

“A”

Recommended Findings

RECOMMENDED FINDINGS

**PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING – SEPTEMBER 6, 2017
Palmaz Personal Use Heliport
Use Permit, Application P14-00261 – UP
Napa County Assessor's Parcel No. 033-110-079**

CEQA - CERTIFICATION OF FEIR:

The Planning Commission (Commission) hereby finds and certifies as follows:

1. The Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA; and
2. The Final EIR reflects the Planning Commission's independent judgment and analysis; and
3. The Final EIR was presented to the Planning Commission, and the Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to taking an action on the Palmaz Project (P14-00261-UP).
4. The Secretary of the Commission is the custodian of the records of the proceedings on which this decision is based. The records are located at the Napa County Planning, Building & Environmental Services Department, 1195 Third Street, Second Floor, Napa, California.

CEQA - FINDINGS REQUIRED FOR ADOPTION OF MT GEORGE ALTERNATIVE:

5. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, the Commission makes the findings set forth in Exhibit A-1 with respect to the Mt. George Alternative.

USE PERMIT FINDINGS FOR MT GEORGE ALTERNATIVE:

The Commission has reviewed the use permit request in accordance with the requirements of the Napa County Code (NCC) Section 18.124.070 and makes the following findings:

6. The Commission has the power to issue a Use Permit under the Zoning Regulations in effect as applied to property.

Analysis: The property is located in unincorporated Napa County and is subject to the regulations of the NCC. NCC Section 18.120.010(B)(2) identifies personal use airports and heliports as conditionally permitted uses requiring use permits in any zoning district of the County, and NCC Section 18.124.010 identifies the Planning Commission as the decision-making body authorized to hear and decide use permit requests. Additional provisions of NCC Section 18.120.010(B)(2) require operators of personal use heliports to comply with all applicable federal and state requirements prior to commencing operations from the facility; however, there is no companion action necessary for the requested use permit that would require action by the Board of Supervisors.

7. The procedural requirements for a Use Permit set forth in Chapter 18.124 of the Napa County Code (zoning regulations) have been met.

Analysis: The application for a Use Permit has been appropriately filed, and notification and public hearing requirements of NCC Section 18.136.040 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15087 and 15088 have been met. On August 23, 2017, notice of the public hearing and Planning Commission meeting to consider certification of the EIR and the use permit request were published in the Napa Valley Register, posted with the Napa County Clerk, and mailed via first class or electronic mail to the Amalia Palmaz Living Trust (the applicant), as well as, to owners of property within 2,500 feet of the applicant's landholdings and other interested parties who had previously requested such notice or submitted written correspondence regarding the Project. Prior public hearings held before the Planning Commission on March 1, 2017, and May 17, 2017, regarding the Project were noticed in the same manner.

8. The grant of the Use Permit, as conditioned, will not adversely affect the public health, safety or welfare of the County of Napa.

Analysis: Granting the Use Permit for the project as proposed and conditioned will not adversely affect the health, safety or welfare of the County. Various County divisions and departments have reviewed the project and commented regarding roadway improvements for emergency access and drainage improvements for stormwater quality. Conditions are recommended that incorporate these comments into the project conditions of approval to ensure the protection of the public health, safety, and welfare.

The proposed heliport will be used for up to eight flights (four inbound and four outbound) per week, for a single helicopter required to meet or exceed federal noise criteria for stage 3 aircraft. No mitigation is necessary to avoid exceedances of acceptable noise thresholds specified in NCC Chapter 8.16. The nearest sensitive receptor is a farm labor dwelling located over 2,500 feet mile northwest of the Mt. George Alternative heliport site. Due to the distance of that sensitive receptor being well beyond the 242-foot distance at which equipment noise is reduced to an acceptable level not to exceed 75 decibels during daytime hours of construction, construction-related noise for the heliport would be less than significant. Also, due to its more remote location with fewer sensitive receptors in the vicinity, neither of the two proposed flight paths (to/from the northwest and to/from the northeast) for the Mt. George Alternative site will result in significant noise impacts (DEIR, pages 6-16 through 6-18). Both flight paths for the Mt. George Alternative avoid the applicant's designated "No-Fly Zone," a residential neighborhood approximately one mile west of the heliport over which no flights below cruising altitude (1,000 feet) shall occur except in cases of emergencies threatening the safety of the aircraft or its occupants.

The Mt. George Alternative is located on a 46-acre parcel developed with approximately 15 acres of vineyard and substantially surrounded by large, undeveloped parcels of land. Because the Mt. George Alternative site is designated as "Other Land" and is not mapped by the state as Farmland, and because no vineyards would be removed for construction of the heliport, there would be no conversion or other negative impacts to farmlands. In addition to its remote location on the ground, the heliport and its associated aircraft operations from the Mt. George Alternative location were determined by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) not to have an adverse effect on safe and efficient use of airspace by aircraft. More specifically, through its Airspace Analysis Determination of May 16, 2016, the FAA determined that aircraft operations from the Mt. George Alternative and along its proposed flight paths would be acceptable and would not pose conflicts in the existing and planned use of airspace.

Environmental analysis contained within the FEIR prepared for the project identified potentially significant impacts to biological and cultural resources. With mitigation that includes pre-construction plant surveys and cessation of work in the event of discovery of an archeological resource, both of these potentially significant impacts will be reduced to a level of less than significant. All other topic areas analyzed in the FEIR or the initial study checklist (Aesthetics, Air Quality, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards, Hydrology and Water Quality, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation and Traffic, Utilities and Service Systems) were determined not to have potential for significant environmental impacts for which mitigation was necessary.

9. The proposed use complies with applicable provisions of the NCC and is consistent with the policies and standards of the Napa County General Plan and any applicable specific plan.

Analysis – Compliance with the Zoning Ordinance: NCC Section 18.120.010(B)(2) identifies personal use airports and heliports as conditionally permitted uses requiring use permits in any zoning district of the County, subject to compliance with any additional requirements of any applicable state or federal agency. Thus, the application for a use permit to operate a personal use heliport is consistent with the provisions of the County's Zoning Ordinance. With setbacks of over 400 feet from any property line, and a setback of over 700 feet from the headwaters of Hagen Creek over 800 feet, the proposed hangar building for storage of the helicopter will not encroach into minimum setbacks required for the AW District or pursuant to the County's Conservation Regulations (NCC Sections 18.104.010 and 18.108.025).

Analysis – Compliance with the General Plan: See General Plan Consistency Analysis attached as Exhibit A-2 and incorporated here by reference.

10. That the proposed use would not require a new water system or improvement causing significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on the affected groundwater basin in Napa County, unless that use would satisfy any of the other criteria specified for approval or waiver of a groundwater permit under §'s 13.15.070 or 13.15.080 of the County Code.

Analysis: Other than emergency fire suppression facilities, the Mt. George Alternative site will not include any facilities that will require water and will not increase the daily demand for water on-site, as the proposal includes no new restrooms. A wet draft style hydrant system would be attached to a 5,000-gallon poly-tank, both located west of the hangar building. This tank would contain water dedicated for fire suppression delivered through the hydrant. With no new daily water demands other than that needed for emergency fire flow, the project would have a de minimus impact on groundwater supplies and groundwater recharge. Thus, with marginal groundwater demands, the proposed Use Permit is consistent with General Plan Goals CON-10 and CON-11 that support preservation and sustainable use of groundwater for agricultural and related purposes.

EXHIBIT “A-1”

FINDINGS UNDER CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) SUPPORTING APPROVAL OF THE ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE (MT. GEORGE ALTERNATIVE) FOR THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT PREPARED FOR THE PALMAZ PERSONAL USE HELIPORT USE PERMIT NO. P14-00261-UP

The Napa County Planning Commission hereby adopts the following findings pursuant to the CEQA (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.).

I. INTRODUCTION

On or about July 28, 2014, the Amalia Palmaz Living Trust (Palmaz or the Applicant) submitted an application for Use Permit No. P14-00261-UP to the Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services (PBES) Department to allow construction and operation of a personal use heliport. The heliport would include construction of a 60-foot long by 60-foot wide helicopter landing pad (helipad) and approximately 4,000 square foot hangar and storage building on the property. Structures and facilities proposed as accessory to the proposed heliport included: a new fire hydrant; a new water line connecting to the existing water line; a stormwater quality bioretention basin; and two 5,000-gallon water tanks for fire suppression. Additionally, the existing, private vineyard road providing access to the proposed heliport would be improved, widened and paved to comply with the Napa County Road and Street Standards (the proposed Project or Palmaz Project).

The County, as lead agency, caused to be prepared a Draft EIR (or DEIR) for the Palmaz Project (April 2016) (State Clearinghouse No. 2015122030). In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15132, all comments received during the comment period on the Draft EIR were responded to and included in a Final EIR or FEIR. The Final EIR (February 2017) includes the Draft EIR and comments and responses to comments on the Draft EIR and corrections, revisions, and other clarifications and amplifications to the Draft EIR.

These findings have been prepared in accordance with the CEQA, its implementing guidelines (CEQA Guidelines) (Cal. Code Regs., Title 14, § 15000 et seq.), and Napa County’s Local Procedures for Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (revised February 2015) (Local Guidelines). The County is the lead agency for the environmental review of the Palmaz Project and has the principal responsibility for its approval. The Planning Commission is the County decision-maker for purposes of the Project. These findings are therefore adopted pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, CEQA Guidelines section 15091, and Local Guidelines section 301. The purpose of these findings is to satisfy the requirements of CEQA associated with adoption of the Project. These findings provide the written analysis and conclusions of the Planning Commission regarding the Palmaz Project. These findings refer to materials in the administrative record. All of these materials are available for review in the PBES Department.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Project Location

The Project is located at 4031 Hagen Road in unincorporated Napa County approximately two miles east of the City of Napa municipal boundary, on approximately 0.5 acres of the 220.4-acre property. It has a General Plan land use designation of Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space (AWOS), and is within the AW (Agricultural Watershed) zoning district (the Project Site).

The proposed Project would include construction of a 60-foot long by 60-foot wide helicopter landing pad (helipad) and approximately 4,000 square foot hangar and storage building on the property. Structures and facilities proposed as accessory to the proposed heliport include: a new fire hydrant; a new water line connecting to the existing water line; a stormwater quality bioretention basin; and two 5,000-gallon water tanks for fire suppression. Additionally, the existing, private vineyard road providing access to the proposed heliport would be improved, widened and paved to comply with Napa County Road and Street Standards.

B. Project Objectives

As noted in the Draft EIR (pg. 2-1), Palmaz declared the following as the objectives of the proposed Project:

- construct a personal use helipad and hangar on land under the Applicant's control and in close proximity to the Applicant's residence;
- establish flight paths that minimize noise impacts to surrounding residences;
- provide secure access to the helipad and equipment for emergency medical/fire responders; and
- maintain safety/security of the aircraft.

Consistent with the objectives, the Applicant has selected project equipment and proposes to implement certain design and operational features to reduce potential noise impacts to adjoining properties from aircraft operations. These equipment and design features are summarized below and further described in the paragraphs that follow:

- utilize widely recognized Helicopter Association International guidance on minimizing operational noise, to the extent it is safe and reasonable;
- use flight paths that concentrate the greatest noise within the confines of the Palmaz property boundaries;
- travel between 1,000 and 1,500 feet above the ground level whenever possible and when flying over adjacent neighborhoods;
- establish a "no-fly" zone to the northwest of Palmaz property;
- utilize a twin-engine helicopter that offers greater performance and fly-quiet technology; and
- operate on an eastbound departure track and westbound descent, when possible.

To help reduce overflight and noise disturbances on residences, the Applicant has proposed and would agree to a condition of approval implementing a "no-fly zone" over nearby sensitive receptors (Exhibit 2-5 to the DEIR). The no-fly zone would be avoided during approach to and departure from the helipad when conditions permit. If overflight of the area is necessary (when weather conditions dictate), the helicopter would remain at least 1,000 feet above ground level over the no-fly zone to minimize the effects of noise. The no-fly zone is roughly bounded by Hagen

Road, Vichy Avenue, La Grande Avenue, and Olive Hill Lane, and includes the residences near Mt. George Avenue, as shown on Exhibit 2-5 to the DEIR.

A Bell 429 Global Ranger (B429) helicopter or an aircraft with similar or improved acoustical technology would be used for the project. The B429 is a proven modern light, twin-engine helicopter that is equipped with advanced acoustic technology that helps to reduce noise. A powerful twin-engine helicopter would allow for a Category A helicopter approach and departure more frequently (Exhibit 2-6 to the DEIR). With a Category A profile, as is proposed for the project, the helicopter would perform a steeper ascent and descent when taking off and landing. The helicopter could ascend almost straight up until it is at an altitude for level flight, usually 1,000 feet above ground level. This ascent and descent pattern would serve to minimize noise disturbances to surrounding neighborhoods. Further, the Category A helicopter procedures allow for greater safety in the event of engine failures, because the aircraft is capable of being operated in such a manner that, if one engine fails at any time after takeoff or during landing, the helicopter can land safely and stop in the takeoff area, or climb out from the point of failure and attain stabilized single engine forward flight.

The B429 or a similar aircraft would allow approach from and departure to the east when conditions permit. This track would be utilized on a more regular basis (during clear and calm conditions) to help reduce potential disturbances to nearby residences.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

A. Background

In September 2015, the PBES Department assisted by planning consultant Ascent Environmental, Inc. initiated the environmental review process required by CEQA, to analyze the potential environmental impacts of the Palmaz Project.

In December 2015, an Initial Study/Environmental Checklist was prepared to identify areas to be further discussed in an environmental impact report (EIR). On December 11, 2015, a formal Notice of Preparation of an EIR (NOP) was issued soliciting public input regarding the Draft EIR for the Palmaz Project. The comment period was from December 14, 2015 through January 21, 2016.

On January 14, 2016, the Napa County Planning Division of the PBES Department held a public scoping session, in conjunction with circulation of the NOP, to elicit additional comments from the public on the scope and content of the DEIR. During the NOP period and scoping session, the County received over 100 comments. These comments were considered in the preparation of the DEIR.

The County, as lead agency, caused to be prepared a Draft EIR for the Palmaz Project (April 2016) (State Clearinghouse No. 2015122030). In accordance with CEQA, the Draft EIR was released for public and agency review on April 29, 2016. The public comment period ran from April 29, 2016 through July 15, 2016 (the Planning Commission extended the comment period an additional 33 days).

On May 25, 2016, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the Draft EIR for purposes of receiving public comment. Between the start of the public comment period on April 29, 2016, and its end on July 15, 2016, the County received over 100 public and agency written comments on the Draft EIR.

In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15132, all comments received on the Draft EIR during the comment period were responded to and included in a Final EIR or FEIR (February 2017). The Final EIR includes the Draft EIR and comments and responses to comments on the Draft EIR and corrections, revisions, and other clarifications and amplifications to the Draft EIR.

On February 17, 2017 in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21092.5, the Final EIR was mailed to all commenting state and local agencies. Notice of availability of the Final EIR on the County's current projects website was mailed via first class or electronic mail to other organizations and individuals who had commented on the Draft EIR, submitted a written comment on the project, or otherwise requested notification, at least ten days prior to the Planning Commission's action on the Palmaz Project. The FEIR is on file with the PBES Department along with all other documents constituting the record of proceedings.

On March 1, 2017, at a duly noticed public hearing, the Planning Commission referred the matter to the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) for a determination of whether the Project is consistent with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) and continued the hearing on the Project to May 17, 2017¹ to allow the Planning Commission to consider the ALUC's determination and additional public testimony.

On May 17, 2017, the ALUC reviewed both the proposed Project site and the Mt. George Alternative site for consistency with the ALUCP. Due to a tie vote, the ALUC was unable to render a consistency determination for the Planning Commission's consideration. As such, on May 17, 2017, the Planning Commission accepted additional public comments on the Project and the adequacy of the FEIR and continued the public hearing to a date uncertain pending scheduling of the ALUC meeting and receipt of the ALUC's consistency determination.

On August 23, 2017, notice of Planning Commission's September 6, 2017, continued public hearing to consider certification of the EIR and the use permit request were published in the Napa Valley Register, posted with the Napa County Clerk, and mailed via first class or electronic mail to the Applicant, as well as, to owners of property within 2,500 feet of the Applicant's landholdings and other interested parties who had previously requested such notice or submitted written correspondence regarding the Project.

On September 6, 2017, the Planning Commission held a continued public hearing on the Project, considered the consistency determination of the ALUC, and all public comment, and thereafter closed the public hearing and certified the FEIR and adopted these findings prior to approving the Mt. George Alternative.

IV. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

The Record of Proceedings (record) upon which the Planning Commission bases these findings and its actions and determinations regarding the proposed Project includes, but is not limited to:

- The NOP and all other public notices issued by the County in conjunction with the Project;
- The Draft EIR for the Project and all appendices;

¹ The matter was continued to March 22, 2017. The March 22, 2017 meeting was cancelled and all items were continued to May 17, 2017.

- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the Draft EIR;
- All comments and correspondence submitted to the County with respect to the Project, in addition to timely comments on the Draft EIR, including comments submitted subsequent to the release of the Final EIR;
- The Final EIR for the Project, including comments received on the Draft EIR, responses to those comments and appendices;
- Documents cited or referenced in the Draft EIR and Final EIR;
- The mitigation monitoring and reporting program for the Project;
- All findings adopted by the County in connection with the Project and all documents cited or referred to therein;
- All reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents relating to the Project prepared by the County, consultants to the County, or responsible or trustee agencies with respect to the County's compliance with the requirements of CEQA and with respect to the County's action on the Project;
- The Napa County General Plan including but not limited to the General Plan Update EIR and all environmental documents prepared in connection with the adoption of the General Plan;
- The Napa County Zoning Ordinance and all other County Code provisions cited in materials prepared or submitted to the County;
- All other matters of common knowledge to the Commission including, but not limited to, County, state, and federal laws, policies, rules, regulations, reports, records and projections related to development within the County of Napa and its surrounding areas;
- All files, documents and records related the Palmaz Personal Use Heliport Project Use Permit No. P14-00261-UP;
- Any documents expressly cited in these findings, in addition to those cited above; and
- Any other materials required for the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code section 21167.6(e).

The location and name of the official custodian of the record is: The Secretary of the Planning Commission, Napa County Planning, Building and Environmental Services Department, 1195 Third Street, Second Floor, Napa, CA 94559.

V. CONSISTENCY WITH APPLICABLE PLANS

The EIR evaluates the Project to determine whether it is consistent with applicable plans, policies, and regulations. In this case, the relevant plans, policies, and regulations are summarized below.

The Napa County General Plan (2008) designates the Project site as Agricultural, Watershed and Open Space (AWOS). This designation is defined as follows:

Agriculture, Watershed and Open Space: This designation provides for areas where the predominant use is agriculturally oriented and where the protection of agriculture is essential to the general health, safety, and welfare.

The Planning Commission finds the Palmaz Project consistent with the AWOS designation and the Napa County General Plan as set forth in the “Supplemental General Plan Consistency Analysis” attached as Attachment I to the Planning Commission Meeting March 1, 2017, Agenda Report and incorporated here by reference.

Napa County Zoning Ordinance

The project site is zoned Agricultural Watershed (AW). The AW district is defined in Section 18.20.010 of the Napa County Code as follows:

The AW district classification is intended to be applied in those areas of the county where the predominant use is agriculturally oriented, where watershed areas, reservoirs and floodplain tributaries are located, where development would adversely impact on all such uses, and where the protection of agriculture, watersheds and floodplain tributaries from fire, pollution and erosion is essential to the general health, safety and welfare.

Section 18.120.010(B)(1) of the Napa County Code allows personal use heliports in any zoning district upon grant of a use permit. Therefore, the Project is consistent with the county zoning designation of AW for this property.

VI. GENERAL FINDINGS

A. CEQA Requirements for Findings

Public Resources Code Section 21002 provides that “public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]” The same statute states that the procedures required by CEQA “are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects.” Public Resources Code Section 21002 goes on to state that “in the event [that] specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof.”

The mandate and principles announced in Public Resources Code Section 21002 are implemented, in part, through the requirement that agencies must adopt findings before approving projects for which EIRs are required. For each significant environmental effect identified in an EIR for a proposed project, the approving agency must issue a written finding reaching one or more of three permissible conclusions. The three possible findings are:

- (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

- (2) Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by the other agency.
- (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report. (Public Resources Code Section 21081(a); see also CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (a).)

Public Resources Code Section 21061.1 defines “feasible” to mean “capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, and technological factors.” The concept of “feasibility” also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. Moreover, feasibility under CEQA encompasses ‘desirability’ to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors.

For purposes of these findings, the term “avoid” refers to the effectiveness of one or more mitigation measures to reduce an otherwise significant effect to a less than significant level.

CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur. Where, as with this Project, the adoption of feasible mitigation measures substantially lessens or avoids all significant effects on the environment, a lead agency is not required to adopt additional findings addressing the feasibility of project alternatives set forth in a final EIR. (Laurel Hills Homeowners Association v. City Council (1978) 83 Cal.App.3d 515, 519-521.) Nor, under such circumstances, does the approving agency decision-maker have to adopt a statement of overriding considerations pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15093.

B. Evidentiary Basis for Findings

These findings are based upon substantial evidence in the record before the Planning Commission. The references to the Draft EIR and Final EIR set forth in the findings are for ease of reference and are not intended to provide an exhaustive list of the evidence relied upon for these findings.

C. Findings are Determinative

The Planning Commission recognizes that there may be differences in and among the different sources of information and opinions offered in the documents and testimony that make up the EIR and the administrative record; that experts may disagree; and that the Planning Commission must base its decision and these findings on the substantial evidence in the record that is determined to be most persuasive. Therefore, by these findings, the Planning Commission ratifies the Final EIR and resolves that these findings shall control and are determinative of the significant impact of the Project.

D. Findings Associated with Less Than Significant Impacts

The Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the information in the Draft EIR and the Final EIR, addressing environmental effects, mitigation measures, and alternatives. The Planning Commission, relying on the facts and analysis in the Draft EIR, and Final EIR, which were

presented to the Planning Commission and reviewed and considered prior to any approvals, concurs with the conclusions of the Draft EIR and Final EIR regarding the less than significant environmental effects. The Project would result in either no impact or a less than significant impact to the following issue areas: aesthetics, cultural resources, geology/soils, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, population/housing, public services, recreation, transportation and traffic, and utilities/service systems. (DEIR, pp. 1-2 through 1-9.)

E. Findings Regarding Mitigation Measures

Except as otherwise noted, the mitigation measures referenced herein are those identified in the Final EIR and adopted by the Planning Commission as set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).

Except as otherwise stated in these findings, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15092, the Planning Commission finds that environmental effects of development of the Project will not be significant or will be mitigated to be less-than-significant level by the adopted mitigation measures. The Planning Commission further finds that the mitigation measures incorporated into and imposed upon the Project will not have new significant environmental impacts that were not analyzed in the EIR.

F. Relationship of Findings and MMRP to Final EIR

These findings and the MMRP are intended to summarize and describe the contents and conclusions of the Draft EIR and Final EIR for policymakers and the public. For purposes of clarity, these impacts and mitigation measures may be worded differently from the provisions in the Final EIR and/or some provisions may be combined. Nonetheless, the Planning Commission and/or the Applicant will implement all measures set forth in the MMRP. In the event that there is an inconsistency between the descriptions of mitigation measures in these findings or the MMRP and the Final EIR, the Planning Commission and/or the Applicant will implement the measures as they are described in these findings and the attached MMRP. In the event a mitigation measure recommended in the Final EIR has inadvertently been omitted from these findings or from the MMRP, such mitigation measure is hereby adopted and incorporated into the findings and/or MMRP, as applicable. The Planning Commission does not intend that a mitigation measure recommended in the EIR should be rejected, unless the rejection of that mitigation measure is specifically expressed in these findings.

VII. FINDINGS OF FACT

A. Effects Found Not to be Significant

Effects of the Project found to be less-than-significant, and which require no mitigation, are identified in Draft EIR Table ES-1 (Draft EIR pp. ES-6 through ES-13.) Revisions to the Draft EIR that were incorporated into the Final EIR included: (1) clarification of noise mitigation and discussion thereof; (2) revision to text of biological resources mitigation to incorporate information obtained from biological surveys conducted after the public comment period on the DEIR; (3) clarification of the Project description to delete references to on-site vehicle fueling, and revision of the description to delete the Project requirement for an exception to Napa County Road and Street Standards (due to amendment of the Standards approved by the Board of Supervisors in November 2016); and (4) revision to the text of the DEIR Alternatives chapter, to reflect that the No Project Alternative would meet some, but not all, of the Project objectives. Revisions noted in the FEIR also corrected typographical errors in the DEIR. None of

the revisions to the Draft EIR incorporated into the Final EIR increased the level of significance of any impact identified in the Draft EIR. These clarifications and revisions also do not trigger the grounds for recirculation articulated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. The Planning Commission has reviewed the record and agrees with the conclusion that impacts identified as less than significant in Table ES-1 of the Draft EIR would not be substantially changed by the Project, and therefore no additional findings are needed.

B. Potentially Significant or Significant Effects

Effects of the Project found to be potentially significant or significant, and which require mitigation, and the required finding for each are set forth in Exhibit "A-1 (a)" of these findings. The Planning Commission has reviewed the record and agrees with the conclusion that the adopted mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant or significant effects to a less-than-significant level. The Planning Commission hereby finds that the Project will not result in any significant unavoidable impacts. The Planning Commission further finds that the under the Mt. George Alternative, all impacts are less-than-significant, with mitigation required to reduce the potential impacts only to biological and cultural resources.

VIII. MITIGATION, MONITORING, AND REPORTING PROGRAM

An Updated Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program has been prepared for the Project, and is being approved by the Planning Commission at the same time these findings are adopted. The County will use the MMRP to track compliance with project mitigation measures. The MMRP will remain available for public review during the compliance period. The Updated MMRP is incorporated into the EIR, and is approved in conjunction with certification of the Final EIR and adoption of these Findings of Fact.

IX. ALTERNATIVES

A. Legal Requirements

Public Resources Code Section 21002 provides that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such project[.]" The same statute states that the procedures required by CEQA "are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects."

Where a lead agency has determined that, even after the adoption of all feasible mitigation measures, a project as proposed will still cause one or more significant environmental effects that cannot be substantially lessened or avoided, the agency, prior to approving the project as mitigated, must first determine whether, with respect to such impacts, there remain any project alternatives that are both environmentally superior and feasible within the meaning of CEQA.

The Planning Commission's goal in evaluating the project alternatives is to select an alternative that feasibly attains the project objectives, while further reducing the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts. However, all of the environmental impacts associated with the Project will be reduced to a less-than-significant level with the adoption of the mitigation measures set forth in the EIR. In other words, there are no significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the Project or the Mt. George Alternative.

While neither the Project as analyzed in the Draft EIR nor the Mt. George Alternative would result in any significant impacts after mitigation, the Planning Commission finds that a good faith effort was made to evaluate a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives in the EIR that could feasibly obtain the basic objectives of the Project, even when the alternatives might impede the attainment of the Project objectives and might be more costly. As a result, the scope of alternatives analyzed in the EIR is not unduly limited or narrow. The Planning Commission also finds that all reasonable alternatives were reviewed, analyzed and discussed in the review process of the EIR and the ultimate decision of the Project.

B. Range of Alternatives Analyzed

Section 6.0 of the Draft EIR describes the alternatives considered and compares their impacts to the project analyzed in the EIR. The Draft EIR evaluated two alternatives: The No Project Alternative and the Mt. George Alternative. The EIR contains a detailed analysis of the impacts of each of these alternatives. The Planning Commission hereby incorporates by reference the EIR's analysis.

Because the Project, as mitigated, will not result in significant environmental effects on either a project-specific or cumulative basis, the Planning Commission is not required to adopt findings with respect to alternatives to the Project. Nevertheless, the Planning Commission adopts the following findings with respect to each alternative. The Planning Commission further finds that the Commission would adopt these findings if they were in fact required to be adopted under CEQA. The Planning Commission further finds that substantial evidence in the record supports each and every one of these findings.

No Project Alternative (Existing Conditions)

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(1) states that a "no project" alternative shall be analyzed. The purpose of describing a "no project" alternative is to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving a proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project. The "no project" alternative analysis is not the baseline for determining whether the environmental impacts of a proposed project may be significant, unless the analysis is identical to the environmental setting analysis, which does establish that baseline. Under the No Project Alternative, the Project would not be built on the Project Site, and as a result, none of the approvals that would be required by the County for the Project would occur. The Project Site would remain in its existing condition, with the existing single family residence and vineyards maintained on the property. The Applicant would continue to use the Napa County Airport for storage of the helicopter, and for arrival/departure. Approximately eight weekly vehicle trips (two trips per day, four days per week) associated with use of the Napa County Airport for helicopter arrival/departure would occur, consistent with existing helicopter operations. The No Project Alternative would not achieve any of the Applicant's objectives identified above and in the DEIR, page ES-1. For this reason, the Planning Commissions rejects the No Project Alternative.

Mt. George Alternative

The Mount George Alternative provides an opportunity to reduce the potentially significant noise impact associated with the proposed Project to a less-than-significant impact without implementation of mitigation.

Under the Mt. George Alternative, the Applicant would construct a helipad and hangar similar to the design of the project, but at an alternative site (Assessor's Parcel No. 033-110-079) on Mt. George, approximately one mile northeast of the project site. Exhibit 6-1 shows the location of the Mt. George Alternative in relation to the project; both sites are within the boundaries of parcels owned by Palmaz. Access to the alternative site would be provided to the south by existing vineyard roads. Emergency access would be provided to the north by Wild Horse Valley Road to Monticello Road via the Applicant's existing easement through Kenzo Estates.

The alternative site is situated on a flat bluff that is currently used to store miscellaneous vineyard material such as stakes and PVC tubing. The proposed helipad and hangar have been designed such that minimal grading would be needed and would use the existing grading of the bluff to the maximum extent practicable. No large tree removal would be required under this alternative; rather, only small trees and shrubs would be removed.

At 4,080 square feet, the hangar and storage area in this alternative would be slightly larger (approximately 75 square feet) than that of the proposed project and would be located along the natural gradient of the area next to an existing road. The building would be designed to be completely "off the grid," requiring no power from the Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E). It would be powered by a state-of-the-art solar charged battery system with a small propane or diesel powered generator exclusively for emergency backup power in the event the battery system fails. All lighting would be low voltage light emitting diode (LED). The hangar would also include an attached storage area.

The helipad would be constructed in front of the hangar building, also following the land's natural gradient. As with the project, low intensity, sunken LED lights would illuminate both the touchdown and lift-off area (TLOF) and final approach and takeoff (FATO) areas. They would not produce a sky glow and cannot per FAA design, nor would they be visible from off-site viewpoints. Further, the lights would only come on for 15 minutes at a time when the pilot is on final approach, as they are triggered via FAA frequency from the aircraft.

A wet draft style hydrant system would be attached to a 5,000-gallon poly-tank, both located west of the hangar. This tank would contain water dedicated for fire suppression delivered through the hydrant.

The hangar and helipad would total approximately 11,800 square feet of new impervious area. This area would drain to a 500-square-foot bioretention basin that would be designed in compliance with the County's post-construction run off requirements. After leaving the bioretention system, the water would be low-energy disbursed on the hillside where further infiltration to the local groundwater basin would occur.

As part of this alternative and consistent with existing general maintenance practices, fresh road base would be added to the top of the vineyard road, and potholes would be repaired.

Because the building under this alternative would be similar in design and dimensions to the project, construction details would also be similar. Because of the flattened, bluff terrain, the alternate site would require less earth work because there is not as much hillside area to excavate. Additionally, it would not produce any spoils needing deposition elsewhere on-site.

Operation of this alternative would be the same as that described for the project, with helicopter trips consisting of a maximum of four arrivals and four departures per week. There are two proposed flight tracks, one to the east and one to the northwest, associated with this alternative.

The No-Fly Zone associated with the Project would also be implemented with the alternative.

Because the impacts would be less-than-significant, none of the noise or oak woodland mitigation measures required for the proposed Project would apply to the Mt. George Alternative though mitigation measures applicable to biological resources (special status plants) and cultural resources. With the Mt. George Alternative, impacts to land use and agricultural resources, noise, and air quality would be less than the Project as proposed. However, potential impacts pertaining to GHG emissions, biological resources, cultural resources and hazards and safety would be similar to the proposed Project as described in Draft EIR Table 6-3, pp. 6-30. The Planning Commission finds that the Mt. George Alternative is feasible and achieves the Project objectives and avoids the Project's potentially significant environmental effects on land use related to agricultural resources and noise. The Mt. George Alternative would have no impact on agricultural resources or noise and therefore no mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts to less-than-significant. It also further reduces impacts to air quality compared to the proposed Project.

C. Alternatives Removed from Consideration

Two other alternatives were considered during the initial screening process and were not considered further or analyzed in the EIR. The Planning Commission hereby incorporates by reference the discussion of these alternatives in the Draft EIR. (Draft EIR, pp. 6-2 and 6-3.)

D. Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA requires the identification of an Environmentally Superior Alternative: an alternative to the project that has no significant effect or has the least significant effect on the environment while substantially accomplishing the objectives of the project. For reference, significance under CEQA is determined based on substantial or potentially substantial adverse changes of any of the physical environmental conditions due to the project as compared to existing conditions.

A summary matrix was prepared as part of the Draft EIR identifying for each impact area whether the alternatives would be greater, lesser, or similar impacts compared to the Project. (See Draft EIR Table 6.3.) As already set forth above, there would be no significant and unavoidable impacts as a result of the Mt. George Alternative; all impacts would be less-than-significant, with mitigation required only for potential impacts to biological and cultural resources. Therefore, "less" and "similar" impacts as identified in Table 6.3 are referring to varying degrees of impacts below established significance thresholds. In summary, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would cause the least impact to the physical environment.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 suggests that an EIR should identify the "environmentally superior" alternative. "If the environmentally superior alternative is the 'no project' alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives."

The No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, because most of the significant impacts of the project would be avoided. With respect to GHG emissions, this alternative would result in fewer impacts in the short term (during construction), but slightly more in the long term (during operation) because helicopter flight paths under this alternative would be longer than would occur under the project. The existing helicopter trips originating from the Napa County Airport would be approximately 10 nautical miles further from northeastern destinations, which account for approximately 75 percent of helicopter trips, than the proposed and alternative heliport locations on the Palmaz property. Finally, the No Project Alternative would not meet any of the project's objectives because a heliport and hangar would not be constructed on-site.

The Mt. George Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative of the project alternatives considered. With this alternative, impacts to land use and agricultural resources, noise, and air quality would be reduced in the removal of any vineyards or lands designated as important farmlands by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). Further, this alternative would meet all project objectives because it would construct a helipad and hangar within property owned by the Amalia Palmaz Living Trust in proximity to the Applicant's residence, establish flight paths that secure access to the helipad and equipment for emergency medical/fire responders, and maintain safety/security of the aircraft.

If the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, CEQA Guidelines Section 1526.6(e)(2) requires identification of an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives considered in the EIR. When comparing the remaining development alternatives, the Mt. George Alternative is the most environmentally superior alternative. As described throughout these findings, the Mt. George Alternative, is the Project proposed for approval and upon which these findings are based. The Planning Commission therefore approves the environmentally superior alternative.

X. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

CEQA requires a public agency to balance the benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve the project. A public agency may approve a project despite significant unavoidable impacts identified in an EIR.

In this instance, there would be no significant and unavoidable impacts as a result of the Mt. George Alternative Project, and therefore a statement of overriding considerations need not be adopted in order to approve the Mt. George Alternative.

Attachment:

- Exhibit A(1)(a) – Impacts and Mitigation Measures

EXHIBIT A(1)(a)

IMPACTS & MITIGATION MEASURES

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>3.2 Land Use and Agricultural Resources</p> <p>Impact 3.2-1: Conflict with relevant plans, policies, and zoning adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The General Plan contains policies and mitigation measures that promote the preservation of agriculturally productive areas, and the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) contains policies relevant to new heliports. Because the project applicant would secure necessary permits to ensure the project would maintain appropriate compliance with relevant plans, policies, and zoning designed to mitigate an environmental effect, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.2-2: Conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. Implementation of the project would result in the conversion of 0.35 acre of Prime Farmland and 0.18 acre of Farmland of Local Importance from use as a vineyard to a heliport. The total amount of important farmland within the County has been increasing, and the amount of land converted by the project would be very small in comparison. However, conversion of important farmland would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.2-2: Minimize impacts to important farmland. The applicant shall implement the measures listed below with regard to important farmland to minimize project-related impacts on these lands:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Construction activities shall be undertaken in an expedient fashion, and associated construction equipment storage and staging area shall be located outside of important farmland to the extent possible, as shown on the grading plan prior to issuance of a grading permit. ▲ If damage or destruction of active farmland occurs during construction, these areas shall be returned to preconstruction conditions prior to full implementation of the activities authorized by the use permit. ▲ Consistent with General Plan Policy AG/LU-9, the County shall require (at a minimum) long-term preservation of 0.53 acre of existing farmland of equal or higher quality for the 0.53 acre of state designated Prime Farmland and Farmland of Local Importance that would be converted to non-agricultural uses under the project. This protection may consist of the establishment of farmland easements, replanting the stockpile area to vineyard, or other similar mechanism and shall be implemented prior to issuance of the first grading permit for the project. 	LTS
<p>3.3 Biological Resources</p> <p>Impact 3.3-1: Loss or disturbance of individuals or nests of special-status birds. Construction activities would not result in the loss of individuals or nests, or disruptions to nesting attempts of special-status bird species, including raptors, if they nest in the project site or vicinity in the future because no nesting habitat is proposed for removal and noise levels would be similar to existing conditions at the vineyard. The potential disturbance or loss of special-status bird and raptor nests from construction activities would be a less-than-significant impact. Future helicopter use would not result in the loss of individuals or nests from bird strikes, noise</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>disturbance, or helicopter downwash for the following reasons. Bird strikes are not likely to occur at a frequency that would substantially affect the distribution or abundance of special-status birds or raptors. Helicopter operations would create noise disturbances similar to existing operations and maintenance conditions at the vineyard. Vegetation affected by future helicopter downwash does not support nesting by any special-status bird species potentially within the project area. The potential loss or disturbance of special-status birds and their nests from helicopter operations would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.3-2: Loss or disturbance of bat colonies. Implementation of the project would not involve removal of buildings, trees, or snags that could provide roosting habitat for common and special-status bats such as pallid or Townsend big-eared bats. Noise disturbance from helicopter operations would be similar to existing conditions on the vineyard. Because there would be no potential for loss of active bat colonies, and there would be minimal change to existing noise conditions from construction activities and helicopter use, the impact to bats from the project would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.3-3: Loss and/or modification of streamside habitat and fill or other disturbance of waters of the United States and state. Based on site development plans, improvement of the existing road leading to the heliport and water tanks would avoid fill or waters of the United States, effects to wetlands, and effects to waters of the state. Road improvements are designed to be at least 65 feet from Hagen Creek to avoid indirectly and temporarily affecting water quality. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.3-4: Disturbance or loss of special-status plants from construction activities. Oak woodland and chaparral land cover within the project site may provide suitable habitat for special-status plants (holly-leaved ceanothus and Napa bluecurfs). Implementation of the project would occur within oak woodland and chaparral habitat that may provide habitat for these special-status plants. If these special-status species are present on the project site, construction activities could result in the habitat disturbance or loss of individuals. Loss of special-status plants would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.3-4: Avoid or minimize disturbance or loss of special-status plants from construction activities. The applicant shall implement the following mitigation measures in order to avoid or minimize impacts to special-status plant species, including holly-leaved ceanothus and Napa bluecurfs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Prior to construction and during the blooming period (February – October) for the special-status plant species with potential to occur on-site of the project, associated road improvements, and within 108 feet of the heliport, a qualified botanist shall conduct pre-construction surveys for special-status plants in areas where potentially suitable grassland and oak woodland habitat would be removed or disturbed by construction activities. Table 3.3-3 summarizes the normal blooming periods for special-status plant species with potential to occur on or near the project site, which generally indicates the optimal survey periods when the species are most identifiable. ▲ If no special-status plants are found, the botanist shall document the findings in a letter 	LTS

LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.3-5: Reduction in oak woodlands. The Oak Woodland Conservation Act and Napa County General Plan policies protect oak woodlands because of the species' importance to biodiversity and wildlife populations within California and Napa County. The project does not include removal of oak woodland. However, if during construction the proposed grading along the road to the heliport requires tree removal, the removal would occur within oak woodland land cover. If grading causes mortality of oak trees and reduces acreage of oak woodland within the project site, this would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>report to the County and the applicant, and no further mitigation will be required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ If special-status plant species are found that cannot be avoided during construction, the applicant shall consult with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to determine the appropriate mitigation measures for direct and indirect impacts that could occur as a result of project construction and shall implement the agreed-upon mitigation measures to achieve no net loss of occupied habitat or individuals. Mitigation measures may include preserving and enhancing existing populations, creation of off-site populations on project mitigation sites through seed collection or transplantation, and/or restoring or creating suitable habitat in sufficient quantities to achieve no net loss of occupied habitat and/or individuals. Potential mitigation sites could include suitable locations within or outside of the project area. A mitigation and monitoring plan shall be developed describing how unavoidable losses of special-status plants will be compensated. The mitigation plan shall be submitted to and approved by the County Planning, Building, and Environmental Services (PBES) Department prior to the issuance of the first grading permit for the project. ▲ If relocation efforts are part of the mitigation plan, the plan shall include details on the methods to be used, including collection, storage, propagation, receptor site preparation, installation, long-term protection and management, monitoring and reporting requirements, success criteria, and remedial action responsibilities should the initial effort fail to meet long-term monitoring requirements. <p>Success criteria for preserved and compensatory populations shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ The extent of occupied area and plant density (number of plants per unit area) in compensatory populations will be equal to or greater than the affected occupied habitat; and ▲ Compensatory and preserved populations will be self-producing. Populations will be considered self-producing when plants reestablish annually for a minimum of five years with no human intervention such as supplemental seeding. 	<p>LTS</p>

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>height (dbh) or 10 inches aggregate dbh and within the road improvement grading area. A circle with a radius measurement from the trunk of a tree to the tip of its longest limb shall constitute the dripline of the tree.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Grading, or dozer line similar to grading, beneath trees to be saved shall be given special attention. Every reasonable effort shall be made to avoid creating conditions adverse to a protected oak tree's health. The natural ground within the driplines of protected trees shall remain as undisturbed as possible. No grade cuts greater than one foot deep shall occur within the driplines of oak trees, and no grade cuts whatsoever shall occur within five feet of their trunks. ▲ Before grading or excavation within five feet outside the driplines of protected trees, root pruning shall be required at the limits of grading or excavation to cut roots cleanly to a depth of the excavation or 36 inches (whichever is less). Roots shall be cut by manually digging a trench and cutting exposed roots. ▲ Major roots two inches or greater in diameter encountered within the tree's dripline in the course of excavation from beneath trees that are not to be removed shall not be cut and will be kept moist and covered with earth as soon as possible. Roots one inch to two inches in diameter that are severed shall be trimmed and treated with pruning compound and covered with earth as soon as possible. ▲ All protected trees shall be given suitable guards around the bases of their trees to protect them during grading activities that involve heavy mechanized equipment. ▲ No vehicles, heavy equipment, or materials shall be driven, parked, or stockpiled within the dripline of a protected tree. ▲ To the extent practicable, and in consideration of other design requirements and constraints (such as meeting primary treatment objectives and needs, avoidance of other sensitive resources, etc.), the applicant shall attempt to design the dozer lines to minimize impacts to protected oak trees in oak woodland vegetation, particularly trees that contribute to the overstory canopy of this community. <p>To compensate for oak tree mortality, the following actions shall be taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Oak trees within the oak woodland cover type shall be monitored for five years after grading by a certified arborist. A copy of the report shall be submitted annually to the County PBES Department. If signs of tree mortality or signs of potential death occur within the grading area in the oak woodland cover type, 	

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.3-6: Disturbance or loss of wildlife migratory corridors. The project site is located within and at the edge of the Lake Marie-The Cedars/Adams Ridge Essential Connectivity Area (ECA). Construction of the helipad and hangar, and proposed helicopter use would not impede wildlife movement in the area because of the small project footprint (less than an acre) and the current high levels of human disturbance surrounding the project site. Noise levels created by helicopter overflights between 1,000 and 1,500 feet above the ground would not impede wildlife movement through the corridor because it would be comparable to existing noise sources such as large recreational vehicles, tractors, and trucks (LSA Associates, Inc. 2016). Because noise impacts from overflights and removal of vegetation would not disturb wildlife movement, survival, or reproduction throughout the corridor, impacts to wildlife corridors and movement would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	<p>the applicant shall replace oak woodland or preserves of like habitat and quality at the minimum 2:1 ratio for affected canopy area on the Palmaz property, as stipulated by Napa County General Plan Policy CON-24.</p> <p>No mitigation is required.</p>	LTS
<p>3.4 Noise</p>			
<p>Impact 3.4-1: Short-term, construction-related noise. Construction activities would be limited to the less noise-sensitive daytime hours, and construction activity would not expose any off-site noise-sensitive receptors to noise levels that exceed applicable standards established by Napa County. Therefore, project-related construction activity would not result in the exposure of noise-sensitive receptors to a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.4-2: Helicopter operations noise. Project operation would result in helicopter noise associated with approaches and departures occurring at the heliport. Noise modeling was conducted for all proposed flight paths for approach and departure procedures. Based on the modeling conducted, one existing sensitive receptor would be exposed to noise levels that exceed interior noise levels of 65 decibel (dB) single-event noise level (SEL) and, therefore, would experience increased risk of sleep disturbance. Further, helicopter use occurring along the proposed western and northeastern flight paths would result in maximum (L_{max}) noise levels that exceed applicable Napa County exterior noise standards during daytime and nighttime flights at existing sensitive receptors. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2: Reduce exposure to helicopter noise at residential land uses. To reduce noise impacts associated with nighttime helicopter use, all departure and arrival operations shall occur on the southeastern approach and shall be limited to the daytime hours between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m.</p>	LTS

LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>3.5 Air Quality</p>			
<p>Impact 3.5-1: Short-term, construction-generated emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG), oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), and particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}). The project's short-term construction-generated emissions would not exceed applicable significance thresholds for construction. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.5-2: Long-term operational emissions of ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Implementation of the project would not result in long-term operational emissions of ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5} that exceed applicable thresholds of significance (54 lbs/day for ROG and NO_x, 82 lbs/day for PM₁₀, and 54 lbs/day for PM_{2.5} exhaust) or substantially contribute to concentrations that exceed the national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS) or California ambient air quality standard (CAAQS). The project would result in net reductions in daily emissions. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.5-3: Exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants. Short-term construction activities would not result in substantial emissions of diesel PM, would be relatively temporary (i.e., three months for construction), and would not be located in close proximity to off-site sensitive receptors (i.e., nearby residences are located over 1,000 feet west of the project site). Toxic air contaminants (TACs) associated with long-term project operation would be intermittent and also would not be located in close proximity to off-site sensitive receptors. Therefore, levels of TACs from project-related construction and operations would not result in an increase in health risk exposure at off-site sensitive receptors. In addition, residents and workers at or near the project site would not be exposed to a level of cancer, chronic, or acute risk from the combination of nearby TAC sources that exceed applicable thresholds. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.5-4: Exposure of sensitive receptors to odors. The project would not result in substantial odors in the area nor locate receptors where they would be exposed to substantial objectionable odors. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>3.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions</p>			
<p>Impact 3.6-1: Project-generated greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The project would result in a net reduction in annual GHG emissions during the lifetime of the project in comparison to existing conditions. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in a substantial cumulative contribution to GHG emissions and would be consistent with the objective of Napa County General Plan Policy CON-65, which aims to reduce GHG emissions in the County. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.6-2: Impacts of climate change on the project. Climate change is expected to result in a variety of effects that would influence conditions on the project site. These effects include increased temperatures, increased wildfire risk and sea level rise, and changes to timing and intensity of precipitation, resulting in increased stormwater runoff. However, numerous State and County programs and policies are in place to protect the project against and respond to wildland fire and erosion because of stormwater runoff. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>3.7 Hazards and Safety</p>			
<p>Impact 3.7-1: Create a safety hazard for individuals residing or working in the project area. The proposed approach and departure paths and flight techniques would limit low flights over nearby residences and other sensitive uses. In addition, the project as proposed includes avoidance of the Olive Hill rural area to the greatest extent possible as a "No Fly Zone." With these flight measures in place, the project would not create a substantial safety hazard for individuals residing or working in the project area. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.7-2: Expose people or structures to wildland fire. The project site is located adjacent to wildlands on Mt. George in an area designated by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) as having a moderate fire potential. No aspect of the project would be manned or inhabited, use would be limited to a maximum of four roundtrip flights per week, and all buildings would be required to meet applicable building standards that include fire protection measures. Finally, the project includes appropriate fire suppression facilities (e.g., hydrant, water storage tanks) in the event of a fire. Because sufficient design measures are in place and operations at the facility would be limited, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<p>Mitigation Measures from Initial Study</p>			
<p>Cultural Resources. Considering the project area is typically underlain by volcanic rock within 10 centimeters of ground surface and has been previously disturbed by viticulture and by roadway and retaining wall construction, the potential for the discovery of buried archaeological materials within the project area is considered to be low. Nonetheless, it is possible that subsurface cultural resources could be located in the project area. Such archaeological resources could be undisturbed beneath the project site. Removal of the existing surface material during grading and excavation activities could encounter (and possibly damage or destroy) subsurface archaeological resources.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure CUL-1: ▲ In accordance with CEQA Subsection 15064.5(f), should cultural resources be encountered during ground disturbing activities, work shall be halted within 50 feet of the find and a qualified archaeologist (36 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Part 61) and the County PBES Department shall be notified immediately to assess the significance of the find. Construction activities could continue in other areas. If the discovery proves to be significant, additional work, such as data recovery excavation, may be warranted and would be discussed in</p>	LTS

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
		<p>consultation with the property owner and the recognized Native American Tribe, and would be subject to prior approval by the County PBES Department and any other relevant regulatory agency, as appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Should paleontological resources be discovered during ground disturbing activities for the project, work must be halted in that area within 50 feet of the find and a qualified paleontologist and the County PBES Department notified immediately to evaluate the find. Construction activities could continue in other areas. If the discovery proves to be significant under Society of Vertebrate Paleontology criteria, additional work, such as fossil recovery excavation, may be warranted and would be discussed in consultation with the property owner, Napa County PBES Department, and/or any other relevant regulatory agency, as appropriate. ▲ If human remains are encountered, the Napa County Coroner shall be notified of the find immediately to determine if an investigation of the cause of death is required and/or if the remains are of Native American origin. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, if such remains are of Native American origin, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendent (MLD). The MLD shall complete the inspection of the site within 48 hours of notification and may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials. ▲ All persons working on-site shall be bound by contract and instructed in the field to adhere to these provisions and restrictions. 	

LTS = Less than significant PS = Potentially significant S = Significant

**Supplemental General Plan Consistency Analysis
 Palmaz Personal Use Heliport, Use Permit Application #P14-00261**

General Plan Policy	Project Site	Mt. George Alternative Site
<p>AG/LU-3: <i>The County’s planning concepts and zoning standards shall be designed to minimize conflicts arising from encroachment of urban uses into agricultural areas. Land in proximity to existing urbanized areas currently in mixed agricultural and rural residential uses will be treated as buffer areas, and further parcelization of these areas will be discouraged.</i></p> <p>AG/LU-27: <i>For purposes of this General Plan, the terms “urbanized” or “urbanizing” shall include the subdivision, use, or development of any parcel of land for non-agricultural purposes. Engaging in nature-based recreation or agriculturally compatible uses that are permitted in the applicable zoning district without the issuance of a use permit, such as development of one single-family house and/or second unit on an existing legal lot, shall not be considered urbanizing.</i></p>	<p>Substantially Consistent with Mitigation: The Project would include construction of a personal use heliport on land zoned for agricultural development. While the heliport would not be the primary development on the parcel (primary land uses would remain single-family residential and three acres of vineyards), it would represent a secondary, conditionally permitted use that is non-agricultural. General Plan Policy AG/LU-3 promotes implementation of planning concepts that “minimize conflicts” between agricultural and non-agricultural uses in agricultural areas. The use permit, a requirement for the Project, provides one mechanism for allowing the County to adopt conditions of approval that would be specific to the unique circumstances of the subject use permit request, and that would reduce or eliminate potential land use conflicts. For the Project, such conditions would include the voluntary measures proposed by the applicant (limitations on weekly number of flights, establishment of a No-Fly Zone), as well as EIR mitigation measures (restrictions on flight paths and hours of operation) that would primarily serve to reduce noise impacts of helicopter operations on the rural residential environment surrounding the Project site.</p>	<p>Substantially Consistent: As with the Project, the Mt. George Alternative would include construction of a personal use heliport on land zoned for agricultural development. Also like the Project, the heliport would not be a primary use on the site, in that it would occupy less than an acre of the 46-acre parcel, roughly one-third of which is planted with vineyards as the primary land use. The Mt. George Alternative scenario would also require approval of a conditional use permit; however, because the Alternative site is more remote and is a greater distance from sensitive receptors (compared to the Project), noise mitigation restricting hours and flight paths required for the Project would not be imposed on the Alternative. The applicant’s voluntary measures (limitations on the weekly number of flights, establishment of a No-Fly Zone) would be conditions of approval of the Mt. George Alternative as components of the scope of the use permit request.</p>

General Plan Policy	Project Site	Mt. George Alternative Site
<p>AG/LU-4: <i>The County will reserve agricultural lands for agricultural use including lands used for grazing and watershed/open space, except for those lands which are shown on the Land Use Map as planned for urban development.</i></p>	<p>Potentially Inconsistent: The Project would result in conversion of 0.53 acre of existing vineyards to a non-agricultural, personal use heliport. The EIR recommends a mitigation measure that would require the applicant to permanently preserve equivalent farmland acreage to that converted; however, that small area of land converted to the heliport would result in agricultural land not being reserved for agricultural use. See discussion of Policy AG/LU-9, below.</p>	<p>Substantially Consistent: The Mt. George Alternative site is located on agricultural land but it is not designated as farmland of state-wide or local importance. Rather, it is mapped as “Other Lands.” Construction of the heliport at the Mt. George Alternative site would utilize approximately one acre of land that was previously disturbed as a cave spoils deposition site for the applicant’s winery on an adjacent parcel. None of the existing vineyard plantings on the Mt. George Alternative site would be removed to accommodate construction and operation of the heliport at this location.</p>

General Plan Policy	Project Site	Mt. George Alternative Site
<p>AG/LU-9: <i>The County shall evaluate discretionary development projects, re-zonings, and public projects to determine their potential for impacts on farmlands mapped by the State Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program [FMMP], while recognizing that the state’s farmland terminology and definitions are not always the most relevant to Napa County, and shall avoid converting farmland where feasible. Where conversion of farmlands mapped by the state cannot be avoided, the County shall require long-term preservation of one acre of existing farm land of equal or higher quality for each acre of state-designated farmland that would be converted to nonagricultural uses. This protection may consist of establishment of farmland easements or other similar mechanism, and the farmland to be preserved shall be located within the County and preserved prior to the proposed conversion. The County shall recommend this measure for implementation by the cities and town and Local Agency Formation Commission of Napa County (LAFCO) as part of annexations involving state-designated farmlands.</i></p>	<p>Consistent with Mitigation: Portions of the Project are mapped by the State as Prime Farmland or Farmland of Local Importance. Construction of the Project would result in removal of existing agricultural plantings (grape vines) to provide area for the heliport, resulting in 0.53 acres of state-mapped farmlands to non-agricultural use. As recommended in the EIR analysis of the Project, and consistent with the General Plan Policy, the Project would be conditioned to require the applicant to permanently preserve an equivalent area of mapped farmland to that removed to accommodate the Project.</p>	<p>Consistent: The Mt. George Alternative site is not designated farmland; rather, it is mapped as “Other Land” in the State FMMP. Construction of the heliport on the Mt. George Alternative site would not require removal or relocation of existing agricultural land use nor convert any existing, productive farmland acreage to a non-agricultural use.</p>

General Plan Policy	Project Site	Mt. George Alternative Site
<p>AG/LU-12: <i>No new non-agricultural use or development of a parcel located in an agricultural area shall be permitted unless it is needed for the agricultural use of the parcel, except as provided in Policies AG/LU-2, AG/LU-5, AG/LU-26, AG/LU-44, AG/LU-45 and ROS-1.</i></p>	<p>Substantially Consistent: The Project would introduce a personal use heliport onto a 220.4-acre parcel that currently has permitted uses (single-family residence and vineyards). While the heliport is a new non-agricultural use and would not be used in support of the agricultural activities on the property, it would be subordinate to the permitted uses on the property and would occupy a smaller footprint on the parcel than do the permitted uses on-site. The residential and agricultural uses on the property would be maintained with the Project and would remain the predominant and primary development and use of the property. Operations under the Project would be exclusively for the property owner's personal aircraft.</p>	<p>Potentially Inconsistent: The Mt. George Alternative scenario would introduce the personal use heliport onto a smaller, 46-acre parcel that also currently has a use (approximately 15-acre vineyard) that is permitted by and consistent with the property's zoning. While the heliport is a new non-agricultural use and would not be used in support of the agricultural activities on the property, it would be subordinate to the existing permitted use on the property and would occupy a smaller footprint on the parcel than does the permitted use on-site, such that the agricultural use on the property would remain the predominant and primary development of the site. As with the Project, operations under the Mt. George Alternative would be exclusively for the property owner's personal aircraft.</p>

General Plan Policy	Project Site	Mt. George Alternative Site
<p>AG/LU-20: <i>The following standards shall apply to lands designated as Agriculture, Watershed, and Open Space on the Land Use Map of this General Plan:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Intent: To provide areas where the predominant use is agriculturally oriented; where watersheds are protected and enhanced; where reservoirs, floodplain tributaries, geologic hazards, soil conditions, and other constraints make the land relatively unsuitable for urban development; where urban development would adversely impact all such uses; and where the protection of agriculture, watersheds and floodplain tributaries from fire, pollution, and erosion is essential to the general health, safety and welfare.</i> - <i>General Uses: Agriculture, processing of agricultural products, single-family dwellings.</i> 	<p>Substantially Consistent: The Project would construct a personal use heliport on approximately one acre of a 220.4-acre parcel. The existing single-family residence, ornamental landscaping adjacent to the residence, and three acres of vineyards would remain the primary land uses of the parcel and would occupy a larger area on-site than the proposed heliport. Accessory elements to the Project would include bioretention areas for water quality preservation, and improvement of the existing vineyard access road to meet current standards for emergency response access. All site construction associated with the Project would comply with designated stream setbacks established in the County’s Conservation Regulations (County Code Chapter 18.108).</p>	<p>Substantially Consistent: The Mt. George Alternative would construct a personal use heliport on approximately one acre of a 46-acre parcel. The existing, approximately 15 acres of vineyards would remain the primary land use of the parcel and would occupy a larger area on-site than the proposed heliport. Accessory elements to the Mt. George Alternative would include bioretention areas for water quality preservation, and improvement of the existing vineyard access roads to meet current standards for emergency response access. All site construction associated with the Mt. George Alternative would comply with designated stream setbacks established in the County’s Conservation Regulations (County Code Chapter 18.108).</p>

General Plan Policy	Project Site	Mt. George Alternative Site
<p>AG/LU-26: <i>The County will discourage proposed urban developments which require urban services outside of existing urbanized areas. However, nothing in this Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element is intended to preclude the construction of a single-family residence, on an existing, vacant, legal parcel of land in compliance with adopted County ordinances and other applicable regulations, except on designated park land. Pursuant to State law, small child care centers are considered residential uses. Where maximum dwelling unit densities are specified in this General Plan, the population density is determined by multiplying the allowable number of dwelling units times the average persons per household in the unincorporated County as determined by the most recent U.S. Census.</i></p>	<p>Substantially Consistent: The Project is a conditionally-permitted, non-agricultural use on property located outside of a municipal boundary. Water demand would be limited to water storage for emergency fire response; the Project would not have any other water needs nor result in wastewater generation because it would not be plumbed with restroom facilities nor be occupied by any person. As a non-residential use that would not increase population in the area, there would be no impacts to schools or parks. As it includes a new structure, the Project might require responsive services from Cal-Fire in the event of a fire emergency. However, as noted, the Project includes a tank for storage of water for fire suppression and other road improvements (fire truck turnaround at the helipad location, heliport access road improvements that include paving and a mid-road turnout) that were designed in conformance with Napa County Road and Street Standards, the intent of which is to ensure adequate emergency access to and around project sites. If the Project is approved, the associated hangar building would also be subject to review by Cal-Fire staff for conformance with requirements of the Fire Code.</p>	<p>Substantially Consistent: The Mt. George Alternative consists of a conditionally-permitted, non-agricultural use on property located outside of a municipal boundary. Water demand would be limited to water storage for emergency fire response; the Alternative scenario would not have any other water needs nor result in wastewater generation because it would not be plumbed with restroom facilities nor be occupied by any person. As a non-residential use that would not increase population in the area, there would be no impacts to schools or parks. As it includes a new structure, the Mt. George Alternative might require responsive services from Cal-Fire in the event of a fire emergency. However, as noted, the Mt. George Alternative includes tanks for storage of water for fire suppression and other road improvements (fire truck turnaround at the helipad location, heliport access road improvements that include paving and intermittent road turnouts) that were designed in conformance with Napa County Road and Street Standards, the intent of which is to ensure adequate emergency access to and around project sites. If the Mt. George Alternative is approved, the associated hangar building would also be subject to review by Cal-Fire staff for conformance with requirements of the Fire Code.</p>

General Plan Policy	Project Site	Mt. George Alternative Site
<p>CIR-4: <i>The County supports a coordinated approach to land use and circulation planning to promote a healthier community by encouraging walking, bicycling, and other forms of transportation which decrease motor vehicle use.</i></p>	<p>Potentially Consistent: The Project would locate a heliport adjacent to the applicant's residence, significantly reducing driving distance compared to the length of the vehicle trip to the Napa County Airport, where the applicant currently stores his aircraft. The intent of the policy being to promote alternative transportation modes that require greater activity and produce fewer carbon emissions, the Project would include use of a helicopter for personal transportation and would result in carbon emissions from burning of fuel by the aircraft. The Project has the potential to limit carbon emissions compared to current conditions, in that the use permit, if approved, would include a restriction on the number of helicopter flights to eight (inbound or outbound) per week. In the existing condition, flights are unrestricted and could include more than eight trips in any given week without penalty to the operator, resulting in a greater quantity of aircraft emissions relative to the Project. For either the Project or continuance of the existing condition, carbon emissions would be generated from the operation of the helicopter.</p>	<p>Potentially Consistent: The Mt. George Alternative would locate a heliport approximately one mile east and uphill of the applicant's residence, reducing driving distance compared to the length of the vehicle trip on surface streets to the Napa County Airport, where the applicant currently stores his aircraft. The intent of the policy being to promote alternative transportation modes that require greater activity and produce fewer carbon emissions, the Mt. George Alternative would include use of a helicopter for personal transportation and would result in carbon emissions from burning of fuel by the aircraft. The Project has the potential to limit carbon emissions compared to current conditions, in that the use permit, if approved, would include a restriction on the number of helicopter flights to eight (inbound or outbound) per week. In the existing condition, flights are unrestricted and could include more than eight trips in any given week without penalty to the operator, resulting in a greater quantity of aircraft emissions relative to the Mt. George Alternative. For either the Mt. George Alternative or continuance of the existing condition, carbon emissions would be generated from the operation of the helicopter.</p>
<p>CC-46: <i>Noise created by the construction of new transportation noise sources (such as new roadways or new rail service) shall be mitigated so as not to exceed maximum acceptable outdoor or indoor noise levels for existing noise-sensitive land uses [specified in policies CC-38 and CC-39 and County Code Chapter 8.16]. Mitigation may include the retrofitting of existing buildings with noise insulation to maintain interior quiet.</i></p>	<p>Consistent with Mitigation: EIR analysis of the Project concluded that the Project has potential to generate noise levels that exceed acceptable County thresholds identified in the General Plan and County Code. Restriction of helicopter approaches and departures to a southeastern flight path, during daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) only, would reduce the impact to less than significant and avoid exceedances of specified County noise thresholds.</p>	<p>Consistent: The analysis in the EIR did not identify any potentially significant noise impacts of the Mt. George Alternative. Thus, no mitigation is required for heliport operations at the Mt. George Alternative site.</p>

General Plan Policy	Project Site	Mt. George Alternative Site
<p>CON-6: <i>The County shall impose conditions on discretionary projects which limit development in environmentally sensitive areas such as those adjacent to rivers or streamside areas and physically hazardous areas such as floodplains, steep slopes, high fire risk areas and geologically hazardous areas.</i></p>	<p>Consistent: The heliport and related facilities of the Project would comply with stream setback standards of the County’s Conservation Regulations (County Code Chapter 18.108) and would be outside of a floodplain. The Project site is in an area identified by the state as having a moderate fire hazard potential. The Project would incorporate elements (water storage and building fire suppression systems, access roads and turnarounds for emergency response vehicles) to facilitate emergency responders’ access during a fire emergency. No aircraft fueling would occur on-site.</p>	<p>Consistent: The heliport and related facilities of the Mt. George Alternative would comply with stream setback standards of the County’s Conservation Regulations (County Code Chapter 18.108) and would be outside of a floodplain. The Mt. George Alternative site is in an area identified by the state as having a very high fire hazard potential. The Alternative would incorporate elements (water storage and building fire suppression systems, access roads and turnarounds for emergency response vehicles) to facilitate emergency responders’ access during a fire emergency. No aircraft fueling would occur on-site.</p>

General Plan Policy	Project Site	Mt. George Alternative Site
<p>CON-13: <i>The County shall require that all discretionary residential, commercial, industrial, recreational, agricultural, and water development projects consider and address impacts to wildlife habitat and avoid impacts to fisheries and habitat supporting special-status species to the extent feasible. Where impacts to wildlife and special-status species cannot be avoided, projects shall include effective mitigation measures and management plans including provisions to [provide protection of habitats through buffering, replacement of habitats of like quantity and quality, and enhance existing habitat values].</i></p> <p>CON-24: <i>Maintain and improve oak woodland habitat to provide for slope stabilization, soil protection, species diversity, and wildlife habitat through appropriate measures include one or more of the following:</i></p> <p>(a) <i>Preserve, to the extent feasible, oak trees and other significant vegetation that occur near the heads of drainages or depressions to maintain diversity of vegetation type and wildlife habitat as part of agricultural projects.</i></p>	<p>Consistent with Mitigation: The EIR's analysis of the Project identified potentially significant impacts to holly-leaved ceanothus and Napa bluecurls, two special-status plants that were found or that have the potential to occur on the Project site. The EIR also identifies potential impacts to oak woodlands as a result of Project construction. Mitigation measures recommended to reduce the potential biological impacts of the Project include pre-construction surveys, avoidance wherever possible, consultation with California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), relocation of specimens (if required by CDFW), and protection of mature oak trees during construction.</p>	<p>Consistent with Mitigation: The EIR's analysis of the Mt. George Alternative identified potentially significant impacts to holly-leaved ceanothus and Napa bluecurls that were found or that have the potential to occur on the Alternative site. The EIR also identifies potential impacts to oak woodlands as a result of construction of the Alternative. Mitigation measures recommended to reduce the potential biological impacts of the Mt. George Alternative include pre-construction surveys, avoidance wherever possible, consultation with California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), relocation of specimens (if required by CDFW), and protection of mature oak trees during construction.</p>

General Plan Policy	Project Site	Mt. George Alternative Site
<p>CON-18: <i>To reduce impacts on habitat conservation and connectivity, the County shall require discretionary projects to retain movement corridors of adequate size and habitat quality to allow for continued wildlife use based on the needs of the species occupying the habitat.</i></p>	<p>Consistent with Mitigation: As discussed in relation to policies CON-13 and AG/LU-20, above, the Project would be conditioned to comply with mitigation measures requiring protection or avoidance of special-status plants and mature oak trees that have potential to provide habitat for wildlife. Construction of Project improvements would comply with minimum stream setbacks designated in County Code (Chapter 18.108).</p>	<p>Consistent with Mitigation: As discussed in relation to policies CON-13 and AG/LU-20, above, the Mt. George Alternative would be conditioned to comply with mitigation measures requiring protection or avoidance of special-status plants and mature oak trees that have potential to provide habitat for wildlife. Construction of improvements associated with the Mt. George Alternative would comply with minimum stream setbacks designated in County Code (Chapter 18.108).</p>

General Plan Policy	Project Site	Mt. George Alternative Site
<p>CON-45: <i>Protect the County’s domestic supply drainages through vegetation preservation and protective buffers to ensure clean and reliable drinking water consistent with state regulations and guidelines. Continue implementation of current Conservation Regulations relevant to these areas, such as vegetation retention requirements, consultation with water purveyors/system owners, implementation of erosion controls to minimize water pollution, and prohibition of detrimental recreational uses.</i></p> <p>CON-48: <i>Proposed developments shall implement project-specific sediment and erosion control measures (e.g., erosion control plans and/or stormwater pollution prevention plans) that maintain pre-development sediment erosion conditions or at a minimum comply with the state water quality pollution control (i.e., Basin Plan) requirements and are protective of the County’s sensitive domestic supply watersheds. Technical reports and/or erosion control plans that recommend site-specific erosion control measures shall meet the requirements of the County Code and provide detailed information regarding site specific geologic, soil and hydrologic conditions and how the proposed measure will function.</i></p>	<p>Consistent: The Project includes a bioretention facility for stormwater quality, and all proposed site improvements necessary for the heliport would be compliant with the stream setback standards in the County’s Conservation Regulations (County Code Chapter 18.108).</p>	<p>Consistent: The Mt. George Alternative includes a bioretention facility for stormwater quality, and all proposed site improvements necessary for the heliport would be compliant with the stream setback standards in the County’s Conservation Regulations (County Code Chapter 18.108).</p>

General Plan Policy	Project Site	Mt. George Alternative Site
<p>SAF-20: <i>All new development shall comply with established fire safety standards. Design plans shall be referred to the appropriate fire agency for comment as to: 1) adequacy of water supply; 2) site design for fire department access in and around structures; 3) ability for a safe and efficient fire department response; 4) traffic flow and ingress/egress for residents and emergency vehicles; 5) site-specific built-in fire protection; 6) potential impacts to emergency services and fire department response.</i></p>	<p>Consistent: Improvements proposed with the Project include tanks for storage of water for fire suppression, as well as a fire truck turnaround at the helipad location and heliport access road improvements that include paving and a mid-road turnout in compliance with Napa County Road and Street Standards.</p>	<p>Consistent: Improvements proposed with the Mt. George Alternative include a tank for storage of water for fire suppression, as well as a fire truck turnaround at the helipad location and access road improvements that include paving and intermittent turnouts along the length of private roadway to the heliport, in compliance with Napa County Road and Street Standards.</p>

General Plan Policy Abbreviations:
AG/LU – Agriculture and Land Use Element
CC – Community Character Element
CON – Conservation Element
SAF – Safety Element
CIR - Circulation Element