

COUNTY OF NAPA

CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPARTMENT
1195 THIRD ST., SUITE 210
NAPA, CA 94559
(707) 253-4416

Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration

1. **Project Title:** St. Helena Hospital Woodside Subdivision; Use Permit (#P07-00855-UP); Tentative Map (#P07-00856-TM); Rezoning (#P07-00857-RZ)
2. **Property Owner:** St. Helena Hospital (Stan Tempchin, Executive Director Facility Services), 10 Woodland Drive, St. Helena Ca 94574
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Sean Trippi, Principal Planner, 253-4417, strippi@co.napa.ca.us.
4. **Project location and APN:** The project area is located between Sanitarium Road and Deer Park Road, approximately 2.5 to 3.0 miles northeast of St. Helena. The project area includes approximately 92-acres and is comprised of the following Assessor's Parcel numbers:

Tentative Map only – 021-110-015; 021-140-001, 003, 005; and, 021-150-001, 002, 007
Tentative Map & Rezoning – 021-171-001; 021-172-004; and 021-400-011
Rezoning only – 021-171-002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008, 012, 013 and 021-181-001, 002, 005, 007, 009, 010
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Stan Tempchin, 10 Woodland Drive, St. Helena Ca, 94574
6. **Hazardous Waste Sites:** The project area is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.
7. **Project Description:**

The request includes a tentative map to create individual parcels for the 25 existing single-family dwellings owned by the St Helena Hospital, the St. Helena Hospital and Health Center, or the Northern California Conference of 7th Day Adventists, hereafter referred to as St. Helena Hospital. The St. Helena Hospital would retain ownership of the land. The homes could be owned by the resident to provide the homeowner an opportunity to establish equity. The request also includes rezoning properties owned by the St. Helena Hospital from Residential Single: Building Site Combination District – 5-acre minimum (RS:B-5) to Planned Development (PD) consistent with other property owned by the Hospital. A Use permit is also requested to allow the future construction of additions or buildings accessory to the existing homes in the PD district without going through the use permit process each time as is currently required by County Code. The Use Permit would also allow 12 existing structures on the hospital campus to be considered "flex space" that would allow residential uses, administrative offices or clinical/hospital related uses. No new development or the creation of new developable lots is included in this proposal. However 2-3 of the proposed lots (Lots 9, 15, & 16) could potentially require alterations to comply with the appropriate fire resistive construction requirements which would generally entail removing exterior siding materials and applying fire resistive materials to the framing of the structures and replacing the siding materials. This would only be necessary if the portions of the existing structures are less than 5-feet from the proposed property and the construction does not meet currently the fire resistive building requirements.

The tentative map would involve subdividing 10 lots into 31 lots. Three of the 10 lots are currently zoned RS:B-5 and the remaining 7 are zoned PD. Twenty-five (25) of the new lots would be created for existing homes. Two (2) lots would include the main hospital campus and associated buildings and improvements. One (1) lot would include existing apartment buildings. The remaining three (3) lots would remain as open space.

PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION:

The Conservation, Development and Planning Director of Napa County has tentatively determined that the following project would not have a significant effect on the environment and the County intends to adopt a **negative declaration**. Documentation supporting this determination is contained in the attached Initial Study Checklist and is available for inspection at the Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department Office, 1195 Third St., Room 210, Napa, California 94559 between the hours of 8:00 AM and 4:45 PM Monday through Friday (except holidays).

DATE: December 21, 2009



BY: Sean Trippi

WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD: 12/31/2009 to 1/20/2010

Please send written comments to the attention of Sean Trippi at 1195 Third St., Room 210, Napa, California 94559, or via e-mail to strippi@co.napa.ca.us. A public hearing on this project is tentatively scheduled for the Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Commission at 9:00 AM or later on Wednesday, January 20, 2010. You may confirm the date and time of this hearing by calling (707) 253-4416.

COUNTY OF NAPA

CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING DEPARTMENT
1195 THIRD ST., SUITE 210
NAPA, CA 94559
(707) 253-4416

Initial Study Checklist (reference CEQA, Appendix G)

1. **Project Title:** St. Helena Hospital Woodside Subdivision, Use Permit (#P07-00855-UP), Tentative Map (#P07-00856), Rezoning (#P07-00857-RZ)
2. **Property Owner:** St. Helena Hospital (Stan Tempchin, Executive director Facility Services), 10 Woodland Drive, St. Helena Ca 94574
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Sean Trippi, Principal Planner, 253-4417, strippi@co.napa.ca.us.
4. **Project location and APN:** The project area is located between Sanitarium Road and Deer Park Road, approximately 2.5 to 3.0 miles northeast of St. Helena. The project area includes approximately 92-acres and is comprised of the following Assessor's Parcel numbers:

Tentative Map only – 021-110-015; 021-140-001, 003, 005; and, 021-150-001, 002, 007
Tentative Map & Rezoning – 021-171-001; 021-172-004; and 021-400-011
Rezoning only – 021-171-002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008, 012, 013 and 021-181-001, 002, 005, 007, 009, 010
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Stan Tempchin, 10 Woodland Drive, St. Helena Ca, 94574
6. **General Plan Description:** Rural residential
7. **Zoning:** Planned Development (PD) and Residential Single: Building Site Combination District – 5-acre Minimum lot size (RS:B-5)
8. **Background/Project History:**

The St. Helena Hospital and Health Center was originally established as the Rural Health Retreat in 1878 on 10.5 acres of land on Howell Mountain, approximately 2.5 miles northeast of St. Helena. The Rural Health Retreat provided acute medical/surgical and maternity services, hydrotherapy, massage, physical and occupational therapy, and other preventative medical programs. The name of the retreat was changed to St. Helena Sanitarium in the 1890's. Thirty-five (35) buildings associated with the Sanitarium were built between 1878 and 1967. All but eight (8) of the buildings associated with the Sanitarium have been demolished. The homes on the property owned by the hospital were constructed beginning in the late 1800's through the early 1900's to provide housing for hospital employees. A number of use permits and use permit modifications have been approved since 1969 addressing expansion, remodeling, and improvement of the medical complex, the most recent of which was a multi-phase master plan approved in 2006.

9. **Project Description:**

The request includes a tentative map to create individual parcels for the 25 existing single-family dwellings owned by the St Helena Hospital. The St. Helena Hospital would retain ownership of the land. The homes could be owned by the resident to provide the homeowner an opportunity to establish equity. The request also includes rezoning properties owned by the St. Helena Hospital from Residential Single: Building Site Combination District – 5-acre minimum (RS:B-5) to Planned Development (PD) consistent with other property owned by the Hospital. A Use permit is also requested to allow the future construction of additions or buildings accessory to the existing homes in the PD district without going through the use permit process each time as is currently required by County Code. The Use Permit would also allow 12 existing structures on the hospital campus to be considered "flex space" that would allow residential uses, administrative offices or clinical/hospital related uses. No new development or the creation of new developable lots is included in this proposal. However 2-3 of the proposed lots (Lots 9, 15, & 16) could potentially require alterations to comply with the appropriate fire resistive construction requirements which would generally entail removing exterior siding materials and applying fire resistive materials to the framing of the structures and replacing the siding materials. This would only be necessary if the portions of the existing structures are less than 5-feet from the proposed property and the construction does not meet currently the fire resistive building requirements.

The tentative map would involve subdividing 10 lots into 31 lots. Three of the 10 lots are currently zoned RS:B-5 and the remaining 7 are zoned PD. Twenty-five (25) of the new lots would be created for existing homes. Two (2) lots would include the main hospital campus and associated buildings and improvements. One (1) lot would include existing apartment buildings. The remaining three (3) lots would remain as open space.

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

The project area is located between Sanitarium Road to the west and Deer Park road to the east. The elevation of the project area ranges from 350 to 810 feet above mean sea level (msl). The existing hospital/medical complex is located at the base of steep slopes on land that ranges from 500 to 550 feet above msl. Former residential cottages constructed for medical staff are intermingled within the medical complex and have been converted to administrative uses. Single and multi-family residential structures owned by the hospital are located uphill to the north and east of the medical complex. Additional single-family homes not owned by the hospital are intermixed with the homes owned by the hospital and to the north, south and east of the project area. A church is located southwest of the hospital. A fire station building housing the Deer Park volunteer fire department is located to the north of the medical complex. Single-family homes and vineyards are located across Sanitarium Road to the west. An existing private water system provides water to the medical complex and existing homes. Domestic wastewater flows are treated in existing septic tanks, and then disposed of in an existing off-site pond system. Several water tanks for the hospital and residences are located uphill to the northeast of the medical complex and north of the homes.

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

Discretionary approvals required by the County consist of a use permit/master development plan, tentative map and rezone. The project would also require various ministerial approvals by the County, including but not limited to a final map and building permits. No improvements to the existing residence or the hospital are proposed so no building permits will be required or ministerial permits from the California Office of Statewide Health Planning (OSHDP) will be required for new or alterations to existing acute care inpatient buildings.

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

None.

Other Agencies Contacted

None.

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.


Signature

12/21/09
Date

Sean Trippi, Principal Planner

Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

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

Discussion:

a-d. The proposal would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. The project area is currently developed with a hospital, medical facilities, hospital/medical support services, residential structures, private roads and associated improvements. The proposed tentative map, rezoning and use permit would not result in any new development or new developable lots. The proposed "flex" structures and existing residential structures may require alteration to comply with Uniform Building Code requirements depending upon the use of the structure and the proximity of the proposed property lines to the existing structures, respectively. Subsequent additions, remodels or other improvements to the existing homes or medical facilities would require review and approval prior to the issuance of any discretionary or ministerial permits, however, no such proposals are included with the subject applications. There are no rock outcroppings or other designated scenic resources affected by the project. The project site is not visible from a designated scenic vista or within a state scenic highway. No new lighting or other sources of light or glare are included with this proposal.

Mitigation Measures:

None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (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) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a.-c. The project area has been previously developed and is not designated for agriculture. The proposal would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Important as shown on the Napa County Important Farmland Map 2002 prepared by the California Department of Conservation District, Division of Land Resource Protection, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The proposal would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses. There is no Williamson Act contract associated with the parcels. There are no other changes included in this proposal that would result in the conversion of Farmland beyond the immediate project area.

Mitigation Measures:

None required.

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

Discussion:

a-c. The project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plans. The project area is in the foothills and lies northeast of the City of St. Helena and the floor of the Napa Valley, which forms one of the climatological subregions (Napa County Subregion) within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The topographical and meteorological features of the valley create a relatively high potential for air pollution. Potential air quality impacts would primarily result from construction activities. No new development is associated with this proposal. However, portions of 2-3 existing residential structures may require alteration to comply with Uniform Building Code fire resistive construction requirements which could result in construction emissions that would have a temporary effect. The emissions would consist mainly of dust generated during construction activities, exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles, and relatively minor emissions from paints and other architectural coatings. Interior alterations of the "flex" structures may be required depending on the use of the structure. Over the long term, emission sources for the project area would consist primarily of mobile sources including deliveries and motor vehicles of residents and guests. The *Bay Area Air Quality Management Plan* states that projects that do not exceed a threshold of 2,000 vehicle trips per day will not impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, p. 24). Since the area is already developed no new trips would generally result from the proposal and therefore emissions from the proposal would be less than significant. There are no projected or existing air quality violations in this area that this proposal would contribute to, nor would it result in any violations of any applicable air quality standards. The proposal would not 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. Any subsequent construction activities would be subject to the following standard condition of approval as a basic control measure to reduce dust during demolition and construction activities: *"Water and/or dust palliatives shall be applied in sufficient quantities during any subsequent grading and other ground disturbing activities on-site to minimize the amount of dust produced. Outdoor construction activities shall not occur during windy periods."*

In 2006, the State Legislature enacted Assembly Bill 32, requiring the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to design measures and regulations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions statewide to 1990 levels by the year 2020. The measures and regulations to meet the 2020 target are to be put in effect by 2012, and the CARB rulemaking process is ongoing. For purposes of this analysis, CARB greenhouse gas regulations are treated as a relevant State ambient air quality standard.

Overall increases in greenhouse gas emissions in Napa County were assessed in the Environmental Impact Report prepared for the Napa County General Plan Update and certified in June 2008. Despite the adoption of mitigation measures that incorporated specific policies and action items into the General Plan, impacts from greenhouse gas emissions were found to be significant and unavoidable.

Neither the State nor the County has adopted explicit thresholds of significance for greenhouse gas emissions. While some might argue that *any* new emissions of greenhouse gasses could be significant under CEQA, pending amendments to State CEQA Guidelines suggest that agencies may consider the extent to which a project complies with requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions. Napa County is currently developing an emission reduction plan, and in the interim the County has asked that project applicants consider methods to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to incorporate permanent and verifiable emission offsets, consistent with General Plan Policy CON-65(e).

The proposal does not include any new developable lots and no new construction is proposed with the possible exception of minor alterations to portions of 2-3 existing structures to meet fire resistive construction requirements. In light of the relatively modest increase in emissions from potential construction activities, emissions that may result from the proposal are considered to be less than significant. Additionally, consistent with State CEQA standards (see CEQA Guidelines §15183) because the project is consistent with an adopted General Plan for which an EIR was prepared, it appropriately focuses on impacts which are "peculiar to the project," rather than those cumulative impacts which were previously assessed by the General Plan EIR. The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively significant net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under any relevant ambient air quality standard.

- d. Emissions and dust associated with any demolition and construction would be both minor and temporary, having a less than significant impact on nearby receptors. Standard conditions of approval regarding dust suppression serve to limit any potential for impacts to a less than significant level.
- e. Potential construction activities associated with alterations to the existing homes in the project area could generate dust particulates in the short-run. This impact would be less than significant with dust control measures specified in the standard conditions of approval. The application of exterior building finishes, such as stucco/cement plaster and paint, may result in potentially objectionable odors. However, these odors are considered a less than significant impact due to their temporary nature.

Mitigation Measures:

None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The California Department of Fish and Game Natural Diversity Data Base indicates the potential presence of two special status plant species (*Calistoga canothus* and narrow anthered *California brodiaea*) within the vicinity of the project site. The project area is currently developed with a medical complex, parking areas, and single and multi-family residential structures with little or no natural habitat present in the developed areas of the project area. There is an area of Coniferous forest on the hillside between the medical complex and the existing homes. The slopes in this area prevent any development potential. There is no new construction associated with the proposal except for the potential alterations to portions of 2-3 existing structures to meet fire resistive requirements if warranted due to the proximity

of the proposed property lines and interior alterations of the "flex" structures. The potential for this proposal to have a significant impact on special status species is less than significant.

- b/c. There are no streams on the property and no riparian habitat that would be affected by this project (Napa County Environmental Resource Maps, streams and floodplain management/riparian zones layers). No sensitive natural communities have been identified on the property (Napa County Environmental Resource Maps, Sensitive Biotic groups). There are no wetlands on the property or on neighboring properties that would be affected by this proposal.
- d. This proposal would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with their corridors or nursery sites. As mentioned above, the property is developed and exhibits little habitat quality in the previously disturbed areas. The areas adjoining the site are developed with single-family homes and planted in vineyards with limited potential to be used as a wildlife corridor or nursery site. There are no streams on the property.
- e. This proposal would not interfere with any ordinances protecting biological resources. There are no tree preservation ordinances in effect in the County. There are no streams on the property or in the immediate project vicinity and very few trees will be removed to accommodate the proposed parking areas. The project would not interfere with any ordinances in the County concerning the protection of biological resources.
- f. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans or other similar plans in effect for this area that would be affected by this project.

Mitigation Measures:

None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. A previous report entitled, "A CEQA Review and Evaluation for Significance" prepared by Clark Historic Resource Consultants, Inc., dated May 2005, was prepared to evaluate historic resources associated with the 2006 approval updating the Hospital's master development plan. According to the report, the St. Helena Sanitarium's period of historic significance occurred between 1878 and 1967, as a late 19th, early 20th century sanitarium. Thirty-five (35) buildings were constructed during this period, including the five-story hospital building constructed from 1947 and 1950. Only eight (8) of those buildings still remain.

According to the report, the hospital campus has lost nearly all of the original important buildings representative of its historic era. The hospital has been remodeled several times since its initial construction and its International style of architecture is not reflective of the historic era of the sanitarium. The current hospital complex does not include sufficient integrity and concentration of associated significant resources to be considered a historic district. The Nurses Home (c. 1918) is the only building on the site eligible for listing on the State Register of Historical Resources, qualifying it as a significant historical resource. The 1976-78 Historical Resources Inventory included a survey of the residential areas around the hospital and did not note historic merit of the structures in the surveyed area. The project area has been previously developed and no new development is included with this proposal except as mentioned previously regarding potential alterations to portions to 2-3 structures to meet fire resistive requirements if necessary. It is therefore not anticipated that any historic resources will be affected by the proposal, and the potential for impact is considered less-than-significant.

b/c. A previous archaeological evaluation was prepared in conjunction with an environmental impact report (FEIR-010) for the St. Helena Health Center Properties General Development Plan. The study indicated that there were scattered obsidian flakes throughout the residential areas of the study area likely representing soils and waste brought in for construction of the roads. The report did not consider this to be a significant archaeological or paleontological resource. In addition, the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Archaeology sites, sensitive areas, and flags) do not identify any archaeological or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features on the project area. There is no information in the County's files that would indicate that there is a potential for occurrence of these resources. The project area has been previously developed and no new development is included with this proposal except as mentioned previously regarding potential alterations to portions to 2-3 structures to meet fire resistive requirements if necessary. It is therefore not anticipated that any cultural resources are present on the site, and the potential for impact is considered less-than-significant. However, if resources were ever found during future construction, the activity would be required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval *"In the event that archeological artifacts or human remains are discovered during any subsequent construction in the project area, work shall cease in a 50-foot radius surrounding the area of discovery. The permittee shall contact the CDPD for further guidance, which will likely include the requirement for the permittee to hire a qualified professional to analyze the artifacts encountered and to determine if additional measures are required. If human remains are encountered during the development, all work in the vicinity must be, by law, halted, and the Napa County Coroner informed so that the Coroner can determine if an investigation of the cause of death is required, and if the remains are of Native American origin. If the remains are of Native American origin, the nearest tribal relatives as determined by the State Native American Heritage Commission would be contacted to obtain recommendations for treating or removal of such remains, including grave goods, with appropriate dignity, as required under Public Resources Code Section 5097.98."*

- d. No human remains have been encountered on the property during earth moving activities when the hospital complex and homes were constructed. Since this proposal does not include any earth moving activities, the potential that human remains will be encountered is considered less-than-significant. However, if resources were to be found for any reason, construction would be required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard conditions of approval.

Mitigation Measures:

None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a.
- i.) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposal would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.
 - ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Although no structural development or any other earth disturbing activity is proposed, any future construction within the project area would be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
 - iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project area that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Compliance with the latest editions of the Uniform Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.
 - iv.) The Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) did not indicate the presence of landslides on the property.
- b. Based upon the Soil Survey of Napa County, prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the soils on the property are Boomer loam, found on slopes of 2 to 15%, which have medium runoff and a slight erosion hazard, Boomer gravelly loam, found on slopes of 30 to 50%, which have rapid runoff and a moderate erosion hazard, and Cortina very stony loam, found on slopes of 0 to 5%, which have slow runoff and a slight erosion hazard. This proposal includes no development and no specifically identifiable earth disturbing activity would foreseeably result from the proposal. Pursuant to Napa County's Stormwater Ordinance, any future development in the project area would require incorporation of best management practices and would include sediment and erosion control measures and dust control to minimize impacts to adjoining properties, drainages, and roadways. Impacts related to erosion will be less than significant.
- c/d. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Surficial Deposits layer) Pre-Quaternary deposits and bedrock underlie the surficial soils on the majority of the project area. Undifferentiated late Pleistocene alluvium underlie the surficial soils along the eastern edge of the area. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Liquefaction layer) the project site has very low to low susceptibility for liquefaction. Although no new construction is associated with this proposal, subsequent development, such as room additions and the construction of accessory structures, will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- e. No increases in activity are included with this proposal that would result in an increased demand on the existing waste disposal system or increase future waste flows. The existing sewage and wastewater disposal systems are designed to conform to the requirements of the State of California and are operated under permits with the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Mitigation Measure:

None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
	a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires, including where wild-lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild-lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a.-h. A Hazardous Materials Business Plan for the medical facility is currently on file with the Environmental Management Department. Updates to this plan are required by Environmental Management as necessary to reflect any changes to the existing plan. This proposal does not implement any changes that are expected to affect the plan. All hospital hazardous waste is and will continue to be disposed of in conformance with all applicable regulations. The subdivision and rezoning of the project area will not result, either directly or indirectly, in the release of any hazardous materials into the environment. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile of the project site. The project area is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites. The project area is not located within two miles of any airport, be it public or private. The proposal will not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. The project would not significantly increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires.

Mitigation Measures:

None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirement. The project has been reviewed by the Napa County Department of Environmental Management and the Department of Public Works who have found that the project will be able to comply with all applicable water quality and waste discharge requirements.
- b. The St. Helena Hospital is the owner and operator of the St. Helen Hospital water system that provides water to the medical complex and residential uses. The water system is comprised of wells, water treatment facilities, storage tanks, pumps and distribution lines for potable water and fire protection. Present storage capacity in the existing water tanks is approximately 1.6 million gallons. Current water use is approximately 233,000 gallons a day for domestic use and 355,000 gallons per day for emergency use. No changes are proposed to the number of employees at the hospital during the highest shift, or hospital beds, no new developable areas will be created as a result of this proposal, and no change to future water demand is anticipated with the request.
- c-f. The proposal does not include any new development, earth moving activities, or drainage alterations. There are no existing or planned stormwater systems that would be affected by this project. If any future development disturbs more than one acre of land, the project will be required to comply with the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board addressing stormwater pollution during construction activities. There is nothing included in this proposal that would otherwise substantially degrade water quality. No changes are proposed to the existing water and wastewater systems that serve the project area. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to water quality.
- g-i. The project area is not located within the 100-year flood hazard area. The project would not impede or redirect flood flows or expose structures or people to flooding. No new housing is proposed as a part of this project. The project site is not located within a dam or levee failure inundation zone.
- j. The project area is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows.

Mitigation Measures:

None required.

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

Discussion:

- a-c. The proposal would not result in the division of an established community. The project complies with the Napa County Code and all other applicable regulations. There are no applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the property.

Mitigation Measures:

None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures:

None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-d. As discussed previously, no new development is included with this proposal. Any future construction activities to 2-3 of the existing homes to comply with fire resistive construction requirements and interior improvements of the "flex" structures would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during construction and associated demolition activities. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. The proposal would not result in potentially significant temporary construction noise impacts or operational impacts. Construction activities would generally occur during the

period of 7am-7pm on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity. The project area is, and will remain, home to a mix of non-residential and residential uses. No construction or other noise-generating development is proposed. The proposal will not result in the exposure of persons to or generation of noise or vibration either permanently or temporarily.

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

Mitigation Measures:

None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII.	POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
	a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-c. The proposal would not result in the inducement of substantial population growth, either directly or indirectly. No new homes or roads are proposed. No housing or people will be displaced as a result of the project. Furthermore, the County has adopted a Housing Element which identifies locations for new affordable housing, and adopted a development impact fee to provide funds for constructing affordable housing to off-set any cumulative existing affordable housing shortage in the County. The fee would be paid for any subsequent construction at the time building permits are issued and is considered to reduce housing inducement impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures:

None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII.	PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in:				
	a) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
	Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a) Public services are already in existence and provided to the project area and would not be increased as a result of the project. The proposal will have a less than significant impact on public services. The project will have little impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from subsequent building permit fees and property tax increases will help meet the costs of providing public services to the property.

Mitigation Measures:

None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. RECREATION. Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measures:

None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. The project area is located between Sanitarium Road and Deer Park Road. Both roads currently operate at a level of service A/B, in the vicinity of the project area. There are no new dwelling units or proposed increases to the number of hospital, hospital beds, visitors, or

deliveries. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to result in an increase of traffic or affect existing levels of service on surrounding roadways.

- c. This project would not result in any change to air traffic patterns.
- d/e. No changes are proposed to any of the existing roads or driveways within the project area.
- f. No new development is proposed so no additional parking would be required. The proposal includes a drawing that shows at least two on-site parking spaces for each of the existing homes. Parking for the hospital was addressed in the recently approved master plan.
- g. There is no aspect of this project that would conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation. The hospital currently supports carpooling programs.

Mitigation Measures:

None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI.	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
	a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. The proposal will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and will not result in a significant impact. The proposal will not require construction of any new water or wastewater treatment facilities that will result in a significant impact to the environment. Wastewater disposal is accommodated by an existing pond system in compliance with State and County regulations.
- c. The proposal will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, which will cause a significant impact to the environment.
- d. The project area has sufficient water supplies to serve existing and projected needs. No new or expanded entitlements are needed.
- e. Wastewater will be treated by an existing system that does not require a wastewater treatment provider.
- f. The project area will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the projects demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the project.

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

Mitigation Measures:

None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. No new construction is proposed with this proposal. The majority of the site has already been disturbed and developed. The proposal will not disturb any biologically sensitive areas or resources as delineated on the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps. There are no streams on the property, and there are no distinguishable wildlife corridors in the project area. No new construction is proposed that would have any possibility of having a significant impact on biologic resources.
- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- c. The project would not result in any environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.