



A Tradition of Stewardship
A Commitment to Service

COUNTY OF NAPA
CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND PLANNING DEPARTMENT
1195 3rd Street, Suite 210
Napa, Calif. 94559
707.253.4417

Notice of Intent to Adopt a Subsequent Negative Declaration

1. **Project Title & Number:** Inglewood Business Park; Use Permit Modification (P11-00107) and Tentative Parcel Map (P11-00478)
2. **Property Owner:** Inglewood Business Partners LLC, 318 Diablo Rd, Suite 250, Danville, CA 94526
3. **County contact person, phone number, and email:** Linda St. Claire, Planner II, 299-1348, linda.stclaire@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project location and APN:** The 2.92 acre project site is located on the west side of State Highway 29 (St Helena Hwy) and the south side of Inglewood Ave., approximately 0.38 miles south of the City of St. Helena, APN: 027-590-001, 800 St. Helena Hwy, St. Helena
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Donna Oldford, Plans4Wine, 2620 Pinto Way, St. Helena, CA 94574
6. **General Plan designation:** AR – Agricultural Resources
7. **Zoning:** CN – Commercial Neighborhood

Brief Description of the Project: Approval to modify Use Permit #99077-UP to construct an approximately 4,092 square foot one story office building and add an additional 15 parking spaces to an existing 3 building office complex for a total of 27,764 square feet and with a total of 132 parking spaces. The building will be constructed using the same materials and in the same design as the three previously approved and constructed buildings; & approval to re-subdivide the existing 3 unit commercial Condominium project into 14 units with a common owner's association responsible for building and property maintenance.

8. **Hazardous Waste Sites:** The project site is not located on the lists enumerated under Section 65962.5 of the Government Code, including, but not limited to lists of hazardous waste facilities.

PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION:

The Napa County Director of Conservation, Development, and Planning has tentatively determined that the project analyzed in the attached initial study checklist would not have a significant effect on the environment and the County intends to adopt a subsequent negative declaration. Copies of the proposed negative declaration and all documents referenced are available for review at the offices of the Napa County Conservation, Development, and Planning Department, 1195 Third St., Suite 210, Napa, CA 94559 between the hours of 8:00 AM and 4:45 PM Monday through Friday (excepting holidays).

DATE OF THIS NOTICE

BY: Linda St. Claire

WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD: January 8, 2012 to January 27, 2012

Please send written comments to the attention of Linda St. Claire at 1195 Third St., Suite 210, Napa, CA. 94559, or via e-mail to sean.trippi@countyofnapa.org. A public hearing on this project is tentatively scheduled for the Napa County Conservation, Development, and Planning Commission at 9:00 AM or later on February 1, 2012. You may confirm the date and time of this hearing by calling (707) 253.4417.

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

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated September 2010)

1. **Project Title:** Inglewood Business Park; Use Permit Modification (P11-00107) and Tentative Parcel Map (P11-00478)
2. **Property Owner:** Inglewood Business Partners LLC, 318 Diablo Rd, Suite 250, Danville, CA 94526
3. **Napa County contact person, phone number and e-mail:** Linda St. Claire, Planner II, 299-1348, linda.stclaire@countyofnapa.org
4. **Project location and APN(s):** The 2.92 acre project site is located on the west side of State Highway 29 (St Helena Hwy) and the south side of Inglewood Ave., approximately 0.38 miles south of the City of St. Helena, APN: 027-590-001, 800 St. Helena Hwy, St. Helena
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Donna Oldford, Plans4Wine, 2620 Pinto Way, St. Helena, CA 94574.
6. **General Plan description:** AR – Agricultural Resources
7. **Zoning:** CN – Commercial Neighborhood
8. **Project Background:**

The site is currently developed with three commercial office buildings. The Use Permit (#99077-UP) for the Inglewood Village Business Park was originally approved by the Planning Commission in January 2001. The use permit allowed the construction of three commercial structures for general business offices, including professional, executive, financial, real estate, insurance offices, and a retail nursery and garden center. Building A consisted of 3,575 sq. ft. and was intended to be a retail nursery and garden center with approximately one-acre for outdoor display. Buildings B and C consisted of 4,030 sq. ft. and 15,675 sq. ft. respectively, and were intended for office uses. Buildings A and B were one-story and Building C was two-stories. As part of the original project approval, the project site was rezoned from CL (Commercial Limited) to CN (Commercial Neighborhood).

An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) addressing commercial development on the property was previously prepared and certified in January 2001, and used as the basis for approval of the original Use Permit. The EIR assessed the potential environmental effect of the Inglewood Village Business Park, including expected individual and cumulative environmental impacts resulting from the approval, construction, and operation of the project. Mitigation measures were incorporated into the project and have been met or implemented. The prior EIR is on file and available for public review in the CDPD. It was determined that there were economic, social and community benefits to be derived from the project; that there was no conflict with agriculture; and, that the site had limited capacity for commercially-viable agricultural uses. Based upon those findings, a Statement of Overriding Considerations regarding the significant and unavoidable cumulative traffic impacts was adopted for the project. The original traffic analysis for this site assumed more intense commercial site uses based upon 54 PM peak hour trips. The proposed project would generate 6 AM and 6 PM peak hour trips and a total of 26 trips for the site, which is lower than the peak hour trips analyzed in the previous EIR (please see Section XV Transportation /Traffic for more details). The proposed use permit modification is within the scope of the Inglewood Village Business Park EIR. No new environmental impacts which were not assessed by the EIR would result from the proposed modification; no substantial changes are proposed that would require major revisions of the EIR; no substantial changes would occur which would require major revisions of the EIR; and there is no new substantial information.

In June of 2004, a modification was approved (P04-0428-UP-ModVMin) by the Napa County Planning Commission to revise the previously approved site plan by replacing a 3,575 square foot garden center building and one acre outdoor nursery with a 4,030 square foot one story office building and vineyard. The building (Building A) was built during phase 1 of the project.

On June 8, 2010 the Napa County Planning Commission approved a modification (P10-00057) to allow St. Helena Hospital to establish medical offices in approximately 6,345 square feet of the first floor of the existing 15,675 square foot two story building (Building C). The EIR evaluated medical offices as a potential user within the multi-tenant complex. In December of 2010 a very minor mod (P10-00383) was approved to increase the hospital use to an additional 1,600 square feet of the second floor.

Tentative Parcel Map

In 2008 Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) P08-00493 was approved by the Napa County Planning Commission for a single lot tentative parcel map for condominium purposes with three existing commercial buildings and one common space. Each building was approved as a single condominium unit. Two condominium units are sized at 4,030 square feet and one condominium unit is sized at 15,675 square feet. At some point following the approval of the TPM, Building C was converted and now holds six illegal condominium units. Buildings A & B continue to exist as one unit each.

9. Project Description:

Approval to modify Use Permit #99077-UP to: construct an approximately 4,092 square foot one story office building, add an additional 15 parking spaces to an existing 3 building office complex for a total of 27,764 square feet and with a total of 132 parking spaces and install an additional storm water detention system. The building will be constructed using the same materials and in the same design as the three previously approved and constructed buildings, which consist of corrugated metal roofing, board and batten siding with cultured stone base; and approval to re-subdivide the existing 3 unit commercial Condominium project into 14 units with a common owner's association responsible for building and property maintenance.

10. Environmental setting and surrounding land uses:

The 2.92 acre project site is located on the west side of State Highway 29 (St Helena Hwy) and the south side of Inglewood Ave., approximately 0.38 miles south of the City of St. Helena, APN: 027-590-001, 800 St. Helena Hwy, St. Helena. The project site is currently developed with three buildings, divided into condominium spaces and leased out as offices. The site is located on the valley floor. Properties in the vicinity of the project site range in size from 0.13 to 39 acres. Surrounding uses include wineries, commercial uses, single-family homes and vineyards. The nearest commercial entities include Flyers Gas Station, Storage Pro, and St. Helena Wine Merchants. The nearest wineries, within one mile, include V. Sattui and Hall Winery.

11. **Other agencies whose approval is required:** Discretionary approval required by Napa County consists of a use permit modification and tentative parcel map. The proposed project would also require various ministerial approvals by Napa County including, but not limited to building permits, grading permits and waste disposal permits. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is required to meet San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board standards and is administered by the County Public Works Department.

The proposed project does not involve modifications to a streambed, and thus does not require a streambed alteration agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game. The proposed project does not involve the fill of waters of the United States, and thus does not require a dredge-and-fill permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The proposed project does not involve the "take" of listed endangered or threatened species, and thus does not require a "take permit" from the Department of Fish and Game, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or the National Marine Fisheries Service.

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

Other Agencies Contacted

City of St. Helena
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 SUBSEQUENT NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Linda St. Claire, Planner

Date

Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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/c. The project site is currently developed with existing commercial structures and associated improvements. This is a proposal for an additional structure located at the rear of the parcel. The parcel is currently used for commercial purposes. The additional building will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. The EIR prepared in April 2000 found aesthetic impacts to be less than significant.

The project would not result in substantial damage to scenic resources or substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. No tree removal is proposed and there are no rock outcroppings onsite. The building is proposed within a previously disturbed area currently planted in vines.

d. Pursuant to standard Napa County conditions of approval for commercial buildings, outdoor lighting is required to be shielded and directed downwards, with only low level lighting allowed in parking areas. The standard condition of approval relating to lighting states that;

All exterior lighting, including landscape lighting, shall be shielded and directed downward, shall be located as low to the ground as possible, 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. Architectural highlighting and/or spotting are not allowed. Low-level lighting shall be utilized in parking areas as opposed to elevated high-intensity light standards. All lighting shall comply with the California Building Code.

The standard condition of approval will ensure that any potential impacts resulting from new sources of outside lighting are less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. ¹ Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The existing development area has been previously disturbed. According to the Napa County GIS mapping systems this parcel is not identified as "farmland". It is identified as "Urban and Built Up Lands". As a result, this application will not result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use. A total of 0.22 acres of vines will be removed.
- b. The property's CN (Commercial Neighborhood) zoning allows offices and related accessory uses upon grant of a use permit.
- c. As discussed at items "a." and "b.", above, the commercial office uses proposed in this application are allowed under current zoning. Neither this project, nor any foreseeable consequence thereof, would result in changes to the existing environment which would result in the conversion of special status farmland to a non-agricultural use.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

¹ "Forest land" is defined by the State as "land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits." (Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) The Napa County General Plan anticipates and does not preclude conversion of some "forest land" to agricultural use, and the program-level EIR for the 2008 General Plan Update analyzed the impacts of up to 12,500 acres of vineyard development between 2005 and 2030, with the assumption that some of this development would occur on "forest land." In that analysis specifically, and in the County's view generally, the conversion of forest land to agricultural use would constitute a potentially significant impact only if there were resulting significant impacts to sensitive species, biodiversity, wildlife movement, sensitive biotic communities listed by the California Department of Fish and 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. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plan. Office uses, such as the one proposed here, are not producers of air pollution in volumes substantial enough to result in any air quality plan conflicts. The project site lies at the central area of the Napa Valley, which forms one of the climatologically 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. Potential, short term, air quality impacts could 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 preliminary screening for Construction Criteria Pollutant Screen Size established in the May 2011 Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines provides a conservative indication of whether the proposed project would result in the generation of construction related criteria air pollutants and/or precursors that exceed the thresholds of significance. Table 3-1 of the BAAQMD Guidelines lists the criteria for a General office building and it does not exceed the size limitations which would result in pollutants and/or precursors that exceed the thresholds.
- b. Over the long term, emission sources for the proposed project would consist primarily of mobile sources including deliveries and vehicles visiting the site. The *Bay Area Air Quality Management District's* operational-related criteria air pollutant and precursor screening levels are 346 and 53 ksf (where ksf=thousand square feet) respectively. The use permit modification proposed here includes a proposal for a 4,092 square foot structure, well below the significant threshold levels and therefore a less than significant impact on the environment. According to the Institute of Traffic Engineers, Trip Generation, 8th Edition, 2008, office building uses defined as free-standing single business (non-manufacturing uses) are expected to generate 1.55 daily vehicle trips per 1,000 sq. ft. of floor area. Based on the proposed 4,092 sq. ft. building, approximately 20-26 total daily vehicle trips would be generated based on office trip generation rates. However, a focused trip generation analysis was prepared by George W. Nickelson, P.E., of Omni Means, dated September 19, 2011, for the proposal. He used current site specific counts for the existing three office buildings. The analysis indicated that on a fairly typical day, about 20 AM peak hour trips and 26 PM Peak hour trips are generated. Given the number of vehicle trips and deliveries generated by this proposal when compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion, 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. The number of trips is also well below the trips analyzed in the prior EIR.
- b. Please see "a.", above. There are no projected or existing air quality violations in the area to which this proposal would contribute. The project would not result in any violations of applicable air quality standards.
- c. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has established significance thresholds and screening criteria for criteria pollutants and precursors, including reactive organic gas, nitrogen oxide, and ten-micron particulate matter, for both operational and construction related emissions for new development. If the proposed project meets the screening criteria in the District's screening table (BAAQMD Air Quality Guidelines, Table 3.1), the project would not result in the generation of operational or construction related criteria air pollutants and/or precursors that the exceed the Threshold of Significance shown in Table 2-1. The District's screening table suggests that office uses less than 277,000 square feet in size would not generate construction related emissions in excess of the significance criterion for criteria pollutants. Office uses less than 346,000 square feet in size would not generate operational related emissions in excess of the significance criterion for criteria pollutants. Since the building is proposed at 4,092 square feet, construction and operation of the project would therefore result in a less-than significant cumulative impact to air quality from criteria pollutant and precursor emissions.

d/e. The BAAQMD defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact. The nearest residence is approximately 75 feet to the west. 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 Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 proposed project is on a previously developed site with commercial office buildings. No special species, plant or animal has been identified on this previously developed site. No construction or changes are proposed outside previously disturbed areas. The 2000 EIR did not identify any biological resources.

e. The proposed project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including tree preservation policies or ordinances. No trees will be removed as a result of this project.

f. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans applicable to the subject parcel.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 current proposal, to construct an office building, will have no adverse changes on historic resources. No historic resources, as defined in CEQA 15064.5, have been identified on this parcel. The site has been previously disturbed. No information was found to indicate archaeological resources are on the site. However, if resources are found during construction of the proposed building, waste disposal system, and associated improvements, construction would be required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard conditions of approval related to archaeological or paleontological resources, as follows;

In the event that archeological artifacts or human remains are discovered during construction, work shall cease in a 50-foot radius surrounding the area of discovery. The permittee shall contact the Conservation, Development and Planning Department for further guidance, which will likely include the requirement for the permittee to hire a qualified professional to analyze the artifacts encountered and to determine if additional measures are required. If human remains are encountered during the development, all work in the vicinity must be, by law, halted, and the Napa County Coroner informed, so that he 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 information has been encountered that would indicate that this project would encounter human remains. However, if resources are found during construction, construction would be required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard conditions 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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. As such, the proposed facility would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.
 - ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the addition 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 editions of the Uniform Building Code for seismic stability would reduce any impacts to a less than significant level.
 - iv.) No indication of landslides have been found in the geological layers of the Napa County Environmental Resources Maps resulting in a reduction of this risk to a less than significant level.
- b. Based upon the Soil Survey of Napa County, prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the portion of the site where the proposed structure will be located is composed of two types of soils: the Pleasanton loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes and Cortina very gravelly loam, 0 to 5 percent slopes. The Cortina series consists of excessively drained soils on flood plains and alluvial fans. Elevations range from 100 to 500 feet. The vegetation historically consists of willows and water grasses. The Pleasanton loam series consists of well drained soils on alluvial fans. Elevations range from 50-600 feet. The native vegetation is grasses and scattered oaks. The area here has been highly disturbed and runoff has been controlled. Project approval will continue to 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. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Surficial Deposits layer) pre-Quaternary deposits underlie the surficial soils on the project site. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (Liquefaction layer) the project site has a 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 for any improvements requiring building permits. The report will address the soil stability, potential for liquefaction and will be used to design specific foundation systems and grading methods.
- e. The Napa County Department of Environmental Management has reviewed this application and recommends approval based on the submitted wastewater feasibility report. Soils on the property have been determined to be adequate to support the existing septic system and the proposed additional building.

Mitigation Measure(s): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a) Generate a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions in excess of applicable thresholds adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District or the California Air Resources Board which may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- b) Conflict with a county-adopted climate action plan or another applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

☐
☐
☒
☐

Discussion:

- a. Construction and operation of the project analyzed in this initial study would contribute to overall increases in Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions by generating emissions associated with transportation to and from the site, emissions from energy used within the building, and emissions from the use of equipment during construction. In addition, the project may result in a marginal increase in baseline carbon sequestration. Although the project includes the removal of existing ornamental vines; a broad range of plant materials including new trees, shrubs and ground cover will be planted in their place. The project-specific increase in GHG emissions would be relatively modest, given the 26 daily trips per the focused traffic analysis, the increasingly stringent Title 24 energy conservation requirements, and the recently adopted 2010 Green Building Standard, both imposed as part of the building permit process.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has established a significance threshold and screening criteria related to greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) for new development. The District's screening table (BAAQMD Air Quality Guidelines, Table 3.1) suggests that general office building of less than 53,000 square feet in size would not generate GHG in excess of the significance criterion (1,100 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents per year) nor would it exceed the construction criteria pollutant screening size of 277,000 square feet. The proposed building includes approximately 4,092 square feet of floor area. Since the proposed floor area is below the screening levels for similar uses in the District's Guidelines, it's clear that the proposed use would not generate GHG above the significance threshold established by the District, and further analysis (and quantification) of GHG emissions is not warranted.

- b. Cumulative increases in green house gas (GHG) emissions in Napa County were assessed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the Napa County General Plan Update and certified in June 2008. GHG emissions were found to be significant and unavoidable in that document, despite the adoption of mitigation measures incorporating specific policies and action items into the General Plan.

Consistent with these General Plan action items, Napa County participated in the development of a community-wide GHG emissions inventory and "emission reduction framework" for all local jurisdictions in the County in 2008-2009. This planning effort was completed by the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency in December 2009, and is currently serving as the basis for development of a refined inventory and emission reduction plan for unincorporated Napa County.

Pending adoption of the emission reduction plan, the County requires project applicants to consider methods to reduce GHG emissions consistent with Napa County General Plan Policy **CON-65(e)**. The applicant has 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, and bicycle parking as indicated on the Checklist of Voluntary Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Measures.

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, because this initial study assesses a project that is consistent with an adopted General Plan for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was prepared, it appropriately focuses on impacts which are "peculiar to the project," rather than the cumulative impacts previously assessed. The 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): None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>
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 project site would contain primarily offices. No significant hazardous materials are expected to be used by office tenants. Small amounts of toxics could be used (such as white out and office cleaners), but these are not considered to be a significant hazard and are present in all office spaces in the County. The 2000 EIR identified hazardous substances on a parcel now located next to the proposed building site. Mitigation measure included removing the Underground Storage Tank (UST) and identifying contaminants (if any) and creating and implementing a remedial plan. Napa County Environmental Management received a Closure report prepared by KR Environmental, dated September 2002, which describes the UST removal and remediation of the site. Soil samples were analyzed and concentrations were less than the California established maximum levels. No further remediation was required and therefore, the hazard has been reduced to a less than significant level.
- b. Office uses would not emit hazardous emissions, or create a significant hazard to the public through reasonable foreseeable accident conditions.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the proposed project site.
- d. The proposed site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.
- e. The project site is not located within two miles of any public airport.
- f. The project site is not located within the vicinity of any private airports.
- g. The proposed project will not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan.
- h. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. There are no wild lands in the vicinity of the parcel. It is 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 City of St. Helena City Council renegotiated the water agreement with Inglewood Business Park and agreed to continue providing domestic water, albeit on a lesser degree than the original agreement, but still enough for the projected needs. The Napa County Department of Environmental Management has reviewed the proposed upgrades to the wastewater systems and recommends approval as conditioned. Additionally, the applicant will be required to obtain all necessary permits from the Napa County Department of Public Works, including a Stormwater Pollution Management Permit. That permit will provide for adequate on site containment of runoff during storm events through placement of siltation measures around the development area. The City of St. Helena agreed in 2000 to supply 538,740 gallons per year to the site and have modified this agreement to lower the amount of water to 452,542 gallons per year or approximately 8,700 gallons per week. This is a 16% reduction in water use.
- b. As stated above, the property owner has finalized an amended water use agreement with the City of St. Helena for their domestic water uses. Groundwater will be used solely for landscaping. The current and proposed groundwater use is 0.50 acre feet per year.
- c.-e. A public inquiry request to determine the effectiveness of the existing drainage facilities concluded that they are in proper working order as designed. The proposal request includes an additional stormwater detention system and will be conditioned by the Department of Public Works. The applicant has submitted a Stormwater Runoff Management Plan and a hydrology study by Bartelt Engineering which proposes an additional storm water detention vault under the proposed parking area or a similar above ground detention tank, to provide for a 100 year, 6 hour storm event. The additional detention vault or storage tank will capture any additional runoff due to construction of Building D and the

proposed project, as conditioned, would result in a less than significant impact. The permittee will be required to comply with the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board addressing stormwater pollution during construction activities.

- f. There is nothing included in this proposal that would otherwise substantially degrade water quality. As discussed in greater detail in, "a.," above, the Department of Environmental Management has reviewed the sanitary wastewater proposal and has found the existing system adequate to meet the facility's needs as conditioned. No information has been encountered that would indicate a substantial impact to 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). 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. The proposed project is located in an area dominated by commercial, residential and open space uses and the improvements proposed here are in support of the ongoing commercial use of the property. This project will not divide an established community.
- b. The subject parcel is located in the CN (Commercial Neighborhood) zoning district, which allows office buildings and associated accessory uses subject to use permit approval. The County has adopted the 2008 General Plan which allows for and promotes the proposed use on parcels zoned as such. The EIR written for the original project analyzed land use issues and found them consistent with the General Plan.
- c. 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"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. The proposed project will result in a temporary increase in noise levels during the construction of the building, parking areas, and associated improvements. Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. The proposed project would not result in long-term significant permanent construction noise impacts or operational impacts. Furthermore, construction activities would generally occur during the period of 7am-7pm on weekdays, during normal hours of human activity. All construction activities will be conducted in compliance with the Napa County Noise Ordinance (N.C.C. Chapter 8.16).

c/d. Noise from office buildings is very limited. The Napa County Exterior Noise Ordinance, which was adopted in 1984, sets the maximum permissible received sound level for a rural residence as 45 db between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. While the 45 db limitation is strict (45 db is roughly equivalent to the sound generated by a quiet conversation), the area surrounding the subject property is developed, with commercial uses, wineries and homes located in the immediate vicinity.

e/f. The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

a. The applicant is requesting approval to allow a maximum of 16 employees. The Association of Bay Area Governments' *Projections 2003* figures indicate that the total population of Napa County is projected to increase some 23% by the year 2030 (*Napa County Baseline Data Report*, November 30, 2005). Additionally, the County's *Baseline Data Report* indicates that total housing units currently programmed in county and municipal housing elements exceed ABAG growth projections by approximately 15%. The additional employee positions which are part of this project will almost certainly lead to some population growth in Napa County. However, relative to the county's projected low to moderate growth rate and overall adequate programmed housing supply, that population growth does not rise to a level of environmental significance. In addition, the project will be subject to the County's housing impact mitigation fee, which provides funding to meet local housing needs. Prior to building permit issuance, payment of this fee will be required.

b/c. The parcel is zoned Commercial Neighborhood (CN). This application will not displace a substantial volume of existing housing or a substantial number of people and will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a. Public services are currently provided to the project area, and the additional demand placed on existing services would be marginal. Fire protection measures are required as part of the development pursuant to Napa County Fire Marshall conditions and there will be no foreseeable impact to emergency response times with the adoption of standard conditions of approval. The Fire and Public Works Departments have reviewed the application and recommend approval as conditioned. School impact mitigation fees, which assist local school districts with capacity building measures, will be levied pursuant to building permit submittal. The proposed project will have little to no impact on public parks. County revenue resulting from any building permit fees, and property tax increases will help meet the costs of providing public services to the property. The proposed project will have a less than significant impact on public services.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV.	RECREATION. Would the project:				
	a) increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. This application proposes a new office building and some very minor on-site employment. No portion of this project, nor any foreseeable result thereof, would 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 Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a.-b. The project site is located on the west side of State Highway 29 (St Helena Hwy) and the south side of Inglewood Ave. The current proposal includes adding up to 15 employees and 15 parking spaces. As analyzed in the detailed project description and traffic study submitted September 19, 2011 by George Nickelson of Omni Means, the increases in employment and customers proposed in this application would result in an additional 6 AM and 6 PM peak hour trips daily for a total of 26 AM and 32 PM Peak hour trips from all four buildings onsite daily.

An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) previously prepared and certified in January 2001, addressed commercial development of the property and was used as the basis for approval of the original Use Permit. The EIR evaluated the traffic proposal for the original project, which included

a commercial retail garden center with a total of 43 PM Peak hour trips on a weekday and 47 during the Saturday afternoon peak hour. The proposed garden center was not built and was subsequently replaced by an office building. The current traffic study concludes that the project's trips will add about .02 percent to traffic flows on State Route 29, well below the original analysis of 2.1 percent for a commercial garden center and would not cause a substantial increase in traffic.

The EIR assessed the potential environmental effects of the Inglewood Village Business Park, including expected individual and cumulative environmental impacts resulting from the approval, construction, and operation of the project. Mitigation measures in the 2000 EIR included the installation of a left-hand-turn-lane along State Route 29 fronting the project site. The implementation of this mitigation measure reduced the site access impacts on SR 29 to a less-than-significant level. The left-hand-turn-lane was constructed. It was determined that there were economic, social and community benefits to be derived from the project; there was no conflict with agriculture; and the site has limited capacity for commercially-viable agricultural uses. A Statement of Overriding Considerations regarding the unavoidable traffic impacts was previously adopted.

- c. This proposed project would not result in any change to air traffic patterns.
- d.-e. Access to the site is proposed to remain at the existing driveway entrance off Highway 29 utilizing the left-hand-turn-lane. The driveway was approved with the original use permit. No changes are proposed to the access point. Public Works and the Fire Marshall have reviewed the proposal and recommend approval as conditioned.
- f. The project proposes the construction of one additional building on an already developed parcel. An additional 15 parking spaces have been proposed and would be sufficient to accommodate parking needs during normal business days for employees and visitors.
- g. There is no aspect of this proposed project that would conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.

Mitigation Measures: none required

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of a new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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. An existing, approved, wastewater system has the capacity to serve the needs of the proposed office building. The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and will not result in a significant impact on the environment relative to wastewater discharge. Wastewater disposal will be accommodated on-site and in compliance with State and County regulations.

The project will not require construction of any new water or wastewater treatment facilities that will result in a significant impact to the environment. Wastewater disposal will be accommodated on-site in compliance with State and County regulations.

- c. The applicant has proposed an additional stormwater detention system which would not cause significant environmental effects. The Department of Public Works has reviewed the proposal and approved the project with conditions.
- d. The project has sufficient water supplies to serve existing and projected needs. The applicant has a Will Serve agreement with the City of St. Helena to provide domestic water. An existing well will provide water for landscaping and fire protection needs. The current proposal has been reviewed by Napa County Fire and approved with conditions.
- e. The proposed upgrades to the wastewater treatment system has been reviewed by the Department of Environmental Management and found to be adequate to meet the needs of the additional employees. No significant environmental effects will occur.
- f. See response "a." above.
- g. 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 Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

- a. The site has been previously developed with commercial structures. The project would have no impact on wildlife resources. As analyzed above, no sensitive resources or biologic areas will be converted or affected by this project. Also as analyzed above, the project would not result in a significant loss of native trees, native vegetation, or important examples of California's history or pre-history.
- b. As discussed above, the proposed project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level.
- c. There are no environmental effects caused by this project that would result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, whether directly or indirectly. No hazardous conditions resulting from this project have been identified. The project would not have any environmental effects that would result in significant impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. SUBSEQUENT EIR OR NEGATIVE DECLARATION				
a) Are substantial changes proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Are substantial changes proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have substantial changes occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have substantial changes occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Has new information of substantial importance been identified, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted which shows any of the following:				
1. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents have declined to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents have declined to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-e. The changes to the proposed project since adoption of the previous Environmental Impact Report (EIR) generally consists of constructing a 4,092 square foot office building, an additional 15 parking spaces, and a re-subdivision of the existing 3 unit commercial condominium project into 14 units with a common owner's association responsible for building and property maintenance, landscaping and other site improvements as outlined in the project description. Neither the changes to the proposed project nor the circumstances under which the proposed project is being undertaken would require major revisions to the previous EIR. No new significant environmental effects have been identified nor has there been an increase in the severity of previously identified effects. No new information has been identified that would result in new significant impacts not previously analyzed. Any applicable mitigation measures adopted by the County with its approval of the Previously Approved Use Permit will be carried forward and incorporated into this project.