1. Project Title:
   Trinitas Mixed Use Project

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:
   City of Napa, Community Development Department

3. Contact Person and Phone Number:
   Victor Carniglia, (707) 257 9530

4. Project Location:
   2650 Napa Valley Corporate Drive

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:
   Pacific Hospitality Group, 2532 Dupont Drive, Irvine, CA 92612

6. General Plan Designation:
   Corporate Park (CP)

7. Zoning:
   Industrial Park (IP-A, IP-B)

8. Description of Project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheet(s) if necessary.)

   The Trinitas Mixed Use Project proposes a hotel, a winery, and an office building within the Napa Valley Commons corporate park. The project site is made up of four vacant parcels and bound by Napa Valley Corporate Way and Napa Valley Corporate Drive, and Highway 221 is located easterly of the Project site. The proposed Project’s three distinct components are shown on Exhibit 1 - Site Plan.

   The hotel is proposed as a 4-story, 253-guestroom, dual-branded Marriott hotel featuring an AC hotel (153 rooms) and a Residence Inn (100 rooms). The dual-branded hotel will be constructed as a single building with several shared features, but will operate to provide distinct experiences. The building architecture will be different for each brand, with separate arrival and lobby areas. The AC includes a breakfast area, a lounge, a library, and two small media areas that serve as meeting rooms. The Residence Inn includes a breakfast-serving area along with a hearth and a study area, and a small meeting room. The hotels will share a pool area, a fitness room, and an event lawn. As a select service operation, the hotels will not include a restaurant or room service, but will provide limited breakfast service, as mentioned above. The hotel building is proposed to be 60 feet in height.

   The proposed winery is a single-story 26,214-square-foot building that will include production and storage facilities, a conference room, a small tasting area, and a sales office. The winery also includes administrative offices, a wine lab, a storage area, restrooms, and associated mechanical areas with an exterior lawn for small events and tastings. The winery is anticipated to be either a single-tenant or a custom crush operation. The winery building is proposed to be 28 feet high with architectural features extending to 38 feet in height.

   The proposed office building is a 2-story, 29,878-square-foot building with highly modular office space.
with an outdoor courtyard. The office building is proposed to be 24 feet in height with architectural features extending to 32 feet in height.

Vehicular access to the project site will be provided from the existing driveway on Napa Valley Corporate Way, and a new right in/right out driveway is proposed on Napa Valley Corporate Drive. Visitors accessing the hotel and winery are anticipated to utilize the Napa Valley Corporate Way entry point, while the office traffic is anticipated to utilize the Napa Valley Corporate Drive access point.

Once on-site, vehicles accessing the property from Napa Valley Corporate Way will be prompted by internal signage to proceed easterly towards the AC and the Residence Inn arrival areas, and the winery. Delivery trucks entering from Napa Valley Corporate Way will be directed through the property to the winery and hotel delivery areas. The office building will be primarily accessed from Napa Valley Corporate Drive where internal signage will direct vehicles. Surface parking throughout the Project site will allow patrons and guests to park close to their destination. The Project will provide 441 on-site parking spaces.

The Project is intended to complement and operate in association with The Meritage Resort (TMR), which is an existing hotel located south of the Project site, and Meritage Commons (MC), which is currently under construction across from TMR. All three hotels will be under common ownership. The hotels will have shared components including back of house services, laundry, and guest-serving components such as a shuttle between the new hotel component and TMR/MC and to the downtown.

The undeveloped Project site is rough graded where the site is predominantly characterized by a sparse covering of oat grass, and is frequently mowed for fire control.

The project has applied for Planned Development Zoning to address over-height architectural features related to the winery and office developments and to allow for shared parking between the project components. In addition, the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is proposed to be averaged across the TMR and MC properties to allow for a Project-specific increase in square footage, while ensuring the overall Project site is consistent with the 0.4 FAR established by the General Plan. This FAR averaging is proposed consistent with Zoning Code Section 17.52.120.C.1 and 2.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: (Briefly describe the project's surroundings.)

The Project site is located at the southern boundary of the City of Napa, near the junction of State Route 29 (SR 29) and State Route 221 (SR 221) as shown on Exhibit 2 - Regional Map and Exhibit 3 - Vicinity Map. The site is approximately 4 miles south of downtown Napa and is located in a corporate park known as the Napa Valley Commons. The immediate surrounding area is largely built-out with low-rise office and industrial development. The Kaiser Data Center is located northerly of the site across a vacant parcel. Vineyards are located easterly of the site across SR 221.

A planned redevelopment project known as Napa Pipe is located westerly of the site within the County of Napa (County) and the City’s sphere of influence. The Napa County Airport and the Airport Industrial Park are located approximately 4 miles to the south, and the Project site is within the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP).

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

- City of Napa: Major Design Review, Planned Development Overlay for over height features and shared parking, Use Permit for a hotel in IP-A zoning district.
- Napa Sanitation District.
- Airport Land Use Commission: Consistency Determination.
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.

- [x] Aesthetics
- [x] Biological Resources
- [x] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [x] Land Use / Planning
- [x] Transportation / Traffic
- [ ] Agriculture/Forestry Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities / Service Systems
- [x] Air Quality
- [x] Geology / Soils
- [ ] Hydrology / Water Quality
- [x] Noise
- [ ] Recreation
- [x] Mandatory Findings of Significance
Exhibit 1 - Site Plan
DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency):

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

_________________________________________   __________________________
Signature                                           Date

_________________________________________   __________________________
Printed Name   For

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a Lead Agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the Lead Agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The Lead Agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
   a) Earlier Analyses Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources. A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
   a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.
### Issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues: AESTHETICS -- Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES -- In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. -- 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

### III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:  
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 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)? | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues:</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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? | ☑️ | ☐️ | ☐️ | ☐️ |

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases? | ☑️ | ☐️ | ☐️ | ☐️ |

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | ☑️ | ☐️ | ☐️ | ☐️ |

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? | ☑️ | ☐️ | ☐️ | ☐️ |

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | ☑️ | ☐️ | ☐️ | ☐️ |

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? | ☑️ | ☐️ | ☐️ | ☐️ |

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | ☑️ | ☐️ | ☐️ | ☐️ |

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? | ☑️ | ☐️ | ☐️ | ☐️ |

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | ☑️ | ☐️ | ☐️ | ☐️ |

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | ☑️ | ☐️ | ☐️ | ☐️ |

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | ☑️ | ☐️ | ☐️ | ☐️ |

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)? | ☑️ | ☐️ | ☐️ | ☐️ |

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? | ☑️ | ☐️ | ☐️ | ☐️ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X. **LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:**

a) Physically divide an established community? | ☐                             | ☐                                         | ☒                        | ☒        |

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | ☐                             | ☒                                         | ☐                        | ☐        |

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | ☐                             | ☐                                         | ☒                        | ☒        |

XI. **MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:**

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | ☐                             | ☐                                         | ☒                        | ☒        |

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? | ☐                             | ☐                                         | ☒                        | ☒        |

XII. **NOISE -- Would the project result in:**

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | ☒                             | ☐                                         | ☐                        | ☐        |

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | ☐                             | ☒                                         | ☐                        | ☐        |

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | ☐                             | ☒                                         | ☐                        | ☐        |

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | ☒                             | ☐                                         | ☐                        | ☐        |

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | ☐                             | ☒                                         | ☐                        | ☐        |
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:
   a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of road or other infrastructure)?
   b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
   c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES -- Would the project:
   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:
      i) Fire protection?
      ii) Police protection?
      iii) Schools?
      iv) Parks?
      v) Other public facilities?

XV. RECREATION -- Would the project:
   a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?
   b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

XVI. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC -- Would the project:
   a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?
   b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?
   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?
   d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
   e) Result in inadequate emergency access?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES –

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or

ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? ☒

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? ☐

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? ☐

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? In making this determination, the Lead Agency shall consider whether the project is subject to the water supply assessment requirements of Water Code Section 10910, et. seq. (SB 610), and the requirements of Government Code Section 664737 (SB 221). ☐

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? ☒

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs? ☐

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? ☐
XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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, substantially 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current project, and the effects of probable future projects.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

   Less than Significant Impact —

   The City General Plan does not identify scenic vistas within the City limits or surrounding the Proposed Project. The Grape Crusher is a scenic vista identified by the County of Napa General Plan, located approximately one-half mile south of the Project site. While views from the Grape Crusher include the Project site, the vicinity is developed with existing industrial and commercial uses. The proposed building heights are consistent with existing buildings in the area and views of this area. The proposed project would not block area views or adversely affect a scenic vista. Further analysis will be provided in the EIR.

b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

   No Impact —

   The proposed Project would develop a vacant previously graded property within a largely built-out area in Napa Valley Commons. There are no scenic highways located within the vicinity of the proposed Project. The proposed Project would have no impact on scenic resources.

c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

   Less than Significant Impact —

   The Project site is located within Napa Valley Commons, which is largely built-out with commercial and industrial uses; the adjacent property to the west and the surrounding area are developed with office, winery and hotel uses similar to the Project. The proposed architectural style is rustic modern architecture inspired by Napa’s unique features. Unified design character themes and materials such as continuous metal cladding, corrugated metal rooftops, metal coping and trellises, shallow pitched roofs, vertically oriented windows and similar window frames, decorative blocks, glass, and water features will be used throughout the project to create a connectivity to surrounding industrial uses and the existing TMR and MC.

   In addition to high quality themes and materials, the proposed project will be extensively landscaped around the buildings, parking lots, and open space areas. The proposed project is a cohesive themed mixed-use project which will achieve consistency with the General Plan through the planting of 10 different species of trees and utilizing ground cover in areas where appropriate. Design details and visual quality of the site and its surroundings will be further analyzed in the EIR.

d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

   Potentially Significant Impact —

   The Project site is located within Napa Valley Commons, which is largely built-out with commercial and industrial uses; the surrounding properties are currently developed with uses similar to the Project including office, winery, and hospitality uses. The Project will create new sources of light and glare, as the proposed parking lot and landscape areas will include lighting. In addition, the Project is designed to minimize impacts from lighting through measures such as focusing lights towards the ground and the buildings. The proposed Project has been designed with windows as the only potential source of glare.
The Project site can be seen from SR 221, which runs easterly of the Project site. The hotel and the front of the winery will be fully visible from SR 221. Extensive landscaping is proposed for the site, which will serve to partially shield the views of the Project from the highway. The photometric analysis will be prepared for the EIR including analysis of nighttime views in the area due to light and glare generated by the proposed hotel expansion. The EIR will include mitigation measures to specifically address light and glare impacts.

2. **AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY 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?

   **No Impact –**

   The State of California Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) categorizes the Project site as “Farmland of Local Importance” and “Urban and Built-Up Land,” as shown on Exhibit 4 - Important Farmland Map. Farmlands of Local Importance are determined by the County Board of Supervisors, including lands such as drylands, grains, hay lands, and dryland pasture (Department of Conservation Farmland of Local Importance Definitions). The proposed project site does not contain characteristics of Farmland.

   Although a portion of the project site is mapped as Farmland of Local Importance, the site has not operated as farmland. The Project site is located on a relatively small piece of land (11.55 acres) with the surrounding corporate park properties designated as Urban and Built-Up Land by the FMMP. Finally, historical aerial photographs indicate that the project site has not been in intensive agricultural use.

   The Project site is zoned as Industrial Park (IP), has a General Plan (GP) designation of Corporate Park and is located within the City limits. The uses allowed in IP and GP are generally consistent with professional and business offices, research and development, wine and other food manufacturing, and hotel uses. The General Plan and zoning do not allow for farmland or agricultural uses and these uses do not currently exist on-site. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have no potential to 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.

b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

   **No Impact –**

   The proposed Project site is zoned as Industrial Park (IP), which does not permit agricultural uses, and is not regulated by a Williamson Act Contract. The proposed construction of a mixed use project on a vacant parcel of land within Napa Valley Commons would have no impact on zoning regulations for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract.
Source: Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program

Exhibit 4 - Important Farmland Map
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526) or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51140(g))?

No Impact –

The Project site is zoned IP. The Project site does not have forestland, timberland, or land zoned for timber production, and it does not propose the rezoning of a forestland district. The proposed construction of a mixed use project on a vacant parcel of land within Napa Valley Commons would have no impact on regulation of forestland, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest land?

No Impact –

The Project is located in an existing corporate park and includes the construction of a mixed use project on a vacant parcel of land located in a largely built-out area of Napa Valley Commons. There is no forestland on-site, and the Project will not result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use. The proposed Project would have no impact due to the loss of forestland or convert forestland to non-forest uses.

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 forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact –

The Project site is within Napa Valley Commons, an existing corporate park that does not include forest or agricultural uses. The proposed Project will not result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or the conversion of forest to non-forest use. The nature and location of the proposed Project precludes project effects due to conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest uses.

3. AIR QUALITY. Would the project:

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Potentially Significant Impact –

The Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan was adopted by BAAQMD in September 2010 and a Draft 2017 Clean Air Plan has been prepared for review. Under the 2010 Plan, development projects that would exceed significance thresholds must incorporate control measures to reduce emissions. A comprehensive air quality study will be prepared for the project and analyzed in the DEIR.

b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Potentially Significant Impact –

An air quality report will be prepared to evaluate the potential impacts to air quality. Applicable air quality standards and pollutants resulting from the proposed Project will be analyzed in the DEIR.
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)?

Potentially Significant Impact –

An air quality report will be prepared to evaluate the potential impacts to air quality. Applicable air quality standards and pollutants resulting from the proposed Project will be analyzed in the DEIR.

d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less than Significant Impact –

An air quality report will be prepared to evaluate the potential impacts to air quality. Applicable air quality standards and pollutants resulting from the proposed Project will be analyzed in the DEIR.

e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Less than Significant Impact –

An air quality report will be prepared to evaluate the potential impacts to air quality. Applicable air quality standards and pollutants resulting from the proposed Project will be analyzed in the DEIR.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

No Impact –

The Project site is a vacant lot within a largely built-out area of Napa Valley Commons and does not contain habitat of significant importance to species regulated by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The City’s General Plan does not identify the Project area as located within a biologically sensitive area. The proposed Project will not impact any candidate, sensitive, or special status species.

b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

No Impact –

The Project site is located on a vacant parcel of land within a largely built-out area of Napa Valley Commons. No riparian habitat or other sensitive community is identified on the Project site. Therefore, the Project will have no impact on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

No Impact –

The proposed Project is within a largely built-out area of Napa Valley Commons. The Project site is not designated as a wetland by the City’s General Plan, as shown on Exhibit 5 - Generalized Wetlands Map and there are no wetlands onsite; therefore, the proposed Project would have no impact on wetlands.
Exhibit 5 - Generalized Wetlands Map
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?

No Impact –

The Project site is within a largely built-out area of Napa Valley Commons. The Project site does not provide habitat for native species or provide a wildlife corridor. The proposed Project would have no impact on native or migratory species.

e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Potentially Significant Impact –

The Project site is a vacant lot sparsely covered with shrubs and ruderal grass within Napa Valley Commons. Several mature oak trees have been identified on-site. An arborist report will be prepared to assess the existing oak trees with respect to the health of the trees and any potential for conflicts with the proposed site plan. The DEIR will present the findings of the report and will provide an analysis of the City’s tree preservation plan.

f. Conflict with provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

No Impact –

The City of Napa General Plan does not identify the Project site as within an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, a Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. The proposed Project will not impact a federal, state, or local conservation plan.

5. CULTURAL/SCIENTIFIC RESOURCES. Would the project:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?

No Impact –

The Project is located on a site that has been previously disturbed and is within a largely built-out area of Napa Valley Commons. A previous Archeological Inventory Survey (survey), dated December 1, 2014 was prepared by Michael Jensen of Genesis Society for the Meritage Commons development along Bordeaux Way. That survey was referenced in preparation of this Initial Study, and information presented herein relies on the following:

- A records search at the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), letter dated November 17, 2014.
- Pedestrian field survey of the previous project area along Bordeaux Way.
- The Archaeological Survey Report.

The project site is not identified as a historical resource by the Historical Resources Commission as defined in Section 15064.5 of the Public Resources Code and no historical resources have been identified for Meritage Commons. Therefore, the Project would have no impact on, or cause changes in the significance of, historical resources.
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

No Impact –

As stated above, Napa Valley Commons has been previously surveyed for archaeological resources, and no resources have been documented within the area. Two cultural resources have been formally recorded within a one-eighth mile radius of the site; however, both resources were recommended not significant, and both have subsequently been destroyed.

Fieldwork conducted for the Meritage Commons development disclosed that the entire Napa Valley Commons area has been subjected to disturbance. The project site has been graded and re-contoured, and most of the disturbance likely coincides with construction of adjacent commercial and road developments. No evidence of prehistoric use or presence has been observed in the area.

Based on the specific findings of the report, no significant historical resources/unique archaeological resources were observed within the Project area; as a result, no significant historical resources/unique archeological resources should be affected. The applicant will comply with City standard mitigation measures; therefore, there are no anticipated impacts on archeological resources.

c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

No Impact –

The official Napa County Archeological records were examined in conjunction with the Archeological Inventory Survey finding that all of Napa Valley Commons, including the project area, was subject to an archeological survey conducted in 1981 by Sally Salzman in conjunction with the Napa Industrial Park project which involved approximately 246-acres. No prehistoric or historic-era resources were documented. Two cultural resources were formally recorded within 1/8-mile radius, as confirmed by CHRI in a letter dated November 17, 2014; however, both resources were recommended as not significant. The City of Napa does not identify any paleontological resources in the Napa Valley Commons areas, and the Project site is characterized as disturbed and contains no unique geological features. The proposed Project will have no impact on unique paleontological and geologic features.

d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

No Impact –

Records searches, field surveys, and contact with the NAHC have shown that, as within the entire Napa Valley Commons area, it is unlikely that any human remains will be discovered on the Project site. Therefore, as noted in subsection c) above, the Project will not directly or indirectly destroy or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. No impact will occur, because no such resources are anticipated to be discovered on-site.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

No Impact –

The West Napa Fault, located to the northwest of the Project, is the closest to the Project site, as shown on Exhibit 6 - Regional Faulting Map. The West Napa Fault is designated as an Alquist-Priolo Special Study Area; however, the Project is not located within the study area. The Project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Fault-Rupture Hazard Zone, and there are no known active or potentially active faults on the Project site, and there is little potential for ground surface rupture.
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?
   Potentially Significant Impact –
   The proposed Project is located in Northern California which is historically known for its seismic activity. There is a very strong potential for seismic ground shaking at the Project site, as shown on Exhibit 7 - Ground Shaking Intensity for the West Napa Fault. As stated above, there are no faults located within the Project site; however, due to the potential that the proposed Project could be affected by a seismic event on a nearby regional or local fault, ground stability will be further examined through the preparation of a geotechnical report with mitigation recommendations and analyzed in the EIR.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
   Potentially Significant Impact –
   The proposed Project is not located within an area that is identified as susceptible to dynamic settlement such as liquefaction. Due to the site’s location within an area that could be affected by a seismic event on a nearby regional or local fault, ground stability will be further examined through the preparation of a geotechnical report with mitigation recommendations and analyzed in the EIR.

iv. Landslides?
   No Impact –
   The proposed Project is located within a relatively flat and largely built-out area of Napa Valley Commons. The Project will have no impact or adverse effects on people due to landslides as area topography is flat and largely built-out.

b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
   Less than Significant Impact–
   The Project site has been rough graded, and as with other vacant lots in Napa Valley Commons is most likely comprised of fill material reaching several feet below the surface. The potential for the proposed Project to result in soil erosion or the loss of top soil will be further examined through the preparation of a geotechnical report which will be analyzed in the EIR.

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?
   Potentially Significant Impact –
   As described above, the Project site is not located within an area susceptible to liquefaction, and the potential for lateral spreading or subsidence is unlikely. Soil stability will be further examined through the preparation of a geotechnical report and will be analyzed in the EIR.
Exhibit 7 - Ground Shaking Intensity for the West Napa Fault
d. Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

**Potentially Significant Impact** –

The proposed Project will be evaluated for expansive soil characteristics and further examined through the preparation of a geotechnical report and will be analyzed in the EIR.

e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal system where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

**No Impact** –

The proposed Project will connect into an established sewer system and will not rely on the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

### 7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:

a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

**Potentially Significant Impact** –

The proposed Project is the development of a mixed use project on vacant land within a largely built-out portion of Napa Valley Commons. Air quality and greenhouse gas emissions for this area are regulated by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). In response to a statewide goal to lower greenhouse gas emissions, BAAQMD suggested a significance threshold of 1,100 metric tons (MT) of CO₂e (carbon dioxide equivalency).

It is anticipated that the proposed Project may exceed the BAAQMD CO₂e threshold. Greenhouse gas generation and quantities will be examined through the preparation of a greenhouse gas emissions report including mitigation measures for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and will be analyzed in the EIR.

b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

**Potentially Significant Impact** –

The proposed Project is the development of a mixed use project on vacant land within a largely built-out portion of Napa Valley Commons. Federal, state, and local greenhouse gas plans and regulations will be examined through the preparation of a greenhouse gas emissions report and analyzed in the EIR.

### 8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

**No Impact** –

The proposed Project is the development of a mixed use project on vacant land within a largely built-out portion of Napa Valley Commons. The Project will generate waste from the winery; however, it does not include substantial use, production, or transport of hazardous materials or wastes. Hazardous materials storage requirements are enforced by the City’s Fire Department, which is responsible for inspecting facilities containing toxic and/or hazardous materials. The City offers free and unlimited collection and recycling of electronic wastes at the City’s Diversion Facility. All other material generated by the Project that cannot be handled through ordinary means will be disposed of at the Devlin Road Recycle and Transfer Facility. The Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the
routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials because the project will not generate hazardous waste.

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?

No Impact –

The proposed Project is the development of a mixed use project on vacant land within a largely built-out portion of Napa Valley Commons. The Project does not include the use or generation of hazardous materials that could potentially create a hazard to the public. The Project would not create a foreseeable upset or accident condition involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment because the project does not involve hazardous materials.

c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

No Impact –

The proposed Project is the development of a mixed use project on vacant land within a largely built-out portion of Napa Valley Commons. As discussed above, the Project will not emit hazardous emissions or handle emissions or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. In addition, the Project is not located within one quarter mile of an existing school.

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?

No Impact –

The proposed Project is the development of a mixed use project on vacant land within a largely built-out portion of Napa Valley Commons. The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Therefore, the project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Less than Significant Impact –

The proposed Project is the development of a mixed use project on vacant land within a largely built-out portion of Napa Valley Commons. The Project is located approximately 4 miles from Napa Valley Airport and is not located within the airport’s flight plan area. The project site is located within the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), as shown on Exhibit 8 - ALUCP Compatibility Plan Map. The ALUCP divides the compatibility area into Zones A through E, with Zone A being the most restrictive and Zone E the least restrictive. The majority of the project site is located within Zone E. A portion of the parking lot on the southwest side of the site is located in Zone D. A small portion of the hotel will be located in Zone C. The DEIR will include an analysis of density within this zone consistent with the ALUCP. In addition, because a portion of the hotel is located within Zone C, the project will be referred to the Airport Land Use Commission for a determination of consistency with the ALUCP.
f. For a project within the vicinity of private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

   No Impact –

   The proposed Project is located approximately 4 miles from the nearest airport, Napa County Airport, which is a public airport. The Project site is not located in the vicinity of a private airport and would not present a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area.

   g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

   No Impact –

   Emergency response plans and routes are established by the City’s General Plan. Any proposed modifications to vehicular circulation on the Project site will be designed and implemented in compliance with the City’s zoning code and the General Plan, and reviewed by the City’s traffic engineer for approval. The proposed Project will not interfere or impair the designated emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

   h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

   No Impact –

   The Project site is located within a nearly built-out corporate park, and not within an area subject to wildland fires. A large open space agricultural area is located to the east of the proposed Project, across SR 211; however, this area not designated as wildlands and is divided from the proposed Project by SR 221.

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

   a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

      Potentially Significant Impact –

      The proposed Project includes development of vacant land, and does not involve activities that would significantly violate any water quality standard or waste discharge requirement. A hydrology report with recommended mitigation will be prepared and water quality will be analyzed in the EIR.

   b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of the 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)?

      Less than Significant Impact –

      The proposed Project includes development of vacant land and will result in an increase in impervious surfaces. The Project would not draw from a well and does not include activities that would significantly or 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. Potential impacts to groundwater will be examined in a hydrology report and analyzed in the EIR.
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?

Potentially Significant Impact –

The proposed Project includes development of vacant land in a largely built-out corporate park. No streams or rivers are present on-site, and the Project would not cause the alteration of the course of a river in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or off-site. Potential impacts to on-site drainage will be examined in a hydrology report and analyzed in the EIR.

d. Substantially alter drainage patterns 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?

Potentially Significant Impact –

The proposed Project includes development of vacant land in a largely built-out corporate park. Drainage patterns and surface run off will be examined in a hydrology report and analyzed in the EIR, and a WQMP will detail a proposed storm drain system including Best Management Practices (BMPs) and mitigation measures for storm water capture and treatment.

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?

Potentially Significant Impact –

The proposed Project includes development of vacant land in a largely built-out corporate park, and would create runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. The current system is designed for the 10-year storm event and the current City standards require systems designed for the 25-year storm event. The project will be designed to detain the differential between the 10-year and 25-year storm events onsite in order to ensure discharge is consistent with capacity for the 10-year event. Drainage patterns and surface run off will be examined in a hydrology report and analyzed in the EIR, and a WQMP will detail a proposed storm drain system including Best Management Practices (BMPs) for storm water capture and treatment.

f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Less than Significant with Mitigation –

The proposed Project includes development of vacant land in a largely built-out corporate park. Water quality, including the potential for runoff containing pollutants of concern will be further examined in a hydrology report and analyzed in the EIR. In addition, a WQMP will detail a proposed storm drain system including Best Management Practices (BMPs) and mitigation measures for storm water capture and treatment.

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?

No Impact –

The proposed Project includes development of vacant land in a largely built-out corporate park. The Project site is not located in a 100-year floodplain, as shown on Exhibit 9 - 100 Year Floodplain of Napa River and Creeks and the project does not include housing. Therefore, the proposed Project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or flood hazard delineation map. No Impact would occur as a result of Project implementation.
Exhibit 9 - 100 Year Floodplain of Napa River and Creeks
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?

No Impact –

No portion of the Project site located within a designated 100-year flood hazard area, as shown on Exhibit 9 - 100 Year Floodplain of Napa River and Creeks. Therefore, the proposed Project would not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area or impede or redirect flows and there would be no impact on structures within a 100-year flood hazard area.

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?

No Impact –

The Project would not 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 because the project site is not located within an area subject to significant flood hazard risks.

j. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

No Impact –

The Project site is not located within areas such as the ocean, a hillside, downriver from a dam, or a levee prone to flooding which would be subject to risks that would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation involving seiche, tsunami or mudflow.

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

a. Physically divide an established community?

No Impact –

The Project site is located in a largely built-out corporate park, as depicted on Exhibit 3 - Vicinity Map (page 6), with a variety of uses such as commercial, office, industrial, and hotel. The proposed project is a part of an existing development and would not physically divide an established community.

b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environment effect?

Less than Significant Impact –

The land use plans, policies, and regulations applicable to the proposed Project include the City’s General Plan, the Zoning Code/Municipal Code, the ALUCP for Napa County Airport, and the Napa Valley Corporate Park Design Guidelines. The proposed Project includes a zoning code change to the Planned Development Overlay to allow for an increase in building height and shared parking, and would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact. Additional information regarding the Planned Development Overlay zoning change will be provided in the EIR.
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

No Impact –

The Project site is within a largely built-out corporate park, and is not within an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, a Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. The proposed Project will not impact a federal, state, or local conservation plan.

11. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

No Impact –

The City General Plan does not identify mineral resources on the Project site or within the City limits. The Project site is identified by the California Geological Survey (CGS) as located within Mineral Resource Zone MRZ-4. This zone is defined as an area where available information is inadequate for assignment to any other MRZ category, as shown on Exhibit 10 - California Geological Survey Mineral Map. No mines, wells, or other resource extraction activity occurs on the property or is ever known to have occurred on the property. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not 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.

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?

No Impact –

The proposed Project site is not identified as a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in the loss of locally important mineral resource recovery site.

12. NOISE. Would the project:

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?

Potentially Significant Impact –

The proposed Project would generate noise from short-term construction and long-term operational activities. The Project will be required to comply with the City’s noise ordinance requirements, and potential noise generation will be further examined in an acoustical report and analyzed in the EIR.

b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less than Significant Impact –

The proposed Project would generate noise from short-term construction and long-term operational activities. Based on proposed uses, it is not anticipated that the proposed Project will generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Potential noise generation will be further examined in an acoustical report and analyzed in the EIR.
Exhibit 10 - California Geological Survey Mineral Map
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

No Impact –

The proposed Project would generate noise from construction on a temporary basis and operational activities on a long-term basis. The proposed hotel, winery, and office uses are consistent with existing uses in the vicinity, and it is not anticipated that the proposed Project will generate a substantial permanent increase in noise levels beyond existing ambient levels. The proposed Project is located next to a highway with vehicles traveling at high speeds, and will be required to comply with the City’s noise ordinance requirements. Potential noise generation will be further examined in an acoustical report and analyzed in the EIR.

d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Potentially Significant Impact –

The proposed Project would generate noise from construction on a short-term basis and operational activities on a long-term basis. The proposed hotel, winery, and office uses are consistent with existing uses in the vicinity, and potential noise generation will be further examined in an acoustical report and analyzed in the EIR.

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Less than Significant Impact –

The Project site is located approximately four miles north of Napa County Airport and is within the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). The Project site is outside the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan 55 dB CNEL contour. The ALUCP and Community Noise Equivalent Levels (CNEL) and potential noise compatibility will be further examined in an acoustical report and analyzed in the EIR.

f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact –

The Project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the Project would not expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels.

13. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

Less than Significant Impact –

The Project proposes the construction of a hotel, a winery, and an office building on an 11.55-acre vacant parcel within an existing corporate park. The proposed uses are consistent with the City’s Industrial Park Zoning and existing uses in the area. The Project is anticipated to create a limited number of new jobs at the hotel given that it is a select service hotel. In addition, because the hotel will be developed as a part of the larger complex with TMR and MC and will share back of house, laundry and engineering functions, fewer employees are anticipated to be generated compared to a stand-alone, full-service hotel. The
The proposed Project has no potential to induce substantial population growth in the area, either directly or indirectly.

b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
   No Impact –
   The Project is located within the Industrial Park Zoning District where housing is not an allowed use, and there is no existing housing within the immediate Project vicinity. Uses permitted by the City’s General Plan and Zoning Code are limited to manufacturing, warehouse office, and public and quasi-public uses, including hotels, wineries, and offices. There is no potential for housing to be displaced by the proposed Project, and no replacement housing would need to be built as a result of the proposed Project.

c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
   No Impact –
   The proposed Project would be located on vacant land within a largely built-out corporate park. Under current conditions, the Project site does not provide any residential structures, and housing is not an allowable use in the Industrial Park Zoning District. Therefore, the proposed Project would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of housing elsewhere.

14. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project:

a. Would the project 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:

i. Fire protection?
   Potentially Significant Impact –
   The Napa Valley Corporate Park area, including the Project site, is served by Station 4, located at 251 Gasser Drive, approximately 2.5 miles away from the proposed Project. The increase in fire personnel required to serve the proposed Project could measurably degrade existing service ratio, response time, or other performance objectives. The proposed Project has a potentially significant impact associated with demand on fire services.

ii. Police protection?
   Potentially Significant Impact –
   The Project proposes hotel, winery, and office uses in an existing corporate park area. The Napa Valley Corporate Park area, including the Project site, is within the Soscol Gateway Neighborhood service area. The increase in police personnel required to serve the proposed Project could measurably degrade existing service ratio, response time, or other performance objectives. The proposed Project has a potentially significant impact associated with demand on police services.
iii. Schools?

No Impact –

The Project proposes hotel, winery, and office uses in an existing corporate park area. The proposed Project will not generate additional school age children in the area or introduce new students to the local school district, Napa Valley Unified School District. The proposed hotel, winery, and office uses would not have a direct or indirect adverse impact on the school system. Therefore, there would be no environmental impacts on schools as a result of the Project.

iv. Parks?

No Impact –

The Project proposes hotel, winery, and office uses in an existing corporate park area. Park use is not anticipated by the proposed Project, and there are no parks within Napa Valley Commons. Therefore, there would be no environmental impacts on parks as a result of the Project.

v. Other public facilities?

No Impact –

The Project proposes hotel, winery, and office uses in an existing corporate park area. No component of the Project would measurably increase demand on public facilities, and no physically expanded or new public facilities are required. Therefore, there would be no environmental impacts on public facilities as a result of the proposed Project.

15. RECREATION. Would the project:

a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

No Impact –

The Project proposes hotel, winery, and office uses in an existing corporate park area. No component of the Project would increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur. Therefore, there would be no environmental impact as a result of the proposed Project.

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?

No Impact –

The Project proposes hotel, winery, and office uses in an existing corporate park area. No component of the Project would increase the use, physically expand, or require construction of new recreational facilities. Therefore, there would be no environmental impacts as a result of the proposed Project.
16. **TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:**

a. **Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?**

   **Potentially Significant Impact –**

   The proposed hotel, winery, and office are uses that are consistent with the City’s zoning code and General Plan. Applicable plans, ordinances and policies establishing measures of effectiveness for the circulation system will be examined through the preparation of a transportation impact analysis. Potential environmental impacts will be analyzed in the EIR and mitigation measures will be recommended.

b. **Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standard and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?**

   **Potentially Significant Impact –**

   The proposed hotel, winery, and office uses would contribute traffic to area intersections currently operating at a level of service below the City’s standards. Applicable congestion management programs, level of service standards, travel demand measures, and other congestion management standards will be examined through the preparation of a transportation impact analysis. Potential environmental impacts will be analyzed in the EIR and mitigation measures will be recommended.

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?**

   **No Impact –**

   The closest airport is Napa County Airport, located approximately 4 miles south of the proposed Project. The Project does not propose activities that would impact air traffic patterns, traffic levels, or a change in location.

d. **Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

   **No Impact –**

   The Project includes modifications including driveways on Napa Valley Corporate Drive and Napa Valley Corporate Way. No impacts to the roadways or intersections are proposed; therefore, the proposed Project will not result in an increase in hazards.

e. **Result in inadequate emergency access?**

   **No Impact –**

   The Project will maintain vehicular and pedestrian access throughout the site, including emergency access. The proposed Project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

f. **Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?**

   **No Impact –**

   The proposed Project would be designed consistent with and would not otherwise conflict with the City’s alternative transportation policies. Applicable policies, plans, and programs regarding public transit,
bicycle, and pedestrian facilities will be examined through the preparation of a transportation impact analysis and analyzed in the EIR.

17. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or

No Impact –

The project site is not identified in the California Register of Historical Resources. For a property to be considered eligible it must meet the following criteria and be evaluated based on the quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

A. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
B. That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
C. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
D. That have yielded, or may likely yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The project is proposed to be constructed on vacant land with no documented historical significance. Historical cultural resources were not identified within the area by the Archeological Inventory Survey prepared by Genesis Society for the Meritage Commons project. In addition, the project site does not meet the criteria identified by the California Register of Historical Resources as a property with a quality of significance in American history. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact as a property listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k).

ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

No Impact –

The Archeological Inventory Survey prepared by Genesis Society for Meritage Commons included consultation with the NAHC. In a letter dated November 3, 2014, NAHC indicated that a record search of the sacred land file failed to indicate the presence of Native American resources in the immediate area. No historical cultural resources are identified within the area. Therefore, there is no substantial evidence to support that the proposed project would meet criteria set forth in subdivision (C) of Public Resources Code §5024.1. The project will have no impact on Tribal Cultural Resources.
18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

Potentially Significant Impact –

The Project will connect into Napa Sanitation District’s sewer system. Wastewater from the hotel and the office would not exceed wastewater requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. However, the proposed winery crush activities will generate quantities of wastewater that will require additional treatment or alternative disposal. Winery wastewater quantities, treatment, and disposal will be detailed in a technical report and analyzed in the EIR.

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 impacts?

No Impact –

The proposed Project includes wastewater associated with hotel, winery, and office uses. Wastewater will be treated at Napa Sanitation District’s wastewater facility which has adequate capacity to treat typical project wastewater through ongoing infiltration and inflow reduction projects. The crush component of the winery will produce additional wastewater that will require either additional on-site treatment or alternative disposal. Winery wastewater quantities, treatment, and disposal will be detailed in a technical report and analyzed in the EIR.

c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?

Potentially Significant Impact –

The proposed Project includes the construction of new storm drain facilities, consisting of drain inlets, storm drain lines, and on-site treatment facilities. A comprehensive analysis will be conducted, and proposed on-site facilities will be described in a storm water quality control plan and analyzed in the EIR.

d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Less than Significant Impact –

The proposed Project is not subject to the water supply assessment requirements of Water Code Section 10910, et. Seq. (610) or the requirements of Government Code Section 664737 (SB 221). The project site is served by The City of Napa’s Water Division (NWD), which has the primary responsibility of providing customers within the City’s water service boundary with a reliable supply of water safe for consumption and other domestic, industrial, and commercial uses. Water demand for the proposed Project and water conservation strategies will be detailed in the EIR.

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?

Potentially Significant Impact –

The proposed Project will contribute an increase in wastewater through typical hotel, winery, and office uses. The Project will also produce wastewater resulting from the proposed custom crush, and technical analysis will evaluate quantity, treatment, and disposal, which will be analyzed in the EIR.
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

No Impact –

Solid waste generated by the proposed Project will be transported by Napa Recycling and Waste Service and disposed of at the Devlin Road Recycle and Transfer Facility, located approximately 4 miles from the Project site. The transfer facility and the waste service provider have sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed Project.

g. Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

No Impact –

The City of Napa Materials Diversion Division administers the recycling and solid waste collection contract with Napa Recycling and Waste Services, which is responsible for implementing City policy. In accordance with the state’s enactment of AB 341, the City has adopted R2012 100, establishing a disposal reduction policy, including but not limited to, extended producer responsibility, sustainable purchasing responsibility, the High Performance Building Ordinance, and the Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling Ordinance. The City has established residential and commercial collection rates that will be applicable to the proposed Project. Therefore, there will be no impact related to solid waste and the Project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes.

19. MANDATORY FINDINGS

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 Impact –

The proposed project is located on a site that has been subject to urban disturbances such as onsite grading and surrounding development. There is no habitat onsite or adjacent to the project that supports fish or wildlife species and no rare or endangered plant or animal species have been identified onsite or in the project vicinity. Therefore, the project would have no impact or 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.

b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

Potentially Significant Impact –

The project is a mixed use in-fill project within an existing corporate park consistent with the General Plan and Zoning designations. The likelihood that the project will have environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable is potentially significant. The EIR and supporting technical reports will examine the proposed project, existing development, and other approved projects within the general site vicinity. Reduction strategies through the implementation of mitigation measures, standard conditions of approval, and project design features will be presented and analyzed in the EIR. The proposed project will have a potentially significant impact as a result of incremental impacts that, when combined with impacts from other projects, would be cumulatively considerable.
c. Does project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less Than Significant Impact –

The proposed project would not have environmental effects that could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.