

APPENDIX C

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

**Revised¹ Initial Study Checklist
(form updated September 2010)**

1. **Project Title:** Napa Valley Gateway/Napa Executive Center Use Permit Application № P08-00555-UP
2. **Property Owner:** Napa Office LLC, 1010 Main Street, St. Helena, CA 94574
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Kirsty Shelton, Project Planner, (707) 299-1377,
Kirsty.shelton@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project Location and APN:** The project is located in the Napa Airport Industrial Area on a 4.33 acre lot located at the terminus of Gateway Road East bordered by Hwy 29 to the west, and Sheehy Creek to the south, within an IP:AC (Industrial Park: Airport Compatibility Zone D) zoning district. (Assessor's Parcel №s 057-200-001SFAP & -009SFAP). Lot 1 Gateway Road East, Napa, Calif. 94558.
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** William A. Saks and Company, 1010 Main Street, Saint Helena, CA 94574
(707) 698-9696, bill@williamsaks.com
6. **General Plan description:** Industrial
7. **Zoning:** IP:AC (Industrial Park: Airport Compatibility Zone D)

8. **Project Description:** Approval of a Use Permit to allow the construction and operation of a three-story multi-tenant, sustainably designed office building totaling 67,930 square feet of gross floor area, with related site improvements including an exception to the Airport Area Specific Plan design standards for a 15% reduction of required parking spaces. Approximately 58,136 sq. ft. will be leased out to tenants, the remaining square footage ~~are~~ is accessory to office related uses. 244 full time employees ~~will are estimated to work there in the building~~ at full capacity. A 72,731 sq. ft. parking lot will be constructed ~~and to~~ provide for 203 parking spaces. Access will be provided from an extension of the cul-de-sac of Gateway Road East, which is accessed from Devlin Road. Approximately 1 acre of existing riparian vegetation will be preserved and will remain in a habitat conservation easement. Approximately half an acre will be maintained as a landscape easement in between the project and State Highway 29. The project will connect to the City of American Canyon municipal water system. Sewer service will be provided by the Napa Sanitation District.

Environmental Commitments: The project proponent proposes to reduce or avoid adverse effects that could result from project construction. The commitments apply to the design and construction phases of the project and are incorporated in construction documents (plans and specifications) prepared for the project and would thus be required of all construction contractors. The environmental commitments adopted and proposed by the project include the following:

1. The permittee has voluntarily agreed to the following BAAQMD construction-related emissions management practices (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2011) into all construction phases of the subject parcel:

- a. All exposed surfaces shall be watered at a frequency adequate to maintain minimum soil moisture of 12 percent. Moisture content can be verified by lab samples or moisture probe.

¹ The initial ~~study/preliminary project~~mitigated negative declaration was circulated for public review January 19 – February 16, 2011. Based on comments received during the initial comment period, the County of Napa determined that revisions to and recirculation of the document were necessary. Changes to the original document are indicated by underlining and strike out (for additions and deletions respectively).

Formatted: Font color: Red

Formatted: Font color: Red

- b. All excavation, grading, and/or demolition activities shall be suspended when average wind speeds exceed 20 mph.
- c. Wind breaks (e.g., trees, fences) shall be installed on the windward side(s) of actively disturbed areas of construction. Wind breaks should have at maximum 50 percent air porosity.
- d. Vegetative ground cover (e.g., fast-germinating native grass seed) shall be planted in disturbed areas as soon as possible and watered appropriately until vegetation is established.
- e. The simultaneous occurrence of excavation, grading, and ground-disturbing construction activities on the same area at any one time shall be limited. Activities shall be phased to reduce the amount of disturbed surfaces at any one time.
- f. All trucks and equipment, including their tires, shall be washed off prior to leaving the site.
- g. Site accesses to a distance of 100 feet from the paved road shall be treated with a 6 to 12 inch compacted layer of wood chips, mulch, or gravel.
- h. Sandbags or other erosion control measures shall be installed to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from sites with a slope greater than one percent.
- i. Minimizing the idling time of diesel powered construction equipment to two minutes.
- j. The project shall develop a plan demonstrating that the off-road equipment (more than 50 horsepower) to be used in the construction project (i.e., owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles) would achieve a project wide fleet-average 20 percent NOX reduction and 45 percent PM reduction compared to the most recent ARB fleet average. Acceptable options for reducing emissions include the use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, add-on devices such as particulate filters, and/or other options as such become available.
- k. Use low VOC (i.e., ROG) coatings beyond the local requirements (i.e., Regulation 8, Rule 3: Architectural Coatings).
- l. Requiring that all construction equipment, diesel trucks, and generators be equipped with Best Available Control Technology for emission reductions of NOx and PM.
- m. Requiring all contractors use equipment that meets CARB's most recent certification standard for off-road heavy duty diesel engines.

The environmental commitments proposed by the applicant will be incorporated as conditions of approval.

8.9. **Environmental setting and surrounding land uses:** The 4.3 acre subject parcel is located in southern Napa County, roughly equidistant from the southern boundary of the City of Napa and the northern boundary of the City of American Canyon. This portion of the unincorporated County is designated primarily for industrial and transportation uses. Some properties remain undeveloped at this time and are intended for such development in the future. The property is within the boundaries of the Napa Airport Industrial Park and is subject to the County's 1986 Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan and the 1991 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The Napa County Airport, a three runway facility with an FAA-manned air traffic control tower, is located less than a mile to the west. While the airport is primarily a general aviation facility serving corporate and recreational users, it is also a significant flight training hub. According to the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, nearly 50% of all airport operations weare generated by the large JAL pilot training center which was been located at the Airport from since 1971 until quite recently. The project site is located within Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone D, inside the Common Traffic Pattern, which is an area of frequent aircraft overflight at low elevations.

Regional roadway access to the property is provided by State Route 29 (CA-29), which is the main north-south arterial in Napa County. CA-29 abuts the project site along its eastern side. East-west access, connecting to U.S. Route 101 to the west and Interstates 80 and 680 to the east, is provided by State Route 12 (CA-12). CA-12 is coterminous with CA-29 to the north of the project site, but makes a 90 degree turn to the east and separates from the generally north-south running CA-29. The CA-12/CA-29 intersection is currently at-grade and stoplight controlled, with uncontrolled right turn merge lanes at all corners save the right-hand turn from northbound CA-29 onto eastbound CA-12 (Jameson Canyon Road). Significant roadway improvements at the CA-12/29 intersection are envisioned in the County's Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan and are currently being designed by the California Department of Transportation. While design details are not available at this time, it is presumed that in the medium term, the intersection will be replaced with a grade-separated interchange; most likely of a "tight diamond" design.

Local roadway access to and from the site is provided by Gateway Road East, accessed from Devlin Road. Direct access to Devlin Road is from Airport Boulevard, which is currently a four-lane arterial parkway with a raised landscaped median with openings and left-turn pockets at public road intersections, connecting the 12/29 intersection with the Napa County Airport to

the west. Devlin Road is a partially-constructed north-south road, designated as a "collector" in the Specific Plan. Devlin Road is in place and is four lanes wide to the north of Airport Boulevard. Sheehy Creek borders the project to the north.

Based on Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Soil Type* layer), the *Soil Survey of Napa County, California* (G. Lambert and J. Kashiwagi, Soil Conservation Service), and the *Flatland Deposits of the San Francisco Bay Region*, —(M. Blair, U.S. Geological Survey) the subject parcel includes soil classified as Haire Loam (2 to 9 percent slopes). Haire soils of the type located on the subject property are often used for grazing land; runoff is slow to medium and the chance of erosion is slight.

There are a variety of land uses surrounding the project site. In general, the vicinity is a developing urban area focused on industrial development. To date, most of the surrounding industrial development has been related to and generally in service of the wine industry. Specifically, surrounding the property are undeveloped parcels. North of the site is the Gateway hotel and retail complex, including a completed hotel and a number of other, yet to be constructed, facilities including a gasoline station. West of the project site is the approved, but as of yet unbuilt, Greenwood Commerce Center industrial park. CA-29 and the CA-12/29 intersection are located to the southeast of the project area, with vacant land and the Doctors Company headquarters located on the far side of the highway. The large Franzia bottling plant is located south of the project area.

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

Responsible and Trustee Agencies:

San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
City of American Canyon
Napa Sanitation District
Napa County Airport Land Use Commission

Other Agencies Contacts:

City of Napa
Calif. Highway Patrol
Napa County Sheriff
U.S. Fish & Wildlife services
CalTrans

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.

Kirsty Shelton, Planner
Napa County Conservation, Development & Planning Department

Date

	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. The project is not prominently located within or near any known scenic vista. Views to the site are primarily from the adjacent CA-29 and local roadways, though distant views also exist from ridgetop and other up-slope locations along the lower run of the Vaca Mountains and along much of the Mayacamas ridgeline. Because the proposed development is consistent with the long-planned industrial development surrounding the Napa County Airport, and with other existing industrial development in the vicinity, it will not have an adverse impact on any known scenic vista and there are no state scenic highways in the vicinity.
- c. The proposed project is located within a fairly developed portion of the Napa County Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan (AIASP) that allows a mix of industrial developments. The proposed building is located adjacent to the west border of North/South CA-29. The building elevation facing CA-29 includes metal siding, cement plaster, aluminum windows and curtain walls, with a pitched roof and side views to the steel sunscreen on the south elevation. The front/north façade is 260 linear feet with the majority of the massing (200 feet) including a symmetrical three story structure with aluminum windows and curtain walls on the eastern edge, a smaller portion (60 feet) of a similar design is recessed 20 feet. The southern elevation is similarly designed with a significant steel sunscreen intending to shade the top two story windows. The structure is designed with sustainable features including a roof orientation and pitch to house future photovoltaic solar panels, eastern and western windows to allow for cross ventilation and passive solar lighting, and steel sunscreen to provide relief from the southern exposure sun and to limit the use of forced heat and air within the building. Therefore, the project will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and surrounding area.
- d. The new facility will result in a minor increase in the nighttime lighting. In accordance with County standards, all exterior lighting will be the minimum necessary for operational and security needs. Light fixtures will be kept as low to the ground as possible and include shields to deflect the light downward. Avoidance of highly reflective surfaces will be required, as well as standard County condition: "All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward, shall be located as low to the ground as possible, and shall be the minimum necessary for security, safety, or operations and shall incorporate the use of motion detection sensors to the greatest extent practical. No flood-lighting or sodium lighting of the building is permitted, including architectural highlighting and spotting. Low-level lighting shall be utilized in parking areas as opposed to elevated high-intensity light standards. Prior to issuance of any building permit for construction, two (2) copies of a detailed lighting plan showing the location and specifications for all lighting fixtures to be installed on the property shall be submitted for Department review and approval. All lighting shall comply with Uniform Building Code (UBC)."
to prevent light from being cast skyward. This is an area routinely overflowed by low flying aircraft which necessitates strong controls on skyward nighttime lighting. As designed, and as subject to standard conditions of approval, the project will not create a significant impact from light or glare.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Page 4 of 26

Napa Executive Center

Use Permit application P08-0555-UP

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. ² Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. The project site is located within a developing industrial park. The project will not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on the Napa County Important Farmland Map 2004 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 project site is not subject to a Williamson Act contract.
- c. The project site is zoned Industrial Park (IP), which allows light industrial, office and business park uses upon grant of a use permit, and is located with the Napa County Airport Area Industrial Park. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Sensitive Biotic Oak woodlands, Riparian Woodland forest, and Coniferous forest) the project site does not contain woodland or forested areas. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

² "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 Game, water quality, or other environmental resources addressed in this checklist.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. 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./b. The project site lies at the southern end of the Napa Valley, which forms one of the climatologically distinct sub regions (Napa County Sub region) within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. The topographical and meteorological features of the Valley create a relatively high potential for air pollution. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from construction activities. Construction emissions would have a temporary effect; consisting mainly of dust generated during grading and other construction activities, exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles, and relatively minor emissions from paints and other architectural coatings. The ~~thresholds of significance for construction emissions established in from the May 2011~~ Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) ~~CEQA Guidelines thresholds of significance are 54 lbs/day for of ROG and NOx. Modeling conducted by the planning department (URBEMIS results, Shelton) estimate the unmitigated construction emissions for this project at to emit 20.37 lbs/day of ROG and 51.42 lbs/day of NOx; therefore the project's pollutant emissions during the construction phase will be below the BAAQMD's 2010 thresholds of significance for construction activities and are considered therefore less than significant (for cumulative impacts reference, please see **Criteria Pollutants** at "c.", below-).~~ For all projects, the BAAQMD recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction emissions, even where emissions are not considered significant those impacts in their current CEQA Guidelines (CEQA Guidelines—Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, BAAQMD, June 2010). If the proposed project adheres to these measures, then BAAQMD recommends concluding that construction related impacts will be less than significant. Although not required, the applicant has agreed to incorporate these measures from (May -2011 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines) as part of the project. To facilitate their adoption and monitoring, the measures have been and have included them below as environmental commitments defined as the project description, as mitigation measure number three under Section VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

Over the long term, emission sources for the proposed project will consist primarily of mobile sources including deliveries and vehicles visiting the site. The Bay Area Air Quality Management Plan has determined that office park projects that do not exceed a threshold of 2,000 vehicle trips per day 323 ksf will not significantly impact air quality and do not require further study (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May June 2011 Page 3-3 p. 24.). According to the Institute of Traffic Engineers, Trip Generation, 8th Edition, 2008, "General Office" trip rates, are expected to generate 1.55 peak hour trips per 1,000 sq. ft. of gross

floor area. Based on the proposed 67,839 gross floor area, approximately 105 total peak hour trips (TPHT) will result from the development, that number is 15% of the TPHT which would attribute to 1,575 daily trips. A focused trip generation analysis was prepared by George W. Nickelson, P.E., dated December 19, 2008 which supports these assumptions. The total vehicle trip per day potentially generated by this project is below BAAQMD's recommended threshold of 2,000 vehicle trips/day for purposes of performing a detailed air quality analysis. Given the size of the project being 468ksf compared to the the number of vehicle trips and deliveries generated by this proposal when compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 323 ksf, the project project related vehicles would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan.

- c. Thresholds of significance for the emission of criteria air pollutants and precursors, including reactive organic gas (ROG), nitrogen oxide (NOx), and ten-micron particulate matter (PM10), are established by incorporated in the May- May 2011¹⁰ BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines. As explained by the Guidelines, these thresholds "represent the levels at which a project's individual emissions of criteria air pollutants or precursors would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution" to the regional air basin's existing air quality conditions (p. 2-3; also see p. 2-6 for construction emissions). For ongoing operations, encompassing a combination of fixed-sources (such as material off-gassing and structural climate control systems) and mobile-sources (primarily consisting of vehicle trips to and from the site), relevant thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants are established at Table 2.1 of the 2011¹⁰ Guidelines. ROG and NOx are the precursor for smog and considered a regional pollutant, however the BAAQMD has determined that if project emissions do not exceed the established thresholds, they are deemed not to significantly impact air quality either individually or cumulatively and require no further study. The construction and operational emissions associated with this project were modeled using URBEMIS air quality management software and are compared to relevant air quality thresholds of significance below.

ROG

Threshold of significance (2011¹⁰ BAAQMD Standards): 54 lbs/d
Modeled construction emissions (NCDCEP Staff analysis): 20.37 lbs/d
Modeled operational project emissions (NCDCEP Staff analysis): 5.7 lbs/d

NOx

Threshold of significance (2011¹⁰ BAAQMD Standards): 54 lbs/d
Modeled construction emissions (NCDCEP Staff analysis): 51.42 lbs/d
Modeled operational project emissions (NCDCEP Staff analysis): 7.30 lbs/d

PM10

Threshold of significance (2011¹⁰ BAAQMD Standards): 82 lbs/d
Modeled construction emissions (NCDCEP Staff analysis): 18.93 lbs/d
Modeled operational project emissions (NCDCEP Staff analysis): 10.48 lbs/d

As indicated analyzed above because this project is below all applicable the standard thresholds and those thresholds have been specifically established to define "considerable" contributions to cumulative air quality problems, and projects within the vicinity have been mitigated to be below the threshold, the proposed project will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. The project will comply with all duly adopted air quality requirements and the impact is less than significant.

- d/e. The BAAQMD defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact. The project site is not located in close proximity to any sensitive pollution-sensitive receptors. During project construction, the project has the potential to generate substantial amounts of dust or other construction-related air quality disturbances. As a standard practice for County development projects, application of water and/or dust palliatives are required in sufficient quantities during grading and other ground disturbing activities on-site to minimize the amount of dust produced. These Best Management Practices will reduce potential temporary changes in air quality to a less than significant level as specified in Napa County's standard condition of approval relating to dust;

Water and/or dust palliatives shall be applied in sufficient quantities during grading and other ground disturbing activities on-site to minimize the amount of dust produced. Outdoor construction activities shall not occur during windy periods.

Mitigation Measures: ~~None required~~ ~~None required~~

Page 7 of 26

Napa Executive Center

Use Permit application P08-0555-UP

	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 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 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-d. The site is part of the Gateway Business Park Industrial Subdivision approved for industrial development in 1989 and is bordered on three sides by existing development. Industrial development has been progressing in the general vicinity since the late 1980's. Improvements adjoining the site such as curb, gutter, sidewalk, sewer and water laterals, street lights, etc. were installed in the mid-1990's. The site is vacant and has been graded over the years for weed abatement, and contains only seasonal grasses. The property has been previously disturbed by grading and filling. A recorded 35-foot habitat conservation easement from the top of bank along Sheehy Creek was established as part of approvals for the Napa Gateway Industrial Park. There are no existing trees on the site.

The California Department of Fish and Game Natural Diversity Data Base indicates the potential presence of four special status animal species (Burrowing owl, Swainsons' hawk, tri-colored blackbird, and Ferruginous hawk) and one special status plant species (dwarf downingia) within about a mile of the project site. A Special Status Species Evaluation, dated February 16,

2010 was prepared by was conducted by Huffman-Broadway Group Inc (HBG) to determine whether the site is likely to contain wetlands or state or federally listed rare, threatened, or endangered plant or animal species, address potential impacts, if any, to protected species, and recommend mitigation measures as needed.

According to the report, the nearly level project site consists primarily of annual grassland, with mostly non-native grass species. Landscaped areas and ruderal habitat such as those found on the site provide limited wildlife habitat. No special-status plant species, riparian habitat, wetlands or vernal pools were found on the project site. No habitat essential for special-status animal species was found on the project site and no special-status animal species were observed during the field surveys.

The report does mention, however that vegetation found on-site indicate wetland. Prior to the field review, HBG noted that the presence of a leaky recycled water return pipe owned by the City of American Canyon, which was repaired prior to the field studies. HBG found no hydric soils within the development portion of the site and that the wetland hydrology was attributed to the leaky pipe, and determined that there were no regulated wetlands at the property. On February 5, 2010 the Army Corps officially verified that no wetlands occur within the site. Therefore, the development will have no impact on biological special status plant or animal species, does not exist within a federally protected wetland, and will not encroach upon the conservation easement within the riparian corridor.

- e. The project will not conflict with any local policies protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation or the County's Conservation Regulations. The site is a disturbed industrial lot with little native vegetation. In accordance with the requirements of the AIASP, new landscaping will be provided on the site. The project does not conflict with any County ordinance or requirement to preserve existing trees, and therefore is considered as not having potential for a significant impact thereto.
- f. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans. No work will occur within the Sheehy Creek corridor or adjacent conservation easement.

Mitigation Measures: None are 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines§15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-c. The project site is vacant and does not contain any structures. Research into past uses has not identified historic resources that may be present at the site. A previous archaeological survey, entitled A Cultural Resource Inventory of the Napa

Page 9 of 26

Napa Executive Center

Use Permit application P08-0555-UP

Airport Master Environmental Assessment Area, prepared by Archaeological Resource Service (ARS), dated September 1983, was conducted in the AIASP area and included the project site. The study did not indicate the presence of historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources. In addition, the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers –Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology sites, sensitive areas, and flags) do not identify any historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features on the project site. There is no information in the County's files that would indicate that there is a potential for occurrence of these resources. The site has been previously graded when public improvements were installed. It is therefore not anticipated that any cultural resources are present on the site, and there is no potential for impact. However, if resources are found during grading of the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval:

"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 past grading activities when the public improvements were constructed and no information has been encountered that would indicate that this project would encounter human remains. However, if resources are found during grading of the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard condition of approval noted above.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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.
 - ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the facility will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible.
 - iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code for seismic stability would reduce any impacts to a less than significant level.
 - iv.) The Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) did not indicate the presence of landslides on the property.
- b. Based upon the Soil Survey of Napa County, prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the site is composed of soils in the Haire Loam (2-9 percent slopes) series which are characterized by slow or very slow runoff with little or no hazard of erosion. This nearly level soil type is found mainly on old alluvial fans and basins. Runoff is slow with a slight hazard of erosion. Project approval will require incorporation of best management practices and will be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable, to ensure that development does not impact adjoining properties, drainages, and roadways.
- c/d. Late Pleistocene-Holocene fan deposits underlay the site according to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Surficial Deposits layer). Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Liquefaction layer) the project site has low susceptibility for liquefaction. Development will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level. In addition, a soils report, prepared by a qualified Engineer will be required as part of the building permit submittal. The soil is not classified as an expansive soil as per Table 18-1-B of The Uniform Building Code. The report will address the soil stability, potential for liquefaction and will be used to design specific foundation systems and grading methods.
- e. The project will connect to municipal water service provided by the City of American Canyon and sewer service by Napa Sanitation District. No septic tanks or other alternative waste water disposal systems are required. "Will serve" letters have been submitted by the affected jurisdictions indicating that they have sufficient capacity to accommodate the water and wastewater demand of this project.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With	Less Than Significant	No Impact
Page 11 of 26 Napa Executive Center Use Permit application P08-0555-UP				

	Impact	Mitigation Incorporation	Impact	
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a) Generate a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions in excess of applicable thresholds adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District or the California Air Resources Board which may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The construction and operation of the office building proposed here will contribute to overall increases in green house gas emissions. Emissions will be generated by employee vehicle trips to and from the new and additional jobs located at the facility; by the commercial vehicle traffic generated by the proposed office uses; by the production of building materials, their transportation to the site, and the construction process; by the heating, cooling, and lighting of the completed buildings; by the machinery and products utilized in the course of business by eventual tenants; and by the machines, fertilizers, and vehicles used in the ongoing maintenance of the facility.

The Bay Area Air Quality Air District (BAAQMD) has established a significant threshold and screening criteria related to criteria air pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) for new development. The District's screening table (BAAQMD Air Quality guidelines, Table 3.1) addresses offices by providing and is given a screening criteria of 53,000 square feet. If this project exceeds that criterion and therefore was analyzed using the we performed our own Urban Land Use Emissions Model (URBEMIS). Inputting the operational characteristics into our URBEMIS air quality analysis for the project indicated that the facility, once complete, will result in area source emissions of 546.25 metric tons per year of carbon dioxide equivalents (MT/Y CO₂e) and operational (vehicle) emissions of 1,063.93 MT/Y CO₂e. According to the URBEMIS analysis, the project's total ongoing carbon dioxide emissions (area source plus operational emissions) are predicted to total 1,163.36 MT/Y CO₂e.

Effective June 2, 2010, the BAAQMD adopted qualitative and quantitative thresholds that are instructive in this regard. Specifically, the BAAQMD Guidelines (updated May 2011) suggests that development projects which will emit less than 1,100 MT/Y CO₂e may be considered to have a less than significant impact relative to GHG emissions (both individually and cumulatively). At a URBEMIS modeled unmitigated operational emissions rate of 1,163.36 MT/Y CO₂e, the subject project exceeds the BAAQMD's 1,100 MT/Y CO₂e threshold of significance. However, the BAAQMD's list of feasible mitigation measures for operational, mobile, and area-source Emissions (page 4-13-4-154 of the BQAAMD 2011a Guidelines) include sector reductions that this project qualifies for, as follows:

Transit Service 0-15% reduction Bike & Pedestrian 0-9% reduction Reduction of parking supply 0-50% reduction Planting of shade trees/shading the structure 30% reduction

Given that the project only needs a 0.6% reduction, the proposed listed sustainable design elements, the ultimate reduction could be entirely mitigated, however most likely close to a 30% reduction based on the above design elements. The current project incorporates greenhouse gas reduction methods and offsets. In particular, it includes bicycle and pedestrian-friendly facilities and improvements, permanent preservation of riparian habitat and a landscape easement, high efficiency irrigation, recycled water use, low VOC materials, the planting of more than 48 new trees (of which 46 of them will be native), designs that take advantage of passive natural cooling and heating, and a building which is designed to support the structural loads associated with roof-mounted solar arrays. Specifically if at least three transportation demand measures as defined from the Table: URBEMIS Mitigation Measures for Operational Mobile Source Emissions (BAAQMD, CEQA Guidelines, May June 2011a) are incorporated and the design includes pedestrian bike friendliness a 6% sector reduction is determined as feasible mitigation. As defined as part of the project and as required by Mitigation Measure number one and 2 below, the project provides for secure bike parking, preferential carpool parking, information on alternative transportation along with pedestrian and bicycle design features. Further the request for a 15% reduction in the parking supply yields an additional sector reduction of 15%. Therefore, as mitigated by Mitigation Measure Number OneOne, is estimated to result in a combined 21% reduction to the operational and area-source emissions, resulting in -are reduced to an

estimated emissions of 919.02 MT/Y CO₂e, well below the BAAQMD's 1,100 MT/Y CO₂e threshold of significance. The table further indicates that the installation of solar panels on commercial buildings can reduce the sector GHG pollutants by 100% (although not for URBEMIS calculations). The applicant has agreed to ~~Mitigation Measure Number One requires the installation of all pre-wiring, engineering, and pre-construction for the future installation of solar panels and has agreed to meet the requirements of the County's proposed Climate Action Plan. As revised, the October 31, 2011 Climate Action Plan would require discretionary projects to reduce their emissions 39% below "business as usual" in 2020 by applying a combination of State, local, and project-specific measures. As indicated by Mitigation Measure one, the applicant has agreed to provide a calculation demonstrating compliance with this proposed requirement prior to occupancy of the proposed building.~~

Mitigation Measure one reduce the project impacts related to the GHG emission to and global warming will be less than significant.

- b. Cumulative increases in 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. 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 ~~is currently serving~~ as the basis for development of a refined inventory and emission reduction plan for unincorporated Napa County.

Despite the adoption of mitigation measures that incorporated specific policies and action items into the General Plan, cumulative impacts from greenhouse gas emissions were found to be significant and unavoidable. Industrial development of the scale and scope proposed in this application has been programmed for the subject parcel since the County adopted the Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan (AIASP) in 1986. The development levels envisioned in the AIASP further informed the 2008 General Plan revision and provided a basis for the land use, air quality, traffic, and other analyses included in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan Update EIR is certified and the elements considered above were observed and considered conclusive.

The Napa County Department of Conservation, Development and Planning, working with the Napa County Department of Environmental Management and consultants at ICF, have prepared a REVISED Climate Action Plan for unincorporated Napa County and the Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on the revised plan and a checklist proposed for use by project applicants on Jan. 18, 2012. The REVISED Climate Action Plan provides a baseline inventory of green house gas (GHG) emissions from all sources in unincorporated Napa County, as well as strategies for reducing those emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 consistent with California Assembly Bill 32 from 2006. At the close of the hearing on Jan. 18, 2012, the Planning Commission will decide whether to forward the revised plan to the Board of Supervisors for adoption and whether to begin use of the proposed checklist on a trial basis. While the plan will not become effective until it is adopted by the Board of Supervisors, the applicant has agreed to abide by it's requirements and ~~Once adopted, the plan would require applicants to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions by 39% below "business as usual" in 2020. Staff used this project as an example when drafting the proposed spreadsheet and this project would comply as designed and the applicant has agreed to reduce the project's green house gas emissions by 39% as a condition of project approval and also included below as mitigation measure number one.~~

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). The applicants have incorporated GHG reduction methods where feasible including: energy efficient construction techniques and heating and cooling systems, water efficient irrigation; drought tolerant and local plant materials, bicycle parking, design all structures to accommodate solar arrays to the greatest extent possible including building structural design, roofing materials, building wiring and the like and the use of recycled and low VOC construction materials. These environmental commitments will assist the project to come up with the

Consistent with State CEQA standards (please 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 relatively modest increase in emissions expected as a result of the project would be well below the significance threshold suggested by BAAQMD, and in compliance with the County's General Plan efforts to reduce emissions described above. For these reasons, project impacts related to GHG emissions are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s):

2.1- Associated with the plans for construction, the plans shall include reference to installation of bike storage facilities, reduced parking as proposed, depict location and reference to the new transit stop, reference the alternative transportation educational materials, and the inclusion of the sunshade to be installed on the southern elevation, and depict on the DRAFT REVISED Climate Action Plan spreadsheet how the project will meet the objectives of reducing the project's "business as usual" greenhouse gas emissions by 39%.

Method of Mitigation Monitoring: This mitigation measure requires submittal of required building plans and/or specification prior to the issuance of a building permit and proof of installation prior to the authorization of final occupancy the Planning department will confirm the installation took place. If the measure is not complied with, no building permit or final occupancy will be issued.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those small amounts normally used in construction of the building. A Business Plan will be filed with the Environmental Health Division should the amount of hazardous materials reach reportable levels. However, in the event that the proposed use or a future use involves the use, storage or transportation of greater than 55 gallons or 500 pounds of hazardous materials, a use permit and subsequent environmental assessment would be required in accordance with the Napa County Zoning Ordinance prior to the establishment of the use. During construction of the project some hazardous materials, such as building coatings/ adhesives/ etc., will be utilized. However, given the quantities of hazardous materials and the limited duration, they will result in a less-than-significant impact.
- b. The project would not result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site.
- d. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*hazardous facilities* layer) the proposed site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.
- e. The project site is located within two miles of the Napa County Airport, and is therefore subject to the requirements of the County's Airport Compatibility Combination zoning district and the requirements of the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The project site is located within Zone D of the compatibility plan which is an area of common overflight and moderate risk. The proposed use of the building is highly compatible with the risk and noise impacts associated with properties within Zone D. The building has also been designed to comply with specific requirements regarding light and glare to ensure airport land use compatibility. County development regulations have been certified as meeting ALUC compatibility requirements, and consequently the project is not subject to separate ALUC review because it has been designed to comply with County airport compatibility land use requirements.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.
- g. The proposed driveways that serve the project will be improved to comply with County standards and access around the building has been designed to accommodate fire apparatus and large trucks. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Public Works Department and found acceptable as conditioned. The project does not physically interfere with implementation of adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. The project is located within the Napa County Fire local response area. Therefore, the design of the project will not impact or hinder emergency vehicle access.
- h. The project will not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires because the project is located within an urbanized area.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 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, 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not violate any known water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project will discharge into an approved storm drainage system designed to accommodate the drainage from this site. The applicant will be required to obtain a stormwater permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) which is administered by the County Public Works Department on behalf of the RWQCB. Given the essentially level terrain, and the County's Best Management Practices, which comply with RWQCB requirements, the project does not have the potential to significantly

impact water quality and discharge standards.

- b. The project will connect to municipal water provided by the City of American Canyon. No groundwater wells are associated with this property.
- c-d. The proposed project will not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off site. The project will incorporate erosion control measures appropriate to its maximum slope to manage onsite surface drainage and erosion of onsite soils during construction and winter months (October to April). As noted above, the project is required to comply with County Public Works requirements which are consistent with RWQCB standards. These established Best Management Practices have been successfully implemented on numerous previous projects within AIASP area. By incorporating erosion control measures, this project would have a less than significant impact. No substantial alteration of existing drainage is anticipated to occur. There will be an increase in the overall impervious surface resulting from the new buildings, pavement and sidewalks. However, given the size of the drainage basin, the increase in impervious surfaces will not discernibly change the amount of groundwater filtration or discernibly increase surface runoff from that which currently exists on site. Project impacts related to drainage patterns and off-site flows will be less than significant.
- e. The existing storm drainage system is designed to County standards and is sized to accommodate all drainage from this site.
- f. There are no other factors in this project that would otherwise degrade water quality.
- g-i. According to Napa County environmental resource mapping (*Floodplain* and *Dam Levee Inundation* layers), the project site is not located within a flood hazard area, nor would it impede or redirect flood flows or expose structures or people to flooding. The project site is not located within a dam or levee failure inundation zone.
- j. In coming years, higher global temperatures are expected to raise sea level by expanding ocean water, melting mountain glaciers and small ice caps, and causing portions of Greenland and the Antarctic ice sheets to melt. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change estimates that the global average sea level will rise between 0.6 and 2 feet over the next century (IPCC, 2007). However, the project area is located at approximately 42-55 feet above mean sea level. There is no known history of mud flow in the vicinity. The project will not subject people or structures to a significant risk of inundation from tsunami, seiche, or mudflow.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 proposed project as proposed is within the AIASP area and could be defined as a community; however the development is very compatible within the AIASP area community and on the contrary to dividing it, it will enhance it. The project will not

result in the division of an established community. The proposed project complies with the Napa County General Plan, the Napa County Zoning Ordinance and related applicable County Code sections, the Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan, and all other applicable regulations. There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the property.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

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

Discussion:

a/b. 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 or near the project site.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. The proposed project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during the construction of buildings, parking areas, and associated improvements. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly-muffled vehicles. No ground borne vibration or ground borne noise is anticipated. Noise generated during this period is not anticipated to be significant. Furthermore, construction activities will generally occur during the period of 7am-7pm on weekdays- normal waking hours. All construction activities will be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (Napa County Code Chapter 8.16). The proposed project will not result in long-term significant construction noise impacts.
- c/d. The site is currently vacant therefore, development of an office building will increase the overall anticipated level of noise to occur following the completion of construction including the operation of the facility would be typical of a winery in an existing industrial park. The project does not include any activity that will cause a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels. The project is located within a developing industrial park and is not in an area where noise increases resulting from additional industrial development will impact sensitive receptors. Enforcement of Napa County's Exterior Noise Ordinance is and will continue by the Department of Environmental Management and the Napa County Sheriff.
- e. The proposed project site is located within compatibility Zone D of the Napa County Airport, which is an area of common aircraft overflight. As such, persons on the project site will be exposed to noise from regular aircraft overflight. As analyzed at some length in the AIASP and the ALUCP (refer to table 2-1) the conventional construction of the office building eliminates most interior noise intrusions for surrounding properties. , the development and uses proposed her are considered compatible. The nature of the use is not sensitive to increased noise levels from aircraft, and is considered compatible with aircraft operations.
- f. The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Submitted application materials indicate that this project will result in the creation or relocation of approximately 244 full time equivalent jobs. While a number of these jobs may already exist in Napa County (and would simply relocate to the project site from existing industrial or commercial developments) the project will almost certainly add to the local job base and contribute to the 23% population increase projected for Napa County by the year 2030 (*Projections 2003*, Association of Bay Area Governments). However, the County's *Baseline Data Report* (Napa County Baseline Data Report, November 30, 2005) indicates that total housing units currently programmed in county and municipal housing elements exceed ABAG growth projections by approximately 15%. As a result of the county's projected low to moderate growth rate and overall adequate programmed housing supply, the indirect population growth that may result from this project will not create a cumulatively considerable increase in the demand for housing units within Napa County and the general vicinity.

With regard to project-specific impacts, the County has adopted a Housing Element (currently under review by the State Housing and Community Development Agency) which identifies locations for new housing, and has adopted a development impact fee to provide funding for affordable housing projects. The affordable housing impact fee is a condition of project approval and is paid at the time building permits are issued for any new non-residential development and is based on the gross square footage of non-residential space multiplied by the fee established at N.C.C. Chapter 15.60.100, Table 1. The combination of countywide Housing Element programmed housing and required housing impact mitigation fees reduce the project specific growth inducing impacts of a project of this type to a less than significant level.

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

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. Public services are currently provided to the Airport Industrial Area, and as the subject parcel has been slated for intensive industrial development in all relevant County land use plans for more than two decades, the additional demand placed on existing services will be both marginal and entirely foreseen. County revenue resulting from any building permit fees or property tax increases resulting from this project, and potential sales taxes from the sale of wine will help meet the costs of providing public services to the property. As discussed throughout the county below, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact on public services.

Fire Protection

The Fire Marshall has reviewed the submittal and has made a recommendation for approval based on the memo dated October 28, 2008.

Police Protection & Other Public Facilities

The Public Works and Sheriff's Departments have reviewed the application and have not identified any substantial adverse physical impacts associated with public facilities. No other public facilities will be impacted.

School Facilities

School impact mitigation fees, which assist local school districts with capacity building measures, will be levied pursuant to building permit submittal. This project will have no impact to schools.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

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

Discussion:

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

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system and/or conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-16, which seeks to maintain an adequate Level of Service (LOS) at signalized and unsignalized intersections, or reduce the effectiveness of existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-23, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a.-b. Weekday traffic volumes within the project vicinity consist primarily of commute traffic within peak traffic periods and residential flows from nearby communities, commercial, tourist, and industrial park traffic occurring throughout the day. Southern Napa County is characterized by two distinct commute traffic patterns: a Napa to Bay Area commute, and a smaller Solano County to Napa commute. The existing traffic congestion is primarily the result of regional growth impacts. Major improvements to both CA-29 and CA-12 are necessary to address regional traffic congestion. As mandated by Napa County [Resolution numbers 08-146 and 08-147](#), projects within the industrial park are responsible for paying "fair share" costs for the construction of improvements to impacted roadways within the industrial park.

Since 1990, the County has imposed and collected traffic mitigation fees on all development projects within the Airport Industrial Area. A developer's "fair share" fee goes toward funding roadway improvements within the specific plan area including improvements designed to relieve traffic on State Highways. ~~The traffic mitigation fee is further described in Board of Supervisor's Resolution 08-20.~~ For this project, a traffic mitigation fee based on PM peak hour vehicle trips will be imposed and collected prior to issuance of the building permit as determined by the Director of Public Works and is included as a

mitigation measure below. The Department of Public Works is in the process of completing an update of the Airport Industrial Area traffic mitigation fee program. However, the current fee is \$3,551 per PM peak hour trip. The project's 101 PM peak hour trips would result in a fee of \$358,651.

That program specifically addresses, and the associated fees will mitigate, cumulative impacts at the 2008 General Plan Revision sunset date of 2030. Cumulative traffic impacts at the 2030 horizon will be addressed by that larger document and are therefore not a specific subject of this review. The Traffic Mitigation Fee program provides funding for road improvements necessitated by cumulative development and projects are identified in Exhibit A of the Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan Traffic Mitigation Fee Program As per Rick Marshall, Napa County Public Works Deputy Director the next project for construction is the completion of Devlin Road to South Kelly Road. This will improve traffic conditions on State Route 29 because interior traffic flow within the industrial park can happen without traveling on the Highway. The most significant traffic deficient area is the traffic flow from State Route 29 east to Interstate 80 which the construction of four lanes on Jameson Canyon is currently out to bid for construction. Those two reasonably foreseeable projects will be in construction before this project is completed. Another important project in the vicinity is the flyover over/underpass at Soscol Road/121 and State Route 29 is nearing approval of the environmental review, however no funding is currently secured.

The County has established that a significant traffic impact would occur if increases in traffic from a project would cause intersections or two-lane highway capacity to deteriorate to worse than Level of Service (LOS) E, or at intersections or two-lane highways where base case (without project) is LOS F. A significant impact is considered to occur if a project increases the base volumes by more than one percent. The 1% threshold has been utilized consistently throughout all recent EIRs and other CEQA documents addressing projects within the Airport Industrial Area. With the addition of this project trips the CA12-29 intersection would remain acceptable (LOS "D" or better).

The applicant has submitted a traffic study (*Focused Traffic Impact Analysis for the Proposed Napa Executive Center Project in the Napa Airport Industrial Area (NAIA)* George W. Nickelson, December 19, 2008) which analyzes existing and proposed traffic conditions and provides the basis for this analysis. The project is anticipated to generate 105 AM peak trips (93 inbound and 13 outbound), and 101 PM peak trips (17 inbound and 84 outbound) based on "Industrial Park" (land use code 130) trip rates as compiled at *Trip Generation, 8th Edition* (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2008).

With a combination of the traffic demand management measures identified in the analysis and included as a mitigation measure number one and mitigation measure two incorporated below requiring payment of the project's "fair share" of traffic improvements as necessitated by the cumulative traffic impact analysis incorporated into the final adopted Update of Airport Industrial Area Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, there will be no residual individually or cumulatively significant traffic impacts associated with the project as regards traffic congestion and levels of service. All traffic impacts will be mitigated to less than significant. As mitigated hereby, project specific impacts related to traffic will be less than significant. The traffic impact has been analyzed and the project's contribution to cumulative traffic impacts are rendered less than "considerable" due to the imposition of impact fees and the construction of improvements that will result from the payment of fees by this applicant and others.

There will be no residual individually or cumulatively significant traffic impacts associated with this project as regards traffic congestion and levels of service. All traffic impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level by the payment of the in-lieu fees for cumulative traffic impacts.

- c. The project is fully compliant with the Napa Airport Compatibility Plan (please see **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**, above) and will not have any impact on air traffic patterns.
- d.-e. The project includes construction of an extension of Gateway Road east. The new driveway and site access has been designed to comply with all County standards. No hazardous situations will be created and adequate emergency access will be in place.
- f. The project includes 203 automotive parking spaces, plus bicycle parking spaces. The Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan would require 233 parking spaces, meaning that a waiver from parking requirements is technically required for this project. A shortfall of thirty parking spaces, especially in a project of this scale, is not deemed a potentially significant impact. On-site parking would be more than adequate. An exception can be granted under Section V.H.3 of the *Airport Area Specific Plan* for environmental benefits and can be supported by the inclusion of on-site transit stops, bicycle parking, and carpooling programs.

- g. The proposed project includes significant new bike lane and bike parking facilities and does not conflict with any policies or plans supporting alternative transportation.

Mitigation Measure(s): ~~None required.~~

2. ~~4.~~ Prior to County issuance of a Building Permit, the applicant ~~will be required to shall~~ submit payment of the Napa County's traffic mitigation fee in accordance with Board Resolution 08-20, as may be amended.

Method of Mitigation Monitoring: Payment of the traffic mitigation fee is required prior to the issuance of a building permit.

~~Method of Mitigation Monitoring: Payment of the traffic mitigation fee is required prior to the issuance of a building permit.~~

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 +
Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 +
Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent
at: 0.5"

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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. The project will occur within an urbanized area and connect to a publicly maintained wastewater treatment system. The wastewater provider, Napa Sanitation District, has provided a "will serve" letter and has found the project to be in compliance with their master plans. The District's wastewater treatment plant complies with all water quality discharge requirements; the project will comply with regional water quality control standards.
- b. The project will not require construction of any new water or wastewater treatment facilities that will result in a significant

impact to the environment. The project site is located in an area planned for industrial development and existing water and wastewater treatment facilities have been sized to accommodate the proposed project. The subject parcel is within the City of American Canyon water service area and will receive treated water from the City of American Canyon water system (will serve letter dated March 28, 2008), managed by that City's Department of Public Works.

The proposed project will require new pipelines at the site to connect to existing supply pipelines that ultimately tie back into the City of American Canyon's water treatment plant. The project will also install purple irrigation pipe so that reclaimed water supplied by the Napa Sanitation District can ultimately be used for landscape irrigation demand. Use of reclaimed water for irrigation will ultimately reduce the use of treated water provided by the City of American Canyon.

The Napa Sanitation District operates a wastewater treatment plant approximately 1.4 miles to the northwest of the project site. The facility, which is located at 1515 Soscol Ferry Road, is a 15 million gallon per day treatment plant that includes preliminary treatment, primary treatment, biological secondary treatment, secondary clarification or sedimentation, sand filtration, chlorination, sludge digestion, and solids dewatering. As evidenced by the will serve letter, the facility has adequate capacity to treat the projected 3,510 gallons of wastewater per day from the proposed project.

Emissions from the construction and the operation of this facility were evaluated in the approved 2008 General Plan Update and certified EIR further they are well within the contemplated emissions and will comply with all applicable mandates.

- c. The project will ultimately discharge stormwater into an approved storm drainage system designed to accommodate the drainage from this site. The applicant will be required to obtain a stormwater permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, via a program which is administered by the County Department of Public Works. The Department of Public Works will incorporate conditions of approval requiring that the drainage system be designed to avoid diversion or concentration of storm water runoff onto adjacent properties. Environmental impacts related to the connection to the existing draining facilities will be less than significant.
- d. See response "b." above.
- e. The proposed project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity to meet the projects demands. No significant impact will occur from the disposal of solid waste generated by the proposed project.
- g. The proposed project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Mitigation Measure(s): 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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. No historic or prehistoric resources are anticipated to be affected by the proposed project. The project will not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
- b. As mitigated herein, the subject project does not have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. Potential impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions and traffic are discussed in their respective sections above. The project would also increase the demands for public services to a limited extent, increase housing demand, and increase traffic and air pollution, all of which contribute to cumulative effects when future development along CA-29 is considered. Cumulative impacts of these issues are discussed and mitigated, as necessary, in the relevant sections of this initial study (for example: **GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS** and **TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC**).
- c. Having thoroughly reviewed the project and completed the above initial study, as mitigated herein, we find no environmental impacts that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

References:

The following documents are referenced throughout the document and available for review: *Focused Traffic Analysis for the Proposed Napa Executive Center Project in the Napa Airport Industrial*, George Nickelson *Special Status Species Evaluation*, Huffman-Broadway Group, Inc. Dated February 16, 2010 *Stormwater Run off Management Plan* prepared by Riechers and Spence dated October 1, 2010 *URBEMIS Annual Emissions Modeling Report* (Shelton) *Wetland Delineation Determination*, Department of the Army, received April 30, 2010 Will serve letter from the City of American Canyon dated March 28, 2008, Will serve letter from Napa Sanitation District dated April 23, 2008.