

Ms. Dana Morrison, ALUC Executive Officer
July 16, 2024
Page 2

Our comments of the Draft Napa Countywide ALUCP for Napa County Airport and the Angwin Airport-Parrett Field are as follows:

Pages: 2-10, 2-11, 2-17, 2-18, 2-20, 2-21, 2-22, 2-23, 2-26

Policies: 2.4., 2.5., 2.8.1., 2.8.2.(b), 2.10.1., 2.10.2., 2.10.3., 2.10.4., 2.10.5., 2.12.3.

These policies infer to an Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) Executive Officer that has delegated authority from the ALUC to do the following: Provide formal consistency determinations and comments for major land use actions referred to the ALUC and to provide comments on proposed overruling decisions.

The PUC does not authorize the delegation of the ALUC's duty to anyone else, or in this case, an ALUC Executive Officer. PUC Section 21671.5 (e) states:

The commission shall meet at the call of the commission chairperson or at the request of the majority of the commission members. A majority of the commission members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. No action shall be taken by the commission except by the recorded vote of a majority of the full membership.

It is a requirement by law that participation of the majority of the commission members are to constitute a quorum to take any formal action, which includes consistency determinations. PUC, Section 21674, sets forth the powers and duties of the "commission" only.

The Division recognizes the intent of the ALUC Executive Officer to alleviate the workload of the ALUC and to review voluntary referrals, amongst other administrative matters for the ALUC. However, under no circumstances can the ALUC Executive Officer have delegated authority for actions that are mandatory by the ALUC. Please clarify the language in the relevant policies to provide added clarity on this differentiation and to avoid misinterpretation of the policies and subsequent actions, in addition to differentiate authority powers related to Major Land Use Actions, Interim Mandatory Referral of Major Land Use Actions, and Mandatory Land Use Actions.

Safety Zone D1 (Traffic Pattern Zone) and D2 (Other Airport Environs) Exhibit 4-2 – Compatibility Policy Map, Angwin Airport-Parrett Field

From an initial review of the Draft ALUCP it is noted that Zone D1 (Traffic Pattern Zone) only properly encompasses the right side of the runway and does not encompass the left side of the runway, as guided by the CA Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, per the State Aeronautics Act (SAA). The Handbook acts as the starting point for determining airport safety zones and compatibility policies. By not including Zone D1 on the left side, or Zone 6 per the Handbook safety zones, and instead classifying it as Zone D2 (Outer Airport Environs), this would be less restrictive than what the Handbook stipulates for Zone 6 and would not align with the Handbook safety zones. Zone 6 per the Handbook has no limits for residential densities therefore should not be a conflicting factor in expanding Zone D1 onto the other side of the runway.

Ms. Dana Morrison, ALUC Executive Officer
July 16, 2024
Page 3

While a single-sided traffic pattern may eliminate the turning zone on the non-pattern side of the runway, it still calls for some amount of buffer to be maintained (PG 3-23 2011 Handbook). Please also note Example 4 on Page 3-18 of the 2011 Handbook, the short General Aviation (GA) runway for a single sided traffic pattern eliminates zone 3 on one side but still contains the full dimensions of Safety Zone 6.

This variation creates a significant problem with the maximum densities and intensities identified for these zones and the compatibility policies of the Angwin Airport-Parrett Field. These ALUCP Zones need to be corrected to encompass at least the minimum areas stipulated in the Handbook on pages 3-17 through 3-19.

Sufficient aeronautical reason should be provided for any variations in the safety zones and their associated compatibility policies. As it stands, Safety Zones D1 and D2 are not in alignment with the guidance of safety zones as stipulated in the Handbook.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a partial review and comment on the Draft ALUCP for Napa County. A thorough review will subsequently be completed in a timely manner for further consideration by the ALUC and staff. We look forward to continuing our collaboration with the ALUC on these matters.

Sincerely,



Tiffany Martinez
Aviation Planner, Office of Aviation Planning
Division of Aeronautics
California Department of Transportation

c: Wendy Atkins, ALUC Staff Liaison, Napa County <Wendy.Atkins@countyofnapa.org>, Charles Koch, ALUC Chair, Napa County <charles.koch@countyofnapa.org>, Matthew Friedman, Office Chief, Office of Aviation Planning, Caltrans Division of Aeronautics <matthew.friedman@dot.ca.gov>, Tarek Tabshouri, Acting Division Chief, Caltrans Division of Aeronautics <tarek.tabshouri@dot.ca.gov>

bc: Cameron Oaks, Deputy Division Director, District 4 Division of Transportation Planning and Local Assistance <cameron.oakes@dot.ca.gov>, Alexandria Quackenbush, Meeting Clerk, Napa County <meetingclerk@countyofnapa.org>

Napa Countywide Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Update

Public Comment and Response Matrix

July 17, 2024

This attachment contains the public comments received on the *Draft Napa Countywide Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP)* dated May 2024 (Public Review Draft) and CEQA *Initial Study/Negative Declaration* dated June 2024 and their respective responses in the table on the following pages. Comments are presented verbatim.

Committer Information	Comment	Response	Recommended Action
<p>Name: Mike Conklin Representing: Sentinels of Freedom Comment Method: Phone call with D. Morrison 6/17/24 followed by email dated 6/19/24</p>	<p>Wednesday, June 19, 2024</p> <p>Dear Ms. Morrison,</p> <p>Thank you again for all your professional help and information with regards to our Napa property (25.44) acres zoned Light Industrial / APN 057-040-007.</p> <p>In reviewing the Draft Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Public Plan, by Mead & Hunt (May 2024), I have some questions I'd like to get answers to prior to the July 17th 2024 Public Hearing, regarding our parcel APN 057-040-007, and how if approved and implemented it would relate to any use changes less than the use of today's existing zoning.</p> <p>In reference to your email to me on June 18th 2024, you confirmed that the new designation in the recommendation from Mead & Hunt is that our parcel be newly designated as B2 . We are currently D1 or D2 , I'm not sure which.</p> <p>In the Napa County Airport Land Use Compatibility Public Draft Plan by Mead & Hunt, I see no specific mention of our parcel as it relates to this change and the possible impacts to our existing use designation. At this point we are looking at options of land use. Right now we are looking at Warehouse, RV & Boat and Industrial Storage as uses we see that fit the zoning on our parcel , which we believe is in general compliance with existing zoning through the application process of a Land Use Permit.</p> <p>I would like to request that Mead & Hunt provide clarification on the following questions.</p> <p>I'm requesting Mead & Hunt provide us with the internal discussions with the County and Airport Staff as to the work documents, meeting notes, records , in deciding this change with regards in specific to our parcel. In other words, please clarify the reasoning behind the change in destination from (D) to (B2).</p> <p>I'd like to see a side by side analysis of what we have now and what we will possibly lose with respect to existing use designation in the (D) category. By obtaining this</p>	<p>The proposed use of Warehouse, RV & Boat and Industrial Storage appears to be a compatible land use under the Draft Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (Draft ALUCP) as long as the average and single-acre intensity (people per acre) limits are met. Additional clarification for the two questions is included below.</p> <p>1. The adopted compatibility zones were based on guidance from the 1993 California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook. The draft compatibility zones were drawn based on the adopted Napa County Airport - Airport Layout Plan (ALP (Exhibit 7-3 of Draft ALUCP https://pbes.cloud/index.php/s/bPMDHF3fgEDER8A)) and updated criteria from the 2011 California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook (Handbook). Based on the ALP, the nearest runways to APN 057-040-007 are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1L/19R: 5,930' x 150' (existing and future) • 1R/19L: 2,510' x 75' (existing) and 4,301' x 75' (future) – extension on 1R end. <p>Changes to the compatibility zones on parcel 057-040-007 are directly related to the generic safety zone criteria in the Handbook (Figure 3A, p. 3-17 https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/aero-nautics/documents/californiaairportlanduseplanninghandbook-a11y.pdf) for a medium general aviation runway. The composite existing and future safety zones for all runways, based on the generic zones, were used to reassess the delineation of the compatibility zones. APN 057-040-007 is located within Handbook safety zone 3, inner turning zone. The draft compatibility zone extents and criteria were based on this zone and criteria guidance as outlined in the Handbook.</p> <p>2. See Attachment A-1 for site map. In the 1999 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), APN 057-040-007 is within Zone D and in the Draft ALUCP it within Zone B2. Residential uses were not allowed under the adopted ALUCP and this remains unchanged. Intensity criteria under the adopted plan Zone D allowed up to 100</p>	<p>No change proposed.</p>

PUBLIC COMMENT AND RESPONSE MATRIX ATTACHMENT A

Committer Information	Comment	Response	Recommended Action
	<p>information I hope to better understand where we stand in our planned development options.</p> <p>I hope everyone will understand that as Chairman & CEO of our organization , Sentinels of Freedom , a 501c3 , that this is my fiduciary responsibility to ask for this accommodation, and in no way to be considered as counter to the good of the public.</p> <p>My responsibility to our Board of Directors, Donors and the veterans we serve as to maintaining the value of our property rights should be easily respected.</p> <p>I hope this is not too much to ask, and I'm open for a phone call anytime to discuss with you my requests.</p> <p>Overall , the Mead & Hunt Draft looks to be very well done, and I congratulate you and the related of the Staff at Napa County for your dedication and professionalism with regard to said plan.</p> <p>Thank you again.</p> <p>Very Respectfully, Mike Conklin</p>	<p>people per acre on average and up to 150 on a single acre. The draft plan Zone B2 allows for up to 75 people on average per acre (decrease) and up to 225 people on a single acre (increase). The proposed new intensity criteria are consistent with Handbook guidance (Handbook Figure 4D, p.4-22).</p> <p>The parcel (APN 057-040-007) is zoned Industrial Park within the Airport Compatibility Overlay District, which applies Adopted 1991 ALUCP compatibility criteria. According to the land use matrix included in the draft ALUCP (Exhibit 5-1), non-residential uses including large assembly, educational and institutional uses, as well as high intensity commercial, and heavy or high intensity industrial uses are generally incompatible under the draft ALUCP. However, the primary difference between the adopted and draft ALUCPs is the lower average intensity criteria. Most of the allowed uses (Napa County Code of Ordinances §18.40.020) within the Industrial Park Zone, even those that require a use permit, would be allowed under the draft ALUCP, however, the lower intensity criteria must be met. A couple of land uses that could be considered incompatible include telecommunications facilities and primary-use commercial renewable energy facilities (excluding renewable energy such as solar that is an accessory use) both because of potential heights or electronic interference (telecommunications) that could interfere with aircraft and the possibility that an accident that destroys the facility could have far reaching effects on the community and public that depends on services the facility provides.</p>	

Committer Information	Comment	Response	Recommended Action
<p>Name: Mark Witsoe Representing: Napa County Airport Comment Method: July 9, 2024 letter (via email)</p>	<p>July 9, 2024</p> <p>Subject: Proposed ALUCP Support</p> <p>Dear Ms. Morrison,</p> <p>As the Napa County Airport Manager, I support the final draft of the proposed ALUCP as presented in the public workshop.</p> <p>The Project Development Team (PDT), for which I was a member, evaluated the proposed elements for conformance with the updated California handbook guidance and discussed the factors for which a functioning and growing airport should limit responsible developers. The PDT meetings included respectful dialogue on the growing pressures for development opportunity that are opposing the standing subjects of aviation safety, aircraft overflight, and noise-sensitive building occupancies.</p> <p>I support the proposed revisions to the Napa County Airport compatibility zones. This does not impart significant adverse impacts to future private land use. It also demonstrates reasonable flexibility in allowing expanded housing development (splitting D Zone into D1 and D2). The provided work aides (graphics) developed in the package are substantial improvements for staff administration of the ALUCP policies.</p> <p>As a member of the Project Development Team (PDT), PBES and Mead & Hunt as consultant did a great job creating the technical papers and moving the work through our thoughtful review. I look to follow the public process bringing forward community views about the ways in which property owners can make the best use of their land with a safe and thriving airport in their midst.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Mark Witsoe Mark Witsoe, A.A.E./CAE Airport Manager</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	<p>No action necessary.</p>
<p>Name: Mr. Glibreth</p>	<p>Mr. Gilbreth has stake in a property located in Napa County immediately adjacent to the City of American Canyon and</p>	<p>Napa County ALUC staff met with Mr. Gilbreth on July 12 to discuss the ALUCP update, the noticing that</p>	<p>No action necessary.</p>

PUBLIC COMMENT AND RESPONSE MATRIX ATTACHMENT A

Committer Information	Comment	Response	Recommended Action
<p>Representing: individual Comment Method: July 10 voicemail</p>	<p>he requested to speak with staff and hopefully discuss the possibility of a hearing continuance to have more time to review the document.</p>	<p>occurred in anticipation of the hearing and throughout the ALUCP update process, as well the uses deemed compatible under the existing and proposed ALUCP.</p> <p>The parcel is currently located in Zone D of the adopted ALUCP which does not deem any residential development compatible, other than those uses allowed by right in parcels with Agricultural Zoning (AW and AP): single-family residence, Accessory Dwelling Unit, Junior Accessory Dwelling Unit, guest house, various residential accessory structures, and upon granting of a Use Permit – Farmworker housing. Under the updated ALUCP the ~157 acre parcel will predominantly located in Zoned D1, and will have sections which are in Zone D2 (~15 acres) and Zone B1 (~2 acres).</p> <p>Zone D1 does deem compatible (normally compatible and conditionally compatible) development of short-term group lodging (hostels, shelter, farmworker housing), short-term lodging (hotels, motels and other transient lodgings), and long-term lodging (extended-stay hotels, dormitories). Long-term lodging and single family residential are considered Normally Compatible, while the two short-term options are conditionally compatible (need to ensure intensity criteria is met). Also, per Section 2.7.4 – Development by Right the parcel can also be developed with a single-family residence, accessory dwelling unit, Junior ADU, as others uses as noted in that section.</p> <p>Zone D2 does deem compatible (normally and conditionally) development of all that was mentioned above in Zone D1 as well single-family residential development and multi-family residential development. Both are considered conditionally compatible (need to ensure density criteria is met). D2 allows for 10-20 dwelling units per acre. With ~15 acres of Zone D2, there is the potential to develop 300 units on that section of the parcel and be deemed conditionally compatible. As noted earlier, the existing ALUCP Zone D does not allow for any residential development other than the by-right land uses allowed in agriculturally zoned parcel.</p>	

Committer Information	Comment	Response	Recommended Action
		<p>Zone B1 is more restrictive given that it is located in the Inner Approach/Departure Zone, but there are a variety of uses which are a considered conditionally compatible with that zone provided they meet various criteria. Agriculture, live stock uses, outdoor non-group recreation, local community parks, cemeteries (no chapels), limited retail/wholesale, offices, personal/miscellaneous services, fueling facilities, light industrial, R&D laboratories, indoor and outdoor storage, mining and extraction, transportation stations, transportation routes, and auto parking.</p> <p>Staff encouraged Mr. Gilbreth to submit an official comment to the ALUC.</p>	
<p>Name: Erin Chappell Representing: California Department of Fish & Wildlife (CDFW) Comment Method: July 10, 2024 letter (via email)</p>	<p>July 10, 2024</p> <p>Dear Ms. Morrison,</p> <p>The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) received an Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/ND) from Napa County (County) for the Napa County Airport Land Use Combability Plan (ALUCP) Update (Project) pursuant the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines. CDFW is submitting comments on the IS/ND to inform the County, as the Lead Agency, of potentially significant impacts to biological resources associated with the Project.</p> <p>CDFW ROLE</p> <p>CDFW is a Trustee Agency with responsibility under CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15386 for commenting on projects that could impact fish, plant, and wildlife resources. CDFW is also considered a Responsible Agency if a project would require discretionary approval, such as permits issued under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), the Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) Program, or other provisions of the Fish and Game Code that afford protection to the State’s fish and wildlife trust resources.</p> <p>PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY</p>	<p>As stated in Policy 2.7.3, the ALUCP does not apply to existing land uses, and thus, current land uses on CDFW properties are not significantly altered by the adoption of this Draft ALUCP. Furthermore, as stated in Policy 2.7.2 of the Draft ALUCP, “lands controlled (i.e. owned, leased, or in trust) by federal or state agencies or by Native American tribes are not subject to the provisions of the state ALUC statutes or this ALUCP”. Thus, impacts associated with the adoption of the ALUCP would not affect CDFW Properties, including impacts to the Napa-Sonoma Marshes Wildlife Area, the Fagan Slough Ecological Reserve, and the Napa Plant Site Restoration Project. To the extent CDFW may seek to expand restoration areas in the future within the AIA, and particularly with Zone A, they are encouraged to consider the ALUCP and FAA guidance regarding wildlife hazards.</p> <p>State agency conservation plans, such as the Sonoma Marshes Wildlife Area Land Management Plan, are not subject to ALUCP consistency requirements. Thus, consistency with the Sonoma Marshes Wildlife Area Land Management Plan is outside the scope of IS/MD analysis.</p> <p>The purpose of the ALUCP is to encourage the compatibility of future development with airport operations. The ALUCP therefore relies upon the adopted Airport Layout Plans and Airport Master Plans. It is noted</p>	<p>No change proposed.</p>

Committer Information	Comment	Response	Recommended Action
	<p>Proponent: Napa County</p> <p>Objective: The Project is an update to the Napa Countywide (County) Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) applies to lands around the two public-use airports in the county: the Angwin Airport (Parrett Field) and the Napa County Airport.</p> <p>The purpose of the ALUCP is “to protect public health, safety, and welfare by ensuring the orderly expansion of airports and the adoption of land use measures that minimize the public’s exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards within areas around public airports to the extent that these areas are not already devoted to incompatible uses.” The intent of the ALUCP is to discourage the expansion or introduction of incompatible land uses within an airport’s area of influence. ALUCPs are reviewed to ensure consistency with existing general plans, specific plans, zoning ordinances, building regulations, and certain individual development actions of local agencies.</p> <p>Location: The Project applies to two airports in Napa County and the parcels covered by the Airport Influence Area (AIA). Angwin Airport-Parrett Field is located at 1 Airport Way, Angwin, CA 94508; APN 024-080-048-000, and at approximately 38.57262°N and -122.43447°W. Napa County Airport is located at 2000 Airport Road, Napa, CA 94558; APN 057-050-009-000, and at approximately 38.21312°N and -122.28017°W.</p> <p>COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</p> <p>CDFW offers the comments and recommendations below to assist the County in adequately identifying and/or mitigating the Project’s significant, or potentially significant, direct and indirect impacts on fish and wildlife (biological) resources. As the Project impacts to biological resources are unclear as outlined in the below comments, CDFW is uncertain if an IS/ND is appropriate for the Project.</p> <p>COMMENT 1: Potentially Significant Impacts to Sensitive Fish and Wildlife Species and their Habitats</p>	<p>that the Environmental Assessment of the Napa County Airport Master Plan considers the environmental issues raised in the comments, including impacts associated with Water Quality (3.5); Fish, Wildlife, and Plants (3.8); Special Status Species Flora and Fauna (3.9); Wetlands, Jurisdictional or Non-Jurisdictional; Floodplains (3.11); and Coastal Reserves (3.12) due to the presence of the airport and airport operations.</p> <p>The ALUCP considers the planned extension of the short parallel runway (Runway 1R/19L) to the southwest, based on the 2007 Master Plan. The increase in runway length is proposed to be achieved by adding pavement to the south (1R) end of the runway. An aircraft landing on Runway 19L would still touchdown at the same point as currently, but it would have an additional 1,791 feet of pavement available for departures. The RPZ for Runway End 1R would be shifted with the runway extension; however, the dimensions would not be changed. The shifted future RPZ would remain on airport property and would not involve any property acquisition.</p> <p>As mentioned above, the ALCUP is based on the Master Plan but has no authority over on-site aviation facilities. Future expansion of the runway was considered in the Master Plan EA. Additional environmental analysis may be required when the runway expansion is proposed for construction, including impacts to special status species and any future infrastructure improvements proposed to address sea level rise.</p>	

Committer Information	Comment	Response	Recommended Action
	<p><u>Napa-Sonoma Marshes Wildlife Area and Fagan Slough Ecological Reserve</u></p> <p>It is unclear if the Project has the potential to impact sensitive biological resources associated with CDFW's Napa-Sonoma Marshes Wildlife Area and Fagan Slough Ecological Reserve/California Marine Protected Area (CDFW Properties), located directly adjacent to the Napa County Airport, for the reasons outlined in the following paragraph. CDFW Properties contains habitat for several Fully Protected, CESA listed, and California Rare Plant Rank 1B.2 species including California Ridgway's rail (<i>Rallus obsoletus obsoletus</i>), California black rail (<i>Laterallus jamaicensis coturniculus</i>), saltmarsh harvest mouse (<i>Reithrodontomys raviventris</i>), and Suisun marsh aster (<i>Symphyotrichum lentum</i>). According to Figure 4A (page 63) of the IS/ND, CDFW Properties are included in the Draft Airport Influence Area (AIA) boundary.</p> <p>The IS/ND (pages 27-28) states that "The Draft ALUCP does not impact existing land uses, nor does the document include physical activities that would directly impact the AIA environment. Thus, the Draft ALUCP does not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service." On the other hand, the IS/ND states that "...the Draft ALUCP may indirectly affect future land development within the AIA of each airport. Specifically, wildlife hazard policies (Policy 3.5.3) of the Draft ALUCP restrict land uses that attract wildlife within Draft Zone A, including the creation of wetland mitigation sites, conservation areas, and wildlife preserves. This policy also recommends the avoidance of these land uses in the wildlife critical zone", and "Local general plans, specific plans, and zoning ordinances must be consistent with an adopted ALUCP (unless the local jurisdiction overrides the ALUCP as described in Section 1.4). Thus, inconsistency between the adopted ALUCP and current land use plans could result in displacement of planned land uses, including planned habitat and wildlife areas." Based on the above information, it appears that the ALUCP requirements may supersede or otherwise impact existing land use designations thereby</p>		

PUBLIC COMMENT AND RESPONSE MATRIX ATTACHMENT A

Committer Information	Comment	Response	Recommended Action
	<p>putting CDFW’s Properties, including Fully Protected and CESA listed species, at risk.</p> <p><u>Napa Plant Site Restoration Project</u></p> <p>The IS/ND does not evaluate how the adopted ALUCP may affect CDFW’s existing Napa-Sonoma Marshes Wildlife Area Land Management Plan and associated Napa Plant Site Restoration Project success criteria and goals.</p> <p><u>Runway Safety Area Tidal Wetlands and Sea Level Rise</u></p> <p>During the Napa Plant Site Restoration Project planning, CDFW worked with the Federal Aviation Administration, California Department of Transportation Aeronautics, and Napa County Airport and agreed to leave 8.86 acres of CDFW land out of the restoration project, knowing the Napa County Airport will eventually need to extend its Runway Safety Area (RSA). Since 2008, the RSA has subsided and reverted to muted tidal wetlands and is known to support salt marsh harvest mouse (<i>Reithrodontomys raviventris</i>) and Suisun Marsh aster. Additionally, the ALUCP does not address the potential issues of climate change and sea level rise. “No name creek” was overtopping in the mid to late 2000’s causing flooding issues and Fagan Creek has been known to overtop. Has the ALUCP used climate change projections to anticipate increased flooding issues? It seems that the above issues could affect future airport use/expansion, which could in turn result in impacts to CDFW Properties and sensitive biological resources.</p> <p>Recommendations: The Project’s Initial Study should include the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify if there will be any land use impacts to CDFW’s Properties including, but not limited to, if the ALUCP could supersede CDFW Properties’ land uses and describe any potential impacts to CDFW’s Properties and any other sensitive biological resources within the AIA of both airports; • Evaluate how the adopted ALUCP may affect CDFW’s existing Napa-Sonoma Marshes Wildlife Area Land Management Plan and associated Napa Plant Site Restoration Project success criteria and goals; 		

Committer Information	Comment	Response	Recommended Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate how the future RSA and climate change and associated sea level rise could affect future airport use/expansion, and in turn result in impacts to CDFW Properties and sensitive biological resources; and • Include mitigation measures to reduce any impacts to CDFW Properties or sensitive biological resources to less-than-significant, such as modifications to land uses or direct or indirect impacts to special-status species or their habitats. CDFW requests that the County coordinate with CDFW to develop appropriate mitigation measures if such impacts are anticipated. <p>ENVIRONMENTAL DATA CEQA requires that information developed in environmental impact reports and negative declarations be incorporated into a database which may be used to make subsequent or supplemental environmental determinations. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21003, subd. (e)). Accordingly, please report any special-status species and natural communities detected during Project surveys to the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB). The CNDDDB field survey form can be filled out and submitted online at the following link: https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Submitting-Data. The types of information reported to CNDDDB can be found at the following link: https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Plants-and-Animals</p> <p>ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT FILING FEES The Project, as proposed, would have an impact on fish and/or wildlife, and assessment of environmental document filing fees is necessary. Fees are payable upon filing of the Notice of Determination by the Lead Agency and serve to help defray the cost of environmental review by CDFW. Payment of the environmental document filing fee is required in order for the underlying project approval to be operative, vested, and final. (See: Cal. Code Regs, tit. 14, § 753.5; Fish & G. Code, § 711.4; Pub. Resources Code, § 21089.).</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p>		

PUBLIC COMMENT AND RESPONSE MATRIX ATTACHMENT A

Committer Information	Comment	Response	Recommended Action
	<p>CDFW appreciates the opportunity to comment on the IS/ND to assist the County in identifying and mitigating Project impacts on biological resources. Questions regarding this letter or further coordination should be directed to Nicholas Magnuson, Environmental Scientist, at (707) 815-4166 or Nicholas.Magnuson@wildlife.ca.gov; or Melanie Day, Senior Environmental Scientist (Supervisory), at (707) 210-4415 or Melanie.Day@wildlife.ca.gov.</p> <p>Sincerely, Erin Chappell Regional Manager Bay Delta Region</p> <p>cc: Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse (SCH No. 2024060773) Craig Weightman, CDFW Bay Delta Region - Craig.Weightman@wildlife.ca.gov Greg Martinelli, CDFW Bay Delta Region - Greg.Martinelli@wildlife.ca.gov Lauren Thompson, CDFW Bay Delta Region - Lauren.Thompson@wildlife.ca.gov</p>		