

2019039019



**COUNTY OF LAKE**  
 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT  
 Planning Division  
 Courthouse - 255 N. Forbes Street  
 Lakeport, California 95453  
 Telephone 707/263-2221 FAX 707/263-2225

February 28, 2019

**California Environmental Quality Act**  
**INITIAL STUDY 19-10**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

1. **Project Title:** Wallar Lakebed Permit
2. **Permit Number:** IS19-10
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:** Peggy Barthel, Associate Resource Planner II (707) 263-2221
5. **Project Location:** 95 Rocky Point Road, Lakeport; APN 029-252-01  
Lakeport USGS Quad Section 6; T14N R9W, M.D.M.
6. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Russell Wallar  
95 Rocky Point Road  
Lakeport, CA 95453
7. **General Plan Designation:** Low Density Residential & Resource Conservation
8. **Zoning:** "R1 - DR-SC-FF-WW" Single-Family Residential - Design Review-Scenic-Floodway Fringe-Waterway
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).**

The project applicant proposes to rebuild the existing structure. The existing structure is located within the required 10-foot setback from the property line and therefore will be relocated away from the property line. The new structure will be located out of the setback from the property line and will add five feet in length so the depth is sufficient for year-round use. The project includes removal of 14 wood pilings and driving of 15-17 metal pilings. The subject property is currently improved with a single family residence. A floating barge and drop hammer will be utilized to install the pilings and pre-fabricated dock. No earth moving activities would be required to complete the project.

Upon evaluation of the application materials and consultation with California Department of Fish & Wildlife (CDFW), Community Development Department Staff has determined that an Initial Study is required. NCRM prepared a biological assessment and recommended mitigation for potential biological impacts, which have been included in the evaluation Section IV.

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

The proposed project is located in the Rocky Point area of North Lakeport. Surrounding land use is residential.

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

California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	---	Lakebed Alteration Agreement
County of Lake Water Resources	---	Lakebed Encroachment Permit

**12. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?**

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3 (c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

Requests for review of the project were sent to representatives of local tribes. Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians responded to the original Request for Review during the Categorical Exemption phase, but no further response was received regarding the Initial Study. The Middletown Rancheria responded that they have no specific comments. Koi Nation responded that they have no interest in the project. Big Valley Rancheria initially responded that they would be interested as a possible offsite tule mitigation option. However, because no tules will be removed for the project (rather, the pilings will be set into the tule bed without removal), no need for mitigation is anticipated.

Project Site



**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"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions      | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality     | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation                                |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources  | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning           | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources                     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources    | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources             | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire                                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

**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:

Peggy Barthel, Associate Resource Planner

Peggy Barthel  
SIGNATURE

Date: 2/28/19

Michalyn DelValle, 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**
<b>I. AESTHETICS</b> <i>Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:</i>						
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X		The project site is located on a parcel adjacent to Clear Lake in North Lakeport. Scenic vistas within the vicinity of the project site include Clear Lake, Mount Konocti, and rolling hills. The proposed project would be visually consistent with surrounding uses. Therefore, visual impacts are anticipated to be negligible.  There may be a temporary visual impact to the site during construction related to the presence of equipment and materials; however, this would be a temporary impact and is not considered significant.	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	The project is not within sight of a state scenic highway. No trees or rock outcroppings would be disturbed for the project.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			X		The proposed use would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and surrounding area.	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 does not include lighting.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
<b>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES</b> <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. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.</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 designated as "Urban and Built-Up Land" by the Lake County Important Farmland Map. The project would not induce changes to existing farmland that would result in its conversion to non-agricultural use.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X	The subject parcel is not in a Williamson Act contract.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11



IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				X	The project would not result in the rezone of forest land, timber land, or Timberland Production lands.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X	The project would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X	The project would not induce changes to existing farmland that would result in its conversion to non-agricultural use.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11
<b>III. AIR QUALITY</b>						
<i>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district 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	The project is not expected to conflict with an air quality plan. There would be temporary impacts to the site during construction related to the presence of equipment and materials.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12
b) 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?				X	See response to Section III (a).	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X	The parcels in the project area are zoned "R1" Single-Family Residential with residences in the immediate vicinity. Construction would be temporary and is not anticipated to product substantial pollutant concentrations.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?				X	No objectionable emissions or odors are expected. Any odors from construction would be temporary.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>						
<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		<p>A Biological Impact Review was prepared by NCRM (December 2018). The project area was described as having approximately 50-feet of shoreline that is wetland along the perimeter of the property where construction activities are proposed. Above the shoreline, there is a single willow (<i>Salix</i> sp.) tree and a grass lawn. The only species anticipated to be potentially impacted by the project would be aquatic, as the impacts will be from piling removal and pile driving in Clear Lake. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 will reduce potential impacts to Clear Lake hitch to less than significant.</p> <p>NCRM reports that Clear Lake hitch are known to breed in the northwest portion of the lake. The closest known spawning grounds to the project site are Rodman Slough (2.3 miles), Adobe Creek (4.5 miles), Kelsey Creek (6.5 miles), and Cole Creek (6.7 miles). The project does not pose a threat to spawning grounds considering there are no major tributaries adjacent to the project site. The project</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 13, 14, 15, 16

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					<p>may pose treat to larvae and juvenile life stage.</p> <p>Adult hitch are typically found in the limnetic zone of Clear Lake; therefore, the project is unlikely to affect adult hitch. The typical hitch spawning season is mid-February through May, thus NCRM predicts that juveniles will not occupy shallow habitat before February 15th. Hitch juveniles may remain inshore for upwards of 80 days post downstream migrations. Potential exists for this project to have a direct impact on juvenile hitch, as the rushes serve as refuge from predators. NCRM recommends that restricting the construction season from November 1st to January 31st may help mitigate the direct potential impact from pile driving.</p> <p>Project timing is the method of Clear Lake hitch impact avoidance preferred by CDFW. When projects are undertaken between October 15 and December 31, no impact to Clear Lake hitch is anticipated. Prior to commencement of construction, a Lakebed Alteration Agreement shall be obtained from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All the conditions of such permit shall be adhered to throughout the course of the project to reduce the impact to a less than significant level.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measures:</b>  <b>BIO-1: Work along the lakeshore shall be restricted to between October 15 and January 31 to avoid impacts to Clear Lake hitch.</b></p>	
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			See response to Section IV (a). Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 will reduce potential impacts to less than significant.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 13, 14, 15, 16
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			X		There would be no removal, filling, or other hydrological interruption associated with this project. The project will be constructed within waters of the U.S. The applicant is required to comply with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers requirements including any reporting requirements for a nationwide permit.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 13, 14, 15, 16
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 project does not propose to place any structures in the lake that would interfere with the movement of wildlife. Relative to the footprint of Clear Lake, the proposed project area is small and would not impede the ability of any fish or aquatic species to move freely throughout the lake or along the shoreline. The shoreline would not be physically blocked. The proposed construction is temporary. Once construction is complete, the migration of fish or other wildlife species would not be impeded.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 13, 14, 15, 16
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		X			Although Clear Lake hitch was listed as threatened under California Endangered Species Act in 2014, no local protection policies have been adopted. See response to Section IV (a). Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 will reduce potential impacts to less than significant.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 16
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	Although Clear Lake hitch was listed as threatened by the state, no habitat conservation plan has been established.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 16

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES</b> <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X	The project does not propose excavation. Installation of pilings is not anticipated to impact historic resources.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X			Archaeological resources are not likely to be discovered under water during piling installation.  <b>Mitigation Measure CULT-1: If any cultural, archaeological or paleontological materials are discovered during construction, the applicant shall halt all activity in the vicinity of the find(s), and retain a qualified archaeologist to evaluate the find(s) and recommend mitigation procedures, if necessary, subject to the approval of the Community Development Director.</b>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X			The project does not propose excavation. Human remains are not likely to be discovered under water during piling installation.  <b>Mitigation Measure CULT-2: The applicant shall immediately contact the Lake County Sheriff's Department and the Community Development Department if any human remains are encountered.</b>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
<b>VI. ENERGY</b> <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?				X	Project construction will be short-term and will not result in unnecessary consumption of resources.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				X	The project will not conflict with an energy plan.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
<b>VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b> <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Directly or indirectly cause 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	<b>Earthquake Faults</b> An Earthquake Fault Zone has not been established in the project vicinity by the California Geological Survey under the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act.  <u>Seismic Ground Shaking and Seismic-Related Ground Failure, including liquefaction.</u> Lake County contains numerous known active faults. Future seismic events in the Northern California region can be expected to produce seismic ground shaking at the site. However, all construction would be required to be built consistent with Current Seismic Safety construction standards.  <u>Landslides</u> According to the Lawrence Livermore landslide map series for Lake County, the area is considered generally stable and not a landslide risk.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 18, 19, 20, 21



IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X	The project involves driving pilings into the lakebed; the rest of the construction would be done over the water surface of Clear Lake. Driving pilings would have no effect on soil or top soil.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8
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	All subsurface disturbances from driving pilings would be limited to the lakebed only (under water).	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 18, 21
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?				X	Ground disturbance will occur within the lakebed, where soil type is unknown. Pilings are designed to be installed deep enough to support the associated structures.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X	No septic tanks are proposed or needed for the project.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X	No paleontological resources or unique geologic features will be affected by the project.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
<b>VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</b> <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X		In general, GHG emissions from construction activities include the use of construction equipment, worker commute vehicles, and stationary equipment (such as generators, if any). Greenhouse gas emissions resulting from the temporary use of standard construction equipment would be negligible and would not result in a significant impact to the environment.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				X	This project would not conflict with any adopted plans or policies for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12
<b>IX. 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 existing and proposed dock do not create an increased routine hazard for accidents that could involve the release of hazardous materials into the environment. There would be no storage of large quantities of hazardous materials.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 18, 22, 23
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 response to Section VIII (a).	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 18, 22, 23
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 within a quarter-mile of an existing or proposed school.	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**
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	Property is not listed as a site containing hazardous materials.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 25
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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				X	Project is not located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of an airport.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 26
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X	The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 22
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?				X	The project is not expected to increase the risk of wildland fires.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 22, 27, 28
<b>X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b> <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?				X	The project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or degrade surface or groundwater quality.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 29
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?				X	The project does not propose to utilize groundwater resources.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would: i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or off-site; ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; iii) 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; or iv) impede or redirect flood flows?				X	The project would not alter existing drainage patterns nor result in soil erosion. Driving pilings may result in limited and short-term generation of suspended sediment on site but not as a result of altering any drainage.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 29

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?			X		The structure could be inundated by a lake-generated tsunami, but would not cause inundation by a tsunami.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 20, 22, 30
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				X	The project will not affect water quality or groundwater.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 29, 30
<b>XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING</b> <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Physically divide an established community?				X	The project would not divide a community.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X	The project does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation.  The County of Lake Lakebed Management Department will determine if the project meets the Shoreline Ordinance and will issue a Lakebed Encroachment Permit upon the completion of the CEQA process.  CDFW is a responsible agency for projects subject to the CEQA that are also subject to CDFW's Lake and Streambed Alteration regulatory authority. The project's proposed pile driving activity is subject to CDFW's Lakebed Alteration authority.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 31
<b>XII. MINERAL RESOURCES</b> <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	The project site is not identified by the Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan as a mineral resource site.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 32
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	See response to Section XI (a).	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 32
<b>XIII. NOISE</b> <i>Would the project result in:</i>						
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X		There is the potential that construction activities could increase temporary ambient noise levels in the vicinity. All construction activities, including engine warm-up, are limited to from 7AM to 7PM to reduce the impact to a less than significant level.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X		Construction activities may result in small scale ground vibrations. However, this vibration would be short-term and is not anticipated to affect neighboring properties. Impacts are expected to be less than significant.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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	The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 26

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
<b>XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING</b> <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Induce substantial unplanned 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 project would not induce substantial population growth in the area.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X	No housing would be displaced as a result of the project	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
<b>XV. PUBLIC SERVICES</b> <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:  Fire Protection? Police Protection? Schools? Parks? Other Public Facilities?				X	The project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with government facilities.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
<b>XVI. RECREATION</b> <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 project is on private property. No increase of recreational facilities would occur.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X	No population increase is proposed or expected.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
<b>XVII. TRANSPORTATION</b> <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?				X	The project would not conflict with any transportation plan, ordinance, or policy.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 33

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?				X	The project will not increase traffic.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X	The project would not increase hazards do to a design feature.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 22, 33
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X	The project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 22, 33

### XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

*Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:*

a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or			X	The project does not propose excavation. Installation of pilings is not anticipated to impact historic resources.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.		X		<p>A request for review of the project was sent to representatives of local tribes. The Middletown Rancheria responded that they have no specific comments. Koi Nation responded that they have no interest in the project. Big Valley Rancheria initially responded that they would be interested as a possible offsite tule mitigation option. However, because no tules will be removed for the project (rather, the pilings will be set into the tule bed without removal), no need for mitigation is anticipated.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measures:</b></p> <p><b>CULT-1:</b> If any cultural, archaeological or paleontological materials are discovered during construction, the applicant shall halt all activity in the vicinity of the find(s), and retain a qualified archaeologist to evaluate the find(s) and recommend mitigation procedures, if necessary, subject to the approval of the Community Development Director.</p> <p><b>CULT-2:</b> The applicant shall immediately contact the Lake County Sheriff's Department and the Community Development Department if any human remains are encountered.</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5

### XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

*Would the project:*

a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	This project would not induce the need for new wastewater treatment, storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 34
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			X	There is no requirement for water supplies for this project.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 34
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider,			X	There is no need for wastewater treatment for this project.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 34

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
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?						
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				X	Lake County Waste Solutions is located approximately four miles south of the project site. The landfill has the capacity to accommodate development-related waste. It is not anticipated that there would be ongoing waste generated from the project.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 24, 35
g) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X	The project would comply with all federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 24, 35
<p align="center"><b>XX. WILDFIRE</b></p> <p align="center"><i>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</i></p>						
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X	The project will not impair any emergency plan.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 22, 28
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				X	The project will not increase wildfire risks.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 28
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				X	No new infrastructure is required for this project.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				X	No changes will be made to runoff or drainage.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5



## XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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		The potential impacts to Clear Lake hitch potentially present in the project area would be adequately minimized through the implementation of mitigation measures such that the project would have a less than significant impact on biological resources. See response to Section IV.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, 15, 16
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		Potentially significant impacts have been identified related to Biological Resources. Implementation of and compliance with mitigation measures and project conditions of approval would avoid or reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels and would not result in cumulatively considerable environmental impacts.	ALL
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	X		The mitigation measures relating to Biological Resources would insure that there would be less than significant impacts to neighboring residents due to the construction and use of the proposed facilities.	ALL

\* Impact Categories defined by CEQA

**\*\*Source List**

1. Lake County General Plan
2. Lakeport Area Plan
3. Lake County Zoning Ordinance
4. Site Visits June 15, 2018 and January 7, 2019
5. Community Development Department Application Materials
6. U.S.G.S. Topographic Maps
7. California Department of Transportation:  
[http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16\\_livability/scenic\\_highways/index.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/index.htm)
8. U.S.D.A. Lake County Soil Survey
9. Important Farmland Map <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/agriculture/>
10. Lake County Serpentine Soil mapping
11. Lake County Department of Agriculture
12. Lake County Air Quality Management District
13. California Natural Diversity Database
14. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory
15. Biological Impact Review for Clear Lake Hitch for the Wallar Project, NCRM, December 21, 2018
16. California Department of Fish and Wildlife
17. NA
18. Lake County Natural Hazard database
19. U.S.G.S. Geologic Map and Structure Sections of the Clear Lake Volcanics, Northern California, Miscellaneous Investigation Series, 1995
20. Official Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone maps for Lake County
21. Lawrence Livermore landslide map series for Lake County, 1979
22. Lake County Emergency Management Plan
23. Lake County Hazardous Waste Management Plan, adopted 1989
24. Lake County Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan and Siting Element, 1996
25. Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List: [www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public](http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public)
26. Lake County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, adopted 1992
27. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, fire hazard mapping
28. Lakeport County Fire Protection District
29. National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)
30. Lake County Water Resources Department
31. Lake County Shoreline Ordinance
32. Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan
33. 2010 Lake County Regional Transportation Plan, Dow & Associates, October 2010
34. Lake County Special Districts
35. CalRecycle Solid Waste Information System  
<http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/Search.aspx>