

**COUNTY OF NAPA
PLANNING, BUILDING AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT
1195 THIRD STREET SUITE 210
NAPA, CA 94559
(707) 253-4417**

Governor's Office of Planning & Research

JUL 19 2019

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

**Initial Study Checklist
(form updated January 2019)**

1. **Project Title:** New Life Community Adventist Church, Use Permit #P16-00210-UP
2. **Property Owner:** New Life Community Adventist Church, 219 Sandy Neck Way, Vallejo, CA 94591
3. **County Contact Person, Phone Number and email:** Sean Kennings, 415-533-2111, sean@lakassociates.com
4. **Project Location and APN:** This 1.8-acre parcel is located at 1451 American Canyon Road within the AW (Agricultural Watershed) Zoning District; APN 059-100-002
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** New Life Community Adventist Church; contact John Wambaa, 219 Sandy Neck Way, Vallejo, CA 94591
6. **General Plan description:** AWOS (Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space)
7. **Zoning:** AW (Agricultural Watershed)
8. **Background/Project History:** The parcel is comprised of approximately 1.8-acres of developed areas including a dilapidated single-family residence and associated agricultural or grazing activities. A building permit was issued on 10/26/2018 for demolition of the existing single-family residence due to security issues (B18-02168).
9. **Description of Project:** The proposed project includes the development of new church and associated support and educational rooms/facilities on a 1.8-acre site at 1451 American Canyon Road in Napa County. The project includes the construction of a main, two-story, approximately 4,000 sq ft sanctuary/chapel structure and a 500 sq ft attached one-story conference room and bathrooms, a 1,700 sq ft fellowship hall, a 2,000 sq ft lobby, and a 3,100 sq ft semi-circular shaped classroom and office structure. All buildings will result in a net of 11,026 square feet of new development. Current membership for the New Life Community Adventist Church is 80 members. The proposed sanctuary building would have seating for 150 people. Church services will be held once a week on Saturdays, except for possible special events (a maximum of 4 per year) proposed with 250 attendees. Approximately five employees would be on site during the weekdays at various times of the day. An asphalt surface parking lot will provide parking for 62 spaces and would be accessed via a new paved project driveway with access to American Canyon Road. The church is proposing the use of satellite parking lot at the American Canyon High School for larger/wedding events on weekends with shuttle service between the two locations. The new development will also require the widening of American Canyon Road to provide a left turn lane pocket (eastbound) for vehicular access to the site. The proposed church development would be served by a new on-site septic system. Domestic and emergency fire suppression water needs would be served by the existing on-site water well. A 20' tall 35,000-gallon water tank is proposed in the central-western edge of the project site.
10. **Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses.**
The 1.8-acre project site is located within the AW zoning district at 1451 American Canon Road approximately 1,000 feet to the east of the American Canyon Road / Newell Drive intersection and 1.6 miles southwest of the intersection of American Canyon Road and Interstate Highway 80 (I80). The parcel is comprised of approximately 1.8-acres of developed areas including a dilapidated single-family residence and associated agricultural or grazing activities. A building permit was issued on 10/26/2018 for demolition of the existing single-family residence due to security issues (B18-02168). Site topography ranges from slopes of one to less than five percent with soil types including Clear Lake Clay. The primary vegetation is disturbed grasslands used for pasture grazing purposes. There was previously an existing single-family home and multiple small agricultural improvements on the site that possibly supported additional agriculture activities.

The property is bordered on the west by a small agriculture/livestock facility and grazing lands and American Canyon High School farther west, by rural residential and agricultural (grazing/animal) uses across American Canyon Creek to the south, residential subdivisions to the southwest, and steeper slopes to the southeast. East of the property is an old gravel quarry and steeper slopes to the east and northeast. The property has access and frontage on American Canyon Road via an existing dirt ranch road.
11. **Other agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).
The project will require various ministerial approvals by the County and Cal Fire, including but not limited to building permits and grading

permits.

12. **Tribal Cultural Resources. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?** On March 23, 2017, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. One response has been received from the Middletown Rancheria stating that they have no specific comments at this time.

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

The conclusions and recommendations contained herein are professional opinions derived in accordance with current standards of professional practice. They are based on a review of the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps, the other sources of information listed in the file, and the comments received, conversations with knowledgeable individuals; the preparer's personal knowledge of the area; and, where necessary, a visit to the site. For further information, see the environmental background information contained in the permanent file on this project.

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Charlene Gallina for
Signature

July 16, 2019
Date

Name: Sean Kennings, Consultant

Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services
Department

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-c. Visual resources are those physical features that make up the environment, including landforms; geological features, water, trees and other plants, and elements of the human cultural landscape. A scenic vista, then, would be a publicly accessible vantage point such as a road, park, trail, or scenic overlook from which distant or landscape-scale views of a beautiful or otherwise important assembly of visual resources can be taken-in.

The project site is elevated from American Canyon Road and is characterized as rural grazing or agricultural lands. American Canyon Road, in the vicinity of the project site, has a slight rise from west to east, from approximately 100' asl to 150' asl (approximately 600' on either side of the existing project site driveway). A vehicle travelling east along American Canyon Road would not be able to see the new improvements until relatively close to the project site. Travelling west, a vehicle would begin to see the new improvements approximately 1,200 feet to the east of the site. Due to the existing topography on the old quarry site, the project site is mostly blocked from views east of the site. The new structure has a high peaked roof on the south side, but would not project above potential views of ridgelines to the northeast or southeast. As part of the design packet for the proposed development the applicant prepared several elevations and illustrative perspectives. No visual simulations were included but the applicant did provide two viewshed exhibits to illustrate what a vehicle might see travelling along American Canyon Road. Although the viewshed exhibit is not situated on a photo-realistic base map or exhibit, review of available aerial and street view imagery confirms that the proposed church would be located above the immediate field of vision for vehicles traveling along American Canyon Road. The recently demolished residence and associated agriculture activities do not represent a significant visual resource, although there are several areas of rock outcropping features on the site. One such rock outcropping is proposed to be removed to construct the church parking lot. However, this rock outcropping feature is not a resource that has a vertically visual element and is not an identifiable feature from public views or vantage points along American Canyon Road. Given the existing conditions around the project site and the nature of existing visual elements in and around the project site, the visual analysis concludes that the visual impacts would be less than significant as a result of the proposed project.

As generally described in the **Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses** section, above, this area is defined by rural residential uses and grazing areas. The project would not result in a substantial damage to scenic resources or substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The project site was previously currently developed with a dilapidated single-family home and currently associated agricultural activities. Three trees of varying species located in the area of proposed improvement on the 1.8-acre site would be retained as part of the proposed project. Existing site improvements would be demolished, however, the majority of existing rock outcroppings would be left undisturbed as part of the project. There are no other designated scenic resources on the property. American Canyon Rd. is identified as a Scenic Corridor Roadway; however, the County's Viewshed Protection Program is not applicable to the proposed project as no construction is proposed on slopes in excess of 15 percent. Because there is minimal visual impact from public vantage points, there is a less than significant impact to a scenic vista, scenic resources or the visual character of the site.

d. The new church includes interior lighting and security lighting as part of the proposal. The church would typically operate seven days a week with typical increased usage during services. Site lighting for the proposed project consists of pole mounted LED light fixtures on 25' high poles in the proposed parking lot. Other exterior lights will be building mounted LED with lighting contained within the site. Lighting is intended to provide security coverage and to provide lighting for security cameras at required minimum levels. The project also includes two curved illuminated ground signs at the west and east side of the project site. The proposed lighting shall meet light pollution reduction standards required by the California Green Building Code 5.106.8. The application materials do not include a lighting plan or photometric lighting study to determine the potential for light seepage at the property boundaries. As such, the project would be conditioned to require

the applicant to submit for department review and approval, and prior to issuance of any building permit for construction, two copies of a separate detailed lighting plan showing the location and specifications for all lighting fixtures to be installed on the property (standard conditions of approval 6.3 and 4.8(a)). Because there are minimal visual impacts from a new source of sustainable light and glare, there is a less than significant impact to day and nighttime views in the area.

Mitigation Measures: None required

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

Discussion:

a, b. The project site has an Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space land use designation in the Napa County General Plan. The project site is not Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The site is designated as "Other Land (X)," as shown on the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The proposed church development and parking lot will cover a majority of the site; however, the proposed use is recognized by the General Plan under General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-125: which states: New churches or other religious institutions should generally be located within or adjacent to urbanized areas, minimizing the transportation needs of parishioners/members and the potential for loss of agricultural lands. Although the subject property is designated as AWOS, there is little agriculture resources on the property other than grazing lands and the subject property is adjacent to the east side of American Canyon. However, Napa County Code Section 18.120.010.B.11 allows, with the approval of Use Permit, the following in every Zoning District within the County: "churches".

Given the General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy, AG/LU-125 and Napa County Code Section 18.120.010.B 11 discussed above, the proposed church use is considered an acceptable use of non-urban land (i.e. Agricultural Watershed and Open Space designated property such as the subject site). In addition, the site is designated "Other Land (X)" by the FMMP and is not Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Significance or Unique Farmland. As such, there are no significant impacts to prime farmland created by the project. Furthermore, since there is no Williamson Act contract associated with the project site, there would be no impacts as a result of the proposed use.

The proposed project has been further reviewed by Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services (PBES) Planning Division for General Plan Consistency based on the policies and code sections listed above as well as additional policies AG/LU-3, 4, 9, 12 and 26. As churches are considered an acceptable use of non-urban land and no new public services are required as a result of the project, further analysis of any "inconsistency" is not required under CEQA.

¹ "Forest land" is defined by the State as "land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits." (Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) The Napa County General Plan anticipates and does not preclude conversion of some "forest land" to agricultural use, and the program-level EIR for the 2008 General Plan Update analyzed the impacts of up to 12,500 acres of vineyard development between 2005 and 2030, with the assumption that some of this development would occur on "forest land." In that analysis specifically, and in the County's view generally, the conversion of forest land to agricultural use would constitute a potentially significant impact only if there were resulting significant impacts to sensitive species, biodiversity, wildlife movement, sensitive biotic communities listed by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, water quality, or other environmental resources addressed in this checklist.

- c-e. The project site is zoned AW, which allow church uses upon grant of a Use Permit. According to the Napa County Environmental resource maps (based on the following layers – Sensitive Biotic Oak Woodlands, Riparian Woodland Forest and Coniferous Forest) the area on which the proposed development will occur contains no sensitive woodland or forested areas. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emission (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

On June 2, 2010, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) Board of Directors unanimously adopted Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC) Thresholds of Significance to assist in the review of projects under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). These TAC thresholds are designed to establish the level at which BAAQMD believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA and were posted on BAAQMD's website and included in BAAQMD's updated CEQA Guidelines (updated May 2012). The TAC thresholds are advisory and may be followed by local agencies at their own discretion.

The TAC thresholds were challenged in court (California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (1st Dist., Div. 5, 2016) 2 Cal.App.5th 1067) because BAAQMD did not conduct CEQA review of their potential environmental impacts. Following litigation in the trial court, the court of appeal, and the California Supreme Court, all of the thresholds were upheld. However, in an opinion issued on December 17, 2015, the California Supreme Court held that CEQA does not generally require an analysis of the impacts of locating development in areas subject to environmental hazards unless the project would exacerbate existing environmental hazards. The Supreme Court also found that CEQA requires the analysis of exposing people to environmental hazards in specific circumstances, including the location of development near airports, schools near sources of toxic contamination, and certain exemptions for infill and workforce housing. The Supreme Court also held that public agencies remain free to conduct this analysis regardless of whether it is required by CEQA.

In view of the Supreme Court's opinion, local agencies may rely on TAC thresholds designed to reflect the impact of locating development near areas of toxic air contamination where such an analysis is required by CEQA or where the agency has determined that such an analysis would assist in making a decision about the project. However, the TAC thresholds are not mandatory and agencies should apply them only after determining that they reflect an appropriate measure of a project's impacts. These Guidelines may inform environmental review for development projects in the Bay Area, but do not commit local governments or BAAQMD to any specific course of regulatory action.

BAAQMD published a new version of the Guidelines dated May 2017, which includes revisions made to address the Supreme Court's opinion. The May 2017 Guidelines update does not address outdated references, links, analytical methodologies or other technical information that may be in the Guidelines or TAC thresholds Justification Report. The Air District is currently working to revise any outdated information in the Guidelines as part of its update to the CEQA Guidelines and thresholds of significance.

- a-b. The mountains bordering Napa Valley block much of the prevailing northwesterly winds throughout the year. Sunshine is plentiful in Napa County, and summertime can be very warm in the valley, particularly in the northern end. Winters are usually mild, with cool temperatures overnight and mild-to-moderate temperatures during the day. Wintertime temperatures tend to be slightly cooler in the northern end of the

valley. Winds are generally calm throughout the county. Annual precipitation averages range from about 24 inches in low elevations to more than 40 inches in the mountains.

Ozone and fine particle pollution, or PM_{2.5}, are the major regional air pollutants of concern in the San Francisco Bay Area. Ozone is primarily a problem in the summer, and fine particle pollution in the winter. In Napa County, ozone rarely exceeds health standards, but PM_{2.5} occasionally does reach unhealthy concentrations. There are multiple reasons for PM_{2.5} exceedances in Napa County. First, much of the county is wind-sheltered, which tends to trap PM_{2.5} within the Napa Valley. Second, much of the area is well north of the moderating temperatures of San Pablo Bay and, as a result, Napa County experiences some of the coldest nights in the Bay Area. This leads to greater fireplace use and, in turn, higher PM_{2.5} levels. Finally, in the winter easterly winds often move fine-particle-laden air from the Central Valley to the Carquinez Strait and then into western Solano and southern Napa County (BAAQMD, *In Your Community: Napa County*, April 2016)

The impacts associated with implementation of the project were evaluated consistent with guidance provided by BAAQMD. Ambient air quality standards have been established by state and federal environmental agencies for specific air pollutants most pervasive in urban environments. These pollutants are referred to as criteria air pollutants because the standards established for them were developed to meet specific health and welfare criteria set forth in the enabling legislation. The criteria air pollutants emitted by the development the proposed solar energy generation use include ozone, ozone precursors oxides of nitrogen and reactive organic gases (NO_x and ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), and suspended particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}). Other criteria pollutants, such as lead and sulfur dioxide (SO₂), would not be substantially emitted by the proposed development or traffic, and air quality standards for them are being met throughout the Bay Area.

BAAQMD has not officially recommended the use of its thresholds in CEQA analyses and CEQA ultimately allows lead agencies the discretion to determine whether a particular environmental impact would be considered significant, as evidenced by scientific or other factual data. BAAQMD also states that lead agencies need to determine appropriate air quality thresholds to use for each project they review based on substantial evidence that they include in the administrative record of the CEQA document. One resource BAAQMD provides as a reference for determining appropriate thresholds is the *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines* developed by its staff in 2010 and as updated through May 2017. These guidelines outline substantial evidence supporting a variety of thresholds of significance.

As mentioned above, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Operational-Related Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursors Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. The proposed project most closely compares to BAAQMD's operational criteria pollutant screening size of 439,000 square feet for places of worship, or 61,000 square feet for operational screening size (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2017 Page 3-2). Given the size of the entire project, which is approximately 11,000 square feet of proposed enclosed floor area compared to the BAAQMD's screening criterion of 439ksf (places of worship) for NO_x (oxides of nitrogen), the project would contribute an insignificant amount of air pollution and would not result in a conflict or obstruction of an air quality plan. The project falls well below the screening criteria as noted above, and consequently will not significantly affect air quality individually or contribute considerably to any cumulative air quality impacts.

- c. In the short term, potential air quality impacts may result from the minor earthmoving and construction activities required for project construction related to the development of the church buildings and associated site improvements. Earthmoving and construction emissions would have a temporary effect; consisting mainly of dust generated during grading and other construction activities and exhaust emissions from construction related equipment and vehicles. The Air District recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction impacts. If the proposed project adheres to these relevant best management practices identified by the Air District and the County's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts are considered less than significant:

7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

c. AIR QUALITY

During all construction activities the permittee shall comply with the most current version of BAAQMD Basic Construction Best Management Practices including but not limited to the following, as applicable:

1. *Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. The BAAQMD's phone number shall also be visible.*
2. *Water all exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, grading areas, and unpaved access roads) two times per day.*
3. *Cover all haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site.*
4. *Remove all visible mud or dirt traced onto adjacent public roads by using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.*
5. *All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.*
6. *All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.*
7. *Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting off equipment when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five (5) minutes (as required by State Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.*

8. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator. Any portable engines greater than 50 horsepower or associated equipment operated within the BAAQMD's jurisdiction shall have either a California Air Resources Board (ARB) registration Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) or a BAAQMD permit. For general information regarding the certified visible emissions evaluator or the registration program, visit the ARB FAQ http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/perp/perpfact_04-16-15.pdf or the PERP website <http://www.arb.ca.gov/portable/portable.htm>.

Furthermore, while earthmoving and construction on the site would generate dust particulates in the short-term, the impact would be less than significant with dust control measures as specified in Napa County's standard condition of approval relating to dust:

7.1 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

b. DUST CONTROL

Water and/or dust palliatives shall be applied in sufficient quantities during grading and other ground disturbing activities on-site to minimize the amount of dust produced. Outdoor construction activities shall not occur when average wind speeds exceed 20 mph.

- d. While the Air District defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, churches are not known operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. The closest residence is approximately 250 feet to the south of the proposed church sanctuary building. The nearest residential neighborhood is approximately 900 southwest of the project site. Construction-phase pollutants would be reduced to a less than significant level by the above-noted standard condition of approval. The project would not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

A Biological Constraints Analysis was prepared for this property in May 2016 by Foothill Associates. The report concluded that Special-status wildlife species and migratory birds were evaluated for their potential to occur and be affected by the Project. Based on the presence of suitable habitat, two of the twenty special-status wildlife species identified from desktop research have potential to occur in the Project Area: white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*, state fully protected), and burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*, state species of special concern). None of these species were observed during field surveys. Eleven special-status plant species were evaluated for their potential to occur and to be affected by the Project. Of these, none have potential to occur within the Project Area based on absence of suitable habitat. The biological constraint analysis recommends Avoidance and Minimization Measures to avoid and minimize impacts to biological resources from the Project.

- a, b. Potentially occurring special-status plant species (listed in Appendix A of the Foothills report) were identified as occurring within the surrounding region; Figure 4 of the Foothills report shows approximate locations of CNDDDB special-status plants within a five-mile radius of the study area. A survey for potentially-occurring special-status plant species was conducted on May 2, 2016. Although there may be suitable habitat present within the study area for several special-status plants listed in the Foothills report, no species were identified as occurring in the study area. However, as the report is over two years old, a pre-construction survey would be required to confirm the continued absence of special status species. As such, implementation of mitigation measures BIO-1 would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level of less than significant. If the proposed project will impact some of the plants found, and a mitigation plan will be developed in coordination with the Napa County PBES Department.

The study area has potential for breeding and foraging habitat for burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*). The study area also has potential to support foraging and nesting habitat for raptors and other migratory birds. Species include white tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*), ferruginous hawk (*Buteo regalis*), and short-eared owl (*Asio flammeus*). A list of potential wildlife is provided in Appendix A of the Foothills Report. No special status species were observed on-site, and none were reported to potentially occur on site. Although the existing on-site trees would be retained as part of the project, implementation of mitigation measures BIO-2 would reduce potentially significant impacts to a level of less than significant in the event of future and ongoing vegetation removal.

As described in the Mitigation Measures section below, a preconstruction nesting bird survey is recommended prior to any Project development. If necessary, seasonal buffers will be implemented to avoid disturbances to nests. With the implementation of the Mitigation Measures, direct impacts to white-tailed kites are not anticipated. The Project may affect habitat, but Project activities are not likely to affect individuals or lead to a trend towards a loss of viability.

Suitable habitat for burrowing owl exists on the Project Area, however no nests or species were observed at the time of the survey. As described in the Mitigation Measures below, a preconstruction nesting bird survey is recommended prior to any Project activities that occur during the nesting season. If necessary, seasonal buffers will be implemented to avoid disturbances to nests. With the implementation of these Mitigation Measures, direct impacts to yellow warbler are not anticipated. The Project may minimally affect habitat, but Project activities are not likely to affect individuals or lead to a downward population trend for the species.

- c. The Biological Constraints Analysis prepared for this property included protocols for the detection of wetlands and potential impacts of the project's development on adjacent wetland/riparian habitat. There are no wetlands on the property or within the boundary of the proposed project improvements and the location of the improvements do not pose impacts to nearby American Canyon Creek. The site disturbance required for the project improvements would be conditioned to comply with applicable standards and best management practices for stormwater run-off and erosion control. As such, impacts to federally protected wetlands would be considered less than significant and no mitigation would be required.
- d. The Biological Constraints Analysis prepared for this property included protocols for the detection of native or migratory wildlife species and corridors. No evidence of wildlife corridors, raptor nests, wildlife dens, burrows or other unique or sensitive biological habitats or resources were observed as a result of the field survey.
- e, f. Per the project landscape plan included with the application materials, two small on-site apple trees and one large off-site eucalyptus tree (as part of the left turn lane requirement) are proposed for removal as part of the project. These trees are not considered significant habitat and would be replaced per the Napa County Municipal Code Section 18.40 for tree replacement. Consistent with Mitigation Measure Bio-2, the project sponsor shall removal trees outside the nesting season or conduct a pre-construction survey prior to commencement of construction activities. As such, there would be no loss of significant wildlife or other sensitive habitat. Implementation of the project does not result in conflict with any County of Napa General Plan policy or ordinance protection vegetation or wildlife. In addition, there are no Habitat Conservation Plans, or other local or state habitat conservation plans that apply to this site.

Mitigation Measures:

MM BIO-1: Pre-Construction Rare Plant Survey. Prior to issuing permits for construction activities, the project sponsor shall conduct special-status plant surveys of the Project Area during the identifiable period for the species of concern. If no special-status plants are found within the Project Area during seasonal rare plant surveys, no further measures pertaining to special-status plants are required. If special-status plant species are found within the Project Area, the following mitigation measure will be implemented to reduce the impact to less than significant:

- Consult with CDFW to determine appropriate buffer between construction activities and rare plant populations identified during protocol-level surveys to ensure impact avoidance.
- If avoidance is not feasible, implement alternative mitigation measures in keeping with CDFW recommendations. These measures may include but not be limited to:
- Seed collection, plant relocation, reserving a portion of the property for suitable habitat relocation, and implementation of best management practices during construction to avoid any potential indirect impacts to rare plant populations

Monitoring: If construction activity is to occur during the blooming season from March 15 to August 31, the pre-construction survey prepared by a qualified wildlife biologist shall be submitted to Planning Division staff prior to issuance of the grading permit.

MM BIO-2: Prior to working on the Project, the project sponsor shall conduct the following:

- a.) Conduct a take avoidance survey for burrowing owl between 14 and 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities.
- b.) Conduct clearing and tree and shrub removal operations between September 1 and February 14 to minimize potential impacts to nesting birds
- c.) Conduct pre-construction survey for active migratory bird and raptor nests within 14 days to 72 hours prior to commencement of constructions activities or tree removal, if anticipated to commence during the nesting season (February 15 – August 31).

Monitoring: Results of pre-construction surveys shall be submitted to the Planning Division prior to issuance of the grading permit.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-b. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology surveys, sites, sensitive areas, and flags) no historic sites have been identified on the property. Although the existing single-family residence is over 50 years old (1963), it does not appear to be representative of any particular significant architectural style. Furthermore, the structure is in various states of disrepair and virtually unsalvageable. The site was surveyed in January 2016, but no sites were identified within the proposed project area (*Archaeological Resources Survey Report: New Life Community Adventist Church Project, Napa County*). The site field survey did conclude that although there is a moderate to high sensitivity factor for buried resources, the field survey resulted in negative findings. However, if resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the following standard condition of approval:

7.2 ARCHEOLOGICAL FINDING

In the event that archeological artifacts or human remains are discovered during construction, work shall cease in a 50-foot radius surrounding the area of discovery. The permittee shall contact the PBES Department for further guidance, which will likely include the requirement for the permittee to hire a qualified professional to analyze the artifacts encountered and to determine if additional measures are required.

If human remains are encountered during project development, all work in the vicinity must be halted, and the Napa County Coroner informed, so that the Coroner can determine if an investigation of the cause of death is required, and if the remains are of Native American origin. If the remains are of Native American origin, the permittee shall comply with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

- c. No human remains have been encountered on the property and no information has been encountered that would indicate that this project would encounter human remains. Most construction activities would occur on previously disturbed portions of the site. However, if resources are found during project grading, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with standard condition of approval noted above. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None Required

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. ENERGY. Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-b. The project applicant included a Voluntary Best Management Practices checklist as part of the project application, including incentives for employees carpools, installation of water efficient fixtures; application of low impact development; installation of water efficient landscape in compliance with the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (WELO); installation of energy conserving lighting; the installation of bicycle racks; and the designation of clean air/carpool/electric vehicle parking spaces. Furthermore, as discussed in the **Section III Air Quality** of this Initial Study above, Napa County has been working to develop a Climate Action Plan (CAP). Information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or <http://www.countyofnapa.org/CAP/>. Compliance with the Napa County CAP would further reduce the project's energy usage. Energy would be consumed during both the construction and operational phases of the project. The construction phase would require energy for the manufacture and transportation of building materials, preparation of the project site, and construction of buildings and infrastructure. Once in operation, the new buildings and other development would consume energy for multiple purposes, including but not limited to building heating and cooling, lighting, appliances, and electronics. In addition, vehicle trips associated with both construction and operation would consume gasoline. The project would include a variety of energy-saving elements, including energy-efficient building orientation and design features, lighting, utilities, and appliances. Since construction activities would be temporary, they would not result in a long-term increase in energy consumption. The construction contractor would have a financial disincentive to waste fuel used by the construction equipment (i.e., excess fuel usage reduces profits). Therefore, it is generally assumed that fuel used during construction would be conserved to the maximum extent feasible. Furthermore, regulations enforced by the California Air Resources Board (Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations) limit the idling time of diesel construction equipment to 5 minutes. It is anticipated that energy consumption during the construction period would be minimized to the maximum extent practical. Adherence to policies outlined in the County CAP would ensure reduced energy use of construction equipment and construction operations would not be inefficient.

The project includes the development of approximately 11,000 square feet which does not exceed metrics established for greenhouse gas emissions related to energy use during construction and operations. Incorporating Napa County CAP Building Energy Reduction measures and additional energy-saving measures and features into the project will reduce energy consumption. This could include, (1) additional LEED certifications; (2) use of 100-percent renewable electricity, such as Marin Clean Energy (MCE) "Deep Green" or equivalent; (3) all-electric HVAC and other building systems, appliances, and equipment; (4) provision of electric vehicle charging stations; (5) provision of electrical outlets at all parking spaces; and (6) provision for collection green wastes for composting and/or energy generation. Compliance with the County CAP Building Energy Use measures and Best Management Practices would further reduce emissions and ensure no overall environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation. Therefore, these impacts would be considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

A geotechnical investigation was prepared for the subject property by Jim Glomb, Geotechnical and Environmental Consulting on December 16, 2015. The results of the geotechnical investigation concluded that the project is feasible with regards to existing soils conditions.

- a.
 - i.) There are no known faults on the project site as shown on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regards to rupturing a known fault.
 - ii.) All areas of the Bay Area are subject to strong seismic ground shaking. Construction of the project would be required to comply with the latest building standards and codes, including the California Building Code that would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
 - iii.) No subsurface conditions have been identified on the project site that indicated a susceptibility to seismic-related ground failure or liquefaction. Compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code for seismic stability would result in less than significant impacts.
 - iv.) According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (Landslides line, polygon, and geology layers) there are no known landslide areas within the area of the subject site proposed for modification as part of the project.
- b. The proposed improvements would occur on slopes of less than five percent. The project would require incorporation of best management practices and would be subject to the Napa County Stormwater Ordinance which addresses sediment and erosion control measures and dust control, as applicable. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c/d. Based on the Napa County Environmental Sensitivity Maps (liquefaction layer) the improvements are proposed for an area which has a very low susceptibility for liquefaction. Impacts would be less than significant.
- e. According to the Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study prepared by CMP Engineering in May 2016, the project site and proposed septic system would have adequate disposal capacity to serve the project. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

Mitigation Measures: None required

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a) Generate a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions in excess of applicable thresholds adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District or the California Air Resources Board which may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with a county-adopted climate action plan or another applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Napa County has been working to develop a Climate Action Plan (CAP) for several years. In 2012, a Draft CAP (March 2012) was recommended using the emissions checklist in the Draft CAP, on a trial basis, to determine potential greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with project development and operation. At the December 11, 2012, Napa County Board of Supervisors (BOS) hearing, the BOS considered adoption of the proposed CAP. In addition to reducing Napa County's GHG emissions, the proposed plan was intended to address compliance with CEQA for projects reviewed by the County and to lay the foundation for development of a local offset program. While the BOS acknowledged the plan's objectives, the BOS requested that the CAP be revised to better address transportation-related greenhouse gas, to acknowledge and credit past accomplishments and voluntary efforts, and to allow more time for establishment of a cost-effective local offset program. The Board also requested that best management practices be applied and considered when reviewing projects until a revised CAP is adopted to ensure that projects address the County's policy goal related to reducing GHG emissions.

In July 2015, the County re-commenced preparation of the CAP to: i) account for present day conditions and modeling assumptions (such as but not limited to methods, emission factors, and data sources), ii) address the concerns with the previous CAP effort as outlined above, iii) meet applicable State requirements, and iv) result in a functional and legally defensible CAP. On April 13, 2016 the County, as the part of the first phase of development and preparation of the CAP, released Final Technical Memorandum #1: 2014 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Forecast, April 13, 2016. This initial phase included: i) updating the unincorporated County's community-wide GHG emissions inventory to 2014, and ii) preparing new GHG emissions forecasts for the 2020, 2030, and 2050 horizons. Additional information on the County CAP can be obtained at the Napa County Department of Planning, Building and Environmental Services or <http://www.countyofnapa.org/CAP/>.

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

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

In 2011, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) released California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Project Screening Criteria and Significance of Thresholds [1,100 metric tons per year (MT) of carbon dioxide and carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e)]. This threshold of significance is appropriate for evaluating projects in Napa County.

During the ongoing planning effort, the County requires project applicants to consider methods to reduce GHG emissions consistent with Napa County General Plan Policy CON-65(e). (Note: Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, because this initial study assesses a project that is consistent with an adopted General Plan for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was prepared, it appropriately focuses on impacts which are "peculiar to the project," rather than the cumulative impacts previously assessed.)

GHGs are the atmospheric gases whose absorption of solar radiation is responsible for the greenhouse effect, including carbon dioxide, methane, ozone, and the fluorocarbons, that contribute to climate change (a widely accepted theory/science explain human effects on the atmosphere). Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) gas, the principal greenhouse gas (GHG) being emitted by human activities, and whose concentration in the atmosphere is most affected by human activity, also serves as the reference gas to compare other greenhouse gases. Agricultural sources of carbon emissions include forest clearing, land-use changes, biomass burning, and farm equipment and management activity emissions (http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/glossary/letter_c.html). Equivalent Carbon Dioxide (CO₂e) is the most commonly reported type of GHG emission and a way to get one number that approximates total emissions from all the different gasses that contribute to GHG (BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2017). In this case, carbon dioxide (CO₂) is used as the reference atom/compound to obtain atmospheric carbon CO₂ effects of GHG. Carbon stocks are converted to carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e) by multiplying the carbon total by 44/12 (or 3.67), which is the ratio of the atomic mass of a carbon dioxide molecule to the atomic mass of a carbon atom (<http://www.nciasi2.org/COLE/index.html>).

One time "Construction Emissions" associated with development project include: i) the carbon stocks that are lost (or released) when existing vegetation is removed in preparation for a new structure and associated infrastructure; and ii) emissions associated with the energy used to develop and prepare the project area and construct the project, including construction equipment and worker vehicle trips (hereinafter referred to as Equipment Emissions). These emissions also include underground carbon stocks (or Soil carbon) associated with any existing vegetation that is proposed to be removed.

In addition to the one time Construction Emissions, "Operational Emissions" of the project are also considered and include: i) any reduction in the amount of carbon sequestered by existing vegetation that is removed as part of the project compared to a "no project" scenario (hereinafter referred to as Operational Sequestration Emissions); and ii) ongoing emissions from the project, including vehicle trips associated with employees. See Section XVI, Transportation/Traffic, for anticipated number of operational trips. Construction Emissions from the proposed project would be the primary source of emissions given that over the long-term omissions from a passive church development and parking lot are insignificant. The number of operational vehicle trips accessing the site will increase given the weekend service activities which could feature more than 50 private vehicles for those events.

As discussed in the Air Quality section of this Initial Study, in 2010, the BAAQMD adopted and later incorporated into its 2011 CEQA Guidelines project screening criteria (Table 3-1 – Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors & GHG Screening Level Sizes) and thresholds of significance for air pollutants, including GHG emissions, which have now been updated by BAAQMD through May 2017. As discussed above, the proposed project would not exceed the 1,100 MT/yr of CO2e as the project size of 11,000 sq ft is well below the 61,000 sq ft for operational emissions generating uses. Although, the new church facility would generate more vehicular trips than the existing single-family home and agricultural uses, the project would fall below the BAAQMD thresholds, and the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would not involve the transport of hazardous materials. No impacts would occur.
- b. Hazardous materials such as diesel, maintenance fluids, and paints would be used onsite during construction. Should they be stored onsite, these materials would be stored in secure locations to reduce the potential for upset or accident conditions. The proposed project consists of construction of a church and associated support buildings which would not be expected to use any substantial quantities of hazardous materials.

Therefore, it would not be reasonably foreseeable for the proposed project to create upset or accident conditions that involve the release of hazardous materials into the environments. No impact would occur.

- c. According to Google Earth, the nearest school to the project site is American Canyon High School to the northwest, located approximately 1,250 feet to the nearest ball field, and approximately 2,250 feet to the school buildings. A new middle school serving American Canyon is proposed east and adjacent to the high school with new classrooms located approximately 850 to 1000 feet away from the church development. However, as stated in Section VIII (b) above, the operational use of the project would not include hazardous materials or substances. Some potentially hazardous materials such as diesel and maintenance fluids would be used during construction activities but in relatively small quantities that would not create conditions harmful to students at the high school. Therefore, the impacts would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.
- d. Based on a search of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control database, the project site does not contain any known EPA National Priority List sites, State response sites, voluntary cleanup sites, or any school cleanup sites. No impact would occur as the project site is not on any known list of hazardous materials sites.
- e. No impact would occur as the project site is not located within an airport land use plan. The nearest airport, the Napa County Airport, is located approximately 3.89 miles to the northwest of the project site.
- f. The proposed project's existing access driveway meets Napa County Road and Street Standards. Therefore, the project would not obstruct emergency vehicle access. The project has been reviewed by the County Fire Department and Engineering Services Division and found acceptable, as conditioned.
- g. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or substantial groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

On January 14, 2014, Governor Jerry Brown declared a drought emergency in the state of California. That declaration was followed up on April 1, 2015, when the Governor directed the State Water Resources Control Board to implement mandatory water reductions in cities and towns across California to reduce water usage by 25 percent. These water restrictions do not apply to agricultural users. However, on April 7, 2017, Governor Jerry Brown signed an executive order lifting California's drought emergency in all but four counties (Fresno, Kings, Tulare and Tuolumne). The County of Napa had not adopted or implemented any additional mandatory water use restrictions. The County requires all Use Permit applicants to complete necessary water analyses in order to document that sufficient water supplies are available for the proposed project and to implement water saving measures to prepare for periods of limited water supply and to conserve limited groundwater resources.

In 2009 Napa County began a comprehensive study of its groundwater resources to meet identified action items in the County's 2008 General Plan update. The study, by Luhdorff and Scalmanini Consulting Engineers (LSCE), emphasized developing a sound understanding of groundwater conditions and implementing an expanded groundwater monitoring and data management program as a foundation for integrated water resources planning and dissemination of water resources information. The 2011 baseline study by LSCE, which included over 600 wells and data going back over 50 years, concluded that "the groundwater levels in Napa County are stable, except for portions of the MST district". Most wells elsewhere within the Napa Valley floor with a sufficient record indicate that groundwater levels are more affected by climatic conditions, are within historical levels, and seem to recover from dry periods during subsequent wet or normal periods. The LSCE Study also concluded that, on a regional scale, there appear to be no current groundwater quality issues except north of Calistoga (mostly naturally occurring boron and trace metals) and in the Carneros region (mostly salinity). The subject property is located within the Jameson / American Canyon subarea of Napa County according to the Napa County Groundwater Monitoring Plan 2013. The County has no record of problems or complaints of diminished groundwater supplies at the project site or in the general vicinity. The applicant has not experienced any issues with the availability of groundwater.

Minimum thresholds for water use have been established by the Department of Public Works using reports by the United States Geological Survey (USGS). These reports are the result of water resources investigations performed by the USGS in cooperation with the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. Any project which reduces water usage or any water usage which is at or below the established threshold is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels. CMP Civil Engineering conducted a Water Availability Analysis (WAA) on May 4, 2016 evaluating existing and proposed water uses within the project recharge area and analyses to estimate groundwater recharge relative to proposed uses (Tier 1) and a screening analysis of the potential for well interference at neighboring wells located within 500-ft of the project well (Tier 2). The WAA prepared by CMP Engineering indicates the projected water use for the project plus existing demand is 0.21 AF/YR. The anticipated total overall water demand for the project site would be 0.21 AF/YR representing a 0.29 AF/YR decrease of the existing water demand of 0.50 AF/YR. Based on the anticipated use of the project well, and the decrease in use over existing conditions, the parcel water demand can be met with the existing project well and would not interfere with neighboring wells (and could be considered a net increase for neighboring wells). The Water Availability Analysis concluded that sufficient water would be available to serve the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant. The existing onsite well has a capacity of 5 gallons-per-minute (GPM) which is the equivalent of 8.07 acre-ft/yr. According to the recharge evaluation, the project recharge area concluded that a conservative average water year recharge was approximately 0.3 acre-ft/yr compared to the maximum allowed water usage for the subject parcel of 0.55 acre-ft/yr. Comparing the proposed use of the new church, with an anticipated water usage of 0.21 acre-ft/yr (0.11 acre-ft/yr for the church and 0.10 acre-ft/yr for on-site landscaping needs) to the above 0.55 acre-ft/yr, as well as the capacity value of 8.07 acre-ft/yr, CMP determined that the subject parcel and existing well has more than enough capacity to serve the proposed use.

- a/b. The project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements nor substantially deplete local groundwater supplies. The proposed project includes the reuse and update of an existing on-site domestic water well. According to CMP Civil Engineering, the proposed use would be 0.21 acre-ft/yr which is a net decrease of 0.29 acre-ft/yr from the existing calculated use of 0.50 acre-ft/yr for the existing single-family residence. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this project and, given the removal of the single-family home and agricultural uses, found no significant concerns with groundwater availability or use.
- c (i-iv). The project would not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off the project site. The proposed project includes bio-retention drainage areas for both the proposed structures and the parking area per Napa County standards for stormwater run-off. The preliminary utility and drainage plan have been reviewed by the Napa County Engineering Division. Impacts would be less than significant. The preliminary grading and drainage plan have been reviewed by the Napa County Engineering Division. As conditioned, impacts would be less than significant
- d. The parcel is not located in an area that is subject to flood hazards, tsunamis, or seiches, and would not be at risk of releasing pollutants due to inundation. No impacts would occur.
- e. The proposed church development and parking lot includes the redevelopment of an existing disturbed single-family residential property and will not obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or substantial groundwater management plan. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-b. The project would not occur within an established community, nor would it result in the division of an established community.

The project complies with the Napa County Code and all other applicable regulations. Mitigation measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, discussed under the "Biological Resources" section above, are intended to address any potential biological impacts from the proposed project and are precautionary in nature. The subject parcel is located in the AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district, which allows church uses such as the proposed project subject to use permit approval. The proposed project is compliant with the physical limitations of the Napa County Code.

The proposed church development and parking lot will cover a majority of the site; however, the proposed use is recognized by the General Plan under General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy AG/LU-125: which states: New churches or other religious institutions should generally be located within or adjacent to urbanized areas, minimizing the transportation needs of parishioners/members and the potential for loss of agricultural lands. Although the subject property is designated at AWOS there is little agriculture resources on the property other than grazing lands and the subject property is adjacent to the east side of American Canyon. However, Napa County Code Section 18.120.010.B.11 allows, with the approval of Use Permit, the following in every Zoning District within the County: "churches".

Given the General Plan Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Policy, AG/LU-125 and Zoning Ordinance Section 18.120.010.B 11 discussed above, the proposed church use is considered an acceptable use of non-urban land (i.e. Agricultural Watershed and Open Space designated property such as the subject site). As such, there are no significant impacts to Land Use created by the project.

There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the property. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. Historically, the two most valuable mineral commodities in Napa County in economic terms have been mercury and mineral water. More recently, building stone and aggregate have become economically valuable. Mines and Mineral Deposits mapping included in the Napa County Baseline Data Report (*Mines and Mineral Deposits*, BDR Figure 2-2) indicates that there are no known mineral resources nor any locally important mineral resource recovery sites located on the project site. Although the project site is located adjacent to an old rock quarry, the materials extracted from that property were gravel in nature and not a mineral resource of value to the region or residents of the state. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. The project would result in a temporary increase in noise levels during installation of the proposed site improvements and church development. Construction activities would be limited to daylight hours using properly muffled vehicles. Noise generated during this time is not anticipated to be significant. As such, the project would not result in potentially significant temporary construction noise impacts or operational impacts nor would the project result in long-term significant construction noise impacts. Conditions of approval identified below would require construction activities to be limited to daylight hours, vehicles to be muffled, and backup alarms adjusted to the lowest allowable levels. Impacts would be less than significant.

7.3. CONSTRUCTION NOISE

Construction noise shall be minimized to the greatest extent practical and feasible under State and local safety laws, consistent with construction noise levels permitted by the General Plan Community Character Element and the County Noise Ordinance. Construction equipment muffling and hours of operation shall be in compliance with the County Code. Equipment shall be shut down when not in use. Construction equipment shall normally be staged, loaded, and unloaded on the project site, if at all practicable. If project terrain or access road conditions require construction equipment to be staged, loaded, or unloaded off the project site (such as on a neighboring road or at the base of a hill), such activities shall only occur daily between the hours of 8 am to 5 pm.

The proposed project involves a new church facility with associated office and classroom uses with a maximum of 150 guests during specific church services. Up to four events per year could include a maximum of 250 guests. Use of the proposed church during heavily attended services has the potential to generate higher noise levels, compared to existing conditions, as a result of musical/singing activities. Typical daytime operational activities after construction would include church services and after school youth activities. The noise generated by church service could exceed periods of 80 to 95 decibels during musical/singing periods, however, these events would be periodical and would not last more than a half hour at a time. Furthermore, pursuant to Napa County Code Section 8.16.070(A)(2)(e) the maximum noise allowance is 85 decibels when measured at any nearest property. The nearest adjacent properties are an agricultural/livestock property approximately 100' to the west and a single-family residential property approximately 200' to the south and across American Canyon Road. The distance to these properties would yield a noise allowance well below the 65 decibel maximum noise limitations for daytime noise in this location, and well below the 70-75 decibel existing ambient noise environment, as measured by the County of Napa General Plan Final EIR. This ambient noise environment is a result of proximity to American Canyon Road. Although some services are anticipated during nighttime hours for special services, no noise would be generated during the most sensitive noise period of a 24-hour day.

Additional regulations contained within County Code Chapter 8.16 establish exterior noise criteria for various land uses in the County. As described in the Project Setting, above, land uses that surround the proposed parcel are predominantly agricultural but include low density residential; of these land uses, the residential land use is considered the most sensitive to noise. Based on the standards in County Code section 8.16.070, noise levels, measured at the exterior of a residential structure or residential use on a portion of a larger property, may not exceed 50 decibels for more than half of any hour in the window of daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) within which the applicant proposes to conduct events. Noise impacts of the proposed project would be considered bothersome and potentially significant if sound generated by it had the effect of exceeding the standards in County Code more than 50 percent of the time (i.e., more than 50 decibels for more than 30 minutes in an hour for a residential use).

The nearest off-site residence to the proposed development is approximately 200 feet to the south of the proposed church structure. Under the proposed project, the largest event that would occur on the parcel would have an attendance of no more than 250 people, and all events would end by 10:00 p.m., with clean-up conducted afterwards. Typical weekday church operations would occur between 7:30 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. but would not include regular church services. The potential for the creation of significant noise from visitation is significantly reduced, since the noise generating areas are predominantly within the church building itself. Continuing enforcement of Napa County's Noise Ordinance by the Division of Environmental Health and the Napa County Sheriff, including the prohibition against amplified music, should further ensure that

services and other events do not create a significant noise impact. Services, events and non-amplified music are required to finish by 10:00 p.m. Amplified music or sound systems would not be permitted for outdoor events as identified in standard Condition of Approval below. Temporary events would be subject to County Code Chapter 5.36 which regulates proposed temporary events.

4.2 **AMPLIFIED MUSIC**

There shall be no amplified sound system or amplified music utilized outside of approved, enclosed, buildings.

Once completed, the church development and parking lot project creates no noise other than typical activities associated with church uses such as automobile usage at the site and potentially musical/signing events during church services. These activities are well below the threshold for maximum noise limitations for daytime noise at the site and noise disturbance at the property boundaries, therefore these impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

c. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

Discussion:

a-b. The proposed project is located on a currently vacant/dilapidated site. This church development use would not induce population growth, displace a substantial volume of existing housing or a substantial number of people and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

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

v) Other public facilities?

Discussion:

a. Public services are currently provided to the project area and the additional demand placed on existing services as a result of the proposed project would be minimal. The Fire Department and Engineering Services Division have reviewed the application and recommend approval, as conditioned. School impact fees, which assist local school districts with capacity building measures, would be levied pursuant to building permit submittal. The proposed project would have minimal impact on public parks as no residences are proposed. No impacts to public services occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. RECREATION. Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a. The project would not significantly increase use of existing parks or recreational facilities based on its limited scope. No impacts would occur.

b. No recreational facilities are proposed as part of the project. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system and/or conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-16, which seeks to maintain an adequate Level of Service (LOS) at signalized and unsignalized intersections, or reduce the effectiveness of existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-23, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?

Discussion:

a/b/c. The project applicant prepared several reports and analysis for the proposed project, including expected trip generation calculations by Crane Transportation Group in April 2016, and a Focused Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by TJKM on August 20, 2017, with addendums prepared in February 2018, and again in June 2018. TJKM evaluated traffic conditions at two study intersections during the Saturday peak of the project, 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

The highest single one-hour period recorded for the peak period was used in the analysis. The study intersections and associated traffic controls are as follows:

- American Canyon Road and the Project Driveway (One-Way Stop Control)
- American Canyon Road and Flosden Road/Newell Drive (Signalized)

The study addressed the following four traffic scenarios:

- Existing Conditions - This scenario evaluates the study intersection based on existing traffic volumes, lane geometry, and traffic controls. For the existing conditions scenario, the proposed site is analyzed as vacant.
- Existing plus Project Conditions - This scenario is identical to Existing Conditions, but with the addition of traffic from the proposed project.
- Cumulative Conditions - This scenario is similar to the Existing Conditions but with the projected growth rate of one percent per year for 18 years (Year 2035-forecasted traffic) which was applied to Existing Conditions Traffic Volumes.
- Cumulative plus Project Conditions - This scenario is identical to Cumulative Conditions, but with the addition of traffic from the proposed project.

The proposed project is located on a vacant parcel in unincorporated Napa County near the City of American Canyon. The area is mainly rural with American Canyon High School (and future American Canyon Middle School) and residential developments located west of the project site. The proposed project consists of two buildings: a 3,115 square foot fellowship hall and a 7,911 square foot sanctuary. The existing New Life Community Church, which operates at a local elementary school off Silver Oak Trail in American Canyon, has a membership of 80 members, of those 30 are children. Services are on Saturdays in the morning, beginning with Sabbath School from 10:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m., main service for worship from 11:00 am to 12:00 p.m., followed by lunch, and activity. The bulk of the membership arrive for the main service and lunch. Initially, on the project site, the Sabbath school, main service, lunch, and afternoon activities would occur in the Fellowship Hall. As the membership grows, the Sanctuary would be built and activities would start in the fellowship Hall for classes, move on to worship for main services, then back to the Fellowship Hall for lunch and activities.

TJKM developed estimated project trip generation for the proposed project based on published trip generation rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineer's (ITE) publication Trip Generation (9th Edition). TJKM used published trip rates for Church (ITE Land use Code S60). Table 4 in the 6/21/18 TJKM report shows the trip generation for the proposed project. Since activities would not occur in both buildings concurrently, trip generation is based on the Sanctuary building, which has the larger square footage. Though Saturday is the day for this project to worship, TJKM used the Sunday peak hour generator, as it represents the average trips generated during worship services.

Using ITE rates, TJKM estimated the project to generate approximately 95 weekend peak hour trips (48 inbound, 47 outbound) during the peak hour. New Life Community Church only operates one service day a week (Saturday), with the maximum use of approximately one hour a week.

Operation of the New Life Community Church facility, as proposed, would not result in a significant traffic impacts under Napa County guidelines, therefore no mitigation is needed to the study intersections. As an added safety measure, TJKM recommends the installation of a stop control at the project driveway with appropriate pavement delineation and signing. Per the Napa County Road and Street Standards, the project is required a left turn lane based on average daily traffic (ADT) travelling along American Canyon Road. Per the standard, ADT greater than 7,500 requires a left turn lane. To ensure no impacts occur related to projected ADT this project design feature has been incorporated into the project design as part of the application review process by Napa PBES Public Works and Engineering departments, and no further mitigation is required.

There is no transit service within the vicinity of study area so the project would not impose any impacts on existing transit service. The nature of the traffic generated by the proposed project would also not create any demand for new transit service and is not expected to generate a need for transit in the area. Currently, there is no bicycle facilities or access to the project site. Per City of American Canyon Bicycle Plan (January 2012), Class II bicycle lanes are proposed on American Canyon Road between SR 29 to South Kelly Road, however, these have not been installed. The project does not conflict with existing and planned bicycle facilities. The project would be conditioned to require the installation of bicycling parking facilities (minimum of two spaces) near the main church/sanctuary structure. Therefore, impacts to transit service are expected to be less-than-significant and there would be no conflict with an adopted transit or other transportation plans, pedestrian, or bicycle plans. No mitigation is required.

- d. As part of Napa County PBES Public Works and Engineering departmental review, the project sponsor has updated the site plan and proposed infrastructure to include a new Left-Hand Turn Lane (eastbound travel turning onto the site) in accordance with PBES Engineering and Public Works standards. The need for a left-turn lane on American Canyon Road at the project driveway was evaluated based on criteria contained in the Napa County Road and Street Standards, 2011. Based on the 24-hour classification counts, average daily traffic on American Canyon Road is 9,034 vehicles. The proposed project driveway average daily traffic is 82 trips. Based on these traffic levels, a left-turn lane would be warranted at the project driveway, with a 165 feet storage lane. At full occupancy, (150 seats and 7,911 square feet based on the site plan), the (ITE) trip generation anticipates eight left turns into the project site during the Saturday peak. At a future buildout membership of 150 members, the capacity of the Sanctuary, there would be a maximum of 50 vehicles added to the roadway network: 30 of which would be turning left into the project site. As a result, staff has reviewed the proposed improvements and recommended conditions of approval for preparation of engineered plans consistent with applicable standards. After construction of these proposed improvements, potential hazards due to a design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses would be eliminated, and potential impacts would be considered less than significant with no mitigation required.
- e. The project has been reviewed by California Fire and Napa PBES Engineering Division for compliance with established development standards. The project has been developed to include a left-turn lane based on trip generation standards. As such no significant concerns have been identified as a result of installation of the project and potential impacts would be considered less than significant with no mitigation required.
- f. Based on the project site plan dated April 12, 2016, 65 standard parking spaces are provided for the New Life Community Church project, which includes standard parking and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) parking. According to the Napa County Municipal Code (18.110.030), Churches requires one per employee plus one per each 3.5 seats in main sanctuary, or 43 spaces. Based on the proposed parking spaces to be provided on site, no parking impacts are projected on City Streets. The applicant has indicated up to four special events per year that would include 250 attendees. The applicant has stated that the Napa Valley Unified School District will rent the American Canyon High School parking lot for \$15/hr for overflow parking and charge the Church accordingly. The Church would then provide a shuttle for attendees to the project site. This agreement would be memorialized as a condition of approval upon project approval. The impact would be considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. 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:				
a) 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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 Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-b. According to the Napa County Environmental Resource Maps (based on the following layers – Historical sites points & lines, Archaeology surveys, sites, sensitive areas, and flags) no historic sites or tribal resources have been identified on the property. Invitation for tribal consultation was completed in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1. On March 23, 2017, County Staff sent invitations to consult on the proposed project to Native American tribes who had a cultural interest in the area and who as of that date had requested to be invited to consult on projects, in accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. One response has been received from the Middletown Rancheria stating that they have no specific comments at this time but no responses have been received to date from the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation or the Mishewal Wappo Tribe. As discussed in **Section V** of this initial study, no significant cultural resources were found on the site, and if any resources not previously uncovered during this prior disturbance are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the proposed project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist must be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the standard county conditions of approval.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of a new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry year?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The project would not require the relocation or construction of a new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities as a result of the project. The project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board and would not result in a significant impact on the environment relative to wastewater discharge. Wastewater disposal would be accommodated on-site and in compliance with State and County regulations. According to the Wastewater Disposal Feasibility Study prepared by CMP Civil Engineering on December 2, 2016, the project site and church development could be served by an on-site system with a maximum total flow of 840 gallons per day at peak flows. The proposed system would include a metering tank and pump for dispersal into the leach field of 375/gal/day. The CMP Civil Engineering report concludes that the project site would have adequate disposal capacity to serve the system designed for the project. Full design calculation and construction plans for the wastewater system(s) must be prepared in accordance with Napa County standards at the time of building permit application. The Division of Environmental Health reviewed this report and concurred with its findings. The preliminary grading and drainage plan have been reviewed by the Engineering Division. As conditioned, impacts would be less than significant.
- b. Water sources for the project site consist of an existing groundwater well for the previous single-family residence. This well has the required 50-foot 3-inch wide annular seal and has a draw of 5 gallons per minute which is equivalent to 8.07 AF/YR. A 35,000-gallon water storage tank is proposed to serve the church development. 28,000 gallons would be reserved for fire protection needs and the remaining 7,000 gallons would be reserved for domestic needs. The applicant submitted a Water Availability Analysis (WAA) completed by CMP Engineering on May 4, 2016 evaluating existing and proposed water uses within the project recharge area and analyses to estimate groundwater recharge relative to proposed uses (Tier 1) and a screening analysis of the potential for well interference at neighboring wells located within 500-ft of the project well (Tier 2). The WAA prepared by CMP Engineering indicates the projected water use for the project plus existing demand is 0.21 AF/YR. The anticipated total overall water demand for the project site would be 0.21 AF/YR representing a 0.29 AF/YR decrease of the existing water demand of 0.50 AF/YR. Based on the anticipated use of the project well, and the decrease in use over existing conditions, the parcel water demand can be met with the existing project well and would not interfere with neighboring wells (and could be considered a net increase for neighboring wells). The Water Availability Analysis concluded that sufficient water would be available to serve the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant.

As discussed in **Section IX** above, the project is categorized as "all other areas" based upon current County Water Availability Analysis policies and therefore water use criteria is parcel specific based upon a Tier 1 and Tier 2 analysis. Based on WAA guidance, a Tier 2 analysis is required because the nearest non-project well is located approximately 200-ft from the proposed project well. According to the recharge evaluation, the project well capacity of 8.07 AR/YR is sufficient for the anticipated use of 0.21 AF/YR which would be a reduction of 0.29 AF/YR over existing uses. The parcel water demand can be met with the existing on site well. In summary, the existing yield would be sufficient to serve all uses on the property. Any project which reduces water usage or any water usage which is at or below the established threshold is assumed not to have a significant effect on groundwater levels. Impacts would be less than significant as there is sufficient water supply available to serve the proposed project.

- c. Wastewater would be treated on-site and would not require a wastewater treatment provider to evaluate adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. Therefore, no impacts would occur.
- d. The project would be served by Keller Canyon Landfill which has a capacity which exceeds current demand. As of January 2004, the Keller Canyon Landfill had 64.8 million cubic yards of remaining capacity and has enough permitted capacity to receive solid waste through 2030. No impacts will occur.
- e. The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas of lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a-d. The subject property is not located in a State Responsibility Area of very high fire hazard severity zone. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. There are no project features that would impair an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for fire safety. The project site is currently served by overhead utilities for power and would continue to do so as a result of the proposed project. No new overhead power line infrastructure would be required for development of the project. Therefore, impacts would be considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None Required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a. As discussed in **Section IV** above, all potential biological related impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the biological resources mitigation measures. As identified in **Section V** above, no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, sites or unique geological features have been identified within the project site. In the event archaeological artifacts are found, a standard condition of approval would be incorporated into the project. Impacts would be less than significant with the incorporation of the biological resources mitigation measures and standard condition of approval related to cultural resources.

b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology, and traffic impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The project would also increase the demands for public services to a limited extent, increase traffic and air pollutions, all of which contribute to cumulative effects when future development in Napa Valley is considered. Cumulative impacts of these issues are discussed in previous sections of this Initial Study, wherein the impact from an increase in air pollution is being addressed as discussed in the project's Greenhouse Gas Voluntary Best Management Practices including but not limited to: employees carpool incentives, installation of water efficient fixtures; application of low impact development; installation of water efficient landscape in compliance with the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (WELO); installation of energy conserving lighting; the installation of bicycle racks; and the designation of clean air/carpool/electric vehicle parking spaces.

Potential impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The project trip generation was calculated from anticipated church service operations, where the calculated trips reflect total attendees, on-site employees and other daily activities. Under the Napa County General Plan, traffic volumes are projected to increase and will be caused by a combination of locally generated traffic as well as general regional growth. The General Plan EIR indicates that much of the forecasted increase in traffic on the arterial roadway network will result from traffic generated outside of the county, however the project would contribute a relatively small amount toward the general overall increase. As discussed in **Section XVI** above, the project includes the development of a left-turn lane to reduce potential impacts to the local circulation network which will in turn reduce impacts to cumulative traffic conditions.

c. All impacts identified in this MND are either less than significant after mitigation or less than significant and do not require mitigation. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in environmental effects that cause substantial adverse effects on human being either directly or indirectly. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None Required.