



COUNTY OF LAKE

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Planning Division

Courthouse - 255 N. Forbes Street

Lakeport, California 95453

Telephone 707/263-2221 FAX 707/263-2225

May 22, 2006

California Environmental Quality Act

INITIAL STUDY 05-70

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** Van Eck Subdivision Map
2. **Permit Number:** Tentative Subdivision Map SD 05-13, Rezone RZ 05-14
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:**
County of Lake
Community Development Department
Planning Division
Courthouse - 255 North Forbes Street
Lakeport CA 95453
4. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Penelope Shibley, Senior Planner, (707) 263-2221
5. **Project Location:** 3640 Lakeview Estates Drive, Kelseyville; ; portions SW ¼ of the SE ¼ of Section 6, T 13 N, R 8 W, MDB &M (Clearlake Highlands USGS Quad) -Rivieras Area Plan 009-008-10
6. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** John Van Eck, 4965 Steelhead Drive, Kelseyville, CA 95451
6. **General Plan Designation:** Suburban Residential
7. **Zoning:**
Existing: "U" Unclassified
Proposed: "R1" Single Family Residential
8. **Description of Project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary).**

Develop a residential subdivision with 16 lots on 7.12 acres. A rezone the property to "R1" is necessary since the property is currently zoned "U" Unclassified. The property is located adjacent to Lakeview Estates Subdivision, near the Riviera Heights Subdivision Unit 1. An orchard is currently on the property. There are no known flood zones, earthquake fault zones, wetlands or serpentine soils on the property. Average cross slope is 10-20%. Public water from Special Districts and on-site sewage disposal are proposed. Two new roads are proposed with access from Lakeview Estates Drive.

10. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

This project is located along Lakeview Estates Drive in a suburban residential setting near the Soda Bay area. Surrounding property to the west, north and east is part of the Lakeview Estates Subdivision recorded in 1966. Lots are zoned "R1" and are typically ½ acre in size. The parcel to the south is 133 acres and split zoned "U" Unclassified and "RL" Rural Lands. Further to the east 800' is the Riviera Heights Subdivision, Unit 1.

11. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., Permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.) None.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Initial Study prepared by:

Penelope Shibley, Senior Planner


SIGNATURE

Date: 6/2/06

Mary Jane Fagalde, Director
Community Development Department

SECTION 1

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, and then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

- KEY:** 1 = Potentially Significant Impact
 2 = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation
 3 = Less Than Significant Impact
 4 = No Impact

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
I. AESTHETICS						
<i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X		The property is outside of the Soda Bay Road view corridor on Lakeview Estates Drive. Height limits are 35'. Because the property is in a valley within a developed community on 3 sides, it is not expected that this project will have a significant impact on scenic vistas.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X		There is a walnut orchard on this property. However, it is not located within a scenic highway area.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 21
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X		The area in the vicinity of the project area is primarily used for suburban residential uses. The creation of 16 new lots in this area will have a minimal impact to viewsheds.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X		The project will be required to meet zoning ordinance standards for section 21-41 which limit light and glare.	4, 5, 6
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES						
<i>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.</i>						
<i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?		X			The project area is described as "Unique Farmland". It contains lesser quality agricultural soils which produce walnuts, historically one of the region's important crops. Soil is designated with prime Class IV 222 Soda Bay Loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes. Walnut trees should be preserved on the site to the greatest degree possible.	8, 9, 10
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X	There are no Williamson contracted properties in the vicinity of this property. While there are some prime soils in the vicinity, surrounding uses include vacant land to the south and residential (to the east, west and north).	2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?			X		The project will not impact other properties in a way that results in the conversion of agricultural uses to non-agricultural use. This is an infill development.	2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10
III. AIR QUALITY						
<i>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.</i>						
<i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?		X			This project is proposed to be served by Lakeview Estates Drive, a paved, County maintained local road. Access to proposed lots will be served through two new roads, Willem Court and Thomas Court. Required mitigations should include dust palliatives during road construction or other improvements.	4, 5, 10, 11
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		X			No serpentine soils are known to occur at this site. Required mitigations should include dust palliatives during road construction or other improvements.	4, 5, 10, 11
c) Result in a cumulatively			X		The project will contribute insignificant amounts of dust into the	4, 5, 10, 11

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. atmosphere and insignificant amounts of other pollutants. Lake County is an attainment area.	Source Number**
considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under and applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?		X		X	Required mitigations should include dust palliatives during road construction or other improvements. This project is not anticipated to generate any significant odors.	4, 5, 10, 11 4, 5, 10
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X		No sensitive plant species are known to occur on this site.. No riparian corridor exists on the property. Vegetation consists primarily of walnut trees. A border of coyote brush (<i>Baccharis</i> sp) is found along the southern and eastern property lines.	4, 5, 6, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X		The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wetlands Inventory does not identify any riparian areas on the property, nor did staff observe any during a site visit.	4, 5, 6, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			X		The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wetlands Inventory does not identify any riparian areas on the property, nor did staff observe any during a site visit.	4, 5, 6, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	X				The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wetlands Inventory does not identify any riparian areas on the property, nor did staff observe any during a site visit. Staff recommends that the <i>Baccharis</i> hedge be preserved as a wildlife habitat.	4, 5, 6, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X		No specific policies prevent removal of vegetation.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 46, 47
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			X		No specific policies prevent removal of vegetation.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Cause a substantial adverse			X		A cultural resources survey completed by Archeological Resource Service	1, 2, 3, 4,

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. (ARS) in January, 2006 identified no cultural resources on site.	Source Number**
change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?						5, 6, 7, 21
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X			Subdivision Map conditions should require that if resources are encountered, that work be halted and a qualified professional evaluate mitigations.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 21
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X		The scope and location of the project is not expected to impact geologic features. If paleontological resources are encountered, the applicant shall be required to provide mitigations.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 21
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X			A cultural resources survey completed by Archeological Resources Services in January, 2006 identified no significant archeological resources in the project area. In the remote possibility that human remains are discovered, the applicant will be required to halt construction and provide appropriate mitigations.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 21
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS <i>Would the project::</i>						
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? iv) Landslides?			X		No Alquist-Priolo earthquake faults have been identified for this project area. No other known active or inactive faults exist as part of this project area. The underlying geology of the area consists of younger pyroclastic deposits (YP), not known as having liquefaction or landslide potential. This site has uniform slopes ranging from 10-20% with minimal landslide hazards. No unusual landslide risk is known to exist at this site.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 15, 22, 23, 24, 25
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X			The USDA Soil Survey for Lake County identifies one soil types in the project area, Soda Bay Loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes, 222. This a deep well drained soil on hills, formed in material weathered from dacite, tuff, breccia or volcanic ash. Surface runoff is rapid and hazard of erosion is severe. Proposed and future development projects should conform to the erosion control standards outlined in Section 41.6 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance. Slopes on this site are in the 10-20% range.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X		The slopes and soil types of this site are not identified as having particular landslide hazards. The project is not expected to significantly contribute to geologic hazards.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 23, 24, 25
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or			X		Soil types 222 has a low to moderate shrink-swell potential.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 23, 24, 25

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?			X		The Environmental Health Division has completed testing of soils for each proposed parcel, which all meet requirements for standard septic systems.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 23, 24, 25, 42, 43
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS B <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X		No unusual hazards proposed.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 26, 27
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X		No unusual hazards proposed.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 26, 27
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X		Project is not located near any schools, however no hazardous materials are proposed as a part of this project.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 26, 27
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X	This is not a hazardous materials site.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 26, 27
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X	Not applicable. Not within an airport vicinity.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 26, 27, 28
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X	Not applicable. Not within an airport vicinity.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 26, 27, 28
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X		The current condition of Lakeview Estates Drive is adequate to serve emergency services. All access ways to future residences will be required to meet the "R1" zoning standards for driveways.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 26, 27
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			X		This project is not likely to significantly increase residential exposure to wildland fire hazards. Three sides of the site are already developed with residences so this is an infill project. Residential density could be increased by 16 homes and 16 granny unit due to this project. Fire hydrants are proposed as part of this project. Hazard abatement is recommended around all perimeters.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 26, 27, 29
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X		Public water service and on site sewage is proposed.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 30, 31, 32, 33
b) Substantially deplete groundwater			X		Water supply is a public water source derived from Clear Lake and is not	1, 2, 3, 4,

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted?)					expected to deplete groundwater.	5, 6, 30, 31, 32, 33
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or off-site?	X				At time of site development, best management practices for erosion control should be used. With mitigations in place, no substantial erosion or siltation is expected from this project.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 30, 31, 32, 33
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-site or off-site?	X				A drainage plan should be provided with road improvement plans indicating appropriate water flows.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	X				With mitigations, the creation of 16 lots on this site will have a minimal impact on the existing storm water drainage pattern and will not substantially increase sources of polluted runoff.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 30, 31, 32, 33, 42
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X		No significant impacts to water quality are expected from this project.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 30, 31, 32, 33, 42
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			X		Parcels are not located within a designated 100-year flood zone.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 32, 33, 34
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			X		Parcels are not located within a designated 100-year flood zone..	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 32, 33, 34
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			X		Not applicable—project is not located in a dam failure inundation zone.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 32, 33, 34, 47
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?		X			The project area is not located in an area designated for risk of seiche inundation.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 32, 33, 34, 47
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING						
<i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Physically divide an established community?		X			Residential projects at this site will be compatible with existing development and will not divide a community.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the	X				The property is currently zoned "U" Unclassified and will need to be rezoned to "R1" prior to recordation of the final map. Proposed parcels meet the "R1" Rural Residential zoning district criteria. With a rezone, this	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?					project is consistent with the Lake County General Plan, draft Rivieras Area Plan and zoning ordinance.	
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?			X		No particular plans applicable to this site.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
X. MINERAL RESOURCES						
<i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?			X		Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan identifies no source of aggregate minerals at this site.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 35
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?			X		Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan identifies no source of aggregate minerals at this site.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 35
XI. NOISE						
<i>Would the project result in:</i>						
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X			Any future construction associated with this project will be subject to applicable performance standards as outlined in the Lake County Code and be mitigated by Subdivision Map conditions.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				X	Project is not expected to create unusual vibration.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X		No unusual noise is proposed by the project.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		X			During any proposed construction, a temporary increase in noise is expected. Construction noise should be mitigated by Subdivision Map conditions.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X	Not applicable. Not within an airport land use plan.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 28
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X	Not applicable. Not within an airport vicinity.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 28
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING						
<i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X		Project is not likely to have a substantial impact on population growth. All proposed growth is consistent with Lake County General Plan, Rivieras, and zoning ordinance.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
b) Displace substantial numbers of				X	No housing displacement by this project.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?						6
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement?			X		No displacement proposed.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:			X		Resulting growth will not result in a significant increase in population.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
b) Fire Protection? Police Protection? Schools? Parks? Other Public Facilities?					A central postal facility should be provided to allow postal access. School and fire fees must be paid at time of construction.	
XIV. RECREATION <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?		X			The proposed project is in close proximity to several recreational facilities. The proposed increase in population will not create a substantial deterioration of community recreational facilities. Each of the proposed parcels will be subject to the payment of park fees of \$3393 per proposed parcel as outlined in section 17-27 of the Lake County Subdivision Ordinance.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X		Resulting population growth associated with proposed project will not require the expansion or construction of community recreational facilities.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
XV. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e. result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?		X			A moderate increase in traffic is anticipated due to construction of new residential units. Improvements to Lakeview Estates Drive should be adequate to mitigate impacts to the existing street system in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?		X			A minimal increase in traffic is anticipated. According to the Department of Public Works, Lakeview Estates Drive should be improved to minor road standards. A dedication of roadway 25' from centerline should be required on the final map. New roads should be built to minor road standards.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in				X	No impact to air traffic proposed.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
location that results in substantial safety risks?						
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X		A minimal increase in traffic is anticipated and minimal conflicts are anticipated.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?			X		The current infrastructure along Lakeview Estates Drive combined with access driveways to each of the proposed lots is adequate in serving the needs required for emergency services.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 26, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?			X		Adequate parking will be made available on each proposed lot.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			X		There are no existing public transit routes adjoining this site. The closest one is on Soda Bay Road. A Class III bike lane is exists along Soda Bay Road but will not be impacted by this project.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS						
<i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X		On site septic systems are proposed to serve the wastewater generated from this project.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 42, 43, 44, 45
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?		X			A report prepared by Benett Engineering indicates that adequate water is available through the Soda Bay Water System, operated by Special Districts. There is an estimated fee of \$147,000 which will be collected to provide water to serve the 16 proposed lots. Special Districts has indicated that adequate water service capacity must be provided to serve the proposed parcels. A capacity expansion fee will be required to upgrade the existing water system.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 42, 43, 44, 45
c) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X		Due to the minimal population growth expected as part of this proposed project existing entitlements and resources will be adequate.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 42, 43, 44, 45
d) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X	On site septic systems are proposed to serve the wastewater generated from this project.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 42, 43, 44, 45
e) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X		Each individual owner will be required to provide trash service. With recycling implemented for projects such as this, landfill capacity should be adequate to serve future development in Lake County.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 48
f) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X		County and state goals include a 50% rate of recycling of solid waste produced. With recycling areas provided, this project is expected to comply with this requirement.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 48
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE						
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or			X		It is expected that this project will have a less than significant impact to the environment.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?						
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			X		The overall impact of this project is less than significant, with mitigations in place.	ALL
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X		The overall impact of this project is less than significant, with mitigations in place	ALL

Source List

1. Lake County General Plan
2. draft Rivas Area Plan
3. Site Visit 12/5/2005
4. Lake County Zoning Ordinance
5. Community Development Department Application, received 10/24/2005
6. U.S.G.S. Topographic Maps
7. California Historical Resources Information System, letter dated November 8, 2005
8. U.S.D.A. Lake County Soil Survey
9. Lake County Important Farmland 2004 map, California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
10. Lake County Agricultural Commissioner
11. Lake County Air Quality Management District
12. U.S.D.A. Natural Resources Conservation Service
13. Lake County Serpentine Soil mapping
14. California Natural Diversity Database
15. *Geology of the Kelseyville Quadrangle, Sonoma, Lake and Mendocino Counties, California*, by James McNitt, 1968, California Division of Mines and Geology
- 16.
17. California Department of Fish and Game
18. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
19. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wetlands Inventory
20. Water Resources Division, Lake County Department of Public Works wetlands mapping
21. Site specific historical resources survey, Archeological Resource Service, January 2006
22. Official Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone maps for Lake County ; Clearlake Highlands USGS quad
23. U.S.G.S. Geologic Map and Structure Sections of the Clear Lake Volcanics, Northern California, Miscellaneous Investigation Series, 1995
24. Landslide Hazards in the Eastern Clear Lake Area, Lake County, California, Landslide Hazard Identification Map No. 16, California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, DMG Open –File Report 89-27, 1990
25. Landslides and Geology along Cache Creek between Clear Lake and Capay Valley, Lake, Colusa and Yolo Counties, California, Landslide Hazard Identification Map No. 19, California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, DMG Open –File Report 89-30, 1990
26. Lake County Emergency Management Plan

27. Lake County Hazardous Waste Management Plan, adopted 1989
28. Lake County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, adopted 1992
29. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, fire hazard mapping
30. National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)
31. Hydrologic Studies
32. site specific drainage plans
33. Lake County Drainage master plan
34. FEMA flood hazard maps
35. Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan
36. Lake County Department of Public Works, Roads Division, comments received
37. California Department of Transportation
38. Lake County Bikeway Plan
39. Lake County Transit for Bus Routes
40. site specific traffic study
41. Kelseyville Fire District
42. California Regional Water Quality Control Board
43. Lake County Environmental Health Division
44. Lake County Special Districts, comments received August 5, 2005, November 10, 2005 and March 13, 2006
45. Site specific capacity analysis, prepared by Bennett Engineering entitled *Soda Bay Special District #20, Lakeview Estates Phase II proposal, February 13, 2006*
46. Lake County Grading Ordinance
47. Lake County Natural Hazard database
48. Lake County Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan and Siting Element, 1996