

April 19, 2016

California Environmental Quality Act

INITIAL STUDY IS 15-12

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** Smythe Parcel Map
2. **Permit Number:** PM 15-03
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of Lake
Community Development Department, Planning Division
Courthouse – 255 North Forbes Street
Clearlake Oaks CA 95453
4. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Keith Gronendyke, Associate Planner (707) 263-2221
5. **Project Location:** 19658 and 19697 East Road, Lower Lake Ca, APNs: 012-049-07 and 012-049-10
7. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Cody Smith and Patrick Smythe, P O Box 1007,
Middletown CA, 95461
8. **General Plan Designation:** Rural Lands
9. **Zoning:** RL-W
10. **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).**

Applicant is proposing a parcel map of two approximately forty acre lots to reconfigure them into three parcels. Parcel one being approximately twenty-four acres, parcel two being approximately thirty-two acres and parcel three being approximately twenty-three acres. Proposed parcel one is already developed with a single family residence, while the other proposed parcels are undeveloped. Access to the parcels is off on a private road easement.

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

Surrounding land uses include residential to the west with vacant lands to the north, south and east. Surrounding Land descriptions would consist of chaparral and open rangeland. A large vernal pool is located on the southern side of APN 012-049-10, which would be bisected by this application.

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

County of Lake Environmental Health Department, Department of Public Works' Roads Division, County Surveyor.

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	Public Service
Agriculture Resources	☒ Hydrology / Water Quality	Recreation
Air Quality	Land Use / Planning	Transportation / Traffic
☒ Biological Resources	Mineral Resources	Utilities / Service Systems
Cultural Resources	Noise	Mandatory Findings of Significance
☒ Geology / Soils	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:

Keith Gronendyke, Associate Planner

SIGNATURE

Date: _____

Scott DeLeon, Interim 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, 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		This project is a subdivision of two existing lots into three parcels. At most two additional single family residences and possibly two accessory second units would be constructed on proposed lots two and three. All parcels would be in excess of twenty acres in size, which would preclude them from having any significant effect on surrounding properties. Less than significant.	5
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X	There are no designated scenic highways in Lake County according to the State of California's database. No impact.	39
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				X	See I(a) above. No impact.	5
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X		The large parcel sizes along with the absence of a significant amount of surrounding residences will both contribute to a minimal amount of significance that two additional residences and possible accessory second units would impact with regards to light or glare. Less than significant.	5
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, as proposed, will not impact prime farmland, as the land associated with this application is designated as not being important farmland. No impact.	8, 35
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X	The project, will not impact agricultural uses or Williamson Act contracts, as neither parcel is encumbered by a Williamson Act contract. No impact.	1, 5, 8, 35
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	As noted above in II (a) the project is not designated as prime farmland. No impact.	8, 35
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 parcel map application will not impact any applicable air quality plan. Any future development of residential units would be subject to all County of Lake regulations. No impact.	9

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X	This project does not propose any activities that will contribute to air quality degradation or violations. No impact.	9
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)?				X	The County of Lake is in compliance with applicable federal and state ambient air quality standards. No impact.	9
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X	This subdivision of land application will not include activities that would create any objectionable odors. The area surrounding the subject property is rural in nature with very few residences located in the vicinity. Although the project site is not located within a mapped serpentine rock or soil area, any disturbance of serpentine soils would require that all work be stopped until an approved serpentine dust control plan is in place. No impact.	5
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X	This subdivision of land project is not anticipated to generate any significant odors. No impact.	5
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	X		A review of the CNDDDB GIS layer indicates that the site does contain habitat for at least four sensitive species located within an existing and mapped vernal pool site located within the southern area of APN 012-049-10. The named species are: <i>many flowered navarretia</i> , the <i>legenere</i> , the <i>slender orcutt grass</i> and the <i>boggs lake hedge-hyssop</i> . Many-flowered navarretia is a California endangered plant species and also is listed as endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act. Many-flowered navarretia is a small annual herb that forms in mats and produces 10-60 small pale blue flower heads that typically bloom from April to June. Flower numbers are usually twice that of the closely related subspecies few-flowered navarretia (<i>Navarretia leucocephalasp. pauciflora</i>). Many-flowered navarretia is a vernal pool plant, and is found only in these unique wetlands. It is included in the Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon (Recovery Plan) completed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in 2005. Like other vernal pool species, the biggest threat to many-flowered navarretia is habitat loss and fragmentation due to agriculture and development. Development can result in direct removal of vernal pool habitat as well as indirect consequences such as altered hydrology, runoff, invasive species encroachment, and groundwater contamination. Occurrences of many-flowered navarretia on privately-owned land should be protected through conservation easements or other means. Surveys should be conducted at all occurrences to determine the current status of the species. Additionally, research should be conducted on the genetic structure and taxonomic status of many-flowered navarretia and its related subspecies. Potential habitat should be surveyed, and if new populations are located, they should be protected. <i>Legenere limosa</i> is an annual wildflower of the bellflower family	2, 11, 12, 30, 35, 44

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					endemic to limited portions of Northern California. This species is the sole member of the genus <i>Legenere</i>. The species common name is False Venus' looking glass. Blooming in May and June, it occurs below elevations of 610 meters in vernal pools and certain other moist habitats. Principal colonies are in Solano County, Sacramento County, Lake County, Napa County, Sonoma County, Tehama County and Yuba County. According to the California Native Plant Society <i>L. limosa</i> is classified on List 1B: Rare, threatened, or endangered; and 0.1: Seriously endangered. Main threats to the species are grazing and human overpopulation. Stems are reclining and of length ten to thirty centimeters, but the lateral slender branches are rigid. An alternate common name for this organism is Greene's <i>Legenere</i>, after Edward Lee Greene who first described this plant in 1890; the genus name <i>Legenere</i> is derived as an anagram of "E. L. Greene". The species name <i>limosa</i> derives from the Latin words <i>limus</i> (meaning <i>mud</i>) and <i>sella</i> (meaning <i>seat</i>): the plant that is seated in mud. Slender Orcutt Grass is State-listed as endangered and Federally listed as threatened. Slender Orcutt grass is endemic to California and has been found in Butte, Lake, Lassen, Modoc, Plumas, Shasta, Siskiyou, and Tehama Counties, with the southernmost extent of its current range falling in Sacramento County. Occurrences of slender Orcutt grass are concentrated in the northeastern portion of the Sacramento Valley and on the Modoc Plateau. It is not known to grow in the Natomas Basin, but appropriate habitat exists in the vernal pools along the basin's eastern edge. The closest known occurrence is approximately 12 miles (19 kilometers) southeast near the city of Rancho Cordova. Habitat Requirements: Slender Orcutt grass grows in the drying clay substrate of relatively deep vernal pools and swales. It is found at elevations of approximately 120"-5,800 feet (35"-1,750 meters). Orcutt grass is a small annual herb in the grass family (Poaceae) that blooms May through September and sometimes in October. It is one of the latest blooming members of the Orcuttieae tribe, and it grows in the thickest stands. This dense growth habit may have evolved in conjunction with grazing impacts, both to defend against trampling damage and to keep other plants from gaining a foothold following grazing. It has been theorized that the seeds of slender Orcutt grass require fungi to germinate. Like other Orcuttieae, slender Orcutt grass releases a sticky and odorous fluid that coats the leaves, protecting the plant from drying out and making it less palatable to grazers. Slender Orcutt grass often grows in association with various <i>Downingia</i> species and Fremont's goldfields (<i>Lasthenia fremontii</i>). Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop is a California endangered plant species. Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop occurs in California's Central Valley, inner north coast range and Sierra Nevada foothills, but the largest concentration of occurrences are located within the Modoc Plateau. The species is restricted to clay soils in or near shallow water such as at the margins of lakes and vernal pools, and blooms April through September. Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop has probably been most impacted in the past by habitat loss and fragmentation resulting from development and conversion of land	

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					for agriculture and other purposes. Development, infrastructure construction and other intensive land uses continue to threaten remaining populations of Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop. Grazing, trampling, and competition with invasive species such as Medusa-head grass may also be significant threats. The small and isolated populations of Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop are also especially vulnerable to extirpation from random events, and the species may also be vulnerable to the effects of climate change. Actions to be undertaken to conserve Boggs Lake hedge-hyssop include protecting and managing unprotected populations and investigating and managing the threats to the species from grazing, trampling, invasive species, and other factors. As a result of these four plant species being identified as potentially residing in a known vernal pool on the site, it could be anticipated that any encroachment into this vernal pool habitat could negatively affect any and all plant species, including the above noted endangered types. As such mitigations have been included in Section C of the conditions of approval that will mitigate impacts to a less than significant level.	
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	X		As noted above in IV. (a), there is a recorded vernal pool site located at the southern side of APN 012-049-10, which could be negatively and significantly affected by this application. Conditions of approval will mitigate these potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.	2, 5, 11, 12, 35
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	X		There is a recorded vernal pool site located at the southern side of APN 012-049-10. Conditions of approval have been introduced that list mitigation measures that will lessen the potential impacts to the documented vernal pool to a less than significant level.	2, 11, 12, 35
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		A review of the County of Lake's GIS database indicates that no significant or unique fish or wildlife habitat areas are present. Less than significant.	11, 35
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X		No specific policies in County of Lake documents prevent removal of trees. Division 2, Chapter 4, Article 3.5 Oak Woodlands Conservation Act within the California Fish and Wildlife Code governs removal of Oak woodlands. A subdivision of land does not necessitate tree removal. Less than significant.	5, 37
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	The project site is not encumbered with a Habitat Conservation Plan. No impact.	1, 3,
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES						
<i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Cause a substantial adverse			X		During the review period for this parcel map application, Sonoma	2, 34

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?					State College's Northwest Information Center, commented that a record search of the site determined that there was a possibility that there was the possibility that unrecorded archaeological sites could be present and that an archaeological survey was recommended to be conducted by a registered archaeologist. A cultural resources study was conducted by John Parker. The results of this study did not find any significant cultural resources and Dr. Parker recommended that the project proceed as planned. To address unknown archaeological resources that could be found during any significant construction on any of the parcels, conditions of approval in Section C have been included. This would render any impacts to historical resources less than significant .	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?			X		A cultural resources study was conducted by John Parker. The results of this study did not find any significant cultural resources and Dr. Parker recommended that the project proceed as planned. To address unknown archaeological resources that could be found during any significant construction on any of the parcels, conditions of approval in Section C have been included. This would render any impacts to historical resources less than significant .	2, 34
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X		A search of the database at the University of the California Museum of Paleontology did not identify any formally documented paleontological sites within or near the project area. However, there is a possibility of unanticipated and accidental paleontological discoveries during ground disturbing project-related activities. Unanticipated and accidental paleontological discoveries during project implementation have the potential to affect significant paleontological resources. Projects within the project area would be required to comply with General Plan Policy OSC-8.13, which requires the County to protect significant archaeological and paleontological resources that are discovered during ground disturbing activities. Compliance with General Plan Policy OSC-8.13 and the Lake County Grading Ordinance will reduce impacts to unique paleontological resources to less than significant .	41
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X		In the remote possibility that human remains are discovered during any land disturbance activities, the applicant will be required to provide appropriate mitigations. Less than significant .	2
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: b) 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.			X	X	i) A review of the Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map did not indicate an active earthquake fault zone within the project boundaries. No impact . ii) See i) response above. No impact . iii) The soils found on the subject parcel are known as the following: Collayomi-Aiken Whispering complex (127), five to thirty percent slopes which are identified as well drained with rapid surface runoff with moderate permeability and moderate hazard of erosion. Also on site is Konocti-Hambright complex (152) five to fifteen percent slopes, which is identified as moderately deep and well drained with medium runoff, moderate permeability and a hazard for erosion on steeper areas. Konocti Variant-Konocti-Hambright complex (156) can also be found. This soil has slopes of fifteen to thirty percent, is deep and well drained, and has rapid surface runoff with moderate erosion hazards and moderately slow	7, 14, 30

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? iv) Landslides?					permeability. Soil type Sobrante-Collayomi-Whispering association also is located on the project sites. This soil type has fifteen to thirty percent slopes, is moderately deep and well drained, has moderate permeability and a moderate erosion hazard potential. None of these soils would be considered to be subject to liquefaction, as they are not loose in nature or non-native fill material Less than significant . iv) A review of the County of Lake's Landslide Hazard Map indicates that the project site is not subject to an increased risk of landslides. No impact .	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X		The soils found on the subject parcel are known as the following: Collayomi-Aiken Whispering complex (127), five to thirty percent slopes which are identified as well drained with rapid surface runoff with moderate permeability and moderate hazard of erosion. Also on site is Konocti-Hambright complex (152) five to fifteen percent slopes, which is identified as moderately deep and well drained with medium runoff, moderate permeability and a hazard for erosion on steeper areas. Konocti Variant-Konocti-Hambright complex (156) can also be found. This soil has slopes of fifteen to thirty percent, is deep and well drained, has rapid surface runoff with moderate erosion hazards and moderately slow permeability. Soil type Sobrante-Collayomi-Whispering association also is located on the project sites. This soil type has fifteen to thirty percent slopes, is moderately deep and well drained, has moderate permeability and a moderate erosion hazard potential. Clearing land for a single family residence, which is the most likely scenario as a result of this parcel map approval would not result in a significant loss of topsoil. As such, impacts can be anticipated to be less than significant .	7
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 USDA Soil Survey for Lake County indicates that the soil types identified in the project site are not subject to subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. Less than significant .	7
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?			X		The USDA Soil Survey for Lake County indicates that the soil type identified in the project site is not subject to severe expansion. Less than significant .	7
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where		X	X		The site of parcel one is already developed with a single family residence with a well for potable water and a septic system for wastewater removal. Proposed parcel two has been approved for septic system and has an existing well on site. Proposed parcel	7, 27

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?					three has neither an approved well site nor an approved septic system location. Conditions in section F have been added to address this possibly significant issue to lessen the impacts to less than significant .	
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	The project's application did not indicate any hazardous materials being transported from or disposed of at the project site. No impact.	5
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	See VII(a). No impact.	5
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	No schools present within ¼ mile. No impact.	5, 35
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. No impact.	43
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 within an airport vicinity. No impact.	5, 35
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	The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impact.	35
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X	In referencing the County of Lake's General Plan document and the Lower Lake Area Plan, the project site will not impact an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No impact.	1, 45
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	X		The project location is within the Calfire response area. It also is located within a high risk fire zone. In 2014, large wildland fires burned areas to the north and south. Construction of any structures within this application's vicinity would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death due to wildland fires. Calfire has adopted stringent construction requirements to lessen the risks of loss injury or death due to wildland fires. Prior to any construction, these requirements would have to be met. Conditions contained in Section G of the conditions of approval shall mitigate all possible impacts due to wildland fires to a less than significant level.	33, 35

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY						
<i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X		The project parcels will utilize septic systems for waste discharge. All requirements of the Environmental Health Department shall be met, as detailed in Section F of conditions of approval. As such this project's impacts to water quality standards or waste discharge will be less than significant .	2, 5, 27
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?)			X		Proposed parcel one has an existing residence being supplied with well water. Proposed parcel two also has an existing well for potable water needs. Proposed parcel three will be required to demonstrate that potable water is available prior to final map approval, as detailed in Section F of conditions of approval. As a result, impacts will be less than significant .	2, 5, 27
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		On site vegetation should be preserved. 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. No stream or river course will be altered as a part of this parcel map. Less than significant .	2, 5
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		See VIII c. Less than significant .	2, 5
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		Any ground disturbance associated with the Parcel Map will result in insignificant increases in storm water to the project area. The site is not serviced by any stormwater drainage system. Best Management Practices (BMP's) for the site will be required to be submitted to the Public Works Department for review prior to any construction or ground disturbance. Less than significant .	2, 5
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X		See VIII e. Less than significant .	2, 5
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	The property is not located within a 100 year flood hazard area, as depicted on the County of Lake's GIS program. No impact .	20, 35
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X	See VIII g above. No impact .	20, 35
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including			X		No levees or dams are close to the project site. Less than significant .	5, 35

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?						
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X	Clear Lake is a shallow lake, which would not have the depth or the mass to generate a seiche or a tsunami of any consequence. Mudflows would not occur at the site location given the types of soils of the property and native vegetation. No impact.	1, 35
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. No impact.	35, 45
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?			X		As mitigated, this project is consistent with the Lake County General Plan and the Lake County zoning ordinance. Less than significant.	1, 3, 45
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X	There is no specific habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans in place relative to this project. No impact.	1, 45
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's Aggregate Resource Management Plan does not identify a source of minerals at this site. No impact.	21
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's General Plan nor the Aggregate Resource Management Plan identifies a source of minerals at this site. No impact.	1, 21
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	This subdivision of property will not generate excessive noise levels. Given the large parcel sizes of over twenty acres, no significant noises can be expected during any construction phases. No impact.	5
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?				X	This project will not create unusual vibration. No impact.	5
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. No impact.	5
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X		The subdivision of land will not lead to a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels. Large parcel sizes would negate any noises due to long distances between residences. Less than significant	5
e) For a project located within an				X	Not applicable. Not within an airport land use plan. No impact.	1, 3, 45

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
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?						
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 airport vicinity. No impact.	1, 3, 45
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		The inclusion of at most five additional housing units (two single family dwellings and three residential second units) will not adversely affect the surrounding area. Less than significant	1, 5
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X	No existing housing units will be required to be displaced. No impact.	1, 5
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement?				X	No displacement proposed. No impact.	1, 5
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: b) Fire Protection? Police Protection? Schools? Parks? Other Public Facilities?			X		The possible construction of a total of two single family residences and three accessory residential units would not require new government facilities including Fire Protection, Police Protection, Schools, Parks or other public facilities. Less than significant	5, 45
XIV. RECREATION <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such			X		The construction of two new single family residences is not anticipated to generate significant demand for recreational facilities. Section b of conditions of approval will require the applicant to pay	2

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?					park mitigation fees. Less than significant.	
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X	The possible residential construction done as a result of this parcel map application will not require that new recreational facilities be built, but in order to facilitate the use of existing park facilities by future residents, condition of approval B1 requires that park mitigation fees are paid to the County of Lake's Public Services Department. Less than significant.	1, 2
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	The possible addition of two additional single family residences and possibly three accessory second units will not adversely affect traffic patterns along East Road or its junction with Spruce Grove Road. No impact.	22
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X	The possible addition of two additional residences will not negatively impact traffic levels of service. No impact.	22
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?				X	No impact to air traffic will occur as a consequence of this application. No impact.	1, 5, 45
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X		All access roads are existing. It has been noted that conditions of approval (section D) have been added that require improvements be made to existing East Road. Less than significant.	2, 22
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?			X		See XV d) response above. Less than significant.	5, 22
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X	Each new parcel will be designed to provide adequate onsite parking for all residential uses as well as guest parking. No impact.	2, 3
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X	No impact to alternative transportation policies. No impact.	5, 24
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS <i>Would the project</i>						
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X		Any residential construction associated with the project will not disturb cumulatively more than one acre of ground. Less than significant.	5
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	The proposed parcels will utilize existing and proposed septic system facilities for wastewater treatment. No impact	5, 27
c) Require or result in the			X		During the construction phase of new residences, the contractor will	2, 13

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?					be required to comply with the Department of Public Work's water Resources stormwater requirements. Less than significant.	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X		The project sites will be provided with potable water through existing or proposed wells. Any new well on proposed parcel three will be required to satisfy all requirements of the Environmental Health Division, as detailed in conditions of approval Section F Less than significant.	2, 5, 27
e) 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	There is no wastewater treatment provider for this site. Septic systems will be utilized. No impact.	5, 35
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X		The project site will be serviced by the local waste disposal service, which has adequate waste capacity at the local Lake County Landfill in Clearlake. Less than significant.	31
g) 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. Less than significant.	31
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 restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X	X		At least four sensitive species are thought to exist found at this site within an existing vernal pool. As such, conditions of approval, as detailed in Section C have been added that will reduce any significant impacts to the listed endangered plant species associated with residential construction to a less than significant level.	ALL
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 project is a three lot subdivision created from the merger and resubdivision of two existing legal parcels of record. Surrounding land uses also are rural and residential. Given the rural nature of the area and restrictive zoning, cumulative effects with this project will not be a factor. Less than significant.	All
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X		The project is being proposed on a site that has had limited human development consisting of a single family residence and the approval of a vineyard and winery building. The development of two additional single family residences and possibly three accessory second units on these previously developed parcels could not be expected to have substantial adverse effect on humans either directly or	All

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					indirectly. Less than significant.	

Source List

1. Lake County General Plan
2. Conditions of Approval
3. Lake County Zoning Ordinance
4. Site Visit, 4/21/2016
5. Community Development Department Application, 15-02 PM
6. U.S.G.S. Topographic Map
7. U.S.D.A. Lake County Soil Survey
8. Lake County Important Farmland 2006 Map
9. Lake County Air Quality Management District
10. Lake County Serpentine Soil Mapping
11. California Natural Diversity Database
12. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory
13. Water Resources Division, Lake County Department of Public Works
14. Earthquake Fault Zone maps for Lake County
15. Lake County Emergency Management Plan
16. Lake County Hazardous Waste Management Plan
17. Lake County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
18. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, fire hazard mapping
19. National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)
20. FEMA flood hazard maps
21. Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan
22. Lake County Department of Public Works, Roads Division
23. Lake County Bicycle Plan
24. Lake County Transit for bus routes
25. Northshore Fire Protection District
26. California Regional Water Quality Control Board
27. Lake County Environmental Health Division
28. Lake County Special Districts
29. Lake County Grading Ordinance
30. Lake County Natural Hazard database
31. Lake County Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan and Siting Element, 1996
32. Site Plan
33. Arc View Wildfire Area Map
34. Cultural Resources Study dated June 22, 2015
35. Lake County GIS mapping system
36. Shoreline Communities Area Plan
37. Fish and Game Code Division 2, Chapter 4, Article 3.5 Oak Woodlands Conservation Act
38. http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/index.htm
39. <http://law.justia.com/codes/california/2010/fqc/1360-1372.html>
40. <http://www.ucmp.berkeley.edu/>
41. <http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Pages/Index.aspx>
42. Lake County Landslide Hazard Map
43. <http://codes.lp.findlaw.com/cacode/GOV/1/7/d1/4.5/6/s65962.5>
44. Various websites for biological data
45. Lower Lake Area Plan