



## ATTACHMENT 6 INITIAL STUDY & MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

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

<b>STATE CLEARING HOUSE NUMBER:</b>		<b>N/A</b>	
<b>Project Name:</b>	Bridgeview Apartments	<b>File Number:</b>	PL15-0102
<b>Site Address:</b>	122 Brown Street 151 Riverside Drive	<b>APN:</b>	005-131-038 005-131-039
<b>General Plan:</b>	MFR-157, Multi-Family Residential (9-20 du/ac) TRI-148, Traditional Residential Infill (2-6 du/ac)		
<b>Zoning:</b>	RM, Multi-Family Residential; :FP, Floodplain Management Overlay RT-5, Traditional Residential; FP, Floodplain Management Overlay		
<b>Applicant:</b>	Stephen R. Cuddy 855 Bordeaux Way, #250 Napa, CA 94558	<b>Phone:</b>	707.324.4420
<b>Staff Manager:</b>	Michael Walker	<b>Phone:</b>	707.257.9530

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Application for two new apartment buildings (eight units each) on a 0.35 acre property at 151 Riverside Drive. The proposed 1-bedroom apartments would be constructed in conjunction with the existing 41-unit apartment complex located next door at 122 Brown Street. The two parcels would be merged to create a 1.4 acre site. The property at 151 Riverside Drive requires a General Plan Amendment and Rezoning in order to develop at the requested density. The design of the new buildings will match the design of the existing buildings.

### ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

The overall project site is a deep rectangular parcel extending from the west side of Riverside Drive to Brown Street. The site is relatively flat, with vegetation limited to grasses, landscaping around the existing apartment buildings, and five small-to-medium tree clusters located on the Riverside Drive parcel. There is an existing single-family residence and garage located near Riverside Drive which will be removed. Surrounding land uses include single-family residences on properties zoned for multi-family uses to the west, single-family residences to the north, public open space to the east along the Napa River, and light industrial uses zoned for mixed-use to the south.

### CITY APPROVALS REQUIRED:

1. General Plan Amendment and Rezoning for the property at 151 Riverside Drive;
2. Density Bonus with concessions;
3. Design Review of the proposed buildings;

### 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.

**A Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration will be prepared and posted for the period of September 30, 2016 through October 20, 2016**

**PREPARED BY:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Walker, *Senior Planner*

\_\_\_\_\_  
September 30, 2016

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

For: Rick Tooker, *Community Development Director*

**I. AESTHETICS**

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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	

Discussion:

While there would be visual changes from the existing viewing locations a change in itself would not necessarily be significant and with the imposition of the special conditions noted below, the overall impact would be reduced to less than significant. Development has been planned and endorsed by the community with the adoption of the 1998 General Plan, which allows for residential types of development. The proposed multi-family residential buildings will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or result in substantial damage to scenic resources. The proposed buildings have been designed and located in a manner that is compatible with the City's Design Guidelines and the visual character of the area. There are currently no significant views of the site or from the site normally visible to a substantial number of people.

Potential aesthetic impacts will be reduced to a less-than-significant level through the City's application of the standard visual mitigation measures, the architectural review process, and conditions of approval. The City requires lighting to be confined to the site. Although the project may generate light and cause reflective glare, these potential impacts will be reduced to a less-than significant level through application of the City's standard light and glare mitigation measures. Daylight sources of light and glare can include buildings and signs, especially if they have mirrored or reflective surfaces. The imposition of the standard mitigations in Policy Resolution 27 and the special mitigation measures noted below should reduce the potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Standard Mitigation Measures:

Policy Resolution 27: Aesthetic Mitigation Measures 1-5.

Special Mitigation Measures:

1. All exterior lighting on the site shall be property shielded and directed downward to preclude glare conditions that might impact adjacent properties or public streets.
2. All roofing, building and sign materials shall be painted or treated with a "flat" paint or treatment to reduce glare and reflective surfaces.

Conclusion:

Potential aesthetic impacts mitigated to less- than-significant.

**II. AGRICULTURAL & FOREST RESOURCES**

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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

<b>II. AGRICULTURAL &amp; FOREST RESOURCES</b>				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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><u>Discussion:</u>  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. The project site at 151 Riverside Drive has a base zoning of RT-5 (Traditional Residential-5) which, upon approval of this project, will be rezoned to RM (Multi-Family Residential). The project site at 122 Brown Street has a base zoning of RM which will remain. Under the City's Rural Urban Limit (RUL) policy, all urban development is to take place within the RUL boundaries, with lands outside the RUL boundaries protected for agricultural use. The project site is located within the RUL boundary and residential development of the site as proposed would not represent a conflict with the RM designation within the RUL boundaries. 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><u>Standard Mitigation Measures:</u>  None.</p> <p><u>Special Mitigation Measures:</u>  None.</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u>  No impacts to agricultural resources.</p>				

<b>III. AIR QUALITY</b> [significance criteria established by BAAQMD may be relied upon to make the following determinations]				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
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><u>Discussion:</u>  A project will normally have a significant environmental effect if it will violate any ambient air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The proposed project is located within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB), which is subject to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) air quality attainment plans. The BAAQMD, Association of Bay Area Governments, and Metropolitan Transportation</p>				

**III. AIR QUALITY** [significance criteria established by BAAQMD may be relied upon to make the following determinations]

Commission are responsible for developing and implementing air quality plans and future strategies for attainment and maintenance of the ambient air quality standards in the SFBAAB. The BAAQMD is the primary agency responsible for assuring that the NAAQS and CAAQS are attained and maintained in the Bay Area.

The BAAQMD has adopted the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan (CAP), which serves as an update to the most recent O<sub>3</sub> plan, the Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy, to comply with state air quality planning requirements as codified in the California Health and Safety Code. The CAP provides a comprehensive multi-pollutant plan to improve Bay Area air quality and protect public health. The CAP defines a control strategy that the BAAQMD and its partner agencies will implement to (1) reduce emissions and decrease ambient concentrations of harmful pollutants, (2) safeguard public health by reducing exposure to air pollutants that pose the greatest health risk, with an emphasis on protecting the communities most heavily impacted by air pollution, and (3) reduce greenhouse gas emissions to protect the climate (BAAQMD 2010).

If a project proposes development and associated growth projections that are greater than that anticipated in the local CAP, the project might conflict with the air quality plans. The current General Plan designation of MFR-157, limits the size of developments to 9 to 20 units per acre. As such, the anticipated development of the project site with density bonuses applied is consistent with the growth projections assumed in the City's General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and in other City documents. The project is proposed in an area surrounded by existing residential development. Surrounding properties include single-family dwellings, multi-family housing developments, and a commercial/industrial property southwest of the project site. The 16-unit apartment complex exceeds the density anticipated on this site, however, with density bonuses applied, it would be consistent with the growth forecasts upon which the CAP is based. The design and construction will utilize environmentally responsible materials and methods wherever appropriate, including but not limited to: structural framing, building services, exterior and interior finishes, casework and fixtures, solar water heating, and landscaping. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the measures identified in the CAP, such as those aimed at increasing energy efficiency. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent at a regional level with the underlying growth forecasts.

The most recent clean air plan is the Bay Area 2010 CAP that was adopted by BAAQMD in September 2010. The proposed project would not conflict with the latest Clean Air planning efforts since: (1) the Project would have emissions well below the BAAQMD thresholds; (2) development of the project site would be considered urban "infill"; (3) development would occur near employment centers; and (4) development would be near existing transit with regional connections. The project is too small to incorporate project-specific transportation control measures listed in the latest CAP (i.e., Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan).

The proposed residential uses are not expected to cause or contribute to any violation of an air quality standard, because the emissions would not exceed BAAQMD CEQA thresholds. Although there may be a temporary degradation of air quality during the construction of this project; the imposition of the special mitigation measures and the standard mitigation measures contained in Policy Resolution 27 will reduce any potential impact to a less than significant level. Dust is generally emitted by the action of construction equipment and vehicles and as a result of wind erosion over exposed earth surfaces. Clearing, grading, demolition, and earthmoving activities comprise the major source of construction dust emissions, although traffic and general disturbance of the soil would also generate significant dust emissions. The effects of construction activities would include increased settling of dust on horizontal surfaces in the vicinity of the project site and locally elevated levels of suspended particulate matter downwind of construction activity. Depending on the weather, soil conditions, amount of activity, and the nature of dust control efforts, these impacts could extend downwind from the project site, thereby affecting adjacent residential uses by increasing soiling and requiring more frequent cleaning and/or maintenance activities. The project would generate localized emissions of diesel exhaust during equipment operation and truck activity. These emissions may be noticeable from time to time by adjacent receptors. However, they would be a localized and are not likely to adversely affect people off site in that they would result in confirmed odor complaints. The project site is not affected by existing odor sources that would cause odor complaints from new residents and the proposed residences would not generate odors that would be expected to result in odor complaints. These impacts would occur primarily during site grading. Since the project would be developed in a single phase, the grading impacts would occur during a limited time period. Although most of the dust-like material is expected to be generated during grading, construction emissions would occur throughout the construction period. The scale of the proposed development is too small to alter air movement or climate either locally or regionally. Based on project location, potential sensitive receptors are not expected to be exposed to any known substantial pollutant concentrations.

**III. AIR QUALITY** [significance criteria established by BAAQMD may be relied upon to make the following determinations]

Odors would be generated from vehicles and/or equipment exhaust emissions during construction of the proposed project. Odors produced during construction would be attributable to concentrations of unburned hydrocarbons from tailpipes of construction equipment, paving of roads and parking areas, and architectural coatings. Such odors are temporary and generally occur at magnitudes that would not affect substantial numbers of people. Construction-related odors would not be significant. Land uses and industrial operations that are associated with odor complaints include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The proposed project entails residential uses and would not result in the creation of a land use that is commonly associated with odors. There are no other sources of noxious odors, such as dairies, treatment plants, or other odor causing uses associated with the project. Therefore, odors associated with project construction and project operations would result in a less-than-significant odor impact. Although there may be a temporary degradation of air quality during the construction of this project; with the imposition of the special mitigation measures and the standard mitigation measures contained in Policy Resolution 27 any potential impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

**Traffic Related Emissions:**

Pursuant to the BAAQMD Guidelines, total emissions that exceed the daily thresholds of significance shall be considered to have a potentially significant impact. The threshold of significance is defined as 54 pounds/day of Reactive Organic Gases (ROG), 54 pounds/day of Nitrogen Oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), 82 pounds/day of Respirable Particulate Matter (PM<sub>10</sub>), and 54 pounds/day of Fine Particulate Matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>). Concern for regional air quality effects are addressed by monitoring these ROG. One of the pollutants of greatest concern is carbon monoxide, which can be elevated as a result of increased levels of traffic and congestion along streets and at intersections associated with a proposed project. Congested intersections with a large volume of traffic have the greatest potential to cause high-localized concentrations of carbon monoxide. Air pollutant monitoring data indicate that carbon monoxide levels have been at healthy levels (i.e., below State and federal standards) in the Bay Area since the early 1990s. As a result, the region has been designated as attainment for the standard. The project would only generate a small amount of traffic so the contribution of project-generated traffic to these levels would be minimal and the project would not cause or contribute to a violation of an ambient air quality standard (W-Trans 2014).

Additionally, the project includes the construction of two new buildings and the demolition of one existing single-family house and a garage, but will not conflict with implementation of air quality standards or violate such standards. Although construction equipment generates emissions, these pollutants were not estimated since they are already included in the emission inventory that forms the basis for the BAAQMD's regional air quality plans and because these emissions are not expected to impede attainment or maintenance of established standards in the Bay Area.

Sensitive receptors are defined as land uses that are occupied by populations sensitive to the health impacts of air pollution such as children, the elderly, and persons with preexisting respiratory or cardiovascular illnesses. Examples of sensitive receptors are residential uses, schools, convalescent homes, and hospitals. The project is located on a fully-developed residentially zoned property where none of these sensitive receptors, other than residential uses, are located. The nearest sensitive receptors (Shearer Elementary School) are more than 1,200 feet away to the west.

**Standard Mitigation Measures:**

Policy Resolution 27: Air Quality Mitigation Measures 1-3.

**Special Mitigation Measures:**

Consistent with guidance from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, the following controls shall be implemented at the construction site to control construction emissions.

1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered at a frequency adequate to maintain minimum soil moisture of 12 percent. Moisture content can be verified by lab samples or moisture probe.
2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
3. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.

**III. AIR QUALITY** [significance criteria established by BAAQMD may be relied upon to make the following determinations]

4. The contractor or City official shall post several publicly visible signs at either end of the property with the telephone number and person to contact at the City regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 24 hours. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.
5. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
6. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
7. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
8. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper order.
9. All excavation, grading, and/or demolition activities shall be suspended when average wind speeds exceed 20 mph.
10. Vegetative ground cover (e.g., fast-germinating native grass seed) shall be planted in disturbed areas as soon as possible and watered appropriately until vegetation is established.
11. The simultaneous occurrence of excavation, grading, and ground-disturbing construction activities on the same area at any one time shall be limited. Activities shall be phased to reduce the amount of disturbed surfaces at any one time.
12. All trucks and equipment, including their tires, shall be washed off prior to leaving the site.
13. Site accesses to a distance of 100 feet from the paved road shall be treated with a 6 to 12 inch compacted layer of wood chips, mulch, or gravel.
14. Any proposed fireplaces within the development shall include a gas insert and all stoves shall be required to meet EPA certification.

Conclusion:

Potential air quality impacts mitigated to less-than-significant.

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) 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 CDFW 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

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**Discussion:

The project site is a rectangular parcel extending from the west side of Riverside Drive to Brown Street. The site is relatively flat, with vegetation limited to grasses, landscaping around the existing apartment buildings, and five small-to-medium tree clusters located on the Riverside Drive parcel. There is an existing single-family residence and garage located near Riverside Drive which will be removed. Surrounding land uses include single-family residences on properties zoned for multi-family uses to the west, single-family residences to the north, public open space to the east along the Napa River, and light industrial uses zoned for mixed-use to the south.

The project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive or special status species, or habitat for such species, as none are known to occupy the project area according to the California Natural Diversity Database, the City's General Plan, and an overall site inspection. Therefore, the project will not have a foreseeable effect on such species.

No riparian or other sensitive habitat is known to exist within the project site. No wetlands are known to exist within the boundaries of the subject property. The Napa River is located across Riverside Drive from the project site, however, the project site is located within a developed area and therefore would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife.

Chapter 12.45 of the Napa Municipal Code establishes regulations regarding protected native trees which are of specific species and specified diameter located on property one acre in size or more. There are no trees on the property that are subject to these regulations. No loss of trees on the City's Significant Tree List is associated with this project. Therefore, the project will not have a foreseeable effect on tree preservation policies or ordinances.

The project site is not part of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or any other habitat conservation plan adopted locally, regionally, or by the State.

Standard Mitigation Measures:

None.

Special Mitigation Measures:

None

Conclusion:

Potential biological resources impacts mitigated to less-than-significant.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES**

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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	

Discussion:

The project site contains an existing residential structure at 151 Riverside Drive that is listed on the City's Historical Resources Inventory as a Listed Resource. To supplement this, the applicant has submitted a Historic Resource Assessment prepared by Stephen Cuddy, AIA and the City requested an independent review by Preservation Architecture (both attached). In summary, the reports concluded that the residential structure was



**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES**

originally constructed in 1915 with no special or significant qualities. The property is not located in a Historic District nor is it located in an area that is likely to become a historic district in the future. Based on the analysis in the Historic Resource Evaluations prepared by Mr. Cuddy and Preservation Architecture, the residential building has very little or no cultural or historic significance and has demonstrated physical change that its historical integrity has been compromised to the extent that the property no longer qualifies for inclusion on the City's Historic Resources Inventory. As such, the removal of this building is a less than significant impact.

The City archeology database identifies the property as having medium archeological sensitivity. There are no unique known paleontological resources that have been identified on the site. No unique geologic features exist on the site. A Cultural Resources Study was prepared by Tom Origer & Associates (attached) and has confirmed that no archeological resources were observed nor did soils examined from the site indicate the presence of buried archaeological deposits.

Although the proposed development of the project site would not disturb any known culturally sensitive site or human remains, the site is adjacent to Napa River so it is possible that a culturally sensitive site or human remains may be encountered during earthmoving and other construction activity at the project site. The imposition of the standard mitigations in Policy Resolution 27 and the special mitigation measures noted below should reduce the potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Standard Mitigation Measures:

Policy Resolution 27: Cultural Resources Mitigation Measure 1.

Special Mitigation Measures:

1. If any archaeological materials or objects are unearthed during project construction, all work in the vicinity shall be immediately halted until a qualified archaeologist is retained by the City of Napa to evaluate the finds. The project applicant shall comply with all mitigation recommendations of the archaeologist prior to commencing work in the vicinity of the archaeological finds.
2. The project applicant shall assure that project personnel (e.g., contractor, construction workers) are informed that collecting significant historical or unique archaeological resources discovered during development of the project is prohibited by law. Prehistoric or Native American resources can include chert or obsidian flakes, projectile points, mortars, and pestles as well as dark friable soil containing shell and bone dietary debris, heat-affected rock, or human burials. Historic resources can include nails, bottles, or other items often found in refuse deposits.

Conclusion:

Potential cultural resources impacts mitigated to less-than-significant.

**VI. GEOLOGY & SOILS**

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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	

## ATTACHMENT 6

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

Discussion:

According to the Geologic Hazards Map on file with the County of Napa, the subject property is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone (a recognized seismic hazard area). The closest zoned fault (Healdsburg-Rodgers Creek) is located approximately 12 miles west. While no landforms were observed within the immediate area that would indicate the presence of an active fault, the project site is located approximately 2.0 miles east of the West Napa fault complex which was the source of the August 2014 South Napa Earthquake. The City's location within the San Francisco Bay Area subjects it to potential ground shaking in the event of an earthquake. The study determined that landslides or mudflows are not a hazard at the site. The grading/filing required by the project to construct the residential building pads, drainage swales, parking lots, and driveways will be minimal with cuts and fills on the order of two to three feet which will not result in a significant-impact. . The imposition of the standard mitigations in Policy Resolution 27 noted below should reduce the potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Standard Mitigation Measures:

Policy Resolution 27: Geology and Soils Mitigation Measures 1-3.

Special Mitigation Measures:

None.

Conclusion:

Potential geology and soils impacts mitigated to less-than-significant.

## VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	

Discussion:

(a) The project would result in GHG emissions from both short-term construction activities and on-going operations. Construction of the proposed project would temporarily generate GHG emissions from the use of construction equipment and vehicle trips made by construction workers and delivery vehicles. BAAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* include thresholds for greenhouse gas emissions. Under these thresholds, if a project would result in operational-related greenhouse gas emissions of 1,100 metric tons (or 4.6 metric tons per service population) of carbon dioxide equivalents a year or more, it would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to greenhouse gas emissions and result in a cumulatively significant impact to global climate change. As outlined in Table 3-1 of the *Air Quality Guidelines*, a low-rise apartment development of 78 dwelling units or more would meet or exceed the BAAQMD operational greenhouse gas emission screening levels and would require preparation of a greenhouse gas emission analysis. Since the size of this office building falls well below this threshold, the project would have a less than significant impact on the emission of greenhouse gases.

(b) The proposed project falls under the BAAQMD threshold for significance and therefore is seen as being complaint with the goals of AB 32. The proposed project will replace one older single-family residence with new

**VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

more efficient residences that will use approximately 25% less energy than buildings built to 2008 title 24 standards. The project would help reduce vehicle miles traveled by increasing density near an urban center. The proposed project falls under the City of Napa waste reduction measures. As such, the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions and impacts would be less than significant.

Standard Mitigation Measures:

None.

Special Mitigation Measures:

None.

Conclusion:

No impacts to greenhouse gas emissions.

**VIII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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

Discussion:

The proposed project would not involve the routine transport, handling, or disposal of hazardous materials or emit hazardous emissions. Residential occupants of the site would be expected to store and use small containerized quantities of hazardous household, car, and automotive products of a wide variety. This type of usage is typical of all residential development and would not constitute a significant hazard to the public or the environment. The imposition of the special mitigation measures noted below should ensure the potential impacts remain at a less-than-significant level.

The Shearer Elementary School is located approximately 1,200 feet to the west of the project site. In any event, the proposed project would not emit hazardous gases, waste, or other substances with a potential to pose a threat to students at the school or to residential properties in closer proximity to the site.

**VIII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

The closest airstrip in Napa County Airport approximately five miles south of the project site and is not within any airport land use plan boundaries.

The proposed project would provide adequate emergency ingress, egress, and equipment turn-around. The addition of 16 residential units to the area would not have the potential to interfere with the implementation of an emergency response or emergency evaluation plan.

The project is located in a fully-urbanized environment; there are no wildlands in proximity to the site. There is therefore no potential to expose people or structures to significant risk of wildland fires.

Standard Mitigation Measures:

None.

Special Mitigation Measures:

1. If any contamination is discovered during site grading/construction, the contractor shall stop work immediately and contact the registered geologist from the County of Napa Planning, Building, and Environmental Services Department.
2. Project construction plans shall include emergency procedures for responding to hazardous materials release for material that will be brought onto the site as part of construction activities. The emergency procedures for hazardous materials releases shall include the necessary personal protective equipment, spill containment procedures, and training of works to respond to accidental spills/release. The Contractor shall be required to have on-hand at all times adequate absorbent materials and containment booms to handle a spill equivalent to the largest container of fuels or oils in their possession. All use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials (including any hazardous wastes) during construction activities shall be performed in accordance with existing local, state, and federal hazardous materials regulations.

Conclusion:

No impacts to hazards or hazardous materials.

**IX. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY**

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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
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	

**IX. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY**

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

Discussion:

Construction activities could potentially affect water quality as a result of erosion of sediment. In addition, leaks from construction equipment; accidental spills of fuel, oil, or hazardous liquids used for equipment maintenance; and accidental spills of construction materials are all potential sources of pollutants that could degrade water quality during construction. If not properly addressed, construction impacts on water quality could be particularly severe because extensive grading of a large area would be required. For residential development projects, the most common source of pollutants with a potential to degrade surface water quality is the automobile, which deposits oil and grease, fuel residues, heavy metals (e.g. lead, copper, cadmium, and zinc), tire particles, and other pollutants onto roadways and parking areas. Other common suburban pollutants that contribute to surface water pollution include pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers from landscaping; organic debris (e.g. grass, leaves); weathered paint; eroded metals from painted and unpainted surfaces; organic compounds (e.g., cleaners, solvents, adhesives, etc.); nutrients; bacteria and viruses; and sediments. These contaminants can be washed by stormwater runoff into surface waterways, degrading water quality. The project site slopes towards Napa River and stormwater likely exits the site in the direction of the river. There are no topographic depressions or low area on the project site that collect stormwater runoff. Per calculations provided by the applicant, the project does not increase the peak flow contributing to the stormwater system and the impacts of the proposed project are less than significant. While the project will introduce new impervious surfaces (such as vehicle parking, roofs, and driveways) which will change the rate of absorption of drainage and surface water run-off; the amounts of impervious surfaces are not substantial in area and changes in absorption and run-off will be insignificant. The project also proposes to include pervious surfaces that would reduce the amount of runoff entering the storm drain system. Stormwater will be run through vegetated Bioretention facilities to remove pollutants prior to being discharged into the existing storm drain system. Standard mitigation measures for erosion control and compliance with National Pollution Discharge Elimination System requirements (NPDES) would mitigate temporary and long-term water quality impacts to a level of insignificance.

Based on a review of the Federal Emergency Management Agency floodplain maps, the project site is located within a 100-year floodplain. This area is designated as Zone AE, defined as an area that will be inundated by a flood event having a 1% chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year. The site is not located within the Floodway. The City participates in the National Flood Insurance Program's (NFIP). The NFIP provides federally backed flood insurance within communities that enact and enforce floodplain regulations. As a participant, the City has adopted and enforces floodplain management regulations to minimize flood damage to future development. Residential buildings located within the floodplain are required to be protected from damage by a 100-year base flood. The imposition of the standard mitigations in Policy Resolution 27 and the special mitigation measures noted below should reduce the potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

The project site is not located in an area affected by seiches or tsunamis; therefore, there would be no impact.

Standard Mitigation Measures:

Policy Resolution 27: Hydrology and Water Quality Mitigation Measures 1-12.

Special Mitigation Measures:

1. All surface drainage must be collected and conveyed to a public street, storm drain or approved outfall. If surface drainage is currently passing from adjoining properties onto the subject property, then the project shall be designed to continue to accept such drainage and easements shall be established in favor of the adjoining property to allow the existing drainage patterns to continue. In addition, site design shall allow for a 100-year overland release with all finish floor elevations a minimum of one foot above the 100-year overland release elevation.

Conclusion:

Potential hydrology and water quality impacts mitigated to less-than-significant.

X. LAND USE & PLANNING				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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><u>Discussion:</u>            The project site has been previously developed with multi-family residential and a single-family home and is bounded to the west by an existing street (Brown Street), to the north by single-family residential properties, the east by Riverside Drive, and to the south by light industrial development. As the site has previously been used for residential purposes, it does not divide an established community. Furthermore, construction of the proposed project would not result in large roadways that could physically divide an existing neighborhood.</p> <p>The General Plan Designation for the site is existing 1.1 acre multifamily parcel is MFR-157, Multi-Family Residential, which provides for residential development densities between 9 to 20 units per acre, however, the property has been developed with 41 units designated as low-income for seniors since the 1980s. The proposed development requires a General Plan Amendment and rezoning on the 0.35 acre site to accommodate the 16 proposed units, 3 of which would be designated for very-low income residents. The overall project would have an overall density of 40 units per acre, which is consistent with the maximum density allowed under General Plan policies for projects which meet Density Bonus standards as outlined in Napa Municipal Code Section 17.52.130.</p> <p>The proposed development would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community preservation plans. The imposition of the standard mitigations in Policy Resolution 27 noted below ensures no impacts to land use and planning.</p> <p><u>Standard Mitigation Measures:</u>            Policy Resolution 27: Land Use and Planning Mitigation Measures 1-3.</p> <p><u>Special Mitigation Measures:</u>            None.</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u>            No impacts to land use and planning.</p>				

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES				
Would the project:	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><u>Discussion:</u>            There are no known or documented regionally or locally significant mineral mapped on the project site; as such mitigation measures are not required.</p>				

Standard Mitigation Measures:

None.

Special Mitigation Measures:

None.

Conclusion:

No impacts to mineral resources.

**XII. NOISE**

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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

Discussion:

There will be short-term construction noise impacts associated with site preparation and construction. Although construction activities would be temporary and short-term in nature, impacts would be considered potentially significant due to construction activities occurring in close proximity to the residences where people may be home during the day and may be disturbed by construction noise. Compliance with Mitigation Measures listed below would ensure the project would comply with the City's Noise Ordinance that allows noise associated with construction activities to occur and would require the placement of noisy equipment in areas that would minimize disturbance to adjacent residents. The imposition of the standard mitigations in Policy Resolution 27 noted below should reduce the potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

The closest airstrip is Napa County Airport approximately five miles south of the project site.

Standard Mitigation Measures:

Policy Resolution 27: Noise Mitigation Measures 1-4.

Special Mitigation Measures:

None.

Conclusion:

Potential impacts to noise mitigated to less-than-significant.

**XIII. POPULATION & HOUSING**

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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><u>Discussion:</u> The proposed project would directly generate population growth through the development of 16 new multi-family units. The General Plan Designation for the adjacent multifamily parcel is MFR-157, Multi-Family Residential, which provides for residential development densities between 9 to 20 units per acre. The 0.35 acre site will be developed with 16 units. The growth in population that would occur with the implementation of the proposed project was anticipated for in the General Plan, and the impacts of this growth were previously evaluated in the General Plan EIR. In addition, the project would constitute infill development within a developed urban area, and new roads and infrastructure would not be extended into an undeveloped area. The project will also assist the City in meeting regional housing needs.</p> <p>The proposed 16-unit complex will replace a single-family residence, which does not necessitate the construction of replacement housing.</p> <p><u>Standard Mitigation Measures:</u> None.</p> <p><u>Special Mitigation Measures:</u> None.</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> No impacts to population and housing.</p>				

**XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES**

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services including:				X
i) Fire Protection?			X	
ii) Police Protection?			X	
iii) Schools?			X	
iv) Parks?			X	
v) Other Public Facilities?				X
<p><u>Discussion:</u> All agencies referenced above have been contacted and reviewed the proposed development plan. Adequate fire and police protection and other facilities are available to serve the project and no significant impacts have been identified by any of the above agencies. The imposition of the standard mitigation measures of Policy</p>				



Resolution 27 will further reduce any impacts to public services. The project is required to pay school impact fees to meet demand for new students consistent with State law. See "XV Recreation" for parks discussion.

Standard Mitigation Measures:

Policy Resolution 27: Public Services Mitigation Measures 1-6.

Special Mitigation Measures:

None.

Conclusion:

Potential impacts to public services mitigated to less-than-significant.

**XV. RECREATION**

	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. 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	

Discussion:

The future population within the 16-unit complex will not significantly impact the existing parks and recreational facilities. 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 or upgraded facilities. The proposed development of residential units at the project site is within the development potential anticipated by the General Plan, which does not represent a "significant impact" in regards to recreation. The imposition of the standard conditions found in Policy Resolution 27 (payment of quadrant fees, etc.) will further reduce any impacts to parks and recreation facilities.

Standard Mitigation Measures:

Policy Resolution 27: Recreation Mitigation Measures 1 & 2.

Special Mitigation Measures:

None.

Conclusion:

Potential impacts to recreation mitigated to less-than-significant.

**XVI. TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC**

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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

Discussion:

The scale of the proposed development of the project will not significantly impact existing roadways. The layout for the project has taken into account the most efficient plan for overall circulation in the area. The volumes of traffic associated with the project would not result in a significant individual impact on traffic. However, the traffic generated by the project will contribute to the cumulative impact on the City's arterial and collector street system by decreasing the available capacity of existing roadways within the project area, increasing average stopped delay for drivers using the existing facilities, decreasing average travel speed, increasing vehicle operating costs, hydrocarbon emissions, and fuel consumption, and increasing traffic safety concerns. The cumulative impact of the traffic generated by the subject project on the City's arterial and collector street system will be mitigated by the developer paying a Street Improvement Fee in accordance with Policy Resolution 27 and Policy Resolution 16.

The closest airstrip is Napa County Airport approximately five miles south of the project site. The project will not have an effect on air traffic patterns or air traffic levels.

The project does not create a new public street and locates the single driveway to the east to Riverside Drive. The City Public Works Department has not identified a hazard due to project design or incompatible uses.

Emergency access to the site is provided through the driveway located on the western-side of the property onto Brown Street. The proposed development will extend emergency and vehicular access through the property to the east to Riverside Drive. The City Fire Department has indicated that the proposed project provides the necessary space to allow for adequate emergency access.

The proposed project provides 21 new parking spaces (total of 56) within a combination of garages, carports, and surface parking stalls. Each of the proposed new units will have at least one parking space located within a garage. The existing apartment project was under-parked based on the project's status as a senior housing low-income development. The proposed development is providing one more parking space than required for the 16 new units. The project site's proximity to commercial services and established public transportation routes reduces the number of on-site parking spaces required for residents and guests and will not result in a significant impact.

The project would be consistent with General Plan policies requiring new development to provide facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists, and public transit by providing a four-foot wide sidewalk along Riverside Drive. The project will not otherwise affect existing pedestrian, bicycle, or transit facilities. Therefore, the project will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

**XVI. TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC**Standard Mitigation Measures:

Policy Resolution 27: Transportation and Traffic Mitigation Measures 1-5.

Special Mitigation Measures:

None.

Conclusion:

Potential impacts to transportation and traffic mitigated to less-than-significant.

**XVII. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS**

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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

Discussion:

The applicable utility companies or agencies have been contacted and have received copies of the proposed development plan. No significant impacts have been identified. Standard mitigation measures require water conservation and recycling measures, use of the City's franchised garbage hauler and appropriate stormwater design. The City has entitlements to ensure that water supplies are adequate to serve the project, and Napa Sanitation District has not notified the City of any critical wastewater capacity situation. The project will not generate an extraordinary amount of solid waste and both collection and disposal systems are available to adequately serve the proposed development. The imposition of the standard mitigations in Policy Resolution 27 noted below ensures less-than-significant impacts to utilities and service systems.

Standard Mitigation Measures:

Policy Resolution 27: Utilities and Service Systems Mitigation Measures 1-12.

Special Mitigation Measures:

None.

Conclusion:

Potential impacts to utilities and service systems mitigated to less-than-significant.

**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><u>Discussion:</u></p> <p>In regard to (a) no such effects are associated with this project due its location within an urbanized setting. In regard to (b) there are no cumulative impacts associated with this project. In regard to (c) construction related activity at the project site could have a temporary adverse effect on human beings, but these impacts are effectively mitigated to a level of less-than-significant through the implementation of the Standard Mitigation Measures. No significant impacts would occur as a result of this project. The project has been modified to include the Standard Mitigation Measures contained in Policy Resolution 27 and the Special Mitigation Measures identified in this Initial Study; the overall effect is that no significant-impacts would occur as a result of this project.</p>	

**SOURCES OF INFORMATION USED IN PREPARATION OF THIS INITIAL STUDY:**

- Project Development Plans (attached)
- City of Napa; Policy Resolution 27 (attached)
- Applicant's Project Description (attached)
- City of Napa; General Plan Policy Document, Adopted December, 1998
- 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
- City of Napa; Resolution 89-362 Establishing a Street Improvement Fee for all new Development within the City and subsequent Resolutions Amending this Resolution: Resolution 93-198.
- City of Napa, Water System Optimization and Master Plan, 1997; West Yost & Associates
- City of Napa; Water System Optimization and Master Plan; Final EIR; 1997
- County of Napa; Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, April, 1991
- 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

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- Location Map
- Project Development Plans (applicable sheets)
- Policy Resolution 27 (pages 2 through 8)
- Historic Resource Analysis prepared by Stephen Cuddy
- Historic Resource Analysis prepared by Preservation Architecture
- Cultural Resources Study prepared by Tom Origer & Associates