

City Of Napa – Community Development Department
 1600 First Street – P.O. Box 660
 Napa, CA 94559
 (707) 257-9530

INITIAL STUDY OF ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE

PROJECT NAME:	First Street Apartments	FILE NUMBER:	PL13-0020
SITE ADDRESS:	2611 and 2617 First Street	APNs:	004-081-002, 004-081-003
GENERAL PLAN:	MFR-132, Multi-Family Residential (20-30 du)		
ZONING:	RM, Multi-Family Residential		
APPLICANT/ PROPERTY OWNER:	Napa One, LP 365 Ranchitos Del Sol Aptos, CA 95003	PHONE:	(831) 662-2979

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project proposes to construct a 50 unit apartment complex. A Lot Line Adjustment is also requested to merge the two parcels. The 50 units consist of three, three-story buildings, with one building containing 18 units, one containing 13 units and the third containing 19 units. The mix of unit types is eleven 1-bedroom units, thirty-five 2-bedroom units and four 3 bedroom units. The three buildings combined total square footage is 49,803 square feet. Access to the new development will be via a private road which connects to First Street. Parking is provided for 98 vehicles with 25 enclosed in a garage, 25 within a carport and the remaining uncovered in the parking area surrounding the apartment building. A picnic/play area will be provided underneath one of the remaining oak trees in one of the two open space areas that total 9,692 square feet. A 33 unit townhouse development (Lefty's Townhomes; File # PL07-0031) had previously been approved for the project site but has never been constructed.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

The project site is comprised of a vacant 1.1 acre parcel and an adjacent 0.62 acre parcel containing two single family residences and accessory structures which will be demolished. Both lots are relatively flat. There are two large valley oak trees which are proposed to be saved, the remainder of the site contains various ornamental trees and shrubs that will be removed. The project site is bordered by a small duplex housing development on the west with four single family homes to the east. The Valley Oak Villas condominiums are adjacent to the south and the First Street Church of Christ is located to the north across First Street.

CITY APPROVALS REQUIRED:

Design Review and Lot Line Adjustment

OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES:

None.

ATTACHMENT 3

This is a detailed street map of the Westwood area in Los Angeles. The map shows a grid of streets including California Blvd, State Hwy 101, and various residential streets like Glenwood, York, Muller, and Clay. A large black rectangular area is highlighted on the left side, near the intersection of State Hwy 101 and a residential street. The map also labels 'WESTWOOD SCHOOL' and 'PREMIUM OUTLET STORES'.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" 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 July 25, 2014 - August 14, 2014

PREPARED BY:

Michael Allen, Associate 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. Would the project:				
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: 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 project is adjacent to but set back from First Street and except for the first of the three buildings which fronts on First Street, the majority of the developed area of the site would not be highly visible from First Street. The proposed multi-tenant 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Conclusion: The project would result in less than significant 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> <p>Standard Mitigation Measures: Policy Resolution 27: Aesthetic Mitigation Measures 1-4</p> <p>Special Mitigation Measures: 1. All exterior lighting on the site shall be properly 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.</p>				
II. AGRICULTURAL & FOREST RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				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,				X

ATTACHMENT 2

ATTACHMENT 3

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production?				
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. The project site has a base zoning of "RM" (Multi Family Residential) 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>Conclusion: No impact to agricultural resources.</p> <p>Standard Mitigation Measures: None.</p> <p>Special Mitigation Measures: None.</p>				
III. AIR QUALITY. [Significance criteria established by the BAAQMD may be relied upon to make the following determinations] Would the project:				
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>Discussion: 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 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.</p>				

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>The BAAQMD has adopted the Bay Area 2010 CAP, which serves as an update to the most recent O3 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).</p> <p>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-114, limit the size of developments to 20 to 30 units per acre. As such, the anticipated development of the project site 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 and commercial development. Surrounding properties include single-family dwellings, multi-family housing developments, several churches and a school. (SR) 29 is located approximately 900 feet to the west. The 50 unit apartment complex does not exceed the density anticipated on this site and 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, landscaping, and being located in close proximity to public transportation and highway systems. 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.</p> <p>The most recent clean air plan is the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan 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 Clean Air Plan (i.e., Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan).</p> <p>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 Bay Area Quality Management District 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</p>				

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>concentrations.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>Traffic Related Emissions</i> – 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 lbs/day of Reactive Organic Gases (ROG), 54 lbs/day of Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x), 82 lbs/day of Respirable Particulate Matter (PM₁₀), and 54 lbs/day of Fine Particulate Matter. 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 generate a small amount of traffic (about 31 trips per busiest hour), 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.</p> <p>Additionally, the project includes the construction of three new buildings and the demolition of two existing residential buildings and a small outbuilding, 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.</p> <p>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 adjacent to State Route 29 where none of these sensitive receptors are located. The nearest sensitive receptors are more than 400 feet away.</p> <p>Conclusion: The 50 unit apartment complex and its construction would not exceed BAAQMD's threshold of significance and therefore is a less than significant impact. Potential air quality impacts associated with the short term construction related air quality impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of the standard mitigations included in this section.</p> <p>Standard Mitigation Measures: Policy Resolution 27: Air Quality Mitigation Measures 1-3.</p> <p>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.</p>				

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>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.</p> <p>2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>5. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>7. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>10. All excavation, grading, and/or demolition activities shall be suspended when average wind speeds exceed 20 mph.</p> <p>11. 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.</p> <p>12. 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.</p> <p>13. All trucks and equipment, including their tires, shall be washed off prior to leaving the site.</p> <p>14. 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.</p> <p>15. Any proposed fireplaces within the development shall include a gas insert and all stoves shall be required to meet EPA certification.</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				

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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

Discussion: The project site is located on the south side of First Street at the intersection of freeway drive, just west of highway 29. The site is nominally flat with two large oak trees that will remain. The existing structures - two detached single-family dwellings and accessory structures (built between 1890 and 1930) - shall be demolished, as will the insignificant vegetation. Surrounding properties include single-family dwellings, multi-family housing developments, several churches and a school. Although quite large, the two parcels that comprise the project site have been primarily developed for over a century and are surrounded by fully developed properties. The site is not known to contain any special biological resources. The project site has not been identified as habitat for candidate, sensitive, or special status species. The project does not contain riparian habitat, known wetlands, or sensitive natural communities. In regards to "e & f" the development will not conflict with any local policies, ordinances or adopted plans protecting biological resources.

Conclusion: No impact to biological resources is anticipated. With regard to the two large oak trees which are proposed to remain, the following special mitigation measures are included.

Standard Mitigation Measures: None.

Special Mitigation Measures: 1. The plans submitted for improvement plan review shall include a final landscape plan which clearly indicates the location of the two large Coast Live Oak trees on the project site. In the event that either of the two trees recommended to be saved are removed, the tree(s) shall be replaced or provided to the City for planting within a community area at a ratio of 5 new trees for each tree lost. The replacement trees shall be native trees and subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department or submit to the City of Napa Community Resources Department an in-lieu fee of 300 dollars per new replacement tree.

2. To the extent feasible the 2 trees identified as for preservation shall be protected and preserved. The improvement plans submitted for review and approval to the Public Works Department shall include a tree preservation plan, prepared by a certified arborist which includes measures for protection of root structures, trunks and limbs during construction and any additional measures necessary for the continued health of the trees. This report shall evaluate the status of the trees and include recommendations for the optimum location, and configuration of the improvements in the interest of creating minimal impact on the subject trees.

3. A plan review letter shall be submitted by the tree preservation plan preparer which indicates whether or not the recommended measures have been satisfactorily included in the improvement plans.

4. The tree preservation plan preparer or other certified arborist, shall be retained during the construction process to make sure that the procedures specified in the preservation plan are followed. A final project review letter shall be submitted to the City by the tree preservation plan preparer, prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, which reviews the final status of the trees and provides any additional recommendations for the continued protection upon occupancy of the dwelling units.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*

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 City's cultural resources database (*Pastfinder*) indicates that the property has a low cultural

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>resource sensitivity. The two existing homes on the site are not listed on the City's Historic Resources Inventory or subject to the Historic Preservation and Neighborhood Conservation Ordinance. The cultural resources maps maintained by the City of Napa Planning Department do not identify the subject site as being a recorded archeological site and is considered in an area having medium archaeological sensitivity.</p> <p>Conclusion: The standard mitigation in Policy Resolution 27 and the special mitigations listed below would address any unanticipated discovery of archaeological resources.</p> <p>Standard Mitigation Measures: Policy Resolution 27: Cultural Resource Mitigation Measure 1.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>				
VI. GEOLOGY & SOILS. Would the project:				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area, or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special 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: A Geotechnical Investigation dated May 26, 2006 (and updated November 21, 2012) was conducted by Miller Pacific Engineering Group, which evaluated the subsurface conditions at the project site and provides geotechnical recommendations for the design of the proposed development. The investigation concluded that from a geotechnical engineering viewpoint the proposed development could be constructed as planned, provided the development is developed in accordance with the recommendations presented in the report. To assure adequate design, all final construction plans are subject to review and approval of the Geotechnical Engineer. There are no known geologic faults that traverse the site. Well-designed structures and foundations should be able to withstand the anticipated level of potential ground shaking. The study determined that landsliding or mudflows are not a hazard at the site. The grading/filling required by this project to construct the residential</p>				

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>building pads, positive surface drainage and driveways will be minimal with cuts and fills on the order of 1 to 3 feet which will not result in a significant environmental impact. With the imposition of the mitigations measures noted below the likelihood of exposure of people and property to geologic hazards is minimal.</p> <p>The City's location within the San Francisco Bay Area subjects it to potential ground shaking in the event of an earthquake. The closest known active fault is the West Napa Fault which is approximately 5 miles west of the site however; there are no known geologic hazards on site. According to the Geologic Hazards Map on file with the City of Napa Planning Department, the subject property is not located in an Alquist Priolo Special Studies Zone (a recognized seismic hazard area), but is located in an identified area of known soils instability. As with most of the San Francisco Bay Area, the site could be subject to ground shaking in the event of a regional earthquake.</p> <p>Conclusion: Implementation of the standard geotechnical mitigations required under the California Building Code for any work requiring a building permit will reduce any potential risks to life or property to a less than significant level. The standard mitigation measures contained in Policy Resolution 27 would also reduce such potential effects to a less than significant level. Potential erosion impacts would also be mitigated to a less than significant level by incorporation of the standard mitigation measures contained in Policy Resolution 27.</p> <p>Standard Mitigation Measures: Policy Resolution 27: Geology/Soils Mitigation Measures 1-3.</p> <p>Special Mitigation Measures: None.</p>				
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
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
<p>Discussion: According to the US Environmental Protection Agency, climate change refers to any significant change in measures of climate, such as average temperature, precipitation, or wind patterns over a period of time. Climate change may result from natural factors, natural processes, and human activities that change the composition of the atmosphere and alter the surface and features of the land. Significant changes in global climate patterns have recently been associated with global warming, an average increase in the temperature of the atmosphere near the Earth's surface, attributed to accumulation of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions in the atmosphere. Greenhouse gases trap heat in the atmosphere, which in turn heats the surface of the Earth. Some GHGs occur naturally and are emitted to the atmosphere through natural processes, while others are created and emitted solely through human activities. The emission of GHGs through the combustion of fossil fuels (i.e., fuels containing carbon) in conjunction with other human activities, appears to be closely associated with global warming. State law defines GHG to include the following: carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride (Health and Safety Code, section 38505(g).) The most common GHG that results from human activity is carbon dioxide, followed by methane and nitrous oxide.</p> <p>Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, recognizes that California is the source of substantial amounts of GHG emissions. The potential adverse impacts of global warming include the exacerbation of air quality problems, a reduction in the quality and supply of water to the state from the Sierra snowpack, a rise in sea levels resulting in the displacement of thousands of coastal businesses and residences, damage to marine ecosystems and the natural environment, and an increase in the incidences of infectious diseases, asthma, and other human health-related problems. In order to avert these consequences, AB 32 establishes a state goal of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020 (a reduction of approximately 25 percent from forecast emission levels) with further reductions to follow.</p> <p>Lead agencies are required to make a good-faith effort, based on available information, to calculate, model, or</p>				

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------	---	---	------------------------------	-----------

estimate the amount of CO₂ and other GHG emissions from a project, including the emissions associated with vehicular traffic, energy consumption, water usage and construction activities.

The BAAQMD thresholds were developed specifically for the Bay Area after considering the latest Bay Area GHG emission inventory and the effects of AB 32 scoping plan measures that would reduce regional emissions. BAAQMD intends to achieve GHG reductions from new land use developments to close the gap between projected regional emissions with AB 32 scoping plan measures and the AB 32 targets. The BAAQMD applies GHG efficiency thresholds to projects with emissions of 1,100 metric tons of CO₂e (carbon dioxide equivalency) or greater. Projects that have emissions below 1,100 metric tons of CO₂e per year are considered to have less than significant GHG emissions. The significance threshold applied to projects with emissions greater than 1,100 metric tons of CO₂e annually is 4.6 metric tons of CO₂e per capita. The per capita emissions are computed by dividing the proposed project CO₂e emissions by the service population. Service population is the combined number of new residents and workers associated with the proposed project.

Construction Emissions

The URBEMIS2007 model was used to predict construction emissions in the form of CO₂. An approximate 1-year construction schedule was assumed in the modeling. Construction phases included fine site grading, utilities trenching, paving, building construction and application of architectural coatings.

CO₂ emissions associated with construction were assumed to all occur in 2014 through 2015. Under this scenario, construction of the project would emit 367 to 434 metric tons of CO₂ annually (or 404 to 478 US tons). These would be temporary emissions. Neither the City of Napa nor the BAAQMD have quantified thresholds for construction activities. However, the Project's emissions would be below the lowest threshold adopted by BAAQMD.

Emissions Summary of Mitigated Construction Related Activities (Average Daily Emissions Measure at Pounds per Day)

Type of Pollutant	ROG	NOx	CO	SO ₂	PM ₁₀ exhaust /PM ₁₀ dust	PM _{2.5} exhaust /PM _{2.5} dust	CO ₂
Napa Apartments	2.44	19.12	11.57	0.00	0.89/BMP	0.82/BMP	52.87
Threshold of Significance (BAAQMD)	54	54	None	N/A	82/Best Management Practices	54/Best Management Practices	N/A

Emissions Summary of Mitigated Construction Related Activities (Annual Emissions Measured at Tons per Year:

Type of Pollutant	ROG	NOx	CO	SO ₂	PM ₁₀ exhaust /PM ₁₀ dust	PM _{2.5} exhaust /PM _{2.5} dust	CO ₂
Napa Apartments	.31	.40	3.44	0.00	0.78	0.15	434
Threshold of Significance (BAAQMD)	10	10	None	N/A	15	10	N/A

Operational Emissions

Air pollutant emissions from the proposed project were modeled using the URBEMIS2007 model. BAAQMD developed a GHG model referred to as the BAAQMD GHG Model or BGM. BGM is an Excel workbook tool that uses the URBEMIS2007 file to provide GHG emissions in the form of equivalent CO₂ emissions or CO₂e in metric tons per year. Unless otherwise noted below, the model defaults for the San Francisco Bay Area were

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>used. BGM provides emissions for transportation, areas sources, electricity consumption, natural gas combustion, electricity usage associated with water usage and wastewater discharge, and solid waste land filling and transport.</p> <p>The URBEMIS2007 modeling for the proposed project used the Year 2015 and also included the Year 2020 for this analysis, since BAAQMD thresholds are based on meeting the AB 32 reduction goals by 2020. The BGM model adjusts mobile emissions based on the effect of new regulations to reduce GHG emissions. These regulations include the Pavley Rule that increases fleet efficiency (reducing fuel consumption) and the low carbon fuel standard. This model is sensitive to the year selected, since vehicle emissions have and continue to be reduced due to fuel efficiency standards and low carbon fuels.</p> <p>BGM applies electricity and natural gas usage rates for the URBEMIS2007 selected land uses to estimate the annual rate of consumption. Standard emission rates of CO₂ are applied to these consumption rates to estimate GHG emissions from energy usage. For natural gas, BGM uses default emission rates developed by U.S. EPA. For energy consumption, BGM applies a statewide CO₂ emission rate. Emissions associated with electricity consumption output by BGM were adjusted to account for the lower emission rate reported by Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E). BGM uses a statewide rate of 805 pounds of CO₂ per megawatt of electricity produced, while the rate for PG&E is much lower. Currently, PG&E has a verified emission factor for 2010 of 559 pounds per megawatt hour. PG&E forecasts a lower future rate since the current portfolio of renewable sources will increase each year. The derived 2015 rate was 391 pounds CO₂ per megawatt and the 2020 rate for PG&E was estimated at 290 pounds of CO₂ per megawatt of electricity delivered.</p> <p>The service population was computed based on the number of proposed new residences. The number of new residences (i.e., 50 dwelling units) was multiplied by the average number of residents per dwelling unit in Napa (2.69). This yields a population of 135 new residents associated with the proposed project. No new workers were assumed in this assessment.</p> <p>As the results of the emissions analysis, the proposed project, would not result in any cumulatively considerable new increase of GHG's, including ozone, or PM₁₀ the two criteria pollutants for which the project region is non-attainment, under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards. Although the proposed project would have no impact in regard to GHG's emissions, as shown in the above tables, the BAAQMD recommends the use of BMP related to construction activities, which are included under the mitigations measures proposed under Air Quality.</p> <p>Because the City recognizes the need to address global climate change, the City's General Plan includes several City-wide policies that will help the City reduce local emissions and thereby addressing the potential increase in greenhouse gases. The following measures are currently being implemented by the City:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Land use patterns and transportation: providing a variety of higher density land uses in proximity to each other, allowing individuals to meet daily needs without having to use a car and designed to promote ease of pedestrian and bike access. ▪ Energy sources and energy use: increasing the use of renewable energy sources, including micro-scale energy sources such as photovoltaic solar, and also reducing energy consumption. ▪ Energy efficient building practices and sustainable materials: siting and designing buildings and landscaping to reduce heating and cooling needs and provide more natural light; incorporating renewable energy and water efficiency; reducing storm runoff; using renewable, local, salvage and nontoxic building materials; improving indoor environmental [air] quality. ▪ Waste disposal and recycling: reducing use of non-recyclable materials; replacing disposable materials with reusable materials; reducing packaging and yard wastes; increasing efficiency of reuse/recycling. <p>The City considers the policies, standards and practices listed above as program level mitigation that addresses the cumulative potential for increases in greenhouse gases within the local region. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.</p>				

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>The <i>Climate Change Scoping Plan</i>, approved by the CARB on December 12, 2008, provides an outline for actions to reduce California's GHG emissions. The Scoping Plan requires the CARB and other state agencies to adopt regulations and other initiatives to reduce GHGs. At this time, the City of Napa has not adopted a GHG Reduction Strategy, and while the County of Napa has taken steps to address climate change impacts through the draft <i>Napa County Climate Action Plan</i>, this document has yet to be adopted. As a result, the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs, as none have been adopted. No impact would result.</p> <p>Conclusion: No impact to greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Standard Mitigation Measures: None</p> <p>Special Mitigation Measures: None.</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. The project does not involve the routing, transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. Any site remediation requirements of the Napa County Environmental Health Department will be implemented during construction. The project site is not within airport land use plan boundaries. The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the City of Napa's emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The site is not adjacent to wild land fire interface areas that are located along the fringes of the city limits.</p> <p>Conclusion: There are no apparent impacts related to hazards or hazardous materials. The project would not result in a safety hazard for people working in the project area due to aviation operations as the site is not within an area located within an airport land use plan.</p> <p>Standard Mitigation Measures: None.</p>				

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Special Mitigation Measures: None.				
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
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: A project will normally have a significant environmental effect if it substantially degrades water quality, contaminates a public water supply, substantially depletes or interferes with groundwater discharge, or exposes people or property to risks from flooding. The project site contains a single family residence and several outbuildings; one single family residence has already been relocated. Other than several gravel impacted driveways, the majority of the site is comprised of dirt and grasses, therefore the proposed development would have the potential to alter the runoff from the property if not for standard Public Works requirements that require new developments to maintain post-development peak runoff and average volume of runoff levels that are similar to pre-development levels. Additionally, the project is not in a flood hazard area and is not in a location that would be affected by seiches or tsunamis. Further, all projects in the city boundaries are connected to City water supplies, and therefore this project will not adversely affect nearby groundwater supplies.</p> <p>The project will be required to install drainage improvements as necessary to meet City standards. Source control best management practices (BMPs) will be implemented in the project design and construction, as required by the special mitigations identified below, to the extent practicable to mitigate pollutants from entering the storm water system and receiving water bodies. Reasonable measures to address runoff (although such runoff will be equal to or lower than occurring under existing conditions) will ensure that discharges into the storm water system are clean.</p> <p>Conclusion: Although the project is not expected to cause an adverse impact on hydrology or water quality, the incorporation of Standard and Special Mitigations as specified in this section through the issuance of any building permits are proposed to ensure the project impacts remain <i>less than significant</i> through construction</p>				

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
and post construction.				
Standard Mitigation Measures: Policy Resolution 27: Hydrology and Water Quality Mitigation Measures 1 – 12.				
Special Mitigation Measures:				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> To mitigate the project's long-term impacts, the property owner shall provide a Post-Construction Storm Water Runoff Management Plan (SWRMP) that is in accordance with the latest edition of the City of Napa's "Post Construction Storm Water Pollution Prevention Design Standards". The SWRMP shall include, but is not limited to the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> BMP's designed in accordance with the latest edition of the California Storm Water Association's "Handbook for Storm Water BMP's". Detention system improvements as required to maintain post development project runoff flows at pre-development levels for the 10 year, 25 year and 100 year storms and water quality treatment system improvements for runoff from storms with an intensity of 0.2 inches per hour. This will include <u>time-based routing</u> through the detention system to verify the adequacy of the system's storage volume. Detention system inlets sized to pass at a minimum the 100-year flows. Notation of the property owner's responsibility to maintain the BMP's. 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. 				
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 50 unit apartment complex will be consistent with the property's Multi-Family Residential zoning. As the site has previously been used for residential purposes and does not physically separate any neighborhoods, the request will not divide an established community. The 50 unit apartment complex would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans. High density residential development have been planned and endorsed by the community with the adoption of the General Plan and the Housing Element, which both provides for multi-family residential development on this site. Therefore, the project does not conflict with any land use plan, policy or resolution of any agency with jurisdiction over the project. The project would not conflict with conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.</p> <p>Conclusion: The fifty unit apartment development is consistent with the intent of the Multi-Family Residential zoning, the Westwood Planning Area of the General Plan, and the surrounding character of the area.</p> <p>Standard Mitigation Measures: None.</p> <p>Special Mitigation Measures: None.</p>				

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
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>Conclusion: There are no impacts related to mineral resources associated with the proposal.</p> <p>Standard Mitigation Measures: None.</p> <p>Special Mitigation Measures: None.</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 50 unit apartment complex within an established commercial area could expose people to noise levels in excess of General Plan standards or create substantial increases in background noise levels above existing levels. The General Plan contains policies requiring residential projects to provide for an interior noise level of 45 decibels due to exterior noise sources. Also, an acoustical analysis is required prior to approval of any new residential development in a noise impacted area. The project location on First Street is considered a noise impacted area. A noise analysis was conducted for a previous multi-family project at this site (Lefty's Townhomes Site Noise Assessment; Rosen, Goldburg, Der & Lewitz, May 2007). As very little has changed in the surrounding vicinity, and the projects are very similar, the study remains relevant. The study concluded that by using noise attenuating construction methods, the project would achieve acceptable interior noise levels. Staff recommends a condition requiring the use of noise attenuating construction methods including windows with a minimum STC rating of 32 (34 for bedrooms along First Street), and entry doors with minimum STC rating of 29. The project site is not within an airport land use plan area. Any significant noise generated by this project will be limited to noise associated with construction/grading during construction. There will be a short-term noise increase associated with general development and construction practices. Temporary construction noise generated by this project is mitigated by standard mitigation measures contained in Policy Resolution 27</p> <p>Conclusion: The incorporation of standard and special noise mitigation measures required in accordance with the California Building Code will ensure compliance with the noise requirements of the City's Municipal Code and the Policies of the General Plan and will reduce impacts to a less than significant level.</p> <p>Standard Mitigation Measures: Policy Resolution 27: Noise Mitigation Measures 1-4</p>				

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Special Mitigation Measures: Noise attenuating construction methods shall be used including windows with a minimum STC rating of 32 (34 for bedrooms along First Street), and entry doors with minimum STC rating of 29.</p>				
<p>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:</p>				
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: This project will not significantly impact population and housing as the project is consistent with growth planned by the City's general plan and would not induce additional population growth. The number of people introduced into this area will be consistent with the anticipated population of the General Plan and is not considered to be significant. The proposed 50 unit multi-family apartment complex will replace a single family residence, which does not necessitate the construction of replacement housing.</p> <p>Conclusion: The project does not present new impacts related to jobs and housing not already anticipated by the General Plan and addressed through the implementation of existing General Plan policies and existing city ordinances.</p> <p>Standard Mitigation Measures: None.</p> <p>Special Mitigation Measures: None.</p>				
<p>XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project:</p>				
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>Discussion: Adequate fire and police protection, and other facilities are available to serve the project. The project design has been modified in response to equipment access concerns expressed by the Fire department. The project is required to pay school impact fees to meet demand for new students consistent with State law. See "Recreation" below for parks discussion.</p> <p>Conclusion: All agencies referenced above have been contacted and have reviewed the proposed 50 unit apartment complex. No significant impacts have been identified by any of the above agencies. As such, any potential public service impacts are anticipated to be at a less than significant level. The imposition of the standard mitigation measures of Policy Resolution 27 will further reduce any impact to public services.</p>				

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Standard Mitigation Measures: Policy Resolution 27: Public Services Mitigation Measures 1- 6				
Special Mitigation Measures: None.				
XV. RECREATION. <i>Would the project:</i>				
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. The proposed development of residential units at the project site is within the development potential anticipated by the General Plan and Housing Element, which should not represent a "significant impact" in regard 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. The project includes the construction of various recreational facilities on-site which will further reduce impacts to existing recreational facilities.</p> <p>Conclusion: The project will not cause an increased use of existing parks and recreational facilities.</p> <p>Standard Mitigation Measures: Policy Resolution 27: Recreation Mitigation Measures 1 & 2</p> <p>Special Mitigation Measures: None.</p>				
XVI. TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>				
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: A focused Traffic Assessment was prepared by W-Trans Inc. dated 3/3/14, (with an addendum dated 4/15/14) for the project. The assessment determined that the 50 units would be expected to generate an average of 333 trips daily, including 26 during the morning peak hour and 31 during the evening peak hour. These counts fall well below the minimum threshold of 50 peak hour trips that require a full traffic study. Therefore, a full traffic study was not required for the project.</p> <p>The volumes of traffic associated with the project would not result in a significant individual impact on traffic.</p>				

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>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. Specifically, the project would contribute to the cumulative impact by increasing traffic safety concerns in proximity of the intersection of First Street and Freeway Drive by increasing the volume of traffic making a left-turn out of the project site across multiple lanes of traffic. The proposed project driveway has been designed to meet City standards and thus does not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature. 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, and by the imposition of the following special mitigation measure.</p> <p>Conclusion: Standard traffic impact mitigation fees would be collected based on the valuation of any building permit necessary for the apartment complex. A raised median with a left-turn pocket would be constructed in the existing two-way turn lane on First Street. Any impacts would be considered less than significant.</p> <p>Standard Mitigation Measures: Policy Resolution 27: Transportation/Traffic Mitigation Measures 1-5.</p> <p>Special Mitigation Measures: A raised median with a westbound left-turn pocket shall be constructed in the existing two-way turn lane on First Street to allow for left-turns into the project driveway but prohibit left-turns out of the project driveway. The raised median shall be designed to allow for emergency vehicles to access the project driveway, and shall meet MUTCD and City standards.</p>				
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: Development of this site was anticipated by the City's 1998 General Plan and the potential impacts to utility capacity were evaluated at a program level in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR found that policies were included in the General Plan to address potential impacts to utilities from future development to a less than significant level. The proposed project is not anticipated to increase utility impacts greatly over levels anticipated by the General Plan. Utility providers have reviewed the project and provided comments, conditions of approval and confirmation that the utility is adequate to serve the project. This project will not significantly impact utilities and service systems, and special mitigation measures are not required. Standard mitigation measures require water conservation and recycling measures, use of the city's franchised</p>				

Environmental Issue Area	Potentially Significant Impact, Unmitigated	Potentially Significant Impact, Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>garbage hauler and appropriate storm water 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.</p> <p>Conclusion: The site has been designated for developments of this size and density. The project can be adequately served by local utilities and services without overburdening these services.</p> <p>Standard Mitigation Measures: Policy Resolution 27: Utilities and Service Systems Mitigation Measures 1-10.</p> <p>Special Mitigation Measures: None.</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: In regard to "a" no such effects are associated with this project due its location within an urbanized setting. In regard to "b" the project with the appropriate mitigations achieves some long term environmental goals. In regard to "c" there are no cumulative impacts associated with this project. In regard to "d" 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:

Applicants Written Project Statements

Location Map and Aerial Photos

Site Plan and Grading Plans (attached)

Landscape Plans

Geotechnical Investigation dated May 26, 2006 (updated November 21, 2012) by Miller Pacific Engineering Group

Traffic Impact Study for 2611 First Street; dated March 3, 2014 (updated April 15, 2014) W-Trans Inc.

Site Noise Assessment; Lefty's Townhomes, dated May 4, 2007 by Rosen, Goldberg, Der & Lewitz

City of Napa Policy Resolution #27 (attached)

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.

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

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, CEQA Guidelines, 1996

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

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

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.