



ATTACHMENT 5

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Community Development Department
1600 First Street – PO Box 660
Napa, CA 94559
707.257.9530

Project Name:	Third Street General Plan Amendment and Rezone	File Number:	PL16-0183
Site Address:	750 Third Street	APN:	006-132-001 006-132-002 006-132-006
General Plan:	(existing) TRI-190; Traditional Residential Infill (proposed) MU-532; Mixed Use		
Zoning:	(existing) RT-5; Traditional Residential (proposed) MU-G; Gateway Mixed Use		
Applicant/Property Owner:	City of Napa 955 School Street Napa, CA 94559	Phone:	707-257-9500
Staff Contact:	Michael Walker	Phone:	707-257-9530
Review Period:	February 9 through March 2, 2017		

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project proposes a General Plan and Zoning Amendment to re-designate the General Plan Land Use Designation for three parcels at 750 Third Street from Traditional Residential Infill (TRI-190) to Mixed Use (MU-532); and to rezone the parcels from Traditional Residential (RT-5) to Gateway Mixed Use (MU-G). No development is being proposed in conjunction with this project.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

The subject property is comprised of three vacant parcels (1.6 acres) that are covered with gravel and have been used in recent years for construction staging and special event parking. The lots are undeveloped, mostly flat, and with no vegetation. The subject properties are bordered by the Napa River on the north, residential uses on adjacent properties to the south and east, and railroad tracks to the west.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:

The City will receive comments on the Initial Study and proposed Negative Declaration for a 20-day period, commencing on February 9 through March 2, 2017. Such comments may be submitted to the Planning Division, Attention: Michael Walker, PO Box 660, Napa, CA 94559.

PUBLIC HEARING DATE:

The Planning Commission will consider recommending to the City Council adoption of the proposed Negative Declaration on March 2, 2017 at 5:30 PM in Council Chambers at City Hall, 955 School Street, Napa, CA.

DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY:

Copies of the Initial Study and the proposed Negative Declaration are on file and available for review at the Community Development Department located at 1600 First Street, Napa, CA 94559.

PREPARED BY:

Michael Walker, AICP, *Senior Planner*

February 9, 2017
Date

For: Rick Tooker, *Community Development Director*



Community Development Department

INITIAL STUDY OF ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE

PROJECT NAME:	Third Street General Plan and Zoning Amendment	FILE NUMBER:	PL16-0183
SITE ADDRESS:	750 Third Street	APNs:	006-132-001 006-132-002 006-132-006
GENERAL PLAN:	(existing) TRI-190; Traditional Residential Infill (proposed) MU-532; Mixed Use		
ZONING:	(existing) RT-5; Traditional Residential (proposed) MU-G; Gateway Mixed Use		
APPLICANT/ PROPERTY OWNER:	City of Napa 955 School Street Napa, CA 94559	PHONE:	707-257-9500

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project proposes a General Plan and Zoning Amendment to re-designate the General Plan Land Use Designation for three parcels at 750 Third Street from Traditional Residential Infill (TRI-190) to Mixed Use (MU-532); and to rezone the parcels from Traditional Residential (RT-5) to Gateway Mixed Use (MU-G). No development is being proposed in conjunction with this project.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

The subject property is comprised of three vacant parcels (1.6 acres) that are covered with gravel and have been used in recent years for construction staging and special event parking. The lots are undeveloped, mostly flat, and with no vegetation. The subject properties are bordered by the Napa River on the north, residential uses on adjacent properties to the south and east, and railroad tracks to the west.

CITY APPROVALS REQUIRED:

General Plan and Zoning Amendment

OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES:

None.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages. This initial study prescribes mitigation measures to reduce all potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology & Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation & Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

CEQA DETERMINATION:

- ☒ The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ 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 or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ The proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) 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, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ 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.

FISH AND GAME FEE DETERMINATION:

Based on the information in this initial evaluation, analysis has been necessary to determine if wildlife resources or the habitat upon which they depend may be impacted and mitigation measures have been imposed; therefore, even though the effect is satisfactorily mitigated, the project is subject to the Fish and Game Environmental Fee which shall be paid upon filing of a Notice of Determination for the project.

A Notice of Negative Declaration will be prepared and posted for the period of February 9, 2017 to March 2, 2017.

PREPARED BY:

February 9, 2017

Michael Walker, *Senior Planner*

Date

For: Rick Tooker
Community Development Director

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST:

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				X
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is located in a developed portion of the City. The proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezone will be consistent with the existing use and will not impact the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None.</p> <p>Conclusion: The project would not result in any negative impacts to aesthetics or affect the scenic attributes of the surrounding area. No scenic resources will be impacted. The project will not introduce substantially more exterior lighting than currently exists. The project will have no impact to aesthetics.</p>				
II. AGRICULTURAL & FOREST RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract?				X
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production?				X
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
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 or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
<p>Discussion: A project will normally have a significant environmental effect if it will convert prime agricultural land to nonagricultural use or impair productivity of prime agricultural land. This project is located within the urban boundaries of the City of Napa on previously disturbed land. Moreover, the proposed project is not located on land designated by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection as farmland or farmland of importance (2004 Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map). No Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance is located within any of the previously developed areas of the City of Napa. No land within the City of Napa is under a Williamson Act Contract. No loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use will occur. As such, the project will not result in the conversion of agricultural farmland, conflict with land zoned for agricultural use or influence land under Williamson Act contract.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None.</p> <p>Conclusion: No impact to agricultural resources.</p>				
III. AIR QUALITY. [Significance criteria established by the BAAQMD may be relied upon to make the following determinations] <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X
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)?				X
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezone will not obstruct the implementation of BAAQMD plans, nor will it violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. As the subject properties are previously disturbed and no new construction is proposed, the project not result in the cumulative net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment, expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, or create objectionable odors. Any future development and resulting structures would be subject to the same design review process that currently exists and impacts to sensitive receptors and the creation of objectionable odors would be subject to subsequent environmental review and analyzed during the application process.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None.</p> <p>Conclusion: No impact to air quality.</p>				
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal result in:				
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 (CDFG) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?				X
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 CDFG or USFWS?				X
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, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
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?				X
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
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?				X
<p>Discussion: The project will not impact state or federally listed species, riparian habitat, wetlands, sensitive natural communities, migratory fish or wildlife species, adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Plan, trees, or marine animals. The subject properties are previously disturbed and no new construction is proposed as part of this amendment. Future redevelopment projects will be subject to subsequent environmental review and will be evaluated for potential impacts to biological resources.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None.</p> <p>Conclusion: No impact to biological resources.</p>				

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in Sec.15064.5?				X
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Sec. 15064.5?				X
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X
<p>Discussion: The project pertains to the use of existing undeveloped but previously disturbed properties and therefore, there are no physical changes to structures. Future redevelopment projects will be subject to subsequent environmental review and will be evaluated for potential impacts to cultural resources.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None</p> <p>Conclusion: No impact to cultural resources.</p>				
VI. GEOLOGY & SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
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 Pub. 42				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X
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)?				X
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X
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?				X
<p>Discussion: The project pertains to the use of existing undeveloped, but previously disturbed properties and as such will not result in any direct changes in the environment. As with most of the San Francisco Bay Area, various sites throughout the City would be subject to ground shaking in the event of a regional earthquake. However, the rezoning of an existing commercial property would not increase the potential to expose more people to strong seismic ground shaking, ground failure, or landslides. Any future construction would be subject to environmental review associated with new development entitlement approvals.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None.</p> <p>Conclusion: No impact to geology and soils.</p>				
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that				X

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
may have a significant impact on the environment?				
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				X
<p>Discussion: The project will not cause an increase in cumulative greenhouse gas emissions nor will it conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing greenhouse gases. Any future structures and uses would be subject to the application review process that currently exists.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None</p> <p>Conclusion: No impact to greenhouse gas emissions.</p>				
VIII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routing transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
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?				X
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
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?				X
<p>Discussion: This project does not involve routine transport, handling or disposal of hazardous materials or emit hazardous emissions. The site is not currently listed as a hazardous material property, nor is any construction proposed with the project. Any future construction would be subject to environmental review associated with new development entitlement approvals. The project site is not within airport land use plan boundaries. The site is not adjacent to wild land fire interface areas that are located along the fringes of the city limits.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None.</p> <p>Conclusion: No impacts related to hazards or hazardous materials.</p>				
IX. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
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?				X

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				X
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?				X
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
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?				X
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
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?				X
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
<p>Discussion: As the project pertains to existing undeveloped but previously disturbed properties, this project will not introduce new impervious surfaces which may change the rate of absorption of drainage and surface water run-off. Any future development of the property would be subject to environmental review associated with new development entitlement approvals. Since the property is not in a location that would be affected by seiches or tsunamis, the project would not be subject to these phenomena. All projects in the City are connected to City water supplies, thus will not affect any nearby wells.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None.</p> <p>Conclusion: No impacts to hydrology and water quality.</p>				
X. LAND USE & PLANNING. Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?				X
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or resolution 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?				X
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed GPA and Rezoning will be consistent with the zoning of adjacent to properties to the west of the site; therefore, the request will not divide an established community. The GPA/Rezone would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans. The project is requesting a change to the land use and zoning change to a designation which allows parking with a Use Permit. With the approval of the requested GPA, Rezoning, and subsequent Use Permit, the project would not conflict with Zoning Ordinance's land use and development standards.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None.</p> <p>Conclusion: No impacts to land use & planning.</p>				
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
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?				X
<p>Discussion: There are no known or documented mineral resource sites affected by the project, and mitigation measures are not required.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None.</p> <p>Conclusion: No impacts to mineral resources.</p>				
XII. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i>				
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??				X
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?				X
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project				X
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
<p>Discussion: The GPA and Rezoning from residential to commercial in an established commercial area would not expose people to noise levels in excess of General Plan standards or create substantial increases in background noise levels above existing levels. The project site is not within an airport land use plan area. Any future construction would be subject to environmental review associated with new development entitlement approvals.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None</p> <p>Conclusion: No impact to Noise.</p>				
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. <i>Would the project:</i>				
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 and other infrastructure)?				X
b. Displacing substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
<p>Discussion: The project will not significantly impact population and housing. The project sites are undeveloped and have been historically operating as construction staging and overflow parking uses.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None.</p> <p>Conclusion: No significant impact to Population and Housing.</p>				
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Result in 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				X

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services including:				
i) Fire Protection?				X
ii) Police Protection?				X
iii) Schools?				X
iv) Parks?				X
v) Other Public Facilities?				X
<p>Discussion: Adequate fire and police protection, and other facilities are available to serve the project. The project does not propose any new construction.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None.</p> <p>Conclusion: No impact to public services.</p>				
XV. RECREATION. Would the project:				
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that a substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
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?				X
<p>Discussion: This project will not significantly impact the existing parks and recreational facilities that are primarily located and designed to serve the local population. The Parks and Recreation element of the General Plan does not identify this area of the City as underserved with parks or recreation facilities and it is not anticipated that this project will require any new facilities.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None.</p> <p>Conclusion: No impact to recreation.</p>				
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 (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				X
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
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?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersection) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity				X
g) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X
<p>Discussion: The project will not substantially increase traffic hazards. The GPA and Rezoning will not generate a substantial increase in traffic as the properties have been recently used for special event parking.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None.</p> <p>Conclusion: No impact to Transportation and Traffic.</p>				

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
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?				X
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
<p>Discussion: The subject site is undeveloped and no new construction is proposed as part of the project. The project will not impact utilities and service systems, and special mitigation measures are not required. Any future construction would be subject to environmental review associated with new development entitlement approvals.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures: None.</p> <p>Conclusion: The sites have previously been developed as commercial uses and the General Plan Amendment and rezoning will not alter or worsen existing conditions.</p>				
XVIII. 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?				No
b. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in conjunction with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects and the effects of probable future projects.)				No
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				No
<p>Discussion: The project pertains to the use of existing undeveloped properties and therefore does not grant approval of physical changes to structures. As no construction is proposed, the project will not substantially increase impacts to the surrounding area or City resources. No significant impacts would occur as a result of this project.</p>				

SOURCES OF INFORMATION USED IN PREPARATION OF THIS INITIAL STUDY:

As permitted by Section 15150 of the State CEQA Guidelines, this initial study incorporates several documents by reference. The reference documents identified below were utilized during the preparation of the Initial Study. The relevant information and/or analyses that have been incorporated by reference into this initial study have been summarized. Each of the documents identified below, which have been

incorporated by reference, are available for review at the City of Napa Community Development Department, located at 1600 First Street, Napa, California 94559.

City of Napa; *General Plan Policy Document*, Adopted December, 1998 (Amended 2007).

City of Napa; *General Plan Background Report*, Adopted December, 1998.

City of Napa; *General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*, Adopted December, 1998.

City of Napa; *Zoning Ordinance*, 2003.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *CEQA Guidelines*, 1996

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *Bay Area '97 Clean Air Plan*, December, 1997

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Napa River/Napa Creek Flood Protection Project General Design Manual and Supplemental EIR/EIR, December, 1997.

State of California, Resources Agency, *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program*