a plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system in this area. It is likely that most of the incoming trips would arrive prior to the morning peak hour times on Highway 29 are generally (7:00 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.), and outgoing trips would be spread out during the remaining hours as the balloons launch. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. Based on balloon capacity, which can accommodate 11-15 guests, a day completing the maximum of eight balloon launches could see between 88 and 120 guests. However, guests are picked up in groups from local lodging facilities and public sites, reducing the overall vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. The site is currently used for hot air balloon launchings in compliance with Administrative Permit P19-00235, allowing up to 50 launch days per year. Trips are generally be limited to the hours of 5:30 a.m. - 9:30 a.m. There is adequate room on the site so that vehicles associated with the operation will not interfere with residential use of the driveway and parking area. The project does not include physical development or changes to existing driveway that would increase hazards. No impact would occur.
- d. The project does not include physical development or changes to existing driveway that would interfere with emergency response or evacuation. No impact would occur.
- e. Vehicles associated with the project will generally be limited onsite to the hours of 5:30 a.m. - 9:30 a.m. The vehicles will park during the launch and leave shortly after, as described above. Individual cars will not be traveling to and parking on the site. The project will not include excessive parking. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k); or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

On March 20, 2020, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. No responses were received.

a.-b. No physical improvements are proposed and no new development is proposed. Launches would take place on the undeveloped area of the property. The project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of a new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) 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"/> |
| d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

- e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Discussion:

a.-e. The existing residential facilities (kitchen, restrooms, septic system, trash) will not be used by the operation. The project does not propose the construction of any new on-site facilities, or require improvements to water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities. The operation would not utilize groundwater or generate wastewater or solid waste on site. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures:

| XX. | WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-----|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | b) Due to slope, prevailing winds and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

The project site is located on the valley floor, with slopes less than 5%. The project site is surrounded by vineyards on the north, east, and south property lines. Residential structures are located to the north and west, with Washington Street and Highway 29 to the west. Vineyards and roads serve as natural fire breaks.

- a. There are no proposed changes to existing access road or site configuration. The project does not include physical development or changes to existing driveway that would interfere with emergency response or evacuation.
- b.-d. The project site is located on the valley floor, with slopes less than 5%. No new physical improvements or development that would increase wildfire risk are proposed.

In regards to general fire safety, the applicant notes that all equipment trucks and passenger vehicles are equipped with fire extinguishers that are inspected and certified by the Napa City Fire Department. Each employee is trained and updated monthly on fire prevention and company emergency procedures. Additionally, every balloon is also equipped with fire extinguishers. All passengers are given pre-flight safety instructions and must agree to follow them and their pilot's directions before the launches can take place.

In order to address previous neighbor concerns regarding the PG&E Power lines on the property, the property owner completed conversion of overhead power lines to underground power lines. The buried PG&E power line is located along the property's southern property line adjacent to the southern neighbor's vineyard access road. It extends 450 feet east to the edge of the neighboring property vineyard. It is not beneath or close to the launch site.

The proposed activity would not exacerbate wildfire risks or expose occupants to pollutant concentrations or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. A wildfire would not impact the slope or drainage of the property. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

| XXI. | MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|------|--|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

- a. As discussed, no new physical improvements or development are proposed. The project would not physically alter the parcel in a way that would impact wildlife habitat or disturb cultural or historical resources. The continued use of the property for hot air balloon launching would not result in an impact.
- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential impacts to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions are discussed in the respective sections above and were determined to have a less than significant impact. Potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant.
- c. All impacts identified in this negative declaration are less than significant and do not require mitigation. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in environmental effects that cause substantial adverse effects on human being either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.