

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## INTRODUCTION

This summary is provided in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15123. As stated in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(a), “an environmental impact report (EIR) shall contain a brief summary of the proposed actions and its consequences. The language of the summary should be as clear and simple as reasonably practical.” As required by the Guidelines, this section includes: (1) a summary description of the project; (2) a synopsis of environmental impacts and recommended mitigation measures; (3) identification of the alternatives evaluated and of the environmentally superior alternative; and (4) a discussion of the areas of controversy associated with the project.

## SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The Amalia Palmaz Living Trust (the applicant) is proposing to construct a non-commercial, private-use heliport, inclusive of a helipad and hangar building for personal use on private property in unincorporated Napa County (County). Accessory structures and facilities would include: a new fire hydrant; a new water line connecting to the existing water line; and two, 5,000-gallon water tanks for fire suppression. Additionally, the existing vineyard road would be widened and paved, and several existing retaining walls would be removed.

## Project Objectives

The project applicant has developed the following objectives for the 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.

## Project Location

The project site is located at 4031 Hagen Road (Assessor’s Parcel No. 033-110-080) in unincorporated Napa County. The property is owned by the Amalia Palmaz Living Trust and is located east of the intersection of Hagen Road and Olive Hill Lane, and approximately 3.8 miles northeast of downtown Napa. Approximately one acre of the approximately 220.4-acre parcel would be used for project construction. Access to the project site is provided via an existing vineyard road from Hagen Road.

## Project Characteristics

The applicant proposes to construct a private helipad and hangar for personal use. The project would require removal of approximately 0.36 acre of existing vineyards. The following project components are proposed:

- ▲ **Helipad:** Construction of a landing and take off area for the helicopter. Portions of the surrounding area would be paved with asphalt concrete or resurfaced with permeable material.
- ▲ **Hangar:** Construction of a 3,150-square-foot hangar for helicopter storage. The hangar would be a one-story structure with a peaked roof built into the hillside, behind the helipad, and would have an attached, 855-square-foot storage area.
- ▲ **Accessory structures and facilities:** Installation of a new fire hydrant; a new water line from the new hydrant and connecting to the existing water line; two, 5,000-gallon water tanks for fire suppression; and a bioretention basin.
- ▲ **Driveway improvements:** The existing, unpaved vineyard road would be widened and paved, and several existing retaining walls would be removed.

The project would include limited nighttime security lighting on the hangar building consistent with existing security lighting at the site, and would not substantially increase the amount of glare or nighttime lighting in the project vicinity, as this lighting is proposed by the applicant to be shielded and focused downward. Additionally, low-intensity lights would illuminate both the touchdown and lift-off area (TLOF) and final approach and takeoff (FATO) areas. These lights would be sunken light-emitting diode (LED) fixtures that sit flush with the concrete surface. They would not produce a sky glow nor 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.

The project would require minimal water (the above-mentioned water tanks would be for emergency fire suppression only) and would not generate any wastewater. Proposed stormwater improvements are described in Chapter 2, “Project Description.”

It is anticipated that the helipad would be used for a maximum of four arrivals and four departures per week. Operations may fluctuate based on many factors (including weather, wind, visibility, and cloud ceiling) but would not exceed four inbound and four outbound flights weekly. All maintenance of the aircraft would occur off-site (approximately one to two times per year) at a Federal Aviation Administration-approved facility in Woodland, California. No employees would be required for project operation.

Project construction would occur over a three-month period, anticipated to begin in fall 2016.

## Potential Approvals and Permits Required

Several agencies would be involved in the consideration of project elements. As the lead agency under CEQA, Napa County is responsible for considering the adequacy of the EIR and determining if the overall project should be approved.

Permits and approvals may be required from the following agencies for project construction:

### Federal

- ▲ **Federal Aviation Administration:** Airspace determination.

### STATE

- ▲ **Bay Area Air Quality Management District:** Authority to construct (for devices that emit air pollutants); permit to operate.

- ▲ **California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 3:** Compliance with the California Endangered Species Act (ESA); potential permits under Section 2081 of the Fish and Game Code if take of listed species is likely to occur.

## LOCAL

- ▲ **Napa County:** Approval of a use permit for the personal use heliport; approval of an exception to the County Road and Street Standards to allow the slope of the access road to exceed 16 percent; and approval of various ministerial approvals, including but not limited to building permits and grading permits for construction of the facility.
- ▲ **Napa County Airport Land Use Commission:** Review to determine whether a compatibility plan would need to be developed for the project.

The project to be considered for approval by the Napa County Planning Commission is described in Chapter 2, “Project Description.” If any changes to the project as described in Chapter 2 are proposed subsequent to project approval, subsequent environmental review may be required, subject to determination by the County.

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES

Table ES-1, at the end of this chapter, provides a summary of the environmental impacts of the project, the level of significance of the impact before mitigation, recommended mitigation measures, and the level of significance of the impact after the implementation of the mitigation measures.

## SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

Alternatives to the project that are evaluated in this DEIR include:

- ▲ **No Project Alternative**, which assumes no new development occurs on the project site; and
- ▲ **Mt. George Alternative**, which assumes a new helipad and hangar (similar to the project) would be constructed on an alternative site on Mt. George, approximately one mile uphill from the project site.

The following summary provides brief descriptions of the alternatives. For a more thorough discussion of project alternatives, see Chapter 6, “Alternatives.”

### No Project Alternative

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(1) requires that the no project alternative be described and analyzed “to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the project with the impacts of not approving the project.” The no project analysis is required to discuss “the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published...as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services” (Section 15126.6[e][2]).

Under this 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.

## Mt. George Alternative

Under the Mt. George Alternative, the project 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. Both sites are within the boundaries of parcels owned by the Amalia Palmaz Living Trust. Access to the alternative site would be provided to the south by existing private 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.

Under this alternative, the hangar and adjoining storage area would be slightly larger than the proposed project, with approximately 4,080 square feet (as compared to 4,005 square feet for the 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 TLOF and FATO areas for 15 minutes at a time when the pilot is on final approach.

Accessory facilities would include a wet draft style hydrant system attached to a 5,000-gallon poly-tank, both located west of the hangar; a 500-square-foot bioretention basin; and roadway improvements to the vineyard road.

Operation of this alternative would be the same as that described for the project, with a maximum of four arrivals and four departures per week.

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 terrain, the alternate site would require less earth work because there is not as much earth to excavate. Additionally, it would not produce any spoils needing deposition.

## Environmentally Superior Alternative

The California Code of Regulations (CCR) 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 helipad 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 or avoided, when compared to the project. Regarding important farmlands, this alternative would not result 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 minimize noise impacts to surrounding residences to a greater degree than the proposed project, provide secure access to the helipad and equipment for emergency medical/fire responders, and maintain safety/security of the aircraft.

## AREAS OF CONCERN

In accordance with Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21092 and CCR Section 15082, the County issued a notice of preparation (NOP) on December 11 and 12, 2015, to inform agencies and the general public that an EIR was being prepared and to invite comments on the scope and content of the document (Appendix A). County staff accepted comments on the scope of the EIR between December 14, 2015 and January 21, 2016. A noticed scoping session for the EIR occurred on January 14, 2016.

Based on the comments received during the NOP comment period, the major areas of controversy associated with the project are:

- ▲ County enforcement rights over project operations,
- ▲ land use conflicts arising from helicopter use in a rural residential area,
- ▲ effects on property values,
- ▲ commercial use of the helipad and hangar,
- ▲ noise impacts to surrounding residential area,
- ▲ noise impacts on wildlife,
- ▲ public safety impacts from helicopter crashes and wildfires,
- ▲ cumulative effects of the County approving additional heliports, and
- ▲ alternatives to the project (including continued use of the Napa County Airport).

Areas of concern that fall within the scope of CEQA are addressed in this DEIR. Issues that fall outside the scope of CEQA are not evaluated in this DEIR; however, the County will continue to respond to all of these issues through the entitlement process.

All of the substantive environmental issues raised in the NOP comment letters and at the scoping session have been addressed or otherwise considered during preparation of this DEIR (see Scoping Comment Matrix in Appendix A).

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
<b>3.2 Land Use and Agricultural Resources</b>			
<b>Impact 3.2-1: Conflict with relevant plans, policies, and zoning adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.</b> 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.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.2-2: Conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.</b> 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.	PS	<b>Mitigation Measure 3.2-2: Minimize impacts to important farmland.</b> The applicant shall implement the measures listed below with regard to important farmland to minimize project-related impacts on these lands: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	LTS
<b>3.3 Biological Resources</b>			
<b>Impact 3.3-1: Loss or disturbance of individuals or nests of special-status birds.</b> 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	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
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.			
<b>Impact 3.3-2: Loss or disturbance of bat colonies.</b> 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.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.3-3: Loss and/or modification of streamside habitat and fill or other disturbance of waters of the United States and state.</b> Based on site development plans, improvement of the existing road leading to the heliport and water tanks would avoid fill of 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.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.3-4: Disturbance or loss of special-status plants from construction activities.</b> Oak woodland and chaparral land cover within the project site may provide suitable habitat for special-status plants (holly-leaved ceanothus and Napa bluecurls). 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.	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.3-4: Avoid or minimize disturbance or loss of special-status plants from construction activities.</b> 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 bluecurls:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ 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 helipad, 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.</li> <li>▲ If no special-status plants are found, the botanist shall document the findings in a letter</li> </ul>	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>report to the County and the applicant, and no further mitigation will be required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ 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.</li> <li>▲ 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.</li> </ul> <p>Success criteria for preserved and compensatory populations shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ 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</li> <li>▲ 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.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Impact 3.3-5: Reduction in oak woodlands.</b> 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>	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.3-5: Protect oak trees from grading and compensate for oak tree mortality.</b> To protect oak trees from grading activity, the following actions shall be taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ The applicant shall submit an oak tree protection plan to the County PBES Department concurrently with or prior to filing an application for the first grading permit for the project. The plan shall be subject to review and approval by the PBES Department prior to issuance of the grading permit.</li> <li>▲ Oak trees to be protected shall be greater than six inches diameter at breast</li> </ul>	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>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"> <li>▲ 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.</li> <li>▲ 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.</li> <li>▲ 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.</li> <li>▲ 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.</li> <li>▲ No vehicles, heavy equipment, or materials shall be driven, parked, or stockpiled within the dripline of a protected tree.</li> <li>▲ 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.</li> </ul> <p>To compensate for oak tree mortality, the following actions shall be taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ 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,</li> </ul>	

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
		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.	
<b>Impact 3.3-6: Disturbance or loss of wildlife migratory corridors.</b> 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.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<b>3.4 Noise</b>			
<b>Impact 3.4-1: Short-term, construction-related noise.</b> 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.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.4-2: Helicopter operations noise.</b> 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.	S	<b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2: Reduce exposure to helicopter noise at residential land uses.</b> 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.	LTS

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

<b>Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures</b>			
<b>Impacts</b>	<b>Significance before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance after Mitigation</b>
<b>3.5 Air Quality</b>			
<b>Impact 3.5-1: Short-term, construction-generated emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG), oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>), and particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>).</b> The project's short-term construction-generated emissions would not exceed applicable significance thresholds for construction. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.5-2: Long-term operational emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>.</b> Implementation of the project would not result in long-term operational emissions of ROG, NO <sub>x</sub> , PM <sub>10</sub> , or PM <sub>2.5</sub> that exceed applicable thresholds of significance (54 lbs/day for ROG and NO <sub>x</sub> , 82 lbs/day for PM <sub>10</sub> , and 54 lbs/day for PM <sub>2.5</sub> 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.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.5-3: Exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants.</b> 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.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.5-4: Exposure of sensitive receptors to odors.</b> 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.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<b>3.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>			
<b>Impact 3.6-1: Project-generated greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.</b> 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.	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
<b>Impact 3.6-2: Impacts of climate change on the project.</b> 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.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<b>3.7 Hazards and Safety</b>			
<b>Impact 3.7-1: Create a safety hazard for individuals residing or working in the project area.</b> 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 airspace over 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.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<b>Impact 3.7-2: Expose people or structures to wildland fire.</b> 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.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
<b>Mitigation Measures from Initial Study</b>			
<b>Cultural Resources.</b> 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.	PS	<b>Mitigation Measure CUL-1:</b> ▲ 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	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"> <li>▲ 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.</li> <li>▲ 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.</li> <li>▲ All persons working on-site shall be bound by contract and instructed in the field to adhere to these provisions and restrictions.</li> </ul>	

LTS = Less than significant

PS = Potentially significant

S = Significant

This page intentionally left blank.