

4 ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

The changes to the Napa Pipe project described in Chapter 3 will result in changes to some of the potential environmental impacts described in the 2009 DEIR. Changes to the project include: (1) the use of surface water; (2) an updated on-site wastewater treatment option with the potential for the use of recycled water both on- and off-site; (3) reservation of a school site; (4) an updated site remediation plan; and (5) a number of changes to the proposed site plan to incorporate these project changes and realign off-set intersections as explained in Chapter 3 of this Supplement to the 2009 DEIR.

The impacts of the project changes are addressed sequentially below, together with resulting changes/additions to mitigation measures included in the 2009 DEIR. The discussions below also provide additional information and analysis based on new air quality thresholds and methodologies adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) since the 2009 DEIR was published.

The analysis and conclusions presented here supplement the analysis and conclusions presented in Chapter 4 of the 2009 DEIR. The analysis concludes that the project, as revised, will result in several new potentially significant impacts. The Supplement to the 2009 DEIR identifies mitigation measures that will substantially lessen or avoid these potentially significant impacts.

This Supplement to the 2009 DEIR identifies a significant impact that is unmitigable. The project will result in construction-period emissions nitrogen oxides above stated thresholds. Although mitigation measures were identified to address this impact, this Supplement to the 2009 DEIR concludes that even with mitigation, this impact is *significant and unavoidable*.

Chapters 4.1 through 4.6 of this Supplement to the 2009 DEIR provide an analysis of the following:

- ◆ Chapter 4.1 – Water Supply
- ◆ Chapter 4.2 – Recycled Water Pipeline
- ◆ Chapter 4.3 – School Site
- ◆ Chapter 4.4 – Remedial Design and Implementation Plan

- ◆ Chapter 4.5 – Revisions to the Site Plan
- ◆ Chapter 4.6 – Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Similar to the 2009 DEIR, direct, indirect and cumulative environmental impacts are assessed for each subject areas listed above by evaluating each of the following environmental topic areas:

- ◆ Land Use and Public Policy
- ◆ Population, Employment, and Housing
- ◆ Traffic and Transportation
- ◆ Biological Resources
- ◆ Noise
- ◆ Air Quality
- ◆ Greenhouse Gas Emissions (including Climate Change)
- ◆ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- ◆ Geology, Soils, and Seismicity
- ◆ Hydrology and Water Quality
- ◆ Cultural Resources
- ◆ Public Services and Recreation
- ◆ Utilities
- ◆ Aesthetics

A. Chapter Organization

Chapters 4.1 through 4.5 use the following format to evaluate the environmental impacts of the new project components. To provide a through discussion of the environmental impacts, each chapter uses the same format and consists of the following subsections:

- ◆ The *Existing Conditions* section describes any changes in current conditions and any new environmental setting information not included in the 2009 DEIR that is relevant to the chapter subject area.
- ◆ The *Regulatory Setting* section describes any additional local, State and/or federal regulations that were not included in the 2009 DEIR, but are applicable to the chapter subject area.

- ◆ The *Impacts Found to be Potentially Significant* section provides an analysis of potential impacts (direct and indirect) related to the chapter subject area. Impacts found to be less-than-significant, significant but mitigable, or significant and unavoidable are discussed. Potentially significant cumulative impacts are also discussed.
- ◆ The *Impacts Found Not to Be Potentially Significant* section provides a discussion of other environmental issues that are not relevant to the subject area. The discussion explains why the topic is not relevant, and/or why the proposed project feature will have no effects that would be considered direct or indirect impacts.

The discussion of the revised BAAQMD air quality and greenhouse gas criteria are also discussed in this chapter in Section 4.6 of this Supplement to the 2009 DEIR.

B. Standards of Significance

Chapters 4.1 through 4.5 include assessments of the chapter subject areas based on the standards of significance included in the 2009 DEIR. The standards of significance are listed below to provide the reader with a complete list of the standards. In each chapter, the standards are specifically addressed in the *Impacts Found to be Potentially Significant* sections, or the *Impacts found to not to be Potentially Significant* sections.

Since publication of the 2009 DEIR, the BAAQMD adopted new CEQA Air Quality Thresholds on June 2, 2010.¹ These new thresholds established construction emission thresholds. Because the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for this EIR was issued prior to the adoption of these thresholds (January 2, 2009), this EIR is not required to evaluate the project against these thresholds.

¹ Thresholds are available online at http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/Files/Planning%20and%20Research/CEQA/Adopted%20Thresholds%20Table_6_2_10.ashx, accessed on July 29, 2010.

However, to provide a rigorous environmental evaluation, Chapter 4.6 of this Supplement to the 2009 DEIR evaluates the project against these new thresholds.

1. Land Use

While Napa County has no formally adopted significance standards for land use impacts, the Napa Pipe project would be considered to have a significant impact with regard to land use if it would:

- ◆ Physically divide an established community.
- ◆ Create or exacerbate a conflict between land uses on the project site and in the surrounding area.
- ◆ Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

2. Population, Employment, and Housing

A population, housing, and employment impact would occur if the Project would:

- ◆ Induce substantial growth or concentration of population in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure) such that significant physical environmental impacts would occur (based on CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G). “Substantial” is defined here as exceeding the County’s one-percent population growth standard derived from the Housing Allocation Program (Measure A), or exceeding regional growth projections provided by ABAG.
- ◆ Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- ◆ Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

- ◆ Substantially exacerbate an existing imbalance or cause a new imbalance between employment and housing in the unincorporated area.

3. Traffic and Transportation

To avoid the complexities and confusion associated with using slightly different significance criteria for each jurisdiction, Napa County, in conjunction with the City of Napa, developed the following significance criteria for this project as a derivation of the County General Plan combined with the City of Napa standards in consideration of the urban nature of the proposed project:

Traffic/Intersection Impacts

- ◆ At a signalized intersection, degrade the AM or PM peak hour level of service from an acceptable LOS D or better to LOS E or F.
- ◆ At a signalized intersection, increase traffic volumes at an intersection already operating at LOS E or F by more than 50 vehicles per hour in the AM or PM peak hour (This criterion has not been identified by the County as a threshold).
- ◆ At an unsignalized intersection, degrade the AM or PM peak hour level of service from an acceptable LOS D or better to LOS E or F and the worst-case approach would experience total delay of more than 4.0 vehicle-hours (for a single lane approach) or more than 5.0 vehicle hours (for a multi-lane approach);
- ◆ At an unsignalized intersection, increase traffic volumes at an intersection already operating at LOS E or F by more than 50 vehicles per hour in the AM or PM peak hour.

An intersection can be mitigated to a *less-than-significant* level if an infrastructure improvement or traffic volume reduction results in the intersection operating at an acceptable LOS D or better. If an intersection is currently operating at an unacceptable LOS E or worse, the improvement must, at a minimum, return the intersection to its existing operating conditions to achieve a *less-than-significant* classification.

Bicycle Circulation

- ◆ Be inconsistent with goals to have facilities that encourage greater use of bicycles for recreation, commuting and shopping.
- ◆ Result in substantial conflicts for bicyclists or would adversely affect nearby bicycle facilities.
- ◆ Be inconsistent with goals to develop and maintain a safe, integrated bicycle route network for residents and visitors, connecting key destinations to neighborhoods, neighborhoods to each other and provide adequate bicycle access to the project site.
- ◆ Exacerbate a current substandard pedestrian or bicycle condition in the project area.

Pedestrian Circulation

- ◆ Be inconsistent with goals to provide an interconnected pedestrian network providing safe access to the project site, between residential areas, public uses, shopping and employment centers, with special attention to a high quality downtown pedestrian environment with links to neighborhoods.
- ◆ Result in substantial conflicts for pedestrians or would adversely affect nearby pedestrian facilities.
- ◆ Exacerbates a current unsafe pedestrian condition in the project area.

Transit Network

- ◆ Be inconsistent with goals to develop and maintain an efficient and convenient transit system providing alternatives to the use of the personal automobile to residents, workers and visitors to alleviate congestion and enhance mobility.
- ◆ Cause a transit demand above the levels able to be adequately provided by local transit operators or agencies, or has other adverse impacts on transit operations.

Site Access and Circulation

- ◆ Create an on-site circulation system that would be inadequate for the volumes and types of traffic expected.
- ◆ Vehicular access points would not be designed to appropriate design standards.

Parking

- ◆ An impact to parking would be significant if the proposed parking supply not serve the expected demand. Residential guest parking can be served by on-street parking, and therefore, does not need to be included in the calculation of off-street demand.
- ◆ The project-specific Napa County parking standards are based on conservative peak demand rates and are intended as guidelines. They will not be used in determining the significance of an impact.

Construction

- ◆ A construction impact to the circulation system would be significant if it adversely affected transportation circulation or infrastructure conditions. Impacts specific to construction would be significant if:
 - The construction activity causes substantial adverse effects to vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle circulation.
 - The construction activity causes substantial adverse effects to pavement conditions.

4. Biological Resources

Based on Section 15065 and the Environmental Checklist in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a proposed project could be considered to have significant impacts to biological resources impacts if it would 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, regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS.

- ◆ A substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS.
- ◆ A substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the CWA through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.
- ◆ 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.
- ◆ Conflict with any applicable land use plans, policies, regulations, or ordinances, of an agency with jurisdiction over the project, adopted for the purpose of protecting biological resources or avoiding and mitigating impacts to biological resources.
- ◆ Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan.

5. Noise

The proposed project would have a significant impact with regard to noise if it would result in any of the following:

- ◆ Exposure of people to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the current Napa County General Plan and the Napa County Noise Ordinance.
- ◆ Exposure of people to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.
- ◆ Substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

Because CEQA does not define the noise level increase that is considered substantial, and because traffic noise is likely to be the primary source of changes in ambient noise levels over time, this EIR utilizes thresholds for the traffic impact noise analysis that were developed by the Federal Inter-agency Committee on Noise (FICON)². The FICON thresholds are based on noise levels at which people typically become increasingly annoyed. (FICON thresholds are measured in A-weighted sound levels, expressed as dBA.) These recommendations have since been recognized by various local, State and federal agencies and are typically used for the analysis of transportation noise impacts:

- Increases in predicted traffic noise levels of 5 dBA L_{dn}, or greater, would be considered significant in areas where the ambient noise environment is less than 60 dBA L_{dn}.
- In areas where the ambient noise environment is between 60 and 65 dBA L_{dn}, exceeds applicable noise standards, increases of 3 dBA L_{dn}, or greater, would be considered significant.
- In areas where the ambient noise environment equals or exceeds 65 dBA L_{dn}, a predicted increase of 1.5 dBA L_{dn}, or greater, would be considered significant.
- For areas equal to or greater than 70 dBA L_{dn}, increases of greater than 1 dBA L_{dn} would be considered significant.
- For any of the increases listed above, a 1 dBA increase attributable to the project would be “cumulatively considerable.” Cumulative noise impacts generally occur when traffic associated with a development, in combination with reasonably foreseeable projects, causes noise levels to substantially increase at a noise sensitive receptor, such as an existing residence. For the impact to be considered significant the traffic attributable to the project must make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the increased traffic noise. A cumulatively considerable

² Napa County General Plan Update DEIR, p. 4.7-23, February 2007.

contribution is considered to be 1 dBA L_{dn}, the smallest number that can be accurately measured or modeled.

- Substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity in excess of Napa County's Noise Ordinance Standards.
- ◆ Exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive aircraft noise levels.

6. Air Quality

Subsequent to publication of the 2009 DEIR on June 2, 2010, the BAAQMD adopted new CEQA Air Quality Thresholds,³ including construction period emission thresholds. Because the NOP for this EIR was issued on January 2, 2009 (prior to the adoption of these thresholds) this EIR is not required to evaluate the project against these thresholds. However, to provide a rigorous environmental evaluation, the Supplement to the 2009 DEIR evaluates the project against these new thresholds, as explained further Section 4.6 of this Supplement to the 2009 DEIR.

- ◆ **Conflict or Obstruct Clean Air Planning Efforts.** The CEQA Guidelines include criteria to address the conformance of a project with plans to attain or maintain ambient air quality standards. This criterion addresses whether or not proposed projects would conflict with an applicable clean air plan. The BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (June 2010) recommends using an analysis that determines the consistency between a proposed Plan's projected population growth and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) to the projections in the latest Clean Air Plan (CAP). Consistency is also demonstrated by assessing whether the proposed Plan implements all of the applicable CAP transportation control measures, and assess whether the plan provides buffer zones around potential sources of odors, toxics and accidental releases.

³ Thresholds are available online at http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/Files/Planning%20and%20Research/CEQA/Adopted%20Thresholds%20Table_6_2_10.ashx, accessed on July 29, 2010.

A key element in air quality planning is to make reasonably accurate projections of future human activities, particularly vehicle activities that are related to air pollutant emissions. BAAQMD uses population projections made by ABAG and vehicle use trends made by MTC to formulate future air pollutant emission inventories. These projections are based on land use and growth projections provided by municipalities throughout the Bay Area region. When communities adopt a new general plan or approve a project that is outside of their buildout projections, and therefore not accounted in regional air quality improvement plans, the effectiveness of regional air quality planning is diluted.

- ◆ **Construction Emissions.**⁴ Under BAAQMD's new thresholds, average daily construction period emissions in excess of the following levels would be considered significant:
 - ◆ 54 pounds per day of reactive organic gases (ROG) or nitrogen oxides (NO_x), or
 - ◆ 82 pounds per day of exhaust respirable particulate matter or PM₁₀, or
 - ◆ 54 pounds per day of exhaust fine particulate matter or PM_{2.5} per day.

BAAQMD recommends quantification of emissions using the URBE-MIS2007 model. This is the same model that the 2009 DEIR used to estimate emissions from the project.

- ◆ **Operation Emissions.**⁵ Under the CEQA Guidelines, this analysis of long-term analysis of air quality impacts considers whether "operation" of the project could result in a project-specific or cumulatively considerable net increase of non-attainment air pollutants and could affect localized CO concentrations. Under the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, project buildout associated with mixed-use residential development would cause a significant project-specific or cumulative air quality impacts if routine operations were to result in:

⁴ This is the CEQA criterion for construction emissions.

⁵ This is the CEQA criterion for operational emissions.

- Ozone precursor emissions (ROG and NO_x) or PM_{2.5} emissions from direct and indirect sources (non-typical construction) that exceed the BAAQMD threshold of 54 pounds per day or 10 tons per year; or PM₁₀ emissions from direct and indirect sources that exceed the threshold of 54 pounds per day or 15 tons per year.⁶
 - Project-related emissions of CO that cause a projected exceedance of the ambient CO State standards of 9.0 parts per million (ppm) for an 8-hour averaging period or 20.0 ppm for a 1-hour averaging period would be considered to cause or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.
- ◆ **Exposure of New Residences to Toxic Air Contaminants.**⁷ The CEQA Guidelines require that projects be evaluated for exposing sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations. The BAAQMD has identified health risk and hazard index thresholds to evaluate the significance of these types of exposures from projects but has not yet adopted related thresholds of significance. Improper planning could expose new sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations. Unlike industrial or stationary sources of air pollution, residential development or other development where sensitive receptors would be located do not require air quality permits. Nonetheless, this type of development can expose people to unhealthy conditions. CARB's Air Quality and Land Use Handbook (2005) provides guidance that is intended to encourage local land use agencies to consider the risks from air pollution prior to making decisions that approve the siting of new sensitive receptors (e.g. homes or daycare centers) near sources of air pollution. Placing new residences near busy roadways or industrial activities may expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations. When sensitive receptors are placed near sources of air pollution, the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines thresholds regarding health risks or cancer risk and hazards are addressed through modeling.

⁶ BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, June 2010, page 2-2.

⁷ This is the CEQA criterion for TACs.

- ◆ **Odors.**⁸ Odors are assessed based on the potential of the proposed project to result in odor complaints. The project is not expected to be a source of odors. However, the project could locate sensitive receptors near industrial sources that may generate odors.

7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

At the time the 2009 DEIR was prepared, neither the State of California nor Napa County had identified or quantified a significance threshold for GHG emissions. Although draft CEQA guidelines available at the time indicated a requirement for a quantitative analysis of GHG emissions, no defined criteria existed against which the project emissions could be measured. In the absence of a quantitative threshold, the Draft EIR compared existing GHG emissions in the county to 2020 countywide emissions with and without the Napa Pipe project.

On June 2, 2010, after publication of the 2009 DEIR, BAAQMD adopted new guidance regarding the analysis of air quality impacts under CEQA. The guidance included new thresholds of significance.⁹ Because the NOP for this EIR was issued prior to the adoption of these thresholds, this EIR is not required to evaluate the project against these thresholds. However, to provide a rigorous environmental evaluation, this section of the Supplement to the 2009 DEIR evaluates the project against these new thresholds.

CEQA thresholds for GHG emissions apply only to operational emissions and not to construction-related emissions. Operational emission thresholds adopted by CEQA are distinguished for stationary and non-stationary sources. BAAQMD guidelines define a stationary source as, “A fixed, non-mobile source of air pollution, usually found at industrial or commercial facilities.” None of the project’s GHG emissions would be considered stationary. Thus the following thresholds would apply:

⁸ This is the CEQA criterion for odors.

⁹ Thresholds are available online at http://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/Files/Planning%20and%20Research/CEQA/Adopted%20Thresholds%20Table_6_2_10.ashx, accessed on July 29, 2010.

- ◆ Compliance with qualified GHG reduction strategy, or
- ◆ 1,100 metric tons of CO_{2e} per year (1,100 MT/yr), or
- ◆ 4.6 metric tons per capita per year (4.6 MT/SP/yr, where SP = service population of residents + employees).

8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Napa Pipe Site Plan would have a significant impact regarding hazards and hazardous materials if it would:

- ◆ Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials.
- ◆ Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment
- ◆ Generate hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
- ◆ Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.
- ◆ Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.
- ◆ Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- ◆ For a project 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, result in a safety hazard for people living or working in the project area.

9. Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

In accordance with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the project would have a significant impact with regard to geology and seismicity if it would:

- ◆ Expose People or Structures to Potential Substantial Adverse Effects, Including the Risk of Loss, Injury, or Death Involving Rupture of a Known Earthquake Fault, Strong Seismic Ground Shaking, Seismic-Related Ground Failure, Including Liquefaction and/or Landslides
- ◆ Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.
- ◆ 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, settlement, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.
- ◆ Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-b of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to property.
- ◆ 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 wastewater.

10. Hydrology and Water Quality

The Napa Pipe project would have a significant impact with regard to hydrology and water quality if it would:

- ◆ Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.
- ◆ Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted).
- ◆ Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.
- ◆ Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substan-

tially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.

- ◆ 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.
- ◆ Otherwise substantially degrade water quality.
- ◆ Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map.
- ◆ Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.
- ◆ Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

11. Cultural Resources

The proposed project would have a significant impact on cultural resources if it would:

- ◆ Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5.
- ◆ Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5.
- ◆ Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.
- ◆ Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

12. Public Services and Recreation

The Napa Pipe project would have a significant impact on public services if it would:

Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental or public facilities, or result in the need for new or physically altered police 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 following public services:

- ◆ Law Enforcement
- ◆ Fire
- ◆ Emergency Medical Response
- ◆ Schools
- ◆ Library
- ◆ Parks and Recreation

13. Utilities

Water

The Napa Pipe project would have a significant impact with regard to water services if it would:

- ◆ Have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing and identified entitlements and resources.
- ◆ Require or result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Wastewater

The Napa Pipe Project would have a significant impact with regard to wastewater services if it would:

- ◆ Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.
- ◆ Have insufficient wastewater treatment capacity available to serve the project's projected demand in addition to existing demand.
- ◆ Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Stormwater

The Napa Pipe Project would have a significant impact with regard to stormwater services if it would:

- ◆ Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Solid Waste

The Napa Pipe project would have a significant impact with regard to solid waste services if it would:

- ◆ Not be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the buildout of the project's solid waste disposal needs.
- ◆ Not comply with federal, State and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste and recycling.

Energy Resources

The County has determined that the project would have a significant impact in relation to energy conservation if it would:

- ◆ Waste, or inefficiently or unnecessarily consume, energy,
- ◆ Impede future energy conservation,

14. Aesthetics

Visual changes associated with the project would be considered significant if the project would:

- ◆ Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.
- ◆ Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.
- ◆ Substantially degrade the view from a scenic highway, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and historic buildings.
- ◆ Expose people on- or off-site to substantial light or glare.