## COUNTY OF LAKE

## California Environmental Quality Act

# INITIAL STUDY 04-05 

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project Title:
2. Permit Number:
3. Lead Agency Name and Address:
4. Contact Person and Phone Number:
5. Project Location:
6. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:
7. General Plan Designation:
8. Zoning:

Clear Lake Estates on Konocti Bay Subdivision
SD 04-01, IS 04-05
County of Lake
Community Development Department, Planning Division
Courthouse - 255 North Forbes Street
Lakeport CA 95453
Emily Minton, Associate Planner (707) 263-2221
9555 State Highway 281 and 4619 Kaweah Road, Kelseyville

Clearlake Estates, LLC
Mitchell Thurston, Manager
1832 Oak Knoll Drive
Belmont, CA 94002
Suburban Residential

East of Konocti Bay Road: "R1-B3" Single-Family Residential-( 40,000 square foot minimum parcel size) West of Konocti Bay Road: "U" Unclassified
9. 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).

A subdivision of approximately 55 acres to create 12 residential lots that are one to ten acres in size and a $\pm 20$ acre remainder parcel. All of the lots will utilize surface water from Clear Lake for household use. Sewage disposal will be by individual septic systems. A road will be constructed to access 10 of the lots from Konocti Bay Road. This road will be private and gated. A cul-de-sac will need to be constructed at the end of Kaweah Road to access the two parcels and provide a turn-around area.

The Subdivision Map Act allows a subdivider to create a remainder lot, which is a portion of land that "is not divided for the purpose of sale, lease, or financing" (§66424.6).

The entire project is within an extremely high wildfire hazard area.
The major geologic constraints in developing this property are seismicity and surface fault rupture, and erosion and landslides (including boulders) due to unstable soils. The California Department of Mines and Geology identified two faults on or near this site. A fault crosses through proposed lots $\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{D}, \mathrm{E}$ and L and there is another fault within 150 feet of the eastern property boundary. The state mapped Earthquake Fault Zones that straddle the faults. The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (Public Resources Code Section 2621) defines any subdivision of land which is subject to the Subdivision Map Act (Division 2 (commencing with Section 66410) of Title 7 of the Government Code), and which contemplates the eventual construction of
structures for human occupancy as a "project". Therefore, this project is subject to the requirements of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act. The Act requires geologic reports to be prepared for projects proposed within Earthquake Fault Zones. The required report must be based on a geologic investigation designed to identify the location, recency and nature of faulting that may have affected the project site in the past and may affect it in the future. A second geologist retained by the County must review the report and confirm its findings. The County cannot approve a project within an Earthquake Fault Zone until the geologic and soil conditions of the project site are investigated and appropriate mitigation measures, if any, are incorporated into the development plans. Consistent with the Act, two separate engineering geologists that specialize in fault zone studies reviewed the project site and proposal. The reports included a discussion of their findings and recommended mitigation measures to reduce the risk of seismic hazards. The content of the reports meet the qualifications of the Act. Their recommendations have been included in the proposed conditions as mitigation measures.

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

## North: Clear Lake

| South: $\quad$ Clear Lake Riviera subdivision $-6,000$ to 10,000 square foot lots zoned "R1-RD" |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| East: | Clear Lake Riviera subdivision $-6,000$ to 10,000 square foot lots zoned "R1-RD" |
| West: | Reel Inn mobile home park |

## 11. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., Permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

| Lake County Department of Public Works | (707) 263-2341 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Lake County Health Services Department | (707) 263-1164 |
| Kelseyville Fire Protection District | (707) 279-4268 |
| California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection | (707) 279-4924 |

## 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.

| Aesthetics | 」 Hazards \& Hazardous Materials | $\square$ Public Services |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\square$ Agriculture Resources | $\checkmark$ Hydrology / Water Quality | $\square$ Recreation |
| $\checkmark$ Air Quality | $\square$ Land Use / Planning | $\checkmark$ Transportation / Traffic |
| Biological Resources | $\square$ Mineral Resources | $\square$ Utilities / Service Systems |
| Cultural Resources | 」 Noise | $\checkmark$ Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| $\checkmark$ Geology / Soils | $\square$ Population / Housing |  |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the lead Agency)
On the basis of this initial evaluation:
$\square$ 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.
$\square$ 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:


Date: $12 / 22104$
Emily Minton, Associate Planner

Mary Jane Fagalde, Director
Community Development Department

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

## KEY: 1 = Potentially Significant Impact <br> 2 = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <br> 3 = Less Than Significant Impact <br> 4 = No Impact

| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. <br> Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source <br> Number** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I. AESTHETICS Would the project: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  | The project site is visible from Clear Lake and the west side of Konocti Bay. The roads and homes will be visible. The project proposes lowdensity home development, though, which will not create a substantial adverse effect. | 3, 4 |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  | Project site is not within an identified scenic resource area. See I.a. | 3, 4 |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  | The road will be visible from Clear Lake and west side of Konocti Bay. However, the project proposes low-density residential development that will not substantially degrade the character of the site. | 3, 4 |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  | Project will ultimately lead to additional light, with the development of homes on what is now vacant land. Project is within a developed area, however, and light from homes will not create substantial light or glare. | 3,4 |
| II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES <br> 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. <br> Would the project:: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Project site not identified as prime or unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance. Furthermore, site would most likely not be suitable for any type of agriculture due to the steep topography and proximity to Clear Lake and existing residential development. | 3,5,8 |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | There are no agricultural zoning in the vicinity, or properties under Williamson Act contract. | 1,2 |
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | No impact identified. | 3,4 |
| III. AIR QUALITY <br> 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. <br> Would the project: : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | No impact identified. | 1,2,3,4,9 |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | Primary air quality impacts will be associated with road construction (shortterm). <br> Tentative map condition E.1. The subdivider shall minimize vehicular and fugitive dust during road construction by use of water, paving or | 1, 2, 3, 4, 9 |


| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. <br> Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source <br> Number** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | other acceptable dust palliatives. Graded areas shall be paved, revegetated or covered to reduce wind-induced dust. <br> Tentative map condition E.2. Should the road construction expose serpentine rock or soils (which may contain asbestos), a serpentine dust control plan and additional dust suppression shall be instituted to eliminate all visible dust from the site in compliance with the Lake County Air Quality Management District. If serpentine is discovered during road construction or drainage improvements, all work shall halt and a serpentine dust mitigation plan shall be submitted and approved by the Lake County Air Quality Management District. District regulations and sample dust plans are available from the District. |  |
| c) Result in a cumulatively 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)? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Project region is in attainment with air quality standards. | 9 |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. | 1,2,3, 4, 9 |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Project will not create objectionable odors. | 1,2,3, 4, 9 |
| IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES <br> Would the project: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | None of those species identified on this project site. | 10, 11, 14 |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  | There is a potential for erosion into the lake. <br> Tentative map conditions section C. | 3, 4, 24 |
| 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? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | No wetlands identified on the project site. | 10,11, 14 |
| 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? |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | The parcel is currently vacant and is home to an array of wildlife. It also provides access to Clear Lake. Furthermore, the project will result in a loss of habitat, and the State Fish and Game fee should be required. <br> Tentative map condition C.4. The final map shall include the following note: "All structures, including fences, must be constructed within the designated building envelopes. Only driveways are permitted |  |


| IMPACT <br> CATEGORIES* | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | All determinations need explanation. <br> Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source <br> Number** |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. <br> Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source <br> Number** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Publication 42. <br> ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? <br> iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? <br> iv) Landslides? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | The geotechnical studies identified a risk of substantial erosion on this site. The recommendations (mitigations) recommended by those studies have been included in the conditions of approval. <br> Tentative map conditions section $\mathbf{C}$. | $\begin{aligned} & 5,15, \quad 16, \\ & 23,24,25, \\ & 26,27,29 \end{aligned}$ |
| 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 onsite or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | See VI.b. | $5,15, \quad 16$, <br> 23, <br> 24, <br> 26,25, |
| 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 property? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | The geotechnical studies did not identify any expansive soils on the site. However, a condition of approval requires additional geotechnical/soils studies at the time of home construction for site-specific development and mitigation. <br> Tentative map condition C.5. The final map shall include the following note: "Prior to lot development, geotechnical investigations shall be prepared for each home site which recommend mitigation measures for any identified geological safety issues." | $\begin{aligned} & 5,15,16, \\ & 23,24,25, \\ & 26,27,29 \end{aligned}$ |
| 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? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Ten of the twelve lots were approved for standard septic systems. Lots I and J will require engineered septic systems due to shallow soils. The requirements of the Health Department have been satisfied. | 22 |
| VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS B Would the project: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Project does not entail the use of hazardous materials. | 4 |
| 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 |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | See VII.a. | 4 |


| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. <br> Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source <br> Number** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| the environment? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | See VII.a. | 4 |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Govemment Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | No impact identified. | 1,2,3,4 |
| 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? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Project is not within an airport land use plan area. | 26 |
| 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? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. | 1,3,26 |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | No impact identified. | 1,2, 3, 4 |
| 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? |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | Project site is identified as a high fire severity zone. |  |
| VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ | No impact identified. | 1, 2, 4, 22 |
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Project does not propose the use of groundwater. | 4 |
| 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 |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | According to geotechnical study, drainage on the site has been altered and erosion is occurring which may lead to a landslide. With mitigation measures recommended by geotechnical study, the drainage will be redirected and the area of erosion will be repaired. <br> The new road will alter drainage. Road and drainage improvement plans must be approved by DPW. Mitigations recommended by the geotechnical | $\begin{aligned} & 3,24,25, \\ & 26,27,28, \\ & 29,30 \end{aligned}$ |


| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. <br> Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| or off-site? |  |  |  |  | study must be included in the plans. <br> Tentative map conditions section C. |  |
| 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 onsite or off-site? | . |  |  |  | No impact identified other than what is discussed above in VIII.c. |  |
| 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? |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  | Project will slightly increase water runoff. Engineered improvement and drainage plans are required. <br> Tentative map conditions section C. | $\begin{aligned} & 4,24, \quad 25, \\ & 26,27,28 \end{aligned}$ |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | No impact identified. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,2,3,4, \\ & 24,25,26, \\ & 27,28 \end{aligned}$ |
| 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? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Not applicable. | 4,12 |
| h) Place within a 100 -year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Not applicable. | 4,12 |
| 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? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Not applicable. | 4,12 |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | No impact identified. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,2,3,4, \\ & 5,24,25, \\ & 26,27,28, \\ & 29,30 \end{aligned}$ |
| IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING Would the project: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Physically divide an established community? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Project will not physically divide an established community. | 1,2,3,4 |
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Project is consistent with Lake County Zoning Ordinance and General Plan. | 1,2,4 |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | No impact identified. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,2,3,4, \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| X. MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | No impact identified. | 1,2,19 |


| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. <br> Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| residents of the state? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | No impact identified. | 1,2,19 |
| XI. NOISE <br> Would the project result in:: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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? |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | Noise generated by the project will mainly be associated with road construction. The permit includes conditions regarding working hours and noise generated by equipment. <br> Tentative map condition E.4. All construction activities, including engine warm-up, shall be limited to weekdays and Saturday, between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. to minimize noise impacts on residents in the vicinity. Back-up beepers shall be adjusted to the lowest allowable levels. <br> Tentative map condition E.5. Equipment such as generators, air compressors and portable toilets equipped with self-closing doors shall be located to minimize noise impacts to surrounding residents. Should substantive noise complaints be received, the Planning Division may impose additional mitigation measures or require reduced hours of operation. | 1,2,4 |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Any vibrations would be short-term, mainly related to construction. | 1,2,4 |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | See XI.a. | 1,2,4 |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | See XI.a. | 1,2,4 |
| 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? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Not applicable. | 1, 3, 4, 31 |
| 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? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Project is not within the vicinity of an airstrip. | 1, 3, 4, 31 |
| XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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)? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Project proposes twelve single-family residential lots. Project will not induce substantial population growth. | 4 |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Project will not displace existing housing. | 3, 4 |


| $\begin{gathered} \text { IMPACT } \\ \text { CATEGORIES* } \end{gathered}$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. <br> Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| elsewhere? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Project will not displace people. | 4 |
| XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES Would the project: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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: <br> b) <br> Fire Protection? <br> Police Protection? <br> Schools? <br> Parks? <br> Other Public Facilities? |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  | According to the Lake County General Plan and Lake County GIS Data, the project area lies in a Extremely High Fire Hazard risk area. This area is considered a State Responsibility Area for fire protection, with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) having jurisdiction for fire protection. CDF has adopted Fire Safe Guidelines as specified in Government Code Section 4290. All proposed road, driveway and construction designs within State Responsibility Areas (SRA's) must be compliant with CDF Regulations pertaining to these guidelines. <br> The County Sheriff's Department would provide police protection to the proposed subdivision. The creation of twelve parcels would not significantly impact police protection within the area. <br> Mitigation fees for the local school district would be required for each residential building permit application. California Education Code Section 17620 et. seq. authorizes school districts to levy fees on construction activities for funding construction or reconstruction of school facilities and is considered mitigation under CEQA. Impacts are considered less than significant. <br> The project would not likely result in significant impacts resulting in the need for construction of additional recreational facilities that would result in significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives. According to Section 17-27.2 of the Subdivision regulations, subdivisions proposing lots in excess of forty thousand $(40,000)$ square feet are exempt from the requirement of dedication of land or park fees. <br> Project is of a size and scope that will not substantially increase the need for governmental facilities. Project is in an already developed area. School and fire mitigation fees will be paid at the time of development. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,17, \\ & 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| XIV. RECREATION Would the project: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | No impact identified. Project will not increase population so as to induce substantial deterioration of existing recreational facilities. | 1,2, 3, 4 |
| b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Project does not include the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. | 4 |
| XV. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC Would the project: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | Project will not increase traffic on existing roads substantially. However, a new road will need to be constructed to access the new lots. <br> Tentative map conditions section $A$. | 1, 3, 4, 20 |


| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. <br> Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source <br> Number** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | - |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Project proposes twelve new home sites. Project will not exceed the level of service standard. | 1, 3, 4, 20 |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Project will not have an effect on air traffic. | 1, 3, 4, 31 |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | No impact identified. | 1,3, 4, 20 |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | Emergency access is proposed to be designed to meet all current standards. Cul-de-sacs will be designed to allow emergency vehicles to turn around. <br> Tentative map conditions section $A$. | $\begin{array}{lll} \hline 4, & 18, & 20, \\ 21 & & \end{array}$ |
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | The Zoning Ordinance requires each single-family home to have a minimum of two on-site parking spaces. All parking will be accommodated on the proposed lots, which are sufficient in size. | 2, 4 |
| g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus tumouts, bicycle racks)? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | No impact identified. | 1,2,4 |
| XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVIC |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Not applicable. Each lot will be developed with individual septic systems. | 4,22 |
| 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? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Not applicable. Each lot will be developed with individual septic systems. | 4, 22 |
| c) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? |  |  |  | 7 | Project proposes the use of surface water from Clear Lake. Riparian rights will be extended to non-lakefront lots. Water supply is sufficient. | 4 |
| 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? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Not applicable. Each lot will be developed with individual septic systems. | 4, 22 |
| e) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Landfill has sufficient capacity to accommodate waste disposal. | 1 |


| IMPACT <br> CATEGORIES* | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | All determinations need explanation. <br> Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source <br> Number** |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| f) Comply with federal, state, and <br> local statutes and regulations related <br> to solid waste? |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Proposal is in compliance. | 1 |

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE


## Source List

1. Lake County General Plan, 1981 and 1988, 1992, 1997 and 2000 addenda
2. Lake County Zoning Ordinance, 2003
3. Site Visit by project planner, Emily Minton
4. Community Development Department Application
5. U.S.G.S. Topographic Maps
6. California Historical Resources Information System comments dated February 2, 2004
7. Final Archaeological Survey Report for Clear Lake Estates on Konocti Bay. Meyer, Michael D., M.A. June, 2004.
8. Lake County Important Farmland 2000 map, California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
9. Comments from the Lake County Air Quality Management District dated February 5, 2004.
10. California Natural Diversity Database
11. California Department of Fish and Game comments dated February 20, 2004.
12. Comments from Lake County Department of Public Works, Water Resources Division dated February 6, 2004.
13. Comments from Lake County Department of Public Works, Lakebed Management dated February 6, 2004.
14. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory
15. Official Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone maps for Lake County
16. 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
17. Comments from Califormia Department of Forestry and Fire Protection dated February 6, 2004.
18. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, fire hazard mapping
19. Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan
20. Lake County Department of Public Works, Roads Division dated
21. Comments from Kelseyville Fire Protection District dated February 18, 2004.
22. Comments from Lake County Environmental Health Division dated January 26, 2004 and July 30, 2004.
23. Lake County Natural Hazard database
24. Geologic Evaluation, Proposed Subdivision - Clearlake Estates, Lake County, California, January 28, 2004, prepared by Phoenix Consultants for Clearlake Estates LLC.
25. Supplemental Geologic Evaluation, Proposed Subdivision Lot A - Clearlake Estates, Lake County, California, March 12, 2004, prepared by Phoenix Consultants for Clearlake Estates LLC.
26. Supplemental Fault Evaluation, Proposed Subdivision - Clearlake Estates, Lake County, California, July 27, 2004, prepared by Phoenix Consultants for Clearlake Estates LLC.
27. Review of Alquist-Priolo Fault Investigation of the Clearlake Estates Subdivision, APNs 009-004-22 \& 009-017-07, Konocti Bay Road, Lake County, California prepared by Giblin Associates, Santa Rosa, California, August 17, 2004.
28. Geologic and Seismic Technical Background Report for Seismic Safety Element and Geologic Hazards Portion of Safety Element General Plan Lake County, California. December 15, 1976. Slosson and Associates in cooperation with Sociotechnical Systems.
29. Soil Survey of Lake County, California. May, 1989. United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service.
30. Geologic and Seismic Technical Background Report for Seismic Safety Element and Geologic Hazards Portion of Safety Element General Plan Lake County, California. December 15, 1976. Slosson and Associates in cooperation with Sociotechnical Systems.
31. Lake County Airports Master Plan. 1983. Wadell Engineering Corporation.

All of the above referenced documents are available at the Lake County Community Development Department, Lake County Courthouse, 255 North Forbes Street, Lakeport.

