

# COUNTY OF TULARE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY



5961 South Mooney Boulevard  
Visalia, CA 93277

## Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration

Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019

GPA 17-007(Community Plan)

PZC 17-007 (Zoning District Map)

PZC 19-006 (Section 18.9 Zoning Ordinance - Mixed Use)

PZC 19-017 (Section 16 Zoning Ordinance - By Right)

November 2019

Prepared by  
County of Tulare Resource Management Agency  
Economic Development and Planning Branch  
Environmental Planning Division

## INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. **Project Title:** Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019
2. **Lead Agency:** County of Tulare  
Resource Management Agency  
5961 S. Mooney Blvd.  
Visalia, CA 93277
3. **Contact Persons:** Jessica Willis, Planner IV (Project Planner) – 559-624-7122  
Hector Guerra, Chief, Environmental Planning Division – 559-624-7121
4. **Project Location** Lemon Cove (**see Figure 1**) is located in the northern portion of Tulare County, approximately four (4) miles southeast of Woodlake and eleven miles northeast of Visalia. It is generally bounded by Avenue 319 in the south, Goodale Lane in the north, Road 236 in the west, and Road 248 in the east and encompasses approximately 0.8 square miles of land. Lemon Cove is an agriculturally oriented service community surrounded by lands in agricultural production, vacant lands, and scattered residential homes. State Route (SR) 198 and State Route (SR) 216 provide primary access to the cities of Visalia and Woodlake (**see Figure 2**) to the northwest, and the community of Three Rivers to the northeast. The Tulare County/Fresno County Line is located approximately 10.5 miles north of Lemon Cove.  
  
Lemon Cove is located in Sections 02, 03, 10, and 11, Township 18 South, Range 27 East MDB&M, and can be found within the Woodlake and Rocky Hill Quads United States Geological Survey 7.5 minute topographic quadrangle. Lemon Cove is located at an elevation of 502 feet above sea level.
5. **Latitude, Longitude:** Latitude: 36° 22' 53"N and Longitude: 119° 1' 33".
6. **Applicant:** County of Tulare  
Resource Management Agency  
5961 S. Mooney Blvd.  
Visalia, CA 93277
7. **General Plan Designation:** General Plan Amendment
8. **Zoning:** A-1; AE-20; C-2-SC; O; PD-F-M; R-3; R-A; R-A-M; R-A-M-43; Rights-of-Way
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.**

It has been recognized that Lemon Cove, an unincorporated community, has localized land use needs and issues that should be addressed in a more specific manner particular to its community, geographic features, location of major roadways, such as State Route (SR) 198, population characteristics, availability of water, and other issues unique to the community's area. Therefore, the Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019 has been prepared with an emphasis on these considerations with particular focus on land use and circulation.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019. Executive Summary. Page 19.


“As with any community plan, the contents of this document are not intended to be absolute. Planning is a continuous process and, to be effective, requires periodic re-evaluation and revision to reflect changing needs and priorities. This Plan, therefore, should be reviewed on a periodic basis with the assistance and participation of local citizens, groups, and agencies.”<sup>2</sup>

10. **Surrounding land uses and setting (Brief description):** Lemon Cove (see **Figure 2**) is an agriculturally oriented service community surrounded by lands in agricultural production, vacant lands, and scattered residential homes. Cities and communities surrounding Lemon Cove include Visalia to the southwest; Woodlake to the northwest; and the community of Three Rivers to the northeast. The Tulare County/Fresno County Line is located approximately 10.5 miles north of Lemon Cove.
11. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):** None.
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?** Pursuant to AB 52 and SB 18, a Sacred Land File request was submitted to the Native American Heritage Commission on July 23, 2019 and was returned with negative results. On August 28, 2019, tribal consultation notices were sent to tribal contacts representing five (5) Native American tribes. The County received no responses from the tribes within the 30-day response time. Mitigation measures have been included in the project to reduce potential impacts on tribal cultural resources in the event that any are unearthed during construction-related activities.

---


<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

**Figure 1  
Vicinity Map**






**Figure 2**  
**Aerial Map**







**Figure 3**  
**Proposed Urban Development Boundary**



**Figure 4**  
**Lemon Cove Proposed Land Use Plan**



**Figure 5**  
**Lemon Cove Existing Zoning District Map**





## ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

## B. DETERMINATION:

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 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.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Hector Guerra  
Printed Name

Date: 11/7/19

Chief Environmental Planner  
Title

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Reed Schenke, P.E.  
Printed Name

Date: 11/7/19

Environmental Assessment Officer  
Title

## C. 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 “Earlier Analyses,” as described in (5) below, 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.



		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	
1.	AESTHETICS					
	Would the project:					
	a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of <u>public views of</u> 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Analysis:

The following Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update policies for this resource apply to this Project:

The Lemon Cove Urban Development Boundary (UDB) contains approximately 404.1 acres (including Rights-of-way); the proposed amendment will increase the UDB by approximately 263.7 acres, for a total of approximately 667.8 acres.<sup>3</sup> No proposed development projects are part of this proposed amendment. However, over time, the proposed 263.7-acre expansion and ultimate planned development within the Planning Area could impact the area's aesthetic character as future development replaces existing agricultural lands and rural open spaces. At the time of development, existing General Plan policies and proposed Community Plan policies will be implemented to avoid and/or minimize any potentially adverse impacts to scenic views (for example, *ERM-1.15 Minimize Lighting Impacts* and *ERM-5.18 Night Sky Protection*).

SR 198 traverses through Lemon Cove as it continues northeast toward the Lake Kaweah, and it is designated as a Candidate State Scenic Highway<sup>4</sup>. SR 216, a designated County Scenic Road, also has a small section in the northwest part of Lemon Cove Proposed Planning Study Area.<sup>5</sup> As with much of Tulare County, the Sierra Nevada mountains are visible when conditions (such as haze, fog, or air quality) do not interfere with visibility. Implementation of General Plan policies (for example, *SL-1.1 Natural Landscapes* and *SL-2.1 Designated Scenic Routes and Highways*) are intended to

<sup>3</sup> Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019. Pages 24 and 160.

<sup>4</sup> Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update. Part I. Figure 7-1. Page 7-5. Accessed November 2019 at: <http://generalplan.co.tulare.ca.us/documents.html>.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
<p>minimize impacts to views of landscapes. Future development design will be required to consider potential visual impacts to the surrounding areas, and set-back requirements and building height limitations contained in the Tulare County Zoning Ordinance will also prevent adverse impacts to a scenic vista.</p> <p>a) <b><i>Less Than Significant Impact</i></b> - The proposed Project is a Community Plan and contains no plans for development or construction projects. The Project will not adversely affect any scenic vista; as such, it will not include any structures which may substantially impact a scenic vista. As such, there will be no impact to this resource.</p> <p>b) <b><i>No Impact</i></b> - The proposed Project area includes a mix of uses such as retail office, single-family and multi-family residential, hotel, recreation, limited industrial, and public facilities etc.,<sup>6</sup> The community is completely surrounded by agriculturally productive lands, vacant lands, and scattered residential homes.<sup>7</sup> As such, the proposed Community Plan will not impact scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state or county designated scenic highway or county designated scenic road. Therefore, there will be no impact to this resource.</p> <p>c) <b><i>No Impact</i></b> - The Community Plan will ultimately expand the existing UDB from approximately 404.1 acres to 667.8 acres. The Community Plan does not include any plans for construction or development. As noted earlier, future development design will be required to consider potential visual impacts to the surrounding areas, and set-back and building height limitations contained in the Tulare County Zone Ordinance will also prevent any adverse impacts to a scenic vista. The predominantly agricultural scenery surrounding the Community will remain unchanged as a result of the proposed Community Plan. As such, there will be no impact to this resource.</p> <p>d) <b><i>No Impact</i></b> - The proposed Community Plan will not result in the creation of a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Over the course to the planning horizon, the Plan acknowledges that additional development and growth will likely occur in the planning area that could lead to future impacts from light or glare. Various General Plan Policies are anticipated to minimize impacts from light or glare sources. Evening hour lighting for safety and security purposes cannot be determined until specific locations and development proposals are received. However, there are several General Plan Policies (such as <i>ERM-1.15</i> Minimize Lighting Impacts, <i>LU-4.5</i> Commercial Building Design, <i>LU-7.19</i> Minimize Lighting Impacts, and <i>SL-1.2</i> Working Landscapes) that require new development to minimize lighting impacts. Therefore, the Project will result in no impact to this resource.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Impact Analysis: No Impact</b></p> <p>The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is Tulare County. This cumulative analysis is based on the information provided in the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, General Plan Background Report, Tulare County 2030 General Plan EIR, and/or draft Lemon Cove Community Plan.</p> <p>As the proposed Project is merely a proposed Community Plan and does not include any development proposal, the Project will not create significant Project-specific visual impacts. As such, the proposed Project will result in no significant Project-specific or Cumulative Impacts related to this Checklist Item</p> <p><b>Mitigation: None Required</b></p>					

<sup>6</sup> Lemon Cove Background Report. Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019. Page 26.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid. 19.

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	
<b>Mitigation: None Required</b>						
<b>2.</b>	<b>AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES</b>					
	In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the Rural Valley Lands Plan point evaluation system prepared by the County of Tulare 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. Would the project:					
	a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agriculture use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	c)	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources code 12220(g), timberland (as defined in Public Resource Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Analysis:						
a) - e) <b>No Impact</b> – As mentioned earlier, the proposed Project area includes a mix of uses such as retail office, single-family and multi-family residential, hotel, recreation, limited industrial, and public facilities etc. <sup>8</sup> The Project does not include any						

<sup>8</sup> Op. Cit. 26.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
<p>development projects/proposals; however, future development is anticipated to occur within the proposed UDB area over time. Development within the Planning Area would, over time, affect the area's agricultural lands and rural open spaces as future urban development occurs. The Lemon Cove UDB expansion would result in the addition of approximately 263.7 acres to the existing UDB area. The overall land use pattern will remain as currently defined; however, those areas within the proposed UDB expansion area could ultimately result in new residential, institutional, commercial, and light industrial uses as contained in the Community Plan (see Table 38)<sup>9</sup>.</p> <p>The Project will likely result in the ultimate conversion (i.e., cancellation or non-renewal) of parcels containing Williamson Act (WA) Preserves as build-out of the Planning Area occurs. Over time, parcels classified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) are planned for development to non-agricultural uses. The area within the existing 404.1 acre UDB is designated in the 2018 FMMP map (see Figure 7 of the Community Plan). Of these, approximately 134.54 acres are designated Urban and Built-up Land, approximately 269.56 acres are designated Prime Farmland, approximately 5.50 acres are designated Vacant or Disturbed land. As specific future development proposals are considered, each will be evaluated on its own merits and the appropriate environmental evaluation will determine the level of mitigation measures, if necessary/applicable.</p> <p>As the Project does not include any development proposals, it will not result in the conversion of any prime agricultural land as defined in Section 51201(C) of the Govt. Code to non-agricultural use. It will not conflict with existing zoning for agriculture use, or a Williamson Act contract; it will not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources code 12220(g) or timberland (as defined in Public Resource Code section 4526); it will not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use, nor will it involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The Project, over time and at full build-out, would likely result in conversion of farmland to future non-agricultural use (residential, commercial, or industrial) which will be addressed when project-specific proposals are considered. However, as no development proposals are included as part of this Community Plan, there will be no impact to these resources.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Impacts Analysis: No Impact</b></p> <p>The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is Tulare County. This cumulative analysis is based on the information provided in the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, General Plan Background Report, Tulare County 2030 General Plan EIR, and draft Lemon Cove Community Plan.</p> <p>As noted earlier, the Project does not include any development projects/proposals; however, future development is anticipated to occur within the proposed UDB area over time. Development within the Planning Area would, over time, affect the area's agricultural lands and rural open spaces as future urban development occurs. The overall cumulative impact to agricultural resources has been accounted for in the Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update Revised EIR. As noted in the General Plan Revised EIR, “While the proposed project includes policies to minimize this impact, there would still be a project level significant and unavoidable impact. The loss of agricultural land within the County as a result of urban development is part of an overall trend within the San Joaquin Valley and the County will continue to face development pressure in the foreseeable future. As more fully described in Section 3.10, “Agricultural Resources” [in the Revised EIR], the proposed project does include several policies stating that the County will work at a regional level to control the conversion of agricultural uses. However, since the County is projected to continue to urbanize, the loss of agricultural lands as a result of the proposed project would contribute considerably to a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact to agricultural resources.”<sup>10</sup></p>					

<sup>9</sup> Op. Cit. Table 38. 164.

<sup>10</sup> Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update Recirculated EIR. Page 5-12. Accessed September 2019. <http://generalplan.co.tulare.ca.us/documents.html> then locate

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>This Project is consistent with the conclusions contained in the Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update EIR and does not compound nor contribute to exacerbation of an already determined cumulative impact. As such, the Project is consistent with the Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update EIR as it relates to the agricultural resource.</p> <p><b>Mitigation: None Required</b></p>					
<b>3.</b>	<b>AIR QUALITY</b>				
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. Would the project:					
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Analysis:</b></p> <p>As noted previously, the Project is update to the proposed Lemon Cove Community Plan and no development proposals are being considered at this time. The update is being prepared to accommodate a growth rate of 1.3% (consistent with the Tulare County General Plan). Also, the Project includes proposed expansion of the Urban Development Boundary (UDB) from its existing approximately 404 acres to approximately 668 acres (and increase of 264 acres).</p> <p>The proposed Project is located in the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB), a continuous inter-mountain air basin. The Sierra Nevada Range forms the eastern boundary; the Coast Range forms the western boundary; and the Tehachapi Mountains form the southern boundary. These topographic features restrict air movement through and beyond the SJVAB. The SJVAB is comprised of San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Merced, Madera, Fresno, Kings, and Tulare Counties and the valley portion of Kern County; it is approximately 25,000 square miles in area. Tulare County lies within the southern portion of the SJVAB. The SJVAB is managed by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD or Air District).</p> <p>Both the federal government (through the United State Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)) and the State of California (through the California Air Resources Board (CARB)) have established health-based ambient air quality standards (AAQS) for six air pollutants, commonly referred to as “criteria pollutants.” The six criteria pollutants are: carbon monoxide (CO), ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>), and lead (Pb).</p>					

“Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report February 2010 Draft”, select “Recirculated DEIR.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
<p>National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) have been established for each criteria pollutant to protect the public health and welfare. The federal and state standards were developed independently with differing purposes and methods, although both processes are intended to avoid health-related effects. As a result, the federal and state standards differ in some cases. In general, the California state standards are more stringent.</p> <p>The Federal Clean Air Act requires EPA to set NAAQS for the six criteria pollutants, noted above, that occur throughout the United States. Of the six pollutants, particle pollution and ground-level ozone are the most widespread health threats. EPA regulates the criteria pollutants by developing human health-based and/or environmentally-based criteria (science-based guidelines) for setting permissible levels. The set of limits based on human health is called primary standards. Another set of limits intended to prevent environmental and property damage is called secondary standards.</p> <p>EPA is required to designate areas as meeting (attainment) or not meeting (nonattainment) the air pollutant standards. The Federal Clean Air Act (CAA) further classifies nonattainment areas based on the severity of the nonattainment problem, with marginal, moderate, serious, severe, and extreme nonattainment classifications for ozone. Nonattainment classifications for PM range from marginal to serious. The Federal CAA requires areas with air quality violating the NAAQS to prepare an air quality control plan referred to as the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The SIP contains the strategies and control measures that states will use to attain the NAAQS. The Federal CAA amendments of 1990 require states containing areas that violate the NAAQS to revise their SIP to incorporate additional control measures to reduce air pollution. The SIP is periodically modified to reflect the latest emissions inventories, planning documents, rules, and regulations of Air Basins as reported by the agencies with jurisdiction over them. The EPA reviews SIPs to determine if they conform to the mandates of the Federal CAA amendments and will achieve air quality goals when implemented. If the EPA determines a SIP to be inadequate, it may prepare a Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) for the nonattainment area and impose additional control measures.</p> <p>The SJVAB is designated non-attainment of state and federal health based air quality standards for ozone and respirable particulate matter (PM). The federal classification for the SJVAB is extreme non-attainment for the 8-hour ozone standard. To meet Federal Clean Air Act requirements, the District adopted the 2007 Ozone Plan on April 30, 2007. The ARB approved the Plan on June 14, 2007, while the EPA approved the Plan effective April 30, 2012. The Plan projects that the Valley will achieve the 8-hour ozone standard for all areas of the SJVAB no later than 2023. The District adopted the 2016 Plan for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard in June 2016. This plan satisfies Clean Air Act requirements and ensures expeditious attainment of the 75 parts per billion 8-hour ozone standard. The federal PM<sub>10</sub> standard has been achieved and the US EPA re-classified the SJVAB as in attainment on September 25, 2008. Even after achieving the PM<sub>10</sub> standard, the SJVAB is currently a PM<sub>10</sub> Maintenance Area and all rules and regulations are still in effect. The SJVAB is designated non-attainment for state and federal PM<sub>2.5</sub> (particulate matter less than 2.5 micrometers in diameter) annual standards. The Air District adopted the 2008 PM2.5 Plan in April 2008 to address EPA's annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard of 15 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, which was established by EPA in 1997. The Air District adopted the 2012 PM2.5 Plan to address EPA's 2006 revised 24-hour standard (35 µg/m<sup>3</sup>) in December 2012. On April 16, 2015, the Air District adopted the 2015 Plan for the 1997 PM2.5 Standard which addresses both the annual (35 µg/m<sup>3</sup>) and 24-hour (35 µg/m<sup>3</sup>) standards established by EPA in 1997. The District adopted the 2015 Plan for the 1997 PM2.5 Standard on April 16, 2015. This plan addresses EPA's annual PM2.5 standard of 15 µg/m<sup>3</sup> and 24-hour PM2.5 standard of 65 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, established in 1997. The Air District adopted the 2016 Moderate Area Plan for the 2012 PM2.5 Standard on September 15, 2016. This plan addresses the EPA federal annual PM2.5 standard of 12 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, established in 2012. This plan includes an attainment impracticability demonstration and request for reclassification of the Valley from Moderate nonattainment to Serious nonattainment. The District adopted the 2018 Plan for the 1997, 2006, and 2012 PM2.5 Standards on November 15, 2018. This plan addresses the EPA federal 1997 annual PM2.5 standard of 15 µg/m<sup>3</sup> and 24-hour PM2.5 standard of 65 µg/m<sup>3</sup>; the 2006 24-hour PM2.5 standard of 35 µg/m<sup>3</sup>; and</p>					



		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
<p>the 2012 annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard of 12 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. Measures contained in the 2007 PM<sub>10</sub> Maintenance Plan will also help reduce PM<sub>2.5</sub> levels and will provide progress toward attainment until new measures are implemented for the PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan, if needed. The State does not have an attainment deadline for the ozone standards; however, it does require implementation of all feasible measures to achieve attainment at the earliest date possible. State PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> standards have no attainment planning requirements, but must demonstrate that all measures feasible for the area have been adopted.</p> <p>In addition to consistency with Air District attainment plans, the Tulare County General Plan has a number of policies that apply to projects within County of Tulare. For example, General Plan policies that would apply to future development in the Project area include <i>AQ-1.1 Cooperation with Other Agencies</i>; <i>AQ-1.2 Cooperation with Local Jurisdictions</i>; <i>AQ-1.3 Cumulative Air Quality Impacts</i>; <i>AQ-1.4 Air Quality Land Use Compatibility</i>; <i>AQ-1.5 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Compliance</i>; <i>AQ-3.6 Mixed Land Uses</i>; and <i>AQ-4.2 Dust Suppression Measures</i>. Among General Plan policies regarding land uses which benefit air quality are <i>LU-1.1: Smart Growth and Healthy Communities</i>; <i>LU-1.4: Compact Development</i>; <i>LU-1.8: Encourage Infill Development</i>; <i>LU-3.2: Cluster Development</i>; <i>LU-3.3</i>; and <i>High-Density Residential Locations</i>.</p> <p>The Technical Memorandum “Air Quality Assessment for the Lemon Cove Community Plan” (AQ Memo) was completed by RMA Staff (Jessica Willis, Planner IV) in November 2019 to analyze potential air quality emissions (See Attachment “A”). As indicated in the AQ Memo, the following air quality analysis was “...prepared to evaluate whether the estimated air pollutant emissions generated from implementation of the Project (i.e., future development projects) would cause significant impacts to air quality and health risks to nearby receptors. The air quality assessment was conducted within the context of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA, California Public Resources Code Sections 21000, et seq.). The assessment is intended to provide the County of Tulare (County) with sufficient detail regarding potential impacts of Project implementation and to identify mitigation measures, if necessary, to reduce potentially significant impacts. The estimated emissions are compared to federal and state ambient air quality standards (AAQS) and the thresholds of significance established by the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (Air District). The methodology for the air quality assessment follows the Air District recommendation for quantification of emissions and evaluations of potential impacts on air resources as provided in the <i>Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts</i> (GAMAQI) adopted by the Air District Governing Board on March 19, 2015.”<sup>11</sup></p> <p><b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b></p> <p>“Lemon Cove is currently designated an Unincorporated Community in the 2030 Tulare County General Plan. The objective of the Lemon Cove Community Plan (Plan) is to develop a plan, which can accurately reflect the needs and priorities of the unincorporated community of Lemon Cove. The Land Use and Circulation portions of this Plan provide the mechanism to minimize or avoid the potential adverse impacts of urban growth. The development of an orderly, harmonious land use pattern and appropriate implementation measures are designed to reduce potential conflict between neighboring uses across Tulare County’s 2030 planning horizon, consistent with the Tulare County 2030 General Plan Update. The Plan is needed to increase the availability of infrastructure funding, such as drinking water system improvements (wells, water distribution piping, storage tanks, etc.), wastewater system (such as piping, lift stations, etc.), and public work/safety improvements (such as curbs, gutters, sidewalks, etc.), and to stimulate economic development within the community. Tulare County is proposing new land use and zoning designations within an expanded UDB. The proposed Community Plan, if adopted, will update these designations to be consistent with the General Plan, and will bring existing non-compliant properties into conformity with the Tulare County Zoning Ordinance. The Community Plan also includes the Complete Streets and Road Maintenance programs and the community’s anticipated growth through</p>					

<sup>11</sup> County of Tulare. 2019. Technical Memorandum: Air Quality Assessment (AQ Memo) for the Lemon Cove Community Plan. Page 1. Included in Attachment “A” of this MND.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
--	--	-------------------------------	---	---	----------------------

year 2030 based on the existing land uses, census population data, and the projected 1.3% annual growth rate in unincorporated areas of Tulare County. Other than the Complete Streets and Road Maintenance Programs, there are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) proposed as part of this Project. As an unknown number of proposals may occur within the lifetime of the Plan, the Plan is intended to direct the density, intensity, and types of growth needed to meet the needs of the community. Future developments within the Project planning area will be required to undergo additional CEQA evaluation on a project-by-project basis at such time development is proposed to determine potential environmental impacts.

### **Complete Streets and Road Maintenance**

The Lemon Cove Complete Streets and Road Maintenance Programs are included in the Circulation Element of the proposed Community Plan. The Complete Streets Program has thoroughly analyzed the alternative forms of transportation, including transit, bicycle ways, and pedestrian circulation. Improvements proposed in the Complete Streets Program include, but are not limited to, installation of streetlights, bus shelters, street signage and striping, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, drainage system, and utilities. Road maintenance activities vary by road segment dependent upon the condition of the road and may include chip seal, overlay resurfacing, and asphalt reconstructions.

### **Growth Projections**

There are no specific development projects proposed with the Lemon Cove Community Plan; however, the Plan does include updates to land use designations that could increase the buildout potential of the planning area. Population and residential growth through planning horizon year 2030 was estimated by applying a 1.3% annual growth rate, consistent with the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, to the 2017 baseline population and housing data, as provided in the United States Census Bureau 2017 American Community Survey (ACS).<sup>12</sup> Non-residential growth was estimated through planning horizon year 2030 for a worst-case emissions scenario by applying a 1.3% annual growth rate to the existing uses and assuming all parcels have been improved with structures at a floor to area ratio of 0.20. Using these assumptions for baseline conditions provides a conservative (larger) overall growth estimate. Table 1 (**Table 3-1** in this MND) summarizes the projected growth of the community through horizon Year 2030.”

<b>Table 3-1. Projected Growth through Year 2030</b>								
	Residential <sup>1</sup>		Commercial / Public / Other <sup>2</sup>		Retail <sup>2</sup>		Industrial <sup>2</sup>	
Year	Population	Dwelling Units	Square Feet	Acres	Square Feet	Acres	Square Feet	Acres
2017	232	115	277,129	31.81	65,079	7.47	15,507	1.78
2030	274	136	327,797	37.63	76,977	8.84	18,343	2.11
Overall Growth	42	21	50,668	5.85	11,898	1.37	2,835	0.33
<sup>1</sup> Projections based on 2017 American Community Survey data applying an annual growth rate of 1.3%. <sup>2</sup> Projections based on existing land uses assuming developments/improvements with a Floor to Area Ratio of 0.2 and annual growth rate of 1.3%.								

<sup>12</sup> United States Census Bureau. American FactFinder. 2017 American Community Survey. 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Demographic and Housing Estimates (DP05) and Selected Housing Characteristics (DP04). Accessed November 2019 at: [https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community\\_facts.xhtml](https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml), then enter “Lemon Cove CDP, California”.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
--	--	-------------------------------	---	---	----------------------

## **SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS**

As noted in the AQ Memo, “CEQA Guidelines define a significant effect on the environment as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project. To determine if a project would have a significant impact on air quality and climate change, the type, level, and impact of criteria pollutant and GHG emissions generated by the project must be evaluated. Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines provides the criteria (as Checklist Items) for evaluating potential impacts on the environment.”<sup>13</sup> The CEQA criteria and the Air District’s significance thresholds and guidance for evaluation are provided below.

### **Air Quality Plans**

The Air District has established thresholds of significance for criteria pollutant emissions. These thresholds are based on District New Source Review (NSR) offset requirements for stationary sources. “Stationary sources in the District are subject to some of the toughest regulatory requirements in the nation. Emission reductions achieved through implementation of District offset requirements are a major component of the District’s air quality plans. Thus, projects with emissions below the thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants would be determined to “Not conflict or obstruct implementation of the District’s air quality plan”. ”<sup>14</sup>

“The Air District has three sets of significance thresholds based on the source of the emissions. According to the GAMAQI, “The District identifies thresholds that separate a project’s short-term emissions from its long-term emissions. The short-term emissions are mainly related to the construction phase of a project and are recognized to be short in duration. The long-term emissions are mainly related to the activities that will occur indefinitely as a result of project operations.””<sup>15</sup>

Long-term (operational) emissions are further separated into permitted and non-permitted equipment and activities. Stationary (permitted) sources that comply or will comply with Air District rules and regulations are generally not considered to have a significant air quality impact. Specifically, the GAMAQI states, “District Regulation II ensures that stationary source emissions will be reduced or mitigated to below the District’s significance thresholds... District implementation of New Source Review (NSR) ensures that there is no net increase in emissions above specified thresholds from New and Modified Stationary Sources for all nonattainment pollutants and their precursors. Furthermore, in general, permitted sources emitting more than the NSR Offset Thresholds for any criteria pollutant must offset all emission increases in excess of the thresholds...”<sup>16</sup> The Air District’s significance thresholds are provided in **Table 3-2**.

### **Air Quality Violations**

“Determination of whether project emissions would violate any ambient air quality standard is largely a function of air quality dispersion modeling. If project emissions would not exceed State and Federal ambient air quality standards at the project’s property boundaries, the project would be considered to not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. The need to perform an air quality dispersion modeling analysis for any project (urban development, commercial, or industrial projects) is determined on a case-by-case basis depending on the level of emissions associated with the proposed project. If such modeling is found necessary, the project consultant should check with the District to determine the appropriate model and input data to use in the analysis. Specific information for assessing significance, including screening tools and modeling guidance is available on-line at the District’s website

<sup>13</sup> AQ Memo Page 3.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> Op. Cit. 3 and 4.

<sup>16</sup> Op. Cit. 4.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
--	--	-------------------------------	---	---	----------------------

[www.valleyair.org](http://www.valleyair.org).<sup>17</sup>

“The thresholds of significance for Ambient Air Quality are based on the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) and National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS). A project would be considered to have a significant impact if its emissions are predicted to cause or contribute to a violation of an ambient air quality standard by exceeding any of the following:

1. Any of the CAAQS, or
2. Any of the NAAQS, and if available, the associated Significant Impact Level (SIL).<sup>18</sup>

<b>Table 3-2. Air District Criteria Pollutant Significance Thresholds</b>			
<b>Pollutant/ Precursor</b>	<b>Construction Emissions</b>	<b>Operational Emissions</b>	
		<b>Permitted Equipment and Activities</b>	<b>Non- Permitted Equipment and Activities</b>
	<b>Emissions (tpy)</b>	<b>Emissions (tpy)</b>	<b>Emissions (tpy)</b>
<b>CO</b>	100	100	100
<b>NOx</b>	10	10	10
<b>ROG</b>	10	10	10
<b>SOx</b>	27	27	27
<b>PM<sub>10</sub></b>	15	15	15
<b>PM<sub>2.5</sub></b>	15	15	15

Source: Air District, GAMAQI, Table 2, page 80; and <http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/0714-GAMAQI-Criteria-Pollutant-Thresholds-of-Significance.pdf>, accessed November 1, 2019.

See Table 3 of the AQ Memo which provides the California and National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

“The District ISR rule exempts small development projects (see Table 4 [of the GAMAQI]) from project-specific mitigation requirements. The District performed extensive analysis to identify small projects for which additional mitigation is not feasible. For instance, the exemptions include small residential housing developments of less than 50 units and commercial developments of less than 2,000 square feet. All projects on the exemption list emit less than 2 tons per year of either PM<sub>10</sub> or NO<sub>x</sub>, which is substantially lower than the District’s 10-ton per year significance thresholds. Furthermore, as the tailpipe emissions from motor vehicles continue to decline, these projects will emit even less today than was estimated in 2005 when this rule was adopted. In addition, two tons per year is expected to result in daily emissions of less than the 100 lb/day screening level for either NO<sub>x</sub> or PM<sub>10</sub> that the District has concluded that projects under the ISR exemption thresholds will have a less than significant impact on air quality. Consequently, projects below ISR applicability thresholds are not expected to exceed the thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants emissions (see Section 8.3 [of the GAMAQI]). In addition, projects below the ISR applicability thresholds are not expected to violate any air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation and will not exceed the thresholds of significance for ambient air quality. In this case, the District concludes no emission calculation is needed and no ambient air quality analysis is required.”<sup>19</sup>

“Table 4 [Table 3-3 in this MND] provides the Air District’s ambient air quality analysis (AAQA) screening levels for

<sup>17</sup> Op. Cit. 4 and 5.

<sup>18</sup> Op. Cit. 5.

<sup>19</sup> Op. Cit. 6.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
--	--	-------------------------------	---	---	----------------------

development projects. For projects that exceed the screening thresholds identified in Table 4, the Air District provides further guidance on how to evaluate the 100 pound per day screening level in their guidance document *Ambient Air Quality Analysis Project Daily Emissions Assessment*.<sup>20</sup>

<b>Table 3-3 AAQA Screening Levels For Development Project</b>	
<b>Development Project Type</b>	<b>Space / Size</b>
Residential	50 dwelling units
Commercial	2,000 square feet
Light Industrial	25,000 square feet
Heavy Industrial	100,000 square feet
Medical Office	20,000 square feet
General Office	39,000 square feet
Educational	9,000 square feet
Governmental	10,000 square feet
Recreational	20,000 square feet
Transportation / Transit	Construction exhaust emissions equal or exceeding 2.0 tons NOx or 2.0 tons PM <sub>10</sub>
<i>Source: Air District, GAMAQI, Table 4, page 96</i>	

### **Cumulative Increase in Emissions**

“By its very nature, air pollution is largely a cumulative impact. The nonattainment status of regional pollutants is a result of past and present development. Future attainment of State and Federal ambient air quality standards is a function of successful implementation of the District’s attainment plans. Consequently, the District’s application of thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants is relevant to the determination of whether a project’s individual emissions would have a cumulatively significant impact on air quality. A Lead Agency may determine that a project’s incremental contribution to a cumulative effect is not cumulatively considerable if the project will comply with the requirements in a previously approved plan or mitigation program, including, but not limited to an air quality attainment or maintenance plan that provides specific requirements that will avoid or substantially lessen the cumulative problem within the geographic area in which the project is located [CCR §15064(h)(3)]. Thus, if project specific emissions exceed the thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants the project would be expected to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the District is in non-attainment under applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standards. This does not imply that if the project is below all such significance thresholds, it cannot be cumulatively significant.”<sup>21</sup> **Table 3-4** [Table 5 in the AQ Memo] provides the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin attainment status for federal and state ambient air quality standards

<sup>20</sup> Op. Cit. 6.

<sup>21</sup> Op. Cit. 7.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
	<b>Table 3-4 San Joaquin Valley Attainment Status</b>				
	<b>Pollutant</b>	<b>Designation</b>			
		<b>Federal Standards</b>	<b>State Standards</b>		
	Ozone—1-hour	No Federal Standard	Nonattainment/Severe		
	Ozone—8-hour	Nonattainment/Extreme	Nonattainment		
	PM <sub>10</sub>	Attainment	Nonattainment		
	PM <sub>2.5</sub>	Nonattainment	Nonattainment		
	Carbon monoxide	Attainment/Unclassified	Attainment/Unclassified		
	Nitrogen dioxide	Attainment/Unclassified	Attainment		
	Sulfur dioxide	Attainment/Unclassified	Attainment		
	Lead (Particulate)	No Designation/Classification	Attainment		
	Hydrogen sulfide	No Federal Standard	Unclassified		
	Sulfates	No Federal Standard	Attainment		
	Visibility-reducing particles	No Federal Standard	Unclassified		
	Vinyl chloride	No Federal Standard	Attainment		
Source: Air District, <a href="http://www.valleyair.org/aqinfo/attainment.htm">http://www.valleyair.org/aqinfo/attainment.htm</a> . Accessed November 1, 2019.					

### **Exposure Risks**

“The location of a project is a major factor in determining whether the project will result in localized air quality impacts. The potential for adverse air quality impacts increases as the distance between the source of emissions and receptors decreases. From a health risk perspective, there are two (2) categories of projects that have the potential to cause long-term health risks impacts:

- Type A Projects: Land use projects that will place new toxic sources in the vicinity of existing receptors. This category includes sources of toxic emissions such as gasoline dispensing facilities, asphalt batch plants, warehouse distribution centers, freeways and high traffic roads, and other stationary sources that emit toxic substances.
- Type B Projects: Land use projects that will place new receptors in the vicinity of existing toxic sources. This category includes residential, commercial, and institutional developments proposed in the vicinity of existing sources such as stationary sources, freeways and high traffic roads, rail yards, and warehouse distribution centers.”<sup>22</sup>

“Various tools already exist to perform a screening analysis from stationary sources impacting receptors (Type A projects) as developed for the AB2588 Hot Spots and air district permitting programs. Screening tools may include prioritization charts, AERSCREEN and various spreadsheets. For projects being impacted by existing sources (Type B projects), one screening tool is contained in the ARB Handbook: *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective*. The document includes a table entitled “*Recommendations on Siting New Sensitive Land Uses Such As Residences, Schools, Daycare Centers, Playgrounds, or Medical Facilities*” with recommended buffer distances associated with various types of common sources. If a proposed project is located within an established buffer distance to any of the listed sources, a health risk screening and/or assessment should be performed to assess risk to potential sensitive receptors. These guidelines are intended only for projects that are impacted by a single source. Another useful tool is the CAPCOA Guidance Document: *Health Risk Assessments for Proposed Land Use Projects*. CAPCOA prepared the guidance to assist Lead Agencies in

<sup>22</sup> Op. Cit. 8.



		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
--	--	-------------------------------	---	---	----------------------

complying with CEQA requirements. The guidance document describes when and how a health risk assessment should be prepared and what to do with the results.”<sup>23</sup> **Table 3-5** [Table 6 in the AQ Memo] presents the Air District’s and ARB’s siting recommendations for projects proposing sensitive land uses.

<b>Table 3-5 ARB Recommendations on Siting New Sensitive Land Uses</b>	
<b>Source Category</b>	<b>Advisory Recommendations</b>
Freeways and High-Traffic Roads	Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 500 feet of a freeway, urban roads with 100,000 vehicles/day, or rural roads with 50,000 vehicles/day.
Distribution Centers	Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of a distribution center (that accommodates more than 100 trucks per day, more than 40 trucks with operating transport refrigeration units (TRUs) per day, or where TRU unit operations exceed 300 hours per week).  Take into account the configuration of existing distribution centers and avoid locating residences and other new sensitive land uses near entry and exit points.
Rail Yards	Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of a major service and maintenance rail yard. Within one mile of a rail yard, consider possible siting limitations and mitigation approaches.
Ports	Avoid siting of new sensitive land uses immediately downwind of ports in the most heavily impacted zones. Consult local air districts or the ARB on the status of pending analyses of health risks.
Refineries	Avoid siting new sensitive land uses immediately downwind of petroleum refineries. Consult with local air districts and other local agencies to determine an appropriate separation.
Chrome Platers	Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of a chrome plater.
Dry Cleaners Using Perchloroethylene	Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 300 feet of any dry cleaning operation. For operations with two or more machines, provide 500 feet. For operations with 3 or more machines, consult with the local air district.  Do not site new sensitive land uses in the same building with perchloroethylene dry cleaning operations.
Gasoline Dispensing Facilities	Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 300 feet of a large gas station (defined as a facility with a throughput of 3.6 million gallons per year or greater). A 50 foot separation is recommended for typical gas dispensing facilities.
<b>Sources:</b> Air Resources Board, “Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective”, Page 4, Table 1-1, <a href="https://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/handbook.pdf">https://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/handbook.pdf</a> , accessed November 1, 2019. California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, Health Risk Assessments for Proposes Land Use Projects, Page 9, Table 2, <a href="http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/CAPCOA_HRA_LU_Guidelines_8-6-09.pdf">http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/CAPCOA_HRA_LU_Guidelines_8-6-09.pdf</a> , accessed November 1, 2019.	

“Determination of whether project emissions would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations is a function of assessing potential health risks. Sensitive receptors are facilities that house or attract children, the elderly, people

<sup>23</sup> Op. Cit. 8 and 9.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
<p>with illnesses, or others who are especially sensitive to the effects of air pollutants. Hospitals, schools, convalescent facilities, and residential areas are examples of sensitive receptors. When evaluating whether a development proposal has the potential to result in localized impacts, Lead Agency staff need to consider the nature of the air pollutant emissions, the proximity between the emitting facility and sensitive receptors, the direction of prevailing winds, and local topography. Lead Agencies are encouraged to use the screening tools for Toxic Air Contaminant presented in section 6.5 (Potential Land Use Conflicts and Exposure of Sensitive Receptors [pages 44 – 45 of the GAMAQI]) to identify potential conflicts between land use and sensitive receptors and include the result of their analysis in the referral document.”<sup>24</sup></p> <p><b><u>Nuisance Odors</u></b></p> <p>“Due to the subjective nature of odor impacts, the number of variables that can influence the potential for an odor impact, and the variety of odor sources, there are no quantitative or formulaic methodologies to determine the presence of a significant odor impact. Rather, the District recommends that odor analyses strive to fully disclose all pertinent information. The intensity of an odor source’s operations and its proximity to sensitive receptors influences the potential significance of odor emissions. The District has identified some common types of facilities that have been known to produce odors in the San Joaquin Valley. These are presented in Chapter 8 [of the GAMAQI] along with a reasonable distance from the source within which, the degree of odors could possibly be significant.</p> <p>Two situations create a potential for odor impact. The first occurs when a new odor source is located near an existing receptor. The second occurs when a new receptor locates near an existing source of odor. An analysis of potential odor impacts should be conducted for the following two situations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Generators – projects that would potentially generate odorous emissions proposed to locate near existing sensitive receptors or other land uses where people may congregate, and</li> <li>2. Receivers – residential or other sensitive receptor projects or other projects built for the intent of attracting people locating near existing odor sources.</li> </ol> <p>The intensity of an odor source’s operations and its proximity to sensitive receptors influences the potential significance of odor emissions. The District has identified some common types of facilities that have been known to produce odors in the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin. These are presented in Table 6 (Screening Levels For Potential Odor Sources) [of the GAMAQI] along with a reasonable distance from the source within which, the degree of odors could possibly be significant. Table 6 (Screening Levels for Potential Odor Sources) [of the GAMAQI], can be used as a screening tool to qualitatively assess a project’s potential to adversely affect area receptors. This list of facilities is not all-inclusive. The Lead Agency should evaluate facilities not included in the table or projects separated by greater distances if warranted by local conditions or special circumstances. If the proposed project would result in sensitive receptors being located closer than the screening level distances, a more detailed analysis should be provided.”<sup>25</sup> <b>Table 3-6</b> [Table 7 in the AQ Memo] presents the Air District’s screening levels for potential nuisance odor sources.</p>					

<sup>24</sup> Op. Cit. 10.

<sup>25</sup> Op. Cit. 10 and 11.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
--	--	-------------------------------	---	---	----------------------

<b>Table 3-6 Air District Screening Levels for Potential Odor Sources</b>	
<b>Odor Generator / Type of Facility</b>	<b>Distance</b>
Wastewater Treatment Facilities	2 miles
Sanitary Landfill	1 mile
Transfer Station	1 mile
Composting Facility	1 mile
Petroleum Refinery	2 miles
Asphalt Batch Plant	1 mile
Chemical Manufacturing	1 mile
Fiberglass Manufacturing	1 mile
Painting/Coating Operations (e.g., auto body shop)	1 mile
Food Processing Facility	1 mile
Feed Lot/Dairy	1 mile
Rendering Plant	1 mile
<i>Sources: Air District, GAMAQI, Table 6, page 103; and <a href="http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/GAMAQI-2015/GAMAQI-Criteria-Pollutant-Thresholds-of-Odors.pdf">http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/GAMAQI-2015/GAMAQI-Criteria-Pollutant-Thresholds-of-Odors.pdf</a>.</i>	

## Project Impact Analysis

a) **Less Than Significant Impact** - AAQS designed to protect the health and safety of residents within that air basin. In order to show attainment of the standards, the Air District analyzes the growth projections in the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB), contributing factors in the formation and emission of air pollutants, and existing and future emissions controls. The Air District then formulates an AQP which details the Air District's control strategy to reach attainment. The Air District's 2016 Plan for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard, 2013 Plan for the Revoked 1-Hour Ozone Standard, 2007 Ozone Plan, 2007 PM<sub>10</sub> Maintenance Plan and Request for Redesignation, 2008 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan, 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan, 2015 Plan for the 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Standard, and the 2016 Moderate Area Plan for the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Standard outline a number of control strategies to help the SJVAPCD reach attainment for the revoked federal 1-hour ozone standard, the 24-hour PM<sub>10</sub> standard, and the federal and state PM<sub>2.5</sub> standards, respectively. The 2008 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan, 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan, and 2015 Plan for the 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Standard focus specifically on PM<sub>2.5</sub>, although the control strategies from previous PM<sub>10</sub> plans (particularly those related to fugitive dust control) have already improved the SJVAB ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> levels. Therefore, because fugitive dust controls continue to be addressed in the PM<sub>10</sub> plan, the plans contain a comprehensive list of strict regulatory and incentive-based measures to reduce directly-emitted PM<sub>2.5</sub> and precursor emissions. The San Joaquin Valley Air Basin is in attainment for CO, SO<sub>2</sub>, and lead, so there are no attainment plans for those pollutants.<sup>26</sup> The proposed Project will be required to comply with all applicable Air District rules and regulations including, but not limited to, Regulation VIII (Fugitive PM<sub>10</sub> Prohibitions) requirements and District Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Review).

As previously noted, the Air District has determined that projects with emissions below the thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants (see **Table 3-2**) would "Not conflict or obstruct implementation of the District's air quality plan."<sup>27</sup> There

<sup>26</sup> More information on Air District air quality plans can be found online at [http://valleyair.org/Air\\_Quality\\_Plans/air-quality-plans.htm](http://valleyair.org/Air_Quality_Plans/air-quality-plans.htm).

<sup>27</sup> San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (Air District). Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (GAMAQI). Table 2. Page 80, and Section 7.12. Page 65. Accessed November 2019 at: <http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/0714-GAMAQI-Criteria-Pollutant-Thresholds-of-Significance.pdf>.

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) associated with the Community Plan. However, the Plan does include updates to land use designations that could increase the buildout potential of the planning area. As such, projected growth estimates for population, housing, and non-residential land uses are based on the 1.3% annual growth rate projected for the County in the Tulare County 2030 General Plan. To assess a worst-case growth scenario, the 1.3% growth rate was applied to the existing 2017 base year population and housing data (as provided in the United States Census Bureau 2017 American Community Survey) and the existing non-residential uses within the community (assuming that all developed properties have been improved with structures at a floor-to-area ratio of 0.2) to determine the amount of development that could occur by 2030. The projected growth through 2030 is presented in <b>Table 3-1</b>.</p> <p>The future buildout of the Project would result in short-term, temporary, and intermittent construction-related and long-term operations-related criteria air pollutant emissions. Consistent with the Air District guidance, Project-related construction and operation emissions have been estimated using CalEEMod, Version 2016.3.2 (the most recent version of the model). The CalEEMod modeling results can be found in Attachment “A”. Construction phasing, off-road construction equipment and on-road employee, hauling, and vendor vehicle estimates utilized model default values. Model defaults were also utilized for operational activities, except where Project-specific information could be input. The following changes to default values were used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Project Characteristics – Land Use Setting:</i> Although the future development will be located within the Urban Development Boundary, the rural land use was selected as the Project is within a relatively sparsely developed area.</li> <li>• <i>Land Use – Lot Acreage:</i> Non-residential acreage is greater than the model default as the projected growth is based on the acreage of existing land uses. The acreage represents a 1.3% annual growth rate based on developed/improved properties.</li> <li>• <i>Operational-Mobile – Fleet Mix:</i> The “District Accepted Fleet Mix for Residential Projects” was used for the operational year (2021).</li> <li>• <i>Mitigation – Construction:</i> Water exposed area 3 times per day and unpaved road vehicle speed of 15 miles per hour were selected to account for compliance with Air District Regulation VIII requirements.</li> <li>• <i>Mitigation – Traffic:</i> The following items were selected: low density suburban project setting; improve destination accessibility with the job center at 4 miles from the site; and improve pedestrian network onsite.</li> <li>• <i>Mitigation – Area:</i> The following items were selected: No hearth was selected because residents rely on the use of propane tanks to provide gas services and to account for compliance with Air District Rule 4901 (Wood Burning Fireplaces and Wood Burning Heaters); and 3% was used for electronic lawnmower, electric leaf blower, and electric chainsaw, consistent with Air District approved changes.</li> <li>• <i>Mitigation – Water:</i> Low-flow bathroom faucets, kitchen faucets, toilets and showers were selected to account for Title 24 and Green Building Code requirements; and use of water-efficient irrigation systems was selected to account for the County’s Model Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance (also referred to as MWEL0)</li> </ul> <p><b>Table 3-7</b> (Table 8 in the AQ Memo) provides the construction-related criteria pollutant emissions and <b>Table 3-8</b> (Table 9 in the AQ Memo) provides the operations-related criteria pollutant emissions associated with the projected growth.</p>					

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
--	--	-------------------------------	---	---	----------------------

<b>Table 3-7 Annual Construction Emissions Estimates (Mitigated)</b>						
Construction Year	Estimated Emissions, tons per year					
	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	Total PM <sub>10</sub>	Total PM <sub>2.5</sub>
2020	0.36	3.41	2.70	4.99e-003	0.31	0.22
2021	0.91	1.07	1.06	1.93e-003	0.08	0.06
Construction Total	1.27	4.48	3.76	6.92e-003	0.39	0.28
SJVAPCD Threshold	10	10	100	27	15	15
Threshold Exceeded	No	No	No	No	No	No
<i>Source: See Attachment "A" of this document.</i>						

<b>Table 3-8 Annual Operational Emissions Estimates (Mitigated)</b>						
Construction Year	Estimated Emissions, tons per year					
	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	Total PM <sub>10</sub>	Total PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Operations at Buildout	0.86	2.84	4.06	0.01	0.97	0.27
SJVAPCD Threshold	10	10	100	27	15	15
Threshold Exceeded	No	No	No	No	No	No
<i>Source: See Attachment "A" of this document.</i>						

As previously noted, there are no specific development projects associated with the Community Plan that would result in emissions exceeding Air District thresholds of significance. The Air District evaluates significance of short-term (construction) emissions independent of long-term (operational) emissions. As demonstrated in Tables 8 and 9, the estimated Project-related emissions during construction and operations will not exceed the Air District's CEQA significance thresholds for any criteria pollutant. Future developments will be subject to additional CEQA review and will be evaluated at the time of submittal. The County will consult with the Air District on a project-by-project basis as new developments are proposed to evaluate potential impacts based on project-specific details and determine whether a localized pollutant analysis (such as an Ambient Air Quality Analysis or Health Risk Assessment) would be required. Future developments will comply with all applicable Air District rules and regulations including, but not limited to, Regulation VIII (Fugitive PM<sub>10</sub> Prohibition), Rule 2201 (New and Modified Stationary Source Review), and Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Review). Furthermore, the Air District has used an average annual growth rate for Tulare County ranging from 1.44% to 1.94%. The 1.3% annual growth rate applied in the Lemon Cove Community Plan is lower than the growth rates applied in the applicable Air Quality Plans (AQPs). As such, Project-related emissions would be included in the AQPs emissions inventories. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable AQPs. The Project will have a Less Than Significant Project-specific Impact related to this Checklist Item.

**Cumulative Impact Analysis:    *Less Than Significant Impact***

The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is the San Joaquin Air Basin. The emissions analysis demonstrates the Project will not exceed the Air District's thresholds of significance. As such, the Project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plans. Furthermore, the County will consult with the Air District on a project-by-project basis, and future developments will be required to implement all applicable General Plan policies and to comply with all applicable Air District rules and regulations. Therefore, the Project will result in a less than significant Cumulative impact related to this Checklist Item.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
<p>As previously noted, the Project will not exceed the Air District’s thresholds of significance and therefore, will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plans. Therefore, less than significant Project-specific and Cumulative impacts related to this Checklist Item will occur.</p> <p>b) <b><i>Less Than Significant Impact</i></b> - The Project would be considered to have a significant cumulative impact on air quality if project-specific impacts are determined to be significant. As previously noted, the emissions analysis confirms that Project-specific emissions are below the Air District’s thresholds of significance at a project-specific level, and that the Project will not cause or contribute to an existing air quality violation. Furthermore, the County will consult with the Air District on a project-by-project basis to ensure that future developments are implemented consistent with Air District rules and regulations, including but not limited to, Regulation VIII (Fugitive PM10 Prohibition), Rule 2201 (New and Modified Stationary Source Review), and Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Review). The Project will be required to implement all applicable General Plan policies and to comply with all applicable Air District rules and regulations. Therefore, because the Project would have less than significant Project-specific Impacts, the Project will have a less than significant Cumulative Impact on air quality.</p> <p><u>Cumulative Impact Analysis:</u>                      <b><i>Less Than Significant Impact</i></b></p> <p>The Project would be considered to have a significant cumulative impact on air quality if project-specific impacts are determined to be significant. Because project-specific impacts are less than significant, the Project will have a less than significant Cumulative Impact on air quality.</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u>    <b><i>Less Than Significant Impact</i></b></p> <p>As previously noted, Project-related criteria pollutant emissions fall below the Air District’s significance thresholds and the Project will be required to implement all applicable General Plan policies and to comply with all applicable Air District rules and regulations. Therefore, the Project will have a less than significant Cumulative Impact related to this Checklist Item</p> <p>c) <b><i>Less Than Significant Impact</i></b> –</p> <p><b>Project Impact Analysis</b></p> <p>Sensitive receptors are those individuals who are sensitive to air pollution and include children, the elderly, and persons with pre-existing respiratory or cardiovascular illness. The Air District considers a sensitive receptor to be a location that houses or attracts children, the elderly, people with illnesses, or others who are especially sensitive to the effects of air pollutants. Examples of sensitive receptors include schools, parks and playgrounds, daycare centers, nursing homes, hospitals, and residential dwelling units.<sup>28</sup></p> <p><b><u>Construction-Related Emissions</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Construction Equipment TACs/HAPs:</i></b> Particulate emissions from diesel powered construction equipment are considered a TAC by the California Air Resources Board. There are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) associated with the Community Plan. However, future development projects have the potential to temporarily expose receptors to increased pollutant emission concentrations from diesel powered construction</p>					

<sup>28</sup> Air District. GAMAQI. Page 10.



		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>equipment during the short-term construction phase. However, construction emissions are temporary and would cease upon completion of construction activities. The short-term nature of construction-related emissions would not expose nearby receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. <b><i>Less Than Significant Project-specific Impacts</i></b> related to this Checklist Item will occur.</p> <p><b><i>Dust-borne TACs/HAPs:</i></b> There are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) associated with the Community Plan. However, future development projects have the potential to temporarily expose nearby receptors to fugitive particulate (dust) emissions during the short-term construction phase or from landscaping activities once the development project is operational. As of November 2019, there were no listings within the Project planning area in the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List.<sup>29</sup> A query performed on the DTSC <i>Envirostor</i> indicated that there are no superfund, state response, voluntary cleanup, school cleanup or corrective actions within five (5) miles of the Project planning area.<sup>30</sup> A query of the State Water Resources Control Board (WRCB) <i>GeoTracker</i> Site and Facilities mapping programs revealed seven (7) leaking underground storage tank (LUST) sites within the Project planning area; however, all of these sites are designated as having cleanup being completed and case closed.<sup>31</sup> A query performed on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) <i>Superfund Enterprise Management System</i> (SEMS) website found that there are no listed polluted sites within the Project planning area.<sup>32</sup> Therefore, fugitive dust emissions resulting from earthmoving activities during construction or landscaping activities during operations, would not expose future residents or nearby receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. <b><i>Less Than Significant Project-specific Impacts</i></b> related to this Checklist Item will occur.</p> <p>There are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) associated with the Community Plan. However, future development projects have the potential to temporarily expose nearby residences to other airborne hazards from generation of fugitive dust emissions during construction-related earthmoving activities. Although not specifically required by CEQA, the following discussions related to valley fever and asbestos are included to satisfy requirements for full disclosure of potential Project-related impacts and are for information purposes only.</p> <p><b><i>Valley Fever:</i></b> Valley fever, or coccidioidomycosis, is an infection caused by inhalation of the spores of the fungus, <i>Coccidioides immitis</i> (<i>C. immitis</i>). According to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), the San Joaquin Valley is considered an endemic area for valley fever.<sup>33</sup> “The fungus is known to live in the soil in the southwestern United States and parts of Mexico and Central and South America. The fungus was also recently found in south-central Washington. People can get Valley fever by breathing in the microscopic fungal spores from the air in these areas. Most people who breathe in the spores don’t get sick, but some people do. Usually, people who get sick with Valley fever will get better on their own within weeks to months, but some people will need antifungal medication. Certain groups of people are at higher risk for developing the severe forms of the infection, and these people typically need antifungal treatment. It’s difficult to prevent exposure to <i>Coccidioides</i> in areas where it’s common in the environment, but people who are at higher risk for severe Valley fever should try to avoid breathing in large amounts of dust if they’re in these areas.”<sup>34</sup></p>					

<sup>29</sup> DTSC. Hazardous Waste and Substance Site List.

[https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search.asp?page=8&cmd=search&business\\_name=&main\\_street\\_name=&city=&zip=&county=&status=ACT%2CBKLG%2CCOM&branch=&site\\_type=CSITES%2COPEN%2CFUDS%2CCLOSE&npl=&funding=&reporttitle=HAZARDOUS+WASTE+AND+SUBSTANCES+SITE+LIST&reporttype=CORTESE&federal\\_superfund=&state\\_response=&voluntary\\_cleanup=&school\\_cleanup=&operating=&post\\_closure=&non\\_operating=&corrective\\_action=&tiered\\_permit=&evaluation=&spec\\_prog=&national\\_priority\\_list=&senate=&congress=&assembly=&critical\\_pol=&business\\_type=&case\\_type=&searchtype=&hwm\\_p\\_site\\_type=&cleanup\\_type=&ocierp=&hwmwp=False&permitted=&pc\\_permitted=&inspections=&complaints=&censustract=&cesdecile=&school\\_district=&orderby=county](https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search.asp?page=8&cmd=search&business_name=&main_street_name=&city=&zip=&county=&status=ACT%2CBKLG%2CCOM&branch=&site_type=CSITES%2COPEN%2CFUDS%2CCLOSE&npl=&funding=&reporttitle=HAZARDOUS+WASTE+AND+SUBSTANCES+SITE+LIST&reporttype=CORTESE&federal_superfund=&state_response=&voluntary_cleanup=&school_cleanup=&operating=&post_closure=&non_operating=&corrective_action=&tiered_permit=&evaluation=&spec_prog=&national_priority_list=&senate=&congress=&assembly=&critical_pol=&business_type=&case_type=&searchtype=&hwm_p_site_type=&cleanup_type=&ocierp=&hwmwp=False&permitted=&pc_permitted=&inspections=&complaints=&censustract=&cesdecile=&school_district=&orderby=county). Accessed November 1, 2019.

<sup>30</sup> DTSC. Envirostor. Sites and Facilities mapping website. <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/>. Accessed November 1, 2019.

<sup>31</sup> WRCB, GeoTracker, Sites and Facilities mapping website. <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>. Accessed November 1, 2019.

<sup>32</sup> EPA. SEMS Search. Accessed November 2019 at: <https://www.epa.gov/enviro/sems-search>.

<sup>33</sup> CDC. Accessed November 2019 at: <https://www.cdc.gov/fungal/diseases/coccidioidomycosis/maps.html>.

<sup>34</sup> CDC. Accessed November 2019 at: <https://www.cdc.gov/fungal/diseases/coccidioidomycosis/definition.html>.

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>Construction-related activities generate fugitive dust that could potentially contain <i>C. immitis</i> spores. The Project will be required to implement General Plan Policy AQ-4.2 (Dust Suppression Measures), which was specifically designed to address impacts from the generation of dust emitted into the air. The Project will be required to comply with Air District Regulation VIII (Fugitive PM10 Prohibitions) requirements, including submittal of construction notification and/or dust control plan(s), which minimize the generation of fugitive dust during construction-related activities. Therefore, implementation of General Plan policies and compliance with Air District rules and regulations would reduce the chance of exposure to valley fever during construction-related activities. <b><i>Less Than Significant Project-specific Impacts</i></b> related to this Checklist Item will occur.</p> <p><b><i>Naturally Occurring Asbestos:</i></b> In areas containing naturally occurring asbestos, earthmoving construction-related activities, such as grading and trenching, could expose receptors to windblown asbestos. According to a United States Geological Soil Survey map of areas where naturally occurring asbestos in California are likely to occur, the Project is not located in an area known to contain naturally occurring asbestos.<sup>35</sup> The Project planning area and the immediate vicinity has been previously disturbed by agricultural operations and by rural residential and commercial/retail development. Future development projects will be required to implement General Plan Policy AQ-4.2 (Dust Suppression Measures) to comply with Air District Regulation VIII (Fugitive PM10 Prohibitions) requirements, thereby reducing the chance of exposure to valley fever during construction-related activities. Therefore, <b><i>Less Than Significant Project-specific Impacts</i></b> related to this Checklist Item will occur.</p> <p><b><u>Operations-Related Emissions</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Operations from Future Development:</i></b> There are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) associated with the Community Plan that would be a source of TAC or HAP emissions. However, construction- and operation-related activities associated with future development projects may require the transport and use of hazardous materials. Consumer products and gasoline are regulated by the State and use of these products would not pose a significant risk to residents or nearby receptors. Medium- and Heavy-duty diesel trucks would be a source of diesel particulate matter, which is considered to be a TAC. The County will work with the Air District on a project-by-project basis to determine whether health risk assessments would be required for projects generating diesel truck trips travelling through the Project planning area, and for other equipment that may require Air District permits. Furthermore, future applicants will be required to comply with all local, state, and federal policies related to emission of TACs/HAPs in the event such pollutants require control efforts to minimize their impacts. Tulare County Environmental Health Division will require a Hazardous Waste Business Plan if materials exceed 55 gallons (liquids), 500 pounds (solids), or 200 cubic feet (compressed gas) handled or stored on site.<sup>36</sup> As such, the Project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. <b><i>Less Than Significant Project-specific Impacts</i></b> related to this Checklist Item will occur.</p> <p><b><i>Existing Sources:</i></b> There are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) associated with the Community Plan that would be a source of TAC or HAP emissions, and the location of future development projects in close proximity to sensitive receptors cannot be determined until future projects are identified. To ensure that development within the Project planning area does not expose sensitive receptors to significant impacts from TAC emissions, the County will review individual projects on a project-by-project basis to determine if ARB's Air</p>					

<sup>35</sup> USGS. *Reported Historic Asbestos Mines, Historic Asbestos Prospects, and Other Natural Occurrences of Asbestos in California*. Accessed November 2019 at: <http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2011/1188/>.

<sup>36</sup> Tulare County Health and Human Services Agency, Environmental Health Division. Hazardous Material Business Plan. Accessed November 2019 at: <https://tularecountyeh.org/eh/index.cfm/our-services/hazardous-materials-cupa/hazardous-materials-business-plan-hmbp/> and <https://tularecountyeh.org/eh/index.cfm/guidance-library/hazmat-cupa/hazardous-materials-business-plan-hmbp/business-plan-faqs/>.

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>Quality Land Use Handbook screening criteria presented in <b>Table3-5</b> [Table 6 in the AQ Memo] are exceeded. Projects that exceed the screening criteria will be subject to analysis using screening models or may require dispersion modeling and a health risk assessment. Tulare County will also consult with the Air District during the CEQA process for guidance on the appropriate screening tools and modeling protocols for future development projects within the Plan area. Therefore, existing sources of TAC/HAP emissions would not expose receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. <b><i>Less Than Significant Project-specific Impacts</i></b> related to this Checklist Item will occur.</p> <p><b><i>Existing Agricultural Operations:</i></b> The Project planning area is located in a rural area with urban built up land as well as active agricultural operations. Agricultural operations typically include the use of chemicals on crops for activities such as pest control, damage control, weed abatement, etc. However, these chemicals are regulated by the State and would not pose a significant risk to the existing and future residents within the Project planning area. Furthermore, the Tulare County General Plan includes Policy AG-1.14 Right-to-Farm Noticing which requires new property owners to acknowledge and accept the inconveniences associated with normal farming activities. Future development projects adjacent to agricultural lands will be required to sign a “Right to Farm” notice. <b><i>Less Than Significant Project-specific Impacts</i></b> related to this Checklist Item will occur.</p> <p><u>Cumulative Impact Analysis:</u>     <b><i>Less Than Significant Impact</i></b></p> <p>The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin. The Tulare County General Plan includes policies, which were specifically designed to engage responsible agencies in the CEQA process, to reduce air pollutant emissions through project design, require compliance with emission-reducing regulations, and to address potential impacts from siting incompatible uses in close proximity to each other. Applicable General Plan policies will be implemented for the Project. The County will consult with the Air District on a project-by-project basis as new developments are proposed to evaluate project-specific impacts based on project-specific details and to determine whether a health risk assessment would be needed. Compliance with applicable Air District rules and regulations would further reduce potential impacts from exposure to TAC and HAP emissions, as well as valley fever and asbestos. As such, the development of the proposed Project would not expose the public to substantial pollutant concentrations. Therefore, a less than significant Cumulative Impact related to this Checklist Item will occur.</p> <p><b>Mitigation: None Required</b></p> <p>There are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) associated with the Community Plan. As such, the Project is not a source of, nor are there any known existing sources of, HAPs or TACs within the Project vicinity. Therefore, the proposed Project would not expose the public to substantial pollutant concentrations. less than significant <b><i>Project-specific and Cumulative Impacts</i></b> related to this Checklist Item will occur.</p> <p>d) <b><i>Less Than Significant Impact:</i></b></p> <p><u>Project Impact Analysis:</u>                     <b><i>Less Than Significant Impact</i></b></p> <p>Two situations create a potential for odor impact. The first occurs when a new odor source is located near an existing sensitive receptor. The second occurs when a new sensitive receptor locates near an existing source of odor. There are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) associated with the Community Plan that would be a source of nuisance odors. However, as the Community Plan is built out, dependent upon the location and nature of operations, potential exists for odor impacts to occur resulting from existing and/or new agricultural, commercial, and industrial land uses.</p>					

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	
<p>Potential odor sources associated with construction-related activities could originate from diesel exhaust from construction equipment and fumes from architectural coating and paving operations. However, construction-related odors, if perceptible, would dissipate as they mix with the surrounding air and would be of very limited duration. As such, objectionable odors during construction would not affect a substantial number of people.</p> <p>As presented in <b>Table 3-6</b> [Table 7 in the AQ Memo], the Air District has determined the common land use types that are known to produce odors in the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin. As previously noted, there are no specific development projects associated with the Community Plan. However, the existing agricultural uses in the vicinity of the community could be a source of nuisance odors. All projects, with the exception of agricultural operations, are subject to Air District Rule 4102 (Nuisance). Therefore, odors from agriculture-related operations would not be subject to complaint reporting. There is potential for these agricultural operations to generate objectionable odors; however, these odors would be temporary or seasonal. Furthermore, the Tulare County General Plan includes Policy AG-1.14 Right-to-Farm Noticing which requires new property owners to acknowledge and accept the inconveniences associated with normal farming activities. If future developments are proposed adjacent to active agricultural uses, future residents will be required to sign a “Right to Farm” notice. To ensure potential nuisance odor impacts are addressed, if proposed developments were to result in sensitive receptors being located closer than the recommended distances to any odor generator identified in <b>Table 3-6</b> [Table 7 in the AQ Memo], a more detailed analysis, is recommended. The detailed analysis would involve contacting the Air District’s Compliance Division for information regarding odor complaints Implementation of the applicable General Plan policies and compliance with applicable Air District rules and regulations specifically designed to address air quality and odor impacts, would reduce potential odor impacts. Therefore, the Project would not create or expose existing residents to objectionable odors. Less than significant <i><b>Project-specific Impacts</b></i> related to this Checklist Item will occur.</p> <p><u>Cumulative Impact Analysis:</u>                      <i><b>Less Than Significant Impact</b></i></p> <p>The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin. As there are no development projects proposed with the Project, the Project does not include any new sources of odors. Future developments will be subject to Air District Rule 4102 (Nuisance) and General Plan Policy AG-1.14 Right-to-Farm Noticing will be implemented. As such, the Project will not expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors. Therefore, less than significant <i><b>Cumulative Impacts</b></i> related to this Checklist Item will occur.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measures: None Required</b></p> <p>The Project is not a source of nuisance odors, nor are there existing sources of permanent odors in the Project vicinity that would affect future residents. As such, the Project will not expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors. Therefore, <i><b>Less Than Significant Project-specific and Cumulative Impacts</b></i> related to this Checklist Item will occur.</p>						
4.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES					
	Would the project:					
	a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

			<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
		Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
	b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Analysis:**

As noted previously, the Project is adopt the Lemon Cove Community Plan and no development proposals are being considered at this time. The update is being prepared to accommodate a growth rate of 1.3% (consistent with the Tulare County General Plan). The Project includes expansion of the Urban Development Boundary (UDB); as such, a case-by-case evaluation will be conducted when development proposals are received for both the existing UDB and future UDB area. However, as this Project is merely development of a Community Plan, there is no possibility of changes to biological resources within the UDB area to be established. The basis for the analysis and determinations below is a Technical Memorandum Biological Species Evaluation (Bio Memo) conducted by RMA staff person Jessica Willis, Planner IV and is included in Attachment "B" of this MND.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
<p><b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b></p> <p>The objective in preparing of the Lemon Cove Community Plan is to develop a plan which can accurately reflect the needs and priorities of the unincorporated community of Lemon Cove and assist in fostering future economic development opportunities and grants. Lemon Cove, an unincorporated community, has localized land use needs and issues that should be addressed in a more specific manner particular to its community, geographic features, location of major roadways, such as State Route 198, population characteristics, availability of water, and other issues unique to the community's area. Therefore, the Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019 has been prepared with an emphasis on these considerations with particular focus on land use and circulation.</p> <p><b>PROJECT LOCATION</b></p> <p>Project site is located in the northern portion of Tulare County, approximately four (4) miles southeast of the City of Woodlake and eleven (11) miles northeast of the City Visalia. The community is generally bounded by Avenue 319 in the south, Goodale Lane in the north, Road 236 in the west, and Road 248 in the east (see Figure 1 of the Bio Memo)</p> <p>United States Geological Survey 7.5-minute Quadrangle(s): Woodlake and Rocky Hill  Public Land Survey System: Section(s) 02, 03, 10, 11, Township 18 South, Range 27 East, Mount Diablo Base and Meridian  Latitude/Longitude: 36° 22' 53" N / 119° 01' 33" W (at SR 198, approximately 650 feet south of Avenue 328)</p> <p><b>SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES EVALUATION</b></p> <p>The most recent California Department of Fish and Wildlife's (CDFW) California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), RareFind 5 and Biogeographic Information and Observation System (BIOS) mapping applications were accessed on November 5, 2019.<sup>37</sup></p> <p><b>9-Quad CNDDDB Results</b></p> <p>The Project is located within the Woodlake and Rocky Hill Quadrangles. To identify special status species within the 9-quadrangle Project area, twelve (12) quads were reviewed (Stokes Mountain, Auckland, Shadequarter Mountain, Ivanhoe, Woodlake, Kaweah, Exeter, Rocky Hill, Chickencoop Canyon, Cairns Corner, Lindsay, and Frazier Valley). Based on the information in the CNDDDB and BIOS, there are forty-nine (49) special status species and six (6) natural plant communities of special concern within the 9-quadrangle Project area.</p> <p><b>Project Quad Results</b></p> <p>Based on the information in the CNDDDB and BIOS, within the Woodlake and Rocky Hill quadrangles there are nineteen (19) special status species and two (2) natural plant communities of special concern within the general Project vicinity.</p> <p><b>Project Area Results</b></p> <p>Two (2) special status animal species (<i>Bombus crotchii</i>, Crotch bumble bee and <i>Rana boylei</i>, foothill yellow-legged frog) have been recorded within the Project study area (i.e., the existing Lemon Cove Urban Development Boundary (UDB) and the proposed expanded UDB)(see Figure 2). The Crotch bumble bee is presumed extant (still in existence or</p>					

<sup>37</sup> California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). Accessed November 2019 at: <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Maps-and-Data#43018407-rarefind-5>



		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>surviving) while the foothill yellow-legged frog is considered extirpated (a species that has been locally eliminated but is not extinct) within the Project study area. The one (1) special status plant species (<i>Pseudobahia peirsonii</i>, San Joaquin adobe sunburst) identified in Figure 2 is located outside of the Project study area.</p> <p>The following special status plant and animal species and natural plant communities have not been recorded within the Project study area, but have been recorded within 2.5 miles of the Project study area (see Figure 3).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Brodiaea insignis</i> (Kaweah brodiaea)</li> <li>• <i>Diplacus pictus</i> (calico monkeyflower)</li> <li>• <i>Delphinium recurvatum</i> (recurved larkspur)</li> <li>• <i>Eryngium spinosepalum</i> (spiny-sepaled button-celery)</li> <li>• <i>Pseudobahia peirsonii</i> (San Joaquin adobe sunburst)</li> <li>• <i>Agelaius tricolor</i> (tri-colored blackbird)</li> <li>• <i>Ardea herodias</i> (great blue heron)</li> <li>• <i>Branchinecta lynchi</i> (vernal pool fairy shrimp)</li> <li>• <i>Emys marmorata</i> (western pond turtle)</li> <li>• <i>Eumops perotis californicus</i> (western mastiff bat)</li> <li>• <i>Gymnogyps californianus</i> (California condor)</li> <li>• <i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i> (bald eagle)</li> <li>• <i>Spea hammondi</i> (western spadefoot)</li> <li>• Northern Claypan Vernal Pool</li> <li>• Sycamore Alluvial Woodland</li> </ul> <p>Although only one (1) special status species (Crotch bumble bee) has been recorded and is considered extant in the Project study area, there is a possibility that migratory birds and raptors may be present or that currently undeveloped areas within the UDB could provide habitat or foraging areas. Therefore, future development projects within the UDB subject to subsequent CEQA analysis will be required to implement applicable mitigation measure(s) to reduce potential impacts on special status species to less than significant.</p> <p>Also, the Tulare County General Plan has a number of policies that apply to projects within County of Tulare. For example, General Plan policies that would apply to future development in the Project area include <i>ERM-1.1 Protection of Rare and Endangered Species</i>; <i>ERM-1.17 Conservation Plan Coordination</i>; and <i>ERM-2.7 Minimize Adverse Impacts</i>. And, as indicated earlier, proposed development(s) will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis regarding impacts to the biological resource.</p> <p>a) <b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation</b> - The Lemon Cove Community Plan Urban Development Boundary (UDB) is proposed to be increased by approximately 263.7 acres to an area of approximately 667.8 acres. The following section assumes that special status species within the UDB may be impacted by future development, which will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, as development occurs.</p> <p>As noted earlier, based on the information in the CNDDDB and BIOS 9-Quad results, there are two special status animal species were identified and are shown in Figure 2 (of the Bio Memo). Also, one special status plant outside of the Project study area is also shown in Figure 2 (of the Bio Memo). No other special status plant or animal species have been recorded within the Project's existing Urban Development Boundary (UDB) or within the proposed UDB expansion area. However, there is a possibility that migratory birds and raptors may be present within the Project site, or that currently undeveloped areas within the UDB could provide habitat or foraging areas.</p>					

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
--	--	-------------------------------	---	---	----------------------

Therefore, future development projects within the UDB subject to subsequent CEQA analysis may be required to implement **Mitigation Measures 4-1** through **4-12** (shown as mitigation measures BIO-1 through BIO-12 in the Bio Memo) would reduce potential impacts on special status species to less than significant. **Table 4-1** summarizes **Mitigation Measures 4-1** through **4-12** which can be found in their entirety in Attachment “E” of this IS/MND.

<b>TABLE 4-1 Summary of Mitigation Measures 4-1 through 4-12</b>		
<b>MITIGATION</b>	<b>TYPE OF MITIGATION</b>	<b>SUMMARIZED DESCRIPTION</b>
<b>Measures for Special Status Plant Species</b>		
<b>4-1</b>	Pre-construction Survey	Qualified biologist/botanist conducts pre-construction surveys for special status plant species
<b>Measures for Special Status Animal Species</b>		
<b>4-2</b>	Pre-construction Survey	Qualified biologist conducts pre-construction surveys for special status animal species.
<b>Measures for Special Status Species Identified in Pre-construction Surveys.</b>		
<b>4-3</b>	Employee Education Program	Qualified biologist conducts tailgate meeting to train construction staff on special status species that occur/may occur on the project site.
<b>Measures for Nesting Raptors and Migratory Birds</b>		
<b>4-4</b>	Avoidance	Where possible, Project will be constructed outside the nesting season (between September 1st and January 31st).
<b>4-5</b>	Pre-construction Survey	If Project activities occur during the nesting season (February 1-August 31), a qualified biologist will conduct preconstruction surveys per the <i>Recommended Timing and Methodology for Swainson's Hawk Nesting Surveys in California's Central Valley (2000)</i> .
<b>4-6</b>	Pre-construction Survey	A qualified biologist will conduct pre-construction surveys per the <i>Recommended Timing and Methodology for Swainson's Hawk Nesting Surveys in California's Central Valley (2000)</i> .
<b>4-7</b>	Buffers	Upon active nest discovery, the biologist determines appropriate construction setback distances and a behavioral baseline using applicable CDFW guidelines and/or the biology of the affected species.
<b>Measures for Roosting Bats</b>		
<b>4-8</b>	Temporal Avoidance	To avoid potential impacts to maternity bat roosts, removal of buildings and trees should occur outside of the period between April 1 and September 30.
<b>4-9</b>	Pre-construction Surveys	If removal of buildings or trees is to occur between April 1 and September 30 (general maternity bat roost season), then within 30 days prior to these activities, a qualified biologist will survey affected buildings and trees for the presence of bats. The biologist will utilize bat detection techniques to determine presence of bats.
<b>4-10</b>	Minimization	If a non-breeding bat colony is detected during preconstruction surveys, a biologist shall supervise removal of bats and/or installation of bat exclusion devices to ensure no harm or take of bats occur.
<b>4-11</b>	Avoidance of Maternity Roosts	If a maternity colony is detected during preconstruction surveys, a qualified biologist will supervise establishment of a disturbance-free buffer around the colony and remain in place until a qualified biologist deems that the nursery is no longer active.
<b>Wetlands</b>		
<b>4-12</b>	Consultation	Consultation with the Fresno Field Office of the CDFW and/or the Sacramento Field Office of the USFWS.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measures 4-1** through **4-12** would reduce potential impacts to less than significant with mitigation and ensure that future development activities within the UDB remain compliant with state and federal laws protecting these species.

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>b) <b>No Impact</b> - As noted in Item a., above, the proposed Project area is within the historic sites of various species of concern. However, the Crotch bumble bee is the only species documented as occurring in the CNDDDB Occurrence List within the existing and proposed Lemon Cove UDB. Riparian habitat is proximate to the UDB; however, it is absent and would not be impacted by the proposed Project. Existing rural residences, clusters of single-family residences, and agriculturally productive lands constitute the majority of the types of habitat within the existing and proposed UDB and, as such, are not considered habitats of special concern. Because riparian and other habitats of special concern are absent, the Project and future development proposals will have no impact on these habitats.</p> <p>c) <b>No Impact</b> – As noted in the Bio Memo, “In addition to the CDFW BIOS mapping application, the most recent United States Geological Survey (USGS) National Water Information System (NWIS) and United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) mapping applications were accessed on November 5, 2019.”<sup>38,39</sup> Based on the information in the CDFW BIOS map (see Figure 2), the USGS NWIS map (see Figure 4), and USFWS NWI map (see Figure 5), the following waterways and wetlands are located within the Project study area or in close proximity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foothill Ditch: The ditch (classified as riverine) is located along the northwestern boundary of the Project study area, adjacent and parallel to the proposed expanded UDB (crossing SR 216 at SR 198); the ditch is also approximately 1,500 feet west of the existing UDB.</li> <li>• Kaweah River: The river (classified as riverine and freshwater forested/shrub wetland) is approximately 1,800 feet west of the Project study area at its nearest point (northwest of Wutchumna Hill).</li> <li>• Saint John’s River: The river (classified as riverine, with an area classified as freshwater emergent wetland) is approximately 3,800 feet north of the southern region of the Project study area.</li> <li>• Lemoncove Ditch: This ditch (classified as freshwater pond bounded with freshwater emergent wetland) is located approximately 700 feet east of the Project study area (on the north side of Avenue 328 and approximately 1,500 feet east of SR 198).</li> <li>• Other Waterways: A waterway (classified as riverine and branching off the Lemoncove Ditch wetland) is located approximately 300 feet east of the proposed UDB (near Avenue 330 and Road 248). A waterway branching off Foothill Ditch (classified as riverine) transects the southwestern most portion of the Project study area in two location.</li> <li>• Other Water Bodies: A freshwater pond is located approximately 300 feet east of the Project study area (approximately 1,500 feet east of SR 198 and 500 feet north of Avenue 324); and various small bodies are located to the south and west of the study area.</li> </ul> <p>There are no development projects proposed with this Project. Future projects will be evaluated on a project-by-project bases as they are identified. Best management practices, including compliance with all applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements, which includes a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP), will be required during construction activities. A grading and drainage plan will be submitted and approved by the Tulare County Resource Management Agency (RMA) Engineering Branch. However, to ensure that potential jurisdictional waters are not adversely impacted by future development within the Project study area (the proposed expanded UDB), the following mitigation measure [See Mitigation Measure 4-12 in <b>Table 4-1</b>, above] will be required for projects located adjacent to the waterways and water bodies identified in the BIOS, NWIS and NWI mapping applications. Therefore, the Project will not result in significant impact to any riparian habitats or other protected wetlands.”<sup>40</sup>.</p>					

<sup>38</sup> USGS. <https://maps.waterdata.usgs.gov/mapper/index.html>

<sup>39</sup> USFWS. <https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.HTML>

<sup>40</sup> Bio Memo. Pages 6 and 7. Included in Attachment “B” of this MND.

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>d) <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> - Wildlife movement corridors usually occur where there are relatively large areas of open space composed of undeveloped habitat, ideally native habitat. The majority of the existing UDB is already developed to urban type uses and agriculturally productive land, and it is surrounded by more agricultural land. The areas within the proposed UDB expansion are predominantly agriculturally productive lands. While agricultural land may be attractive to wildlife as movement corridor in otherwise urban, developed landscapes, there is nothing within the existing UDB that would make it more attractive as a wildlife movement corridor than adjacent parcels. It is noted, however, neither the existing nor proposed UDB of the Project were identified in the Environmental Resources Management Element as being a migration corridor or wildlife nursery for any wildlife species. Therefore, a less than significant impact could occur as a result of the Project.</p> <p>e) <b>No Impact</b> - The proposed Project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinances. Therefore, the Project will result in no impact to this resource.</p> <p>f) <b>No Impact</b> - There are two habitat conservation plans that could apply in Tulare County. The Kern Water Habitat Conservation Plan only applies to an area in Allensworth (located approximately 40 miles southwest of the Project area) and does not apply this Project. The Recovery Plan for Upland Species in the San Joaquin Valley outlines a number of species that are important to the San Joaquin Valley; however, only one species (the SJKF) has been documented to occur and its historical range is identified within the proposed Project area.<sup>41</sup> As the Project is a proposed Community Plan and there are no development or other proposed projects, the Project would not conflict with local policies or habitat conservation plans. Further, in the event of future development (e.g., residential, commercial, infrastructure, etc.), <b>Mitigation Measures 4-1 through 4-12</b> would be implemented, as applicable. As such, the proposed Community Plan will result in no impact to this resource.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Impact Analysis: No Impact/Less Than Significant Impact</b></p> <p>The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is the San Joaquin Valley. While the study area is limited to Tulare County, sensitive species with similar habitat requirements may exist in other portions of the San Joaquin Valley, and therefore cumulative impacts would extend beyond Tulare County political boundaries. The proposed Project would only contribute to cumulative impacts related to this Checklist Item if Project-specific impacts were to occur.</p> <p>As the proposed Project does not result in significant loss of habitat or direct impact to these special status species, implementation of <b>Mitigation Measures 4-1 through 4-12</b>, (which can be found in their entirety in Attachment “E” of this IS/MND), as applicable, would result in a less than significant impact to this resource. The proposed Project does not result in significant loss of habitat or direct impact to these special status species, a less than significant cumulative impact will occur. The proposed Project does not result in significant impacts to potential waters of the U.S., a less than significant cumulative impact with mitigation would occur through implementation of <b>Mitigation Measures 4-1 through 4-12</b>, (which can be found in their entirety in Attachment “E” of this IS/MND), as applicable, would result in a less than significant impact to this resource. The Project Study Area is surrounded by agriculturally productive lands (mostly citrus) with the Valley floor generally to the west and the Sierra foothills to the north, south, and east which could serve as movement corridors for native wildlife. Birds using the Pacific flyway will continue to do so following project development. As such, a less than significant cumulative impact related to this Checklist Item will occur. The Project area is not within or in the vicinity of any approved habitat conservation plans, natural community conservation plans, or regional or state habitat conservation plans in effect, will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources (such as a tree preservation policy or ordinances), and is not expected to conflict with the goals or</p>					

<sup>41</sup> U.S. fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon. “Recovery Plan for Upland Species in the San Joaquin Valley.” 1998. Pages 122-136. Prepared by Region 1 Accessed in November 2019 at: [https://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery\\_plan/980930a.pdf](https://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery_plan/980930a.pdf)

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	
<p>policies of the Tulare County General Plan that protect biological resources; as such, there will be no Project-specific or Cumulative impacts to these resources.</p> <p><b>Mitigation: See Mitigation Measures 4-1 through 4-12</b> (in their entirety in Attachment “E”)</p>						
<b>5.</b>	<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>					
	Would the project:					
	a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Analysis:</p> <p>As noted previously, the Project is the Lemon Cove Community Plan and no development proposals are being considered at this time. The Project is based on a projected annual population growth rate of 1.3%<sup>42</sup> (consistent with the Tulare County General Plan). Limited changes to the Urban Development Boundary (UDB) will occur and such changes would incorporate areas that have historically been agriculturally productive; as such, there is no possibility of changes to cultural resources outside of the already established UDB area.</p> <p>The Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center, Bakersfield (SSJVIC or Center) conducted a cultural resources records search at the request of RMA Planning Branch staff. The Center records search (dated August 6, 2019 is included in Attachment “C” of this document) included historic sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places, Historic Property Directory, California State Historical Landmarks, California Register of Historical Resources, California Inventory of Historic Resources, and California Points of Historical Interest. According to the California Historical Resources Information System, there are three (3) recorded cultural resources within the project area and eight within a one-half mile radius of the project area.</p> <p>According to the information provided by the SSJVIC, there have been 3 previous cultural resource studies conducted within the project area, TU-00985, 01498, and 01675. There have been five additional studies conducted within the one-half mile radius, TU-00049, 00108, 00135, 00378, and 00550. However, until the specific location of a development proposal occurs, the locations and nature of the resources will remain confidential and will only be shared with an applicant and remain confidential until otherwise determined by the courts.</p> <p>The following Native American tribes were contacted on August 28, 2019, in order to solicit their interest regarding tribal consultation: Kern Valley Indian Council; Santa Rosa Rancheria Tachi Yokut Tribe; Tubatulabals of Kern County; Tule River Indian Tribe; and Wuksache Indian Tribe. No responses have been received to date. The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was also contacted on July 23, 2019, with a request that they conduct a sacred lands files (SLF)</p>						

<sup>42</sup> Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan. Page 89.

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>search. The SLF records search was completed with negative results.</p> <p>As the Project is a community plan, no immediate ground disturbance will take place. Once specific projects are proposed, location specific studies can be conducted to determine the appropriateness of avoiding or minimizing impacts to cultural resources as applicable.</p> <p>The Tulare County General Plan has a number of policies that relate to the proposed Project area including <i>ERM-6.1 Evaluation of Cultural and Archaeological Resources</i>; <i>ERM-6.2 Protection of Resources with Potential State or Federal</i>; <i>ERM-6.4 Mitigation</i>; <i>ERM-6.10 Grading Cultural Resources Sites</i>; and <i>ERM-6.9 Confidentiality of Archaeological Sites</i> which allows the County to (within its authority) maintain confidentiality regarding the locations of archaeological sites in order to preserve and protect these resources from vandalism and the unauthorized removal of artifacts.</p> <p>a) and b) <b><i>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation</i></b> - As noted above, a CHRIS records search was conducted by the SSJVIC. Three cultural resources have been recorded within the project area, eight known resources were identified within one-half mile of the project area, and there was one unrecorded prehistoric rock art site as well. These resources consist of prehistoric era pictographs and lithic scatters, as well as historic era trash scatters, transmission lines, a hotel, a railroad, and a ditch. The records search included an examination of the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, the California Points of Historic Interest, the California Inventory of Historic Resources, or the California State Historic Landmarks (see Attachment “C”). Also, as noted earlier, three previous cultural resources studies have been completed within the project area and five additional studies have been conducted within the one-half mile radius. The planning area consists of a mix of uses such as retail office, single-family and multi-family residential, hotel, recreation, limited industrial, and public facilities etc.<sup>43</sup> Until an actual development project is initiated, it remains unknown if subsurface historic resources would be encountered.</p> <p>While the proposed Community Plan contains no plans for development or construction, over the planning horizon, future development within the UDB may result in the eventual construction of residences, and establishment of commercial and industrial use, and streets (and possibly other infrastructure such as curbs, gutters, sidewalks, sewer and water collection/distribution systems, etc.). Such future activity could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource were any such resources to be located within the planning area. The proposed Project would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical or archaeological resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. There will be potentially significant impact if historical resources are uncovered during proposed specific development project construction in the future; however, implementation of the <b>Mitigation Measures 5-1</b> through <b>5-3</b> (and also contained in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, Attachment “E”) are included as part of this Mitigated Negative Declaration to reduce potential impacts to historical or archaeological resources to less than significant with mitigation.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measures:</b></p> <p><b>5-1.</b> If, in the course of construction or operation within the Project area, any archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources are uncovered, discovered, or otherwise detected or observed, activities within fifty (50) feet of the find shall be ceased. A qualified archaeologist/paleontologist shall be contacted and advise the County of the site’s significance. If the findings are deemed significant by the Tulare County Resources Management Agency, appropriate mitigation measures shall be required prior to any resumption of work in the affected area of the proposed Project. Where feasible, mitigation achieving preservation in place will be implemented. Preservation in place may be accomplished by, but is not limited to: planning construction to avoid archaeological/paleontological sites or</p>					

<sup>43</sup> Ibid. 26.



		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>covering archaeological/paleontological sites with a layer of chemically stable soil prior to building on the site. If significant resources are encountered, the feasibility of various methods of achieving preservation in place shall be considered, and an appropriate method of achieving preservation in place shall be selected and implemented, if feasible. If preservation in place is not feasible, other mitigation shall be implemented to minimize impacts to the site, such as data recovery efforts that will adequately recover scientifically consequential information from and about the site. Mitigation shall be consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(b)(3).</p> <p><b>5-2</b> - If cultural/archeological/paleontological resources are encountered during project-specific construction or land modification activities, work shall stop and the County shall be notified at once to assess the nature, extent, and potential significance of any cultural resources. If such resources are determined to be significant, appropriate actions shall be determined. Depending upon the nature of the find, mitigation could involve avoidance, documentation, or other appropriate actions to be determined by a qualified archaeologist. For example, activities within 50 feet of the find shall be ceased.</p> <p><b>5-3</b> - Compliance with Section 7050.5 of the of the California Health and Safety Code and (CEQA Guidelines) Section 15064.5, if human remains of Native American origin are discovered during Project construction (See MMRP in Attachment “E” for complete description of this mitigation measure).</p> <p>No formal cemeteries or other places of human internment are known to exist within the Project site; however, in accordance with State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resource Code Section 5097.98, if human remains are unearthed during project-specific construction as development occurs, no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to the origin and disposition of such remains. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 48 hours of the Coroner’s determination. The NAHC will then identify the person(s) thought to be the most likely descendent of the deceased Native American, who will then assist in determining what course of action shall be taken in handling the remains. Impacts to this checklist item will be less than significant with mitigation.</p> <p>c) <b>Less Than Significant</b> - No paleontological resources are known to exist within the proposed Project area, nor are there any known geologic features in the proposed Project area. As there is no project-specific construction anticipated or contemplated, the Project will not disturb any paleontological resources not previously disturbed; however, the measures discussed in Item a.), will ensure proper investigation and handling of any discovery were to occur in future projects. If, in the course of specific-project construction or operation, any archaeological or historical resources are uncovered, discovered, or otherwise detected or observed, activities within fifty (50) feet of the find shall immediately cease. A qualified archaeologist shall be contacted and advise the County of Tulare of the site’s significance. If the findings are deemed significant by the Tulare County Resources Management Agency, appropriate measures shall be required prior to any resumption of work in the affected area of the proposed Project area. As such, the Project would result in a less than significant impact to this resource.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Impact Analysis: Less Than Significant Impact</b></p> <p>The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is Tulare County. This cumulative analysis is based on the information provided in the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, General Plan Background Report, Tulare County 2030 General Plan EIR, and draft Lemon Cove Community Plan.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that Native American remains or other cultural will be found at the proposed Project site. However, consistent with CEQA requirements, Mitigation Measures 5-1 through 5-3 are included in the unlikely event that if Native</p>					

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	
<p>American remains are unearthed during any ground disturbance activities, or if any cultural resources are discovered, such finds will be mitigated to less than significant Project-specific and Cumulative Impacts.</p> <p><b>Mitigation: See Mitigation Measures 5-1 through 5-3 in Attachment “E”</b></p>						
		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	
<b>6.</b>	<b>Energy</b>					
	Would the project:					
	a)	Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b)	Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Analysis:</p> <p>As noted previously, the Project is the Lemon Cove Community Plan and no development proposals are being considered at this time. The Community Plan is being prepared to accommodate a growth rate of 1.3% (consistent with the Tulare County General Plan). The Project includes expansion of the Urban Development Boundary (UDB); as such, a case-by-case evaluation will be conducted when development proposals are received for both the existing UDB and future UDB area. However, as this Project is merely development of a Community Plan, there is no possibility of changes to energy resources within the already established UDB area.</p> <p>The Technical Memorandum “Energy Assessment for the Lemon Cove Community Plan” (Energy Memo) was completed by RMA Staff (Jessica Willis, Planner IV) in November 2019 to analyze potential impacts on energy resources (See Attachment “A”). As indicated in the Energy Memo, the following energy analysis was “...to evaluate whether future buildout of the Project would result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. The energy assessment was conducted within the context of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA, California Public Resources Code Sections 21000, et seq.). The assessment is intended to provide the County of Tulare (County) with sufficient detail regarding potential impacts of Project implementation and to identify mitigation measures, if necessary, to reduce potentially significant impacts.”<sup>44</sup></p> <p>a) <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> – “The proposed Project consists of a Community Plan for the unincorporated community of Lemon Cove. The objective of the Plan is to develop a plan, which can accurately reflect the needs and priorities of the unincorporated community of Lemon Cove. The Land Use and Circulation portions of this Plan provide the mechanism to minimize or avoid the potential adverse impacts of urban growth. The Plan contains various policies that encourage future development to incorporate energy efficient features into the project design, require the County to participate in energy</p>						

<sup>44</sup> County of Tulare. 2019. Technical Memorandum: Energy Assessment (Energy Memo) for the Lemon Cove Community Plan. Page 1. Included in Attachment “A” of this MND.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
--	--	-------------------------------	---	---	----------------------

reduction programs when feasible, and encourages the development of alternative energy resources, such as wind and solar facilities, when appropriately sited. Furthermore, no development projects are proposed as part of the Plan. As such, the Plan itself will not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. However, the Plan does include updates to land use designations that could increase the buildout potential of the planning area.”<sup>45</sup>

#### “Electricity and Natural Gas

“Southern California Edison provides electric service to the majority of Tulare County, including the majority of the San Joaquin Valley and the foothills. Natural gas service is primarily provided by The Gas Company (formerly Southern California Gas Company). Pacific Gas & Electric also serves northern Tulare County’s electric needs on limited basis. The electrical facilities network includes both overhead and underground lines, with new development required to install underground service lines. All utility providers indicate that additional service should be available to new development, depending on the necessary load of the services requested.”

“Electrical service for the Project study area is provided by Southern California Edison (SCE). The Project study area is not supplied with natural gas services and residents rely on the use of propane to supply their fuel needs. However, the analysis presented below presents the theoretical natural gas usage that would occur if services were available.

In 2018, SCE provided 102,520,762.59 gigawatt-hours (GWh) of electricity to approximately 15 million customers across a service area of 15 counties in a 50,000 square mile area within Central, Coastal and Southern California. In the same year, SoCal Gas provided a total of 7,195.95 million therms of natural gas to nearly 21.8 million customers across a service area of 12 counties in a 24,000 square mile area within Central and Southern California. Within the County, total demand for SCE electrical services was 4,433.98 GWh, and total demand for SoCal Gas natural gas services was 157.29 million therms in 2018. Total state and countywide energy demands, including per capita calculations of energy demands based on 2018 populations, are provided in **Table 2** [Table 6-1 of this MND]. The energy demands presented include all residential and nonresidential customers.”<sup>46</sup>

“Implementation of the proposed Project would result in the commitment of additional energy resources, including consumption of natural gas and electricity through operation of the Project. As provided in **Table 3** [Table 6-2 of this MND], operation of the proposed Project is estimated to result in the demand for 15,032 therms per year (therms/yr) of natural gas, and 803 megawatt-hours per year (MWh/yr) of electricity based on CalEEMod modeling results (see Attachment “A”).”<sup>47</sup>

<b>Table 6-1</b>					
<b>2018 County and State Energy Demands (All Users)</b>					
	<b>2018 Population<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Total 2018 Energy Demand</b>		<b>2018 Energy Demand Per Capita</b>	
		<b>Electricity (MWh)<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Natural Gas (therms)<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Electricity (MWh)</b>	<b>Natural Gas (therms)</b>
State	39,557,045	281,120,193.430	12,638,157,740	7.11	319.49
Service Area	---	102,520,762.582	7,195,951,252	---	---
Tulare County	465,861	4,433,976.762	157,285,390	9.52	337.62

<sup>45</sup> Ibid. 3-4.

<sup>46</sup> Op. Cit. 4.

<sup>47</sup> Op. Cit. 5

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
--	--	-------------------------------	---	---	----------------------

- 1 US Census population estimates as of July 1, 2018.  
2 Converted to MWh as CEC Energy Reports expresses in Millions of kWh (GWh).  
3 Converted to Therms as CEC Energy Reports expresses in Millions of Therms.

Sources: California Energy Commission. Energy Consumption Database. <http://ecdms.energy.ca.gov/>. Accessed October 2019.  
<http://ecdms.energy.ca.gov/elecbycounty.aspx>; <http://ecdms.energy.ca.gov/gasbycounty.aspx>;  
<http://ecdms.energy.ca.gov/elecbyplan.aspx>; <http://ecdms.energy.ca.gov/gasbyplan.aspx>

U.S. Census Bureau. American FactFinder. Community Facts. [https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community\\_facts.xhtml](https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml).  
Accessed October 2019.

**Table 6-2**  
**Estimated (mitigated) Project Electricity and Natural Gas Demands (All Users)**

Proposed Land Use	Proposed Project <sup>1</sup>		
	Square Feet / Population <sup>2</sup>	Electricity Demand (MWh/yr) <sup>3</sup>	Natural Gas Demand (therms/yr) <sup>4</sup>
Non-residential Uses	65,401	632.97	9,864.30
Residential Uses	60	169.58	5,167.88
<b>Project Total</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>802.55</b>	<b>15,032.18</b>
Project Average Per Capita/Year	---	13.38	250.54

- 1 Proposed Project demand includes ‘mitigation measures’ in the CalEEMod runs.  
2 The projected Project population based on existing population data is 42 residents; however, because default CalEEMod population is greater and the energy usage is based on the model’s population, the model population is used for this analysis  
3 1,000 megawatt-hours (MWh) = 1 gigawatt-hours (GWh)  
4 1 therm = 100 thousand British Thermal Units (BTU)

Source: CalEEMod output files provided in Attachment “A” of this MND.

“Comparison of **Tables 2 and 3** [Tables 6-1 and 6-2 of this MND], indicate that electricity demand per capita for the Project (13.38 MWh/yr) is higher than Tulare County (9.52 MWh/yr) and State (7.11 MWh/yr) demands per capita. The natural gas demand per capita for the Project (250.54 therm/yr) is lower than both the Tulare County (337.62 therm/yr) and State (319.49 therm/yr) demands per capita. As previously noted, there are no development projects included in the Plan; as such, project-specific energy reducing features have not been included in the analysis. As future development project are identified, energy efficiency and conservation measures will be implemented in conjunction with Project design, including measures resulting from federal, State, and local mandates, as well as voluntary measures proposed by the project applicant. Compliance with the California Building Standards Code and CALGreen are considered demonstrable evidence of efficient use of energy. In addition, the progressive enhancements in building energy efficiency mandates resulting from regular updates to the California building codes will result in lower electrical and natural gas consumption from the totals shown in **Table 3** [Table 6-2 of this MND]. Energy would also be indirectly conserved through water efficient landscaping requirements. Solid waste recycling requirements applicable to both project construction and operation would reduce energy consumed in solid waste disposal. As such, it is anticipated that the Project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during construction and operation.”<sup>48</sup>

<sup>48</sup> Op.Cit. 5-6.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
--	--	-------------------------------	---	---	----------------------

“Vehicle Fuel Consumption

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) reports that approximately 25.65 million automobiles, 8.01 million trucks, 434,671 trailer coaches (motor home/RV), 857,677 motorcycles, and 755,976 other vehicles (miscellaneous and fee exempt vehicles) were registered in the state in 2017, resulting in a total estimated 344.3 billion vehicles miles traveled (VMT). Within Tulare County, an estimated 3.67 million vehicle miles were traveled in 2016.

Operation of the Project would result in the daily consumption of vehicle fuel as residents and visitors would travel to and from the Project site. In order to estimate fuel consumption, it is necessary to estimate vehicle type(s), daily distance(s) travelled (in vehicle miles travelled (VMT)), and average fuel economy by vehicle type(s). According to the Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG), all of Tulare County averaged 10,650,825 million VMT/day.

**Table 4** [Table 6-3 of this MND] provides a comparison of State, County, and Project annual VMT (based on available 2017 data). As provided in **Table 4** [Table 6-3 of this MND], Project operation is anticipated to result in the generation of 636,813 VMT annually, or approximately 0.017 percent of the County’s and 0.0002 percent of the State’s 2017 annual VMT.

<b>Table 6-3 Vehicle Miles Traveled</b>				
	Population	Total Annual VMT	Daily VMT (365 days/year)	Daily VMT per Capita
State of California	38,982,847 <sup>1</sup>	344,300,000,000 <sup>2</sup>	943,287,671	24.20
Tulare County	471,686 <sup>3</sup>	3,686,282,000 <sup>3</sup>	10,099,403	21.40
Proposed Project <sup>4</sup>	60	636,813	1745	29.08
<sup>1</sup> Source: American FactFinder. State of California. (2017) <sup>2</sup> Source: Caltrans Fact Booklet, June 2019. The 2019 report provided data for year 2017. <sup>3</sup> Source: Caltrans. Tulare County Transportation Quick Facts (2017) <sup>4</sup> Source: Project population and VMT see CalEEMod reports (Attachment A)				

“**Tables 5 and 6** [Tables 6-4 and 6-5 of this MND] provides the vehicle fleet mix, VMT, and fuel consumption from the non-residential and residential components of the Project, respectively. Using vehicle fleet mix data provided in Attachment A and average fuel economy information provided by the Bureau of Transportation Statistics, the Project-generated annual VMT would result in the consumption of approximately 128,828 gallons of fuel per year.”<sup>49</sup>

<b>Table 6-4 Estimated Operational Fuel Consumption – Non-Residential<sup>1</sup></b>				
<b>Vehicle Type</b>	<b>Percent of Vehicle Trips<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Mitigated Annual VMT<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>National Average Fuel Economy (miles/gallon)<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Total Annual Fuel Consumption (gallons)</b>
Passenger Car	51.67	972,338	23.96	40,582
Light-Duty Vehicle	34.70	653,038	22.04	29,630
Light-Duty Truck/Van	4.86	91,535	17.40	5,261
Heavy-Duty Truck	7.82	147,213	6.64	22,171
Motorcycles	0.43	8,142	43.89	186
Buses	0.43	8,026	6.33	1,268
Other Vehicles	0.08	1,432	7.69	186
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1,881,725</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>99,282</b>

<sup>49</sup> Op. Cit. 6.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
--	--	-------------------------------	---	---	----------------------

- 1 U.S. Department of Energy. Alternative Fuels Data Center. Average Fuel Economy of Major Vehicle Categories <https://afdc.energy.gov/data/10310>. Accessed October 2019.
- 2 Percentage of Vehicle Trips and Fleet Mix information provided by Attachment A. Passenger Car is the LDA fleet mix trip percentage column; Light Duty Vehicles is the sum of the LDT1, LDT2, and MDV fleet mix trip percentage columns; Light Duty Truck is the sum of LHD1, LHD2, and MHD fleet mix trip percentage columns; Heavy Duty Truck is the HHD fleet mix trip percentage columns, Buses is the sum of OBUS, SBUS and UBUS fleet mix trip percentage columns, Other is the MH fleet mix trip percentage column.
- 3 Annual VMT calculated from total mitigated VMT, which incorporates Project design features; See CalEEMod reports in Attachment A.
- 4 Average fuel economy based on average 2016 U.S. vehicle fuel efficiency (mpg) from Table 4-11: Light Duty Vehicle, Short Wheel Base and Motorcycle Fuel Consumption and Travel; Table 4-12: Average Light Duty Vehicle, Long Wheel Base Fuel Consumption and Travel, and Table 4-13: Single-Unit 2-Axle 6-Tire or More Truck Fuel Consumption and Travel of the National Transportation Statistics.

<b>Table 6-5 Estimated Operational Fuel Consumption –Residential<sup>1</sup></b>				
<b>Vehicle Type</b>	<b>Percent of Vehicle Trips<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Mitigated Annual VMT<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>National Average Fuel Economy (miles/gallon)<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Total Annual Fuel Consumption (gallons)</b>
Passenger Car	53.73	342,160	23.96	14,280
Light-Duty Vehicle	42.13	268,289	22.04	12,173
Light-Duty Truck/Van	1.13	7,196	17.40	414
Heavy-Duty Truck	2.06	13,118	6.64	1,976
Motorcycles	0.26	1,656	43.89	38
Buses	0.53	3,375	6.33	533
Other Vehicles	0.16	1,019	7.69	132
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>636,813</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>29,546</b>

- 1 U.S. Department of Energy. Alternative Fuels Data Center. Average Fuel Economy of Major Vehicle Categories <https://afdc.energy.gov/data/10310>. Accessed October 2019.
- 2 Percentage of Vehicle Trips and Fleet Mix information provided by Attachment A. Passenger Car is the LDA fleet mix trip percentage column; Light Duty Vehicles is the sum of the LDT1, LDT2, and MDV fleet mix trip percentage columns; Light Duty Truck is the sum of LHD1, LHD2, and MHD fleet mix trip percentage columns; Heavy Duty Truck is the HHD fleet mix trip percentage columns, Buses is the sum of OBUS, SBUS and UBUS fleet mix trip percentage columns, Other is the MH fleet mix trip percentage column.
- 3 Annual VMT calculated from total mitigated VMT, which incorporates Project design features; See CalEEMod reports in Attachment A.
- 4 Average fuel economy based on average 2016 U.S. vehicle fuel efficiency (mpg) from Table 4-11: Light Duty Vehicle, Short Wheel Base and Motorcycle Fuel Consumption and Travel; Table 4-12: Average Light Duty Vehicle, Long Wheel Base Fuel Consumption and Travel, and Table 4-13: Single-Unit 2-Axle 6-Tire or More Truck Fuel Consumption and Travel of the National Transportation Statistics.

“Daily VMT per capita for the Project (29.08 VMT) is slightly higher than Tulare County (21.41 VMT) and State (24.20) averages. VMT is used as an important indicator of the impact on the local circulation system and of a project’s air quality impacts. Air quality impacts as described in the Air Quality section of this MND showed the impacts to be less than significant, and that Greenhouse Gas impacts comply with the County’s Climate Action Plan. As future development projects are identified, project design features will be added for compliance with federal, State, and County regulations, which ultimately reduce VMT. The Project includes a Complete Streets component that identify where sidewalks, curbs, and gutters will connect existing uses; future developments will be required to comply with Tulare County building standards for sidewalks, streets, and parking lots. With the implementation of mandatory and voluntary VMT-reducing measures in future developments, the Project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Impacts are less than significant.

#### Energy Conservation Standards

Operation of the proposed Project would result in the demand for approximately 15,032 therms/yr of natural gas and 803 MWh/yr of electricity (see **Table 3** [Table 6-2 of this MND]), and 128,828 gallons/yr of vehicle fuel (see **Tables 5** and **6** [Tables 6-4 and 6-5 of this MND]). Based on existing energy demands, the Project’s estimated operational demand for electricity represents 0.018 percent of SCE’s and 0.0096 percent of SoCal Gas’ total 2018 energy demands for the County.



		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
<p>Further, additional vehicle fuel demand under operation of the Project would result in an increase in statewide fuel demand by less than 0.0006 percent.</p> <p>Based on comparisons of the Project's energy demands with statewide and regional demand and service capacity in total and per capita (<b>Table 3</b> [Table 6-2 of this MND]), the proposed Project is not expected to result in the use of a large amount of energy in an unnecessary, wasteful, or inefficient manner, nor would it affect regional supplies or peak/base periods of demand as the estimated energy demand is typical for a Project of this size, and would result in a negligible increase in regional energy demands. As such, the proposed Project would not necessitate the expansion of existing facilities or construction of new energy generation or transmission facilities. Furthermore, future development projects would be required to implement and be consistent with existing energy design standards at the local and state level. The Project would be subject to energy conservation requirements in the California Energy Code and CALGreen. Adherence to state code requirements would ensure that the Project would not result in wasteful and inefficient use of non-renewable resources due to building operation.”<sup>50</sup></p> <p>“When considering the potential for the Project to result in greater conservation of electricity, natural gas, and transportation fuel through the implementation of proposed Project design features and required mitigation measures not quantified above, the proposed Project has a low potential to result in adverse impacts on energy resources and conservation. Therefore, the direct impacts to energy resources and conservation are less than significant.</p> <p>No development projects are proposed as part of the Plan. Future developments within the Project planning area will be required to undergo additional CEQA evaluation on a project-by-project basis at such time development is proposed to determine potential environmental impacts. Therefore, the Project will not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. The Project will have a less than significant Project-specific impact related to this Checklist Item.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Impact Analysis: - Less Than Significant Impact</b></p> <p>The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is Tulare County. The proposed Project would incrementally contribute to adverse impacts on energy resource demand and conservation when considering the cumulative impact of concurrently planned projects; however, future development projects within the Project study area will be required to comply with local, regional, state, and federal policies designed to reduce wasteful energy consumption, and improve overall energy conservation and sustainability. For instance, all local projects involving the development of new buildings must be designed to conform to CALGreen and the 2019 California Energy Code. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts would result in a significantly considerable wasteful use of energy resources, such that the Project, and other cumulative projects, would have a cumulative effect on energy conservation. The proposed Project will not have a direct or cumulative impact, or create wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Therefore, the Project will result in a less than significant Cumulative impact related to this Checklist Item.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measures: - None Required</b></p> <p>As previously noted, the Project will not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Therefore, less than significant Project-specific and Cumulative impacts related to this Checklist Item will occur.”<sup>51</sup></p>					

<sup>50</sup> Op. Cit. 8.

<sup>51</sup> Op. Cit. 9.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
<p>b) <b>No Impact</b> – “The proposed Project is development of a Community Plan. The Plan contains various policies that encourage future development to incorporate energy efficient features into the project design, require the County to participate in energy reduction programs when feasible, and encourages the development of alternative energy resources, such as wind and solar facilities, when appropriately sited. Furthermore, no development projects are proposed as part of the Plan. As such, the Plan itself will not result in conflicts or obstructions with state or local plan for energy consumption.</p> <p>The following Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update policies for this resource apply to this Project: <i>ERM-4.1 Energy Conservation and Efficiency Measures</i> wherein the County encourages the use of solar energy, solar hot water panels, and other energy conservation and efficiency features; <i>ERM-4.3 Local and State Programs</i> wherein the County shall participate, to the extent feasible, in local and State programs that strive to reduce the consumption of natural or man-made energy sources; <i>ERM-4.3 Local and State Programs</i> wherein the County shall participate, to the extent feasible, in local and State programs that strive to reduce the consumption of natural or man-made energy sources; and <i>ERM-4.6 Renewable Energy</i> wherein the County shall support efforts, when appropriately sited, for the development and use of alternative energy resources, including renewable energy such as wind and solar, biofuels and co-generation. As the Plan requires future development to comply with and implement the General Plan 2030 Update within the community, the Project does not conflict with any local plan for energy consumption.</p> <p>Energy efficiency and conservation measures will be implemented on a project-by-project basis in conjunction with project design and operation, including measures resulting from federal, State, and local mandates, as well as voluntary measures proposed by project applicants. Government-mandated measures include increasingly stringent state and federal regulatory actions addressing vehicle fuel economies and vehicle emissions standards. Compliance with the California Building Standards Code and CALGreen requirements are considered demonstrable evidence of efficient use of energy. In addition, the progressive enhancements in building energy efficiency mandates resulting from regular updates to the California building codes will result in lower electrical and natural gas consumption from those identified in Checklist Item a) above. Energy would also be indirectly conserved through water efficient landscaping requirements consistent with the Tulare County Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance. Stringent solid waste recycling requirements applicable to both project construction and operation would reduce energy consumed in solid waste disposal. In summary, future developments will implement all mandatory federal, State, and local conservation measures and, project design features and voluntary energy conservation measures will further reduce energy demands. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. The Project will have no Project-specific impact related to this Checklist Item.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Impact Analysis: No Impact</b></p> <p>The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is Tulare County. The proposed Project would incrementally contribute to adverse impacts on energy resource demand and conservation when considering the cumulative impact of concurrently planned projects; however, future development projects within the Project study area will be required to comply with local, regional, state, and federal policies designed to reduce energy consumption and improve overall energy conservation and sustainability. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct any plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. The Project will result in a no Cumulative impact related to this Checklist Item.</p> <p>As previously noted, the Project will not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Therefore, no Project-specific and Cumulative impacts related to this Checklist Item will occur”<sup>52</sup></p> <p><b>Mitigation Measures: None Required</b></p>					

<sup>52</sup> Op. Cit. 9-11.

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<b>7. GEOLOGY/SOILS</b>					
Would the project:					
	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 No. 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii)	Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iv)	Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	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- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	f)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Analysis:					
Seismicity:					

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>As noted previously, the Project is development of the Lemon Cove Community Plan and no development proposals are being considered at this time. The Community Plan Update is being prepared to accommodate a growth rate of 1.3% (consistent with the Tulare County General Plan). As changes to the Urban Development Boundary (UDB) are proposed, there is a possibility of changes to geology or soil analysis as areas outside of the already established UDB area may become incorporated into the planning area.</p> <p>The official maps of earthquake fault zones delineated by the California Geological Survey (CGS), State of California Department of Conservation (2010), in accordance with the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, indicate that several faults are known to occur in Tulare County. According to the CGS Fault Activity Map, there is no presence of faults in the vicinity of the Project area [the closest Pre-Quaternary faults (concealed) are more than 8 miles away to the southwest of the Project area.<sup>53</sup> “Earthquakes occur on faults-strike-slip earthquakes occur on strike-slip faults, normal earthquakes occur on normal faults, and thrust earthquakes occur on thrust or reverse faults.”<sup>54</sup></p> <p>Additional faults with the potential to affect the proposed Project area are the San Andreas Fault approximately 40 miles west of the Tulare County boundary, the Owens Valley Fault (approximately 65 miles to the northeast), and the Clovis Fault, approximately six miles south of the Madera County boundary in Fresno County (or approximately 40 miles northwest of Lemon Cove).<sup>55</sup></p> <p>“In 1973, five counties within the Southern San Joaquin Valley undertook the preparation of the Five County Seismic Safety Element to assess seismic hazards. The Element identifies areas of potential seismic activity, including Doyle Springs and most of the Moorehouse subareas, as being in the Sierra 1 (S1) Zone (eastern Sierra Nevada). All of the subareas east of and including Sequoia Crest, Pierpoint, and Roger’s Camp lie within the Sierra 2 (S2) Zone (eastern Sierra Nevada, south of Owens Valley fault). In general, zones C1, S1, and V1 (V-1) are safer than zones C2, S2, and V2.”<sup>56</sup></p> <p>According to the Tulare County General Plan, the planning area lies in the S-1 seismic study area.<sup>57</sup></p> <p>Seismic Zone “S-I” is the “eastern, roughly one-half of the Sierra Nevada Mountains, and is characterized by hard to moderately hard granite or metamorphic rock. The distance to either of the faults expected to be a source of shaking is sufficiently great that shaking should be minimal and the requirements of the Uniform Building Code Zone II should be adequate for normal facilities.”<sup>58</sup></p> <p><u>Soils:</u></p> <p>“According to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), and the Soil Survey of Tulare County, the following soil types are located in Lemon Cove :</p> <p><b>San Joaquin loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes,</b> is moderately deep to a hardpan, well drained and nearly level. This soil is</p>					

<sup>53</sup> California Department of Conservation. Fault Activity Map of California (2010), <http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/>. Accessed September 2019.

<sup>54</sup> What is the relationship between faults and earthquakes? What happens to a fault when an earthquake occurs? USGS, [https://www.usgs.gov/faqs/what-relationship-between-faults-and-earthquakes-what-happens-a-fault-when-earthquake-occurs?qt-news\\_science\\_products=0#qt-news\\_science\\_products](https://www.usgs.gov/faqs/what-relationship-between-faults-and-earthquakes-what-happens-a-fault-when-earthquake-occurs?qt-news_science_products=0#qt-news_science_products). Accessed September 2019.

<sup>55</sup> Background Report Tulare County General Plan. Page 8-6. Accessed November 2019 at: <http://generalplan.co.tulare.ca.us/documents.html>, then locate “Background Report” and click on it.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid.

<sup>57</sup> Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update. August 2012. Seismic/Geologic Hazards and Microzone. Figure 10-5. Page 10-31. . <http://generalplan.co.tulare.ca.us/documents.html>.

<sup>58</sup> Summary of Seismic Hazards & Safety Recommendations. Page 16.

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>suitable for orchards, vineyards, and cultivated crops but is somewhat limited by the presence of hardpan which restricts root growth. This problem can be alleviated by ripping and shattering the hardpan. The soil is poorly suited to urban uses because of a high clay content, very slow permeability and a cemented hardpan. Septic tank filter fields are severely limited for these reasons.</p> <p><b>San Joaquin loam, 0 to 9 percent slopes,</b> is moderately deep to hardpan, well drained and gently rolling. The soil is suited to cultivated crops and orchards. The main limitations are hardpan and a moderate erosion risk on steeper slopes. The soil is also suited for rangeland with erosion a slight limitation. The soil is unsuitable for building sites, roads and septic tank filter fields due to high clay content, very slow permeability and the cemented hardpan. This problem can be overcome by the importation of more suitable soils.</p> <p><b>Blasingame Sandy Loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes,</b> consists of moderately deep, well drained soils located on uneven side slopes in the lower foothills. Surface and subsurface loams and clay loams have of approximately 30 inches, below which exists strongly weathered quartz diorite. Surface run-off is medium and erosion hazard is moderate. Permeability is moderately slow. Limitations for septic tank absorption fields are severe due to shallow depth to rock and slow percolation.</p> <p><b>Blasingame Sandy Loam, 30 to 50 percent slopes,</b> consists of rolling to steeply sloping soil is found on uneven side slopes. Permeability of the Blasingame soil is moderately slow and the available water capacity is low or moderate.</p> <p><b>Blasingame-rock Outcrop Complex, 9 to 50 percent slopes,</b> consists of rolling to steeply sloping soil is found on uneven side slopes. Permeability of the Blasingame soil is moderately slow and the available water capacity is low or moderate. Surface runoff is medium or rapid and the erosion hazard is moderate or high. Effective rooting depth is 20 to 40 inches. Rock outcrop consists of exposures of hard quartz diorite. These areas are impermeable and vegetative growth is limited to features in the rock structure. Surface runoff is rapid with no erosion hazard. The soil is suitable for rangeland while the potential for urban development is poor because of steep slope, depth of soil and rock outcrops. However, some small isolated areas with gentle slopes are suitable for home sites</p> <p><b>Cibo-rock Outcrop Complex 15 to 50 percent slopes,</b> consist of moderately deep, well drained soils that formed in material weathered from basic igneous rocks. Cibo soils are on foothills and mountainous uplands have slopes of 2 to 75 percent. Rock outcrop is impermeable, so run-off is very rapid with no erosion hazard.</p> <p><b>Clear Lake Clay, Drained 2 to 5 percent slopes,</b> consists of very deep, poorly drained soil located on alluvial fans and basins and swales of drainage ways. Surface and subsurface materials are dark gray and gray clay to a depth of 66 inches. Permeability is slow. Limitations for septic tank absorption fields are severe due to slow percolation.</p> <p><b>Greenfield Sandy Loam,</b> consists of deep, well drained soils that formed in moderately coarse and coarse textured alluvium derived from granitic and mixed rock sources. Greenfield sandy loam is used for the production of a wide variety of irrigated field, forage and fruit crops. Vegetation on uncultivated areas consists of annual grass, forbs, some shrubs and scattered oak trees.</p> <p><b>Havala Loam, 0 to 5 percent slopes,</b> consists of deep, well drained soils that formed from mixed alluvium. Havala soils are on old stream terraces and alluvial fans in mountain valleys. Use mainly for range, orchard, cultivated fields, and hay crops. Native vegetation is annual grasses, forbs, scattered live oak, blue oak, and white oak.</p> <p><b>Honcut Sandy Loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes,</b> consists of very deep, well drained soils that formed in moderately coarse textured alluvium from basic igneous and granitic rocks. Honcut soils are on floodplains and moderately sloping alluvial</p>					

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>fans. Honcut soils are highly productive under irrigation. Crops includes alfalfa, small grains, forage crops, apricots, peaches, grapes, prunes, apples, oranges, pears and berries. Vegetation consists of open parklike areas of annual grasses, herbs and scattered oaks.</p> <p><b>Porterville Clay, 2 to 89 percent slopes</b>, deep well drained soils that formed in fine textured alluvial material from basic and metabasic igneous rock. Porterville soils are on fans and foothills, used mostly for range pasture. Vegetation is annual grasses, burclove, herbs and widely spaced shrubs. Most cultivated areas are irrigated and planted to oranges, lemons, olive, figs, and some grapes.</p> <p><b>Yettem Sandy Loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes</b>, consists of very deep, well drained soils that formed in alluvium from granitic sources. Yettem soils are on alluvial fans and flood plains. Vegetation is cropland and annual pasture. Crops are oranges, plums, olives, walnuts and grapes. The native vegetation is annual grasses and forbs.”<sup>59</sup></p> <p>The following Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update policies for this resource apply to this Project:</p> <p>a) <b>No Impact</b> - According to the Tulare County General Plan, the planning area lies in the S1 seismic study area, characterized by hard to moderately hard granite or metamorphic rock.(see precious text).</p> <p>Seismic Zone “S-I” is the “eastern, roughly one-half of the Sierra Nevada Mountains, and is characterized by hard to moderately hard granite or metamorphic rock. The distance to either of the faults expected to be a source of shaking is sufficiently great that shaking should be minimal and the requirements of the Uniform Building Code Zone II should be adequate for normal facilities.”<sup>60</sup></p> <p>i) <b>Fault Rupture:</b> An analysis prepared by the Tulare County Environmental Planning Department based on information provided by the State of California and the Five County Seismic Safety Element indicates that the Project site is not located within the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. No active or potentially active fault traces are known to traverse the site.<sup>61</sup> In addition, the California Department of Conservation’s CGS Information Warehouse indicates that the planning area is not located in a “fault zone,” i.e. in an area where hazards exist that are associated with surface fault rupture.<sup>62</sup> The Project does not include specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses). Any future developments would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis and will be constructed in accordance with all applicable building codes. As such, risk to persons or structures caused by rupture of known earthquake faults are minimal. As such, there will be no impact as a result of the Project.</p> <p>ii) <b>Ground Shaking:</b> As previously discussed, the Project is located in the S-1 seismic zone. The distance to either of the faults expected to be a source of shaking is sufficiently great that shaking should be minimal and the requirements of the Uniform Building Code Zone II should be adequate for normal facilities.”<sup>63</sup> The release of energy caused by an earthquake is a direct result of fault rupture at depth, and when that rupture extends to the ground surface it manifests as displacements expressed as fractures, fissures, tectonic deformation and ground</p>					

<sup>59</sup> Soil Characteristics. Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019. Pages 50-52.

<sup>60</sup> Summary of Seismic Hazards & Safety Recommendations. Page 16.

<sup>61</sup> California Department of Conservation. 2019. Fault Activity Map of California (2010). Accessed November 2019 at: <http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/>.

<sup>62</sup> California Department of Conservation. 2019. CGS Warehouse: Regulatory Maps. Accessed November 2019 at: <http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=regulatorymaps>.

<sup>63</sup> Summary of Seismic Hazards & Safety Recommendations. Page 16.



		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
	<p>shaking.<sup>64</sup> Based on the information discussed in checklist sub-item i), it is unlikely that ground shaking will affect the planning area. As such, there will be no impact as a result of the Project.</p> <p>iii) <i>Ground Failure and Liquefaction:</i> As previously discussed, the Project is located in the S-1 zone. According to The California Department of Conservation's CGS Information Warehouse Regulatory Maps, the planning area is not located in a liquefaction zone.<sup>65</sup> The Project does not include specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses). Any future developments would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis and will be constructed in accordance with all applicable building codes. As such, risk to persons or structures due to liquefaction is minimal. There will be no impact as a result of the Project.</p> <p>iv) <i>Landslides:</i> As previously discussed, the Project is located in the S-1 zone. According to The California Department of Conservation's CGS Information Warehouse Regulatory Maps, the planning area is not located in a landslide zone.<sup>66</sup> The Project does not include specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses). Any future developments would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis and will be constructed in accordance with all applicable building codes. As such, risk to persons or structures due to landslides is minimal. There will be a no impact as a result of the Project.</p> <p>b) <b>No Impact</b> - The proposed Project is a Community Plan and contains no plans for development or construction. As future development occurs, site construction activities would involve earthmoving activities to shape land, trenching for sewer and potable water distribution systems, pouring concrete for sidewalks, curbs, and gutters, and other typical construction-related activities. These activities could expose soils to erosion processes. The extent of erosion would vary depending on slope steepness/stability, vegetation/cover, concentration of runoff, and weather conditions.</p> <p>To prevent water and wind erosion during the construction-related activities, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be developed for projects within the planning area which disturb more than one acre in area where applicable. As part of the SWPPP, applicants would be required to provide erosion control measures to protect the topsoil. Any stockpiled soils would be watered and/or covered to prevent loss due to wind erosion as part of the SWPPP during construction. As a result of these efforts, loss of topsoil and substantial soil erosion during the construction period are not anticipated. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact.</p> <p>c) <b>No Impact</b> - As discussed in subsections a) i – v, the Project site is located in a S-1 seismic zone with minimal and low-to- moderate risks for landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. The Project does not include specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses). Any future developments would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis and will be constructed in accordance with all applicable building codes. A substantial grade change would not occur in the area topography to the point where the developments within the proposed Project area would expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects from on or off-site landslides. Furthermore, as previously discussed in this chapter, lateral spreading, liquefaction or collapse are unlikely to occur as area soils, substrate and seismology are not conducive to such phenomena. Therefore, the Project will result in no impact.</p>				

<sup>64</sup> California Department of Conservation. 2018. Special Publication 42 Revised 2018 Earthquake Fault Zones. A Guide for Government Agencies. Property Owners / Developers, and Geoscience Practitioners for Assessing Fault Rupture Hazards in California. Page 6. Accessed at November 2019 at: <ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sp/Sp42.pdf>.

<sup>65</sup> California Department of Conservation. 2019. CGS Warehouse: Regulatory Maps. Accessed November 2019 at: <http://maps.conservaion.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=regulatorymaps>.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
<p>d) <b>No Impact</b> - As identified in the analysis section of this chapter, the planning area contains at least ten soil types, and most exhibit “moderately” or “well” drained as identified by the USDA’s Soil Survey Map.<sup>67</sup> The California Department of Parks and Recreation has defined expansive soils as clay-based soils that tend to expand (increase in volume) as they absorb water and shrink (lessen in volume) as water is drawn away, resulting in damage to structures, slabs, pavements, and retaining walls if wetting and drying of the soil does not occur uniformly across the entire area.<sup>68</sup> The 1994 Uniform Building Code requires that when expansive soils are present, the building official may require that special provisions be made in the foundation design and construction to safeguard against damage due to this expansiveness, requiring a special investigation and report to provide design and construction criteria.<sup>69</sup> The proposed Project is a Community Plan and contains no plans for development or construction; however, it does anticipate that across the planning horizon that the Lemon Cove community will continue to grow at a 1.3% rate, consistent with the Tulare County General Plan.</p> <p>As future development occurs, construction of residential or commercial structures would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Based on the analysis performed in this chapter, it is anticipated that the area’s low frequency of seismological activity, combined with soil types of moderately to well drained, the use of building and construction standards would result in a low risk thresholds with regard to life or property. Because no development or any project is planned as part of this Community Plan, the Project will result in no impact.</p> <p>e) <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> - The Lemon Cove Community Plan is intended to serve as an outline of community goals regarding the physical development of these respective communities in addition to the promotion of the general welfare of each community. As the proposed Project is a Community Plan contains no plans for development or construction, the Plan in and of itself will not require or lead to the introduction or installation of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems into area soils.</p> <p>The Lemon Cove Sanitary District (LCSD or District) is responsible for providing sanitary sewer service to about 50 residents within the District’s boundary, which is also the same number of connections to their water system.<sup>70</sup> “According to the Wastewater User Charge Survey Report FY 2004-05 (Cal EPA- State Water Resources Control Board, May 2005), the average dry weather flow at the WWTF is approximately 12,000 GPD. Using a demand of 310 GPD per connection, it is estimated that the District’s sanitary sewer treatment and disposal capabilities would allow for approximately 25 additional connections (equivalent dwelling units) to the system.”<sup>71</sup></p> <p>As indicated in the Draft Community Plan, Lemon Cove currently does not have a storm drainage system.<sup>72</sup></p> <p>As noted previously, because no development or any project is planned as part of this development of the proposed Community Plan, the Project will result in no impact.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Impact Analysis: No Impact</b></p> <p>The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is Tulare County. This cumulative analysis is based on the information provided in the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, General Plan Background Report, Tulare County 2030 General Plan EIR, and draft Lemon Cove Community Plan.</p>					

<sup>67</sup> Soil Characteristics, Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019. Pages 50-52.

<sup>68</sup> California Department of Parks and Recreation. 2010. Page 3.5-3. Los Angeles State Historic Park Master Development Plan Final EIR. Accessed November 2019 at: [https://www.parks.ca.gov/pages/22272/files/r3\\_5\\_geology\\_soils.pdf](https://www.parks.ca.gov/pages/22272/files/r3_5_geology_soils.pdf).

<sup>69</sup>

<sup>70</sup> Lemon Cove Background Report, Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019, Page 77.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid.

<sup>72</sup> Op. Cit. 78.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>	
<p>The proposed Project will not increase geotechnical related impacts off-site. Therefore, no Project-specific or Cumulative impacts related to this Checklist Item will occur.</p> <p><b>Mitigation: None Required</b></p>						
<b>8.</b>	<b>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</b>					
	Would the project:					
	a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b)	Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Analysis:</b></p> <p>As noted previously, the Project is the Lemon Cove Community Plan and no development proposals are being considered at this time. The Community Plan Update is being prepared to accommodate a growth rate of 1.3% (consistent with the Tulare County General Plan). Although the Project includes expansion of the Urban Development Boundary (UDB), there are no specific development projects included in the proposed update that would contribute to an increase of greenhouse gases ; as such, there is no possibility of the Project resulting in changes of greenhouse gas emissions outside of the already established UDB. However, future developments within the proposed UDB would generate greenhouse gases and are evaluated in this analysis. The Technical Memorandum “Greenhous Gas Assessment for the Lemon Cove Community Plan” (GHG Memo) was completed by RMA Staff (Jessica Willis, Planner IV) in November 2019 to analyze potential air quality emissions and is included in See Attachment “A” of this MND.</p> <p><b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b></p> <p>Lemon Cove is currently designated an Unincorporated Community in the 2030 Tulare County General Plan. The objective of the Lemon Cove Community Plan (Plan) is to develop a plan, which can accurately reflect the needs and priorities of the unincorporated community of Lemon Cove. The Land Use and Circulation portions of this Plan provide the mechanism to minimize or avoid the potential adverse impacts of urban growth. The development of an orderly, harmonious land use pattern and appropriate implementation measures are designed to reduce potential conflict between neighboring uses across Tulare County’s 2030 planning horizon, consistent with the Tulare County 2030 General Plan Update. The Plan is needed to increase the availability of infrastructure funding, such as drinking water system improvements (wells, water distribution piping, storage tanks, etc.), wastewater system (such as piping, lift stations, etc.), and public work/safety improvements (such as curbs, gutters, sidewalks, etc.), and to stimulate economic development within the community.</p> <p>Tulare County is proposing new land use and zoning designations within an expanded UDB. The proposed Community Plan, if adopted, will update these designations to be consistent with the General Plan, and will bring existing non-compliant properties into conformity with the Tulare County Zoning Ordinance. The Community Plan also includes the Complete Streets and Road Maintenance programs and the community’s anticipated growth through year 2030 based on the existing land uses, census population data, and the projected 1.3% annual growth rate in unincorporated areas of Tulare County. Other than the Complete Streets and Road Maintenance Programs, there are no specific development projects (such as</p>						

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
--	--	-------------------------------	---	---	----------------------

residential, commercial, or industrial uses) proposed as part of this Project. As an unknown number of proposals may occur within the lifetime of the Plan, the Plan is intended to direct the density, intensity, and types of growth needed to meet the needs of the community. Future developments within the Project planning area will be required to undergo additional CEQA evaluation on a project-by-project basis at such time development is proposed to determine potential environmental impacts.

### **Complete Streets and Road Maintenance**

The Lemon Cove Complete Streets and Road Maintenance Programs are included in the Circulation Element of the proposed Community Plan. The Complete Streets Program has thoroughly analyzed the alternative forms of transportation, including transit, bicycle ways, and pedestrian circulation. Improvements proposed in the Complete Streets Program include, but are not limited to, installation of streetlights, bus shelters, street signage and striping, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, drainage system, and utilities. Road maintenance activities vary by road segment dependent upon the condition of the road and may include chip seal, overlay resurfacing, and asphalt reconstructions.

### **Growth Projections**

There are no specific development projects proposed with the Lemon Cove Community Plan; however, the Plan does include updates to land use designations that could increase the buildout potential of the planning area. Population and residential growth through planning horizon year 2030 was estimated by applying a 1.3% annual growth rate, consistent with the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, to the 2017 baseline population and housing data, as provided in the United States Census Bureau 2017 American Community Survey (ACS).<sup>73</sup> Non-residential growth was estimated through planning horizon year 2030 for a worst-case emissions scenario by applying a 1.3% annual growth rate to the existing uses and assuming all parcels have been improved with structures at a floor to area ratio of 0.20. Using these assumptions for baseline conditions provides a conservative (larger) overall growth estimate. **Table 8-1** (Table 1 in the GHG memo) summarizes the projected growth of the community through horizon Year 2030.

<b>Table 8-1 Projected Growth through Year 2030</b>								
	<b>Residential<sup>1</sup></b>		<b>Commercial/Public/Other<sup>2</sup></b>		<b>Retail<sup>2</sup></b>		<b>Industrial<sup>2</sup></b>	
<b>Year</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Dwelling Units</b>	<b>Square Feet</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>Square Feet</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>Square Feet</b>	<b>Acres</b>
2017	232	115	277,129	31.81	65,079	7.47	15,507	1.78
2030	274	136	327,797	37.63	76,977	8.84	18,343	2.11
<b>Overall Growth</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>50,668</b>	<b>5.85</b>	<b>11,898</b>	<b>1.37</b>	<b>2,835</b>	<b>0.33</b>
<sup>1</sup> Projections based on 2017 American Community Survey data applying an annual growth rate of 1.3%.								
<sup>2</sup> Projections based on existing land uses assuming developments/improvements with a Floor to Area Ratio of 0.2 and annual growth rate of 1.3%.								

### **Significance Thresholds**

CEQA Guidelines define a significant effect on the environment as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project.<sup>74</sup> To determine if a project would have a significant impact on climate change, the type, level, and impact of GHG emissions generated by the Project must be evaluated. Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines provides the criteria (as Checklist Items) for evaluating potential impacts on the environment. The CEQA criteria and the Air District's significance thresholds and guidance for evaluation are provided

<sup>73</sup> United States Census Bureau. American FactFinder. 2017 American Community Survey. 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Demographic and Housing Estimates (DP05) and Selected Housing Characteristics (DP04). Accessed November 2019 at: [https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community\\_facts.xhtml](https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml).

<sup>74</sup> Natural Resources Agency. Governor's Office of Planning. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Sections 15002(g) and 15382.

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
below.					
<p><b><u>2008 Climate Change Scoping Plan</u></b></p> <p>The California State Legislature adopted Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32) on September 27, 2006. AB 32 focuses on reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020 and to 80% below 1990 levels by the year 2050. Pursuant to the requirements in AB 32, the ARB adopted the Climate Change Scoping Plan (2008 Scoping Plan), which outlines actions recommended to obtain that goal. The 2008 Scoping Plan calls for an “ambitious but achievable” reduction in California’s GHG emissions, cutting emissions approximately 29% from BAU emission levels projected for 2020, or about 10% from 2008 levels. On a per capita basis, that means reducing annual emissions of 14 tons of carbon dioxide for every man, woman, and child in California down to about 10 tons per person by 2020.<sup>75</sup></p> <p><b><u>2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan</u></b></p> <p>The California State Legislature adopted Senate Bill 32 (SB 32) on September 8, 2016. SB 32 focuses on reducing GHG emissions to 40% below 1990 levels by the year 2030. Pursuant to the requirements in SB 32, the ARB adopted the Climate Change Scoping Plan Update (2017 Scoping Plan), which outlines actions recommended to obtain that goal. ARB recommends statewide targets of no more than six (6) metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e per capita by 2030 and no more than two (2) metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e per capita by 2050.<sup>76</sup></p> <p><b><u>Air District Guidance</u></b></p> <p>“On December 17, 2009, the District’s Governing Board adopted the District Policy: <i>Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for Stationary Source Projects Under CEQA When Serving as the Lead Agency</i>. The District’s Governing Board also approved the guidance document: <i>Guidance for Valley Land-Use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Projects Under CEQA</i>. In support of the policy and guidance document, District staff prepared a staff report: <i>Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions Under the California Environmental Quality Act</i>. These documents adopted in December of 2009 continue to be the relevant policies to address GHG emissions under CEQA. As these documents may be modified under a separate process, the latest versions should be referenced to determine the District’s current guidance at the time of analyzing a particular project.”<sup>77</sup></p> <p>“It is widely recognized that no single project could generate enough GHG emissions to noticeably change the global climate temperature. However, the combination of GHG emissions from past, present and future projects could contribute substantially to global climate change. Thus, project specific GHG emissions should be evaluated in terms of whether or not they would result in a cumulatively significant impact on global climate change. GHG emissions, and their associated contribution to climate change, are inherently a cumulative impact issue. Therefore, project-level impacts of GHG emissions are treated as one-in-the-same as cumulative impacts.</p> <p>In summary, the staff report evaluates different approaches for assessing significance of GHG emission impacts. As presented in the report, District staff reviewed the relevant scientific information and concluded that the existing science is inadequate to support quantification of the extent to which project specific GHG emissions would impact global climate features such as average air temperature, average rainfall, or average annual snow pack. In other words, the District was not able to determine a specific quantitative level of GHG emissions increase, above which a project would have a significant</p>					

<sup>75</sup> CARB. Climate Change Scoping Plan. Accessed November 2019 at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/document/scopingplandocument.htm>.

<sup>76</sup> CARB. California’s 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan. Page 99. Accessed November 1, 2019 at: [https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scoping\\_plan\\_2017.pdf](https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scoping_plan_2017.pdf).

<sup>77</sup> San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, *Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts*. Section 8.9. Page 110. Accessed November 2019 at: [www.valleyair.org/Programs/CCAP/CCAP\\_idx.htm](http://www.valleyair.org/Programs/CCAP/CCAP_idx.htm).

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
<p>impact on the environment, and below which would have an insignificant impact. This is readily understood, when one considers that global climate change is the result of the sum total of GHG emissions, both manmade and natural that occurred in the past; that is occurring now; and will occur in the future.</p> <p>In the absence of scientific evidence supporting establishment of a numerical threshold, the District policy applies performance based standards to assess project-specific GHG emission impacts on global climate change. The determination is founded on the principal that projects whose emissions have been reduced or mitigated consistent with the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as “AB 32”, should be considered to have a less than significant impact on global climate change. For a detailed discussion of the District’s establishment of thresholds of significance for GHG emissions, and the District’s application of said thresholds, the reader is referred to the above referenced staff report, District Policy, and District Guidance documents.”<sup>78</sup></p> <p>“As presented in Figure 6 (Process of Determining Significance of Greenhouse Gas Emissions) [of the GAMAQI], the policy provides for a tiered approach in assessing significance of project specific GHG emission increases.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projects complying with an approved GHG emission reduction plan or GHG mitigation program which avoids or substantially reduces GHG emissions within the geographic area in which the project is located would be determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact for GHG emissions. Such plans or programs must be specified in law or approved by the Lead Agency with jurisdiction over the affected resource and supported by a CEQA compliant environmental review document adopted by the Lead Agency. Projects complying with an approved GHG emission reduction plan or GHG mitigation program would not be required to implement Best Performance Standards (BPS).</li> <li>• Projects implementing BPS would not require quantification of project specific GHG emissions. Consistent with CEQA Guideline, such projects would be determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact for GHG emissions.</li> <li>• Projects not implementing BPS would require quantification of project specific GHG emissions and demonstration that project specific GHG emissions would be reduced or mitigated by at least 29%, compared to Business as Usual (BAU), including GHG emission reductions achieved since the 2002-2004 baseline period, consistent with GHG emission reduction targets established in ARB’s AB 32 Scoping Plan. Projects achieving at least a 29% GHG emission reduction compared to BAU would be determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact for GHG.</li> </ul> <p>The District guidance for development projects also relies on the use of BPS. For development projects, BPS includes project design elements, land use decisions, and technologies that reduce GHG emissions. Projects implementing any combination of BPS, and/or demonstrating a total 29 percent reduction in GHG emissions from business-as-usual (BAU), would be determined to have a less than cumulatively significant impact on global climate change.”<sup>79</sup></p> <p>The Air District’s <i>Guidance for Valley Land-use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Project under CEQA</i> states, “Projects implementing Best Performance Standards in accordance with this guidance would be determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact on global climate change and would not require project specific quantification of GHG emissions. Projects exempt from the requirements of CEQA, and projects complying with an approved GHG emission reduction plan or mitigation program would also be determined to have a less than significant individual or cumulative impact. Such plans or programs must be specified in law or adopted by the public agency with jurisdiction over the affected resources and have a certified final CEQA document. Projects not implementing BPS would require quantification of project specific GHG emissions. To be determined to have a less than significant individual and</p>					

<sup>78</sup> Ibid. 111-112.

<sup>79</sup> Op. Cit. 112.



		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>cumulative impact on global climate changes, such projects must be determined to have reduced or mitigated GHG emissions by 29%, consistent with GHG emission reduction targets established in ARB's AB 32 Scoping Plan. Furthermore, quantification of GHG emissions would be expected for all projects for which the lead agency has determined that an Environmental Impact Report is required, regardless of whether the project incorporates Best Performance Standards.”<sup>80</sup></p> <p>“If total GHG emissions reductions measures add up to 29% or more, are enforceable, and are required as a part of the development's approval process, the project achieves the Best Performance Standard (BPS) for the respective type of development project. Thus, the GHG emissions from the development project would be determined to have a less than individually and cumulatively significant impact on global climate change for CEQA purposes.”<sup>81</sup></p> <p>“By definition, BPS for development projects is achieving a project-by-project 29% reduction in GHG emissions, compared to BAU. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that Lead Agencies implementing the proposed <i>Guidance for Valley Land-use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Projects under CEQA</i> threshold will achieve an overall reduction in GHG emissions consistent with AB 32 emission reduction targets...”<sup>82</sup></p> <p>The Air District's guidance document was adopted to provide a basis for lead agencies to establish significance thresholds consistent with ARB's 2008 Scoping Plan. The Air District currently does not have a recommendation for establishing thresholds or assessing significance consistent with the reduction requirements established in ARB's 2017 Scoping Plan Update, which requires a 33.2% reduction from BAU to achieve the 2030 target. As such, Tulare County prepared and adopted the Tulare County 2018 Climate Action Plan (CAP) Update. <b>Figure 8-1</b> (Figure 1 in the GHG Memo) provides a visual summary of the Air District's process for determining significance of project-related GHG emissions</p> <p>“The CAP serves as a guiding document for County of Tulare (“County”) actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the potential effects of climate change. The CAP is an implementation measure of the 2030 General Plan Update. The General Plan provides the supporting framework for development in the County to produce fewer greenhouse gas emissions during Plan buildout. The CAP builds on the General Plan's framework with more specific actions that will be applied to achieve emission reduction targets consistent with California legislation.”<sup>83</sup></p> <p>“The County of Tulare (County) adopted the Tulare County Climate Action Plan (CAP) in August 2012. The CAP includes provisions for an update when the State of California Air Resources Board (CARB) adopts a Scoping Plan Update that provides post-2020 targets for the State and an updated strategy for achieving a 2030 target. Governor Brown signed Senate Bill (SB) 32 on September 8, 2016 which contains the new 2030 target. The CARB 2017 Scoping Plan Update for the Senate Bill (SB) 32 2030 targets was adopted by the CARB on December 14, 2017 which provided new emission inventories and a comprehensive strategy for achieving the 2030 target (CARB 2017a). With the adoption of the 2017 Scoping Plan, the County proceeded with the 2018 CAP Update that is provided in this document.</p> <p>The 2018 CAP Update incorporates new baseline and future year inventories to reflect the latest information and updates the County's strategy to address the SB 32 2030 target. The 2030 target requires the State to reduce emissions by 40 percent below 1990 levels from the 2017 Scoping Plan and County data. The CAP identifies the County's fair share of reductions required to maintain consistency with the State target.”<sup>84</sup></p>					

<sup>80</sup> Op. Cit. 4.

<sup>81</sup> Op. Cit. 7-8.

<sup>82</sup> Op. Cit. 8.


<sup>83</sup> Tulare County Climate Action Plan, December 2018 Update, Page 1. Accessed November 2019 at: <http://generalplan.co.tulare.ca.us>., then locate and click on “Climate Action Plan February 2010 Draft” or Google: Tulare County Climate Action Plan”

<sup>84</sup> Ibid.



		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
--	--	-----------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

**Figure 8-1**  
**Process of Determining Significance of Greenhouse Gas Emissions**



In addition to consistency with Air District GHG Guidance, the Tulare County General Plan has a number of policies that apply to projects within County of Tulare regarding GHG emissions. For example, General Plan policies that would apply to future development in the Project area include *AQ-1.7 Support Statewide Climate Change Solutions*; *AQ-1.9 Support Off-Site Measures to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions*; *AQ-3.5 Alternative Energy Design*; and *LU-1.1 Smart Growth and Healthy Communities wherein the County shall promote the principles of smart growth and healthy communities in UDBs and HDBs, including LU-1.1.-3. (creating a strong sense of place), LU-1.1.-4. (mixing land uses), and LU-1.1.-9. (preserving open space).*

To reiterate, there are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) associated with the Lemon Cove Community Plan. As such, the proposed Project will not result in GHG emissions until specific development occurs. As noted earlier, the Technical Memo “Greenhouse Gas Assessment for the Lemon Community Plan” (GHG Memo) was completed by RMA Staff (Jessica Willis, Planner IV) in November 2019 to assess potential GHG impacts (See Attachment “A”). The assessment was conducted within the context of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA, California Public Resources Code Sections 21000, et seq.). The methodology follows Air District recommendations for quantification of GHG emissions and evaluation of potential impacts on global climate change as provided in their guidance documents.

a) ***Less Than Significant Impact - Project Impact Analysis:*** The Air District has determined that projects consistent with an adopted Climate Action Plan (CAP) would be considered to have a less than significant impact on the environment. The Tulare County CAP was initially adopted in August 2012 and serves as a guiding document for County actions to reduce GHG emissions and adapt to the potential effects of climate change. The CAP is an implementation measure of the Tulare

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
<p>County General Plan 2030 Update (General Plan) which provides the supporting framework for development in the County. The CAP builds on the General Plan's framework with more specific actions that will be applied to achieve emission reduction targets required by State of California legislation. The General Plan fulfills many sustainability and GHG reduction objectives at the program level. The CAP identifies the policies from the various General Plan elements that promote more efficient development, and reduce travel and energy consumption. The CAP requires projects achieve reductions in excess of the reduction identified in the Scoping Plan. The CAP identifies General Plan policies in place to assist the County in reducing GHG emissions. The 2018 CAP Update incorporates new baseline and future year inventories to reflect the latest information and updates the County's strategy to address the SB 32 2030 target. The CAP identifies the County's fair share of reductions required to maintain consistency with the State's target.</p> <p>The CAP thresholds for determining consistency with the CAP are 500 dwelling units, 100,000 square feet of retail, or equivalent intensity for other uses. These thresholds are the amounts currently required from development related sources within the County to demonstrate consistency with SB 32 2030 targets. Projects exceeding the consistency thresholds must comply with the requirements of the CAP, which requires a GHG analysis report demonstrating emission reductions of at least 31% below 2015 levels by 2030 or a 9% reduction from 2030 BAU emissions. As the CAP implements the County's strategy to achieve the State's 2030 reduction targets, projects below the consistency thresholds have been determined to be consistent with the State's targets and do not require GHG emissions quantification. Projects below the consistency thresholds would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.</p> <p>There are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) associated with the Community Plan. As such, the proposed Project will not result in GHG emissions until specific development occurs. Future developments would be required to comply with the CAP. The CAP states, "The 2018 CAP Update includes an additional method of determining project consistency with the CAP and 2030 targets. Projects subject to CEQA review could use a checklist containing design features and measures that are needed to determine consistency. Large projects (500-unit subdivisions and 100,000 square feet of retail or equivalent intensity for other uses) and new specific plans should provide a greenhouse gas analysis report quantifying GHG emissions to demonstrate that the project emissions are at least 31 percent below 2015 levels by 2030 or 9 percent below BAU emissions in 2030. These are the amounts currently required from development related sources to demonstrate consistency with SB 32 2030 targets. Smaller projects may also prepare a GHG analysis report if the checklist is not appropriate for a particular project or is deemed necessary by the project proponent or County staff. The GHG analysis should incorporate as many measures as possible from the CalEEMod mitigation component as described in Table 15 [of the 2018 CAP] and can take credit for 2017 Scoping Plan measures that have not been incorporated into CalEEMod but that will be adopted prior to 2030 such as 50 percent RPS."<sup>85</sup></p> <p>"The County has already approved a substantial number of lots for development. Development of some of these lots will be limited by various factors such as water supply, sewer/septic capability, road capacity, etc. that cannot be addressed during the planning horizon due to lack of resources. This means that the County expects that new development proposals will be received that are more likely to develop before existing lots are developed because the rural community, landowner, or developer has the resources to provide all improvements and services required for the site. As a rough estimate, this analysis assumes that 40 percent of the development will occur on existing lots and 60 percent will occur in new developments. Development occurring on existing lots will be subject to existing conditions of the approved subdivision and zoning standards. Development occurring in new subdivisions and projects [after 2012] would be subject to additional measures required to mitigate significant impacts. The County will encourage developers of existing lots [established prior to 2012] to implement measures that reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but it has no authority to require additional reductions beyond</p>					

<sup>85</sup> Op. Cit. 73.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
--	--	-------------------------------	---	---	----------------------

those required by State regulation, the building code, and local ordinance.”<sup>86</sup>

“Commercial and industrial development in Tulare County during the 2020 and 2030 planning timeframes will comply with increasingly stringent State energy efficiency regulations in most projects. For industrial projects where the SJVAPCD is a Responsible Agency, the project will be expected to implement Best Performance Standards included in the SJVAPCD Guidelines for Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions on the processes and stationary equipment that emit greenhouse gases to levels that meet or exceed State targets and may be subject to Cap-and-Trade Program requirements.”<sup>87</sup>

There are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) associated with the Community. As indicated in **Table 8-1** (Table 1 in the GHG Memo), projected future growth based on the County’s 1.3% annual growth rate is 21 residential units, 62,566 sf of commercial/retail/office space, and 2,668 sf of industrial space. Projected growth through horizon year 2030 is below the CAP consistency thresholds of 500 dwelling units, 100,000 square feet of retail, or equivalent intensity for other uses. As the Project falls below the CAP consistency thresholds, the Project would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. However, the air quality emissions reports include quantification of GHG emissions (see Attachment “A”). Project-related emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), Version 2016.3.2, and are summarized and provided below for informational purposes only. **Table 8-2** (Table 2 in the GHG Memo) provides the Project’s construction-related GHG emission while **Table 8-3** (Table 3 in the GHG Memo) provides the operations-related GHG emissions.

The Air District does not have a recommendation for lead agencies in assessing the significance of construction related GHG emissions. Emissions from construction would be temporary; however, to account for the construction emissions, the emissions were amortized based on the average life of all future development (30 years) and added to the operational emissions.

<b>TABLE 8-2 CONSTRUCTION-RELATED GHG EMISSIONS (mitigated)</b>	
	CO <sub>2e</sub> Emissions (metric tons per year)
Construction Total	608.90
<b>Amortized Annual Emissions</b>	<b>20.30</b>
<i>Note: Amortized emissions are based on a 30-year life for all developments. Source: See Attachment “A” in the AQA Memo.</i>	

<b>TABLE 8-3 OPERATIONS-RELATED GHG EMISSIONS (metric tons per year)</b>			
	CO <sub>2e</sub> Emissions (unmitigated)	CO <sub>2e</sub> Emissions (mitigated)	% Reduction
Total Operations	1,787.06	1,674.65	6.29
Amortized Annual Emissions	20.30	20.30	0.00
Total Project Emissions	1,807.36	1,694.95	6.22
<i>Note: Amortized emissions are based on a 30-year life for all developments. Source: See Attachment “A” in the AQA Memo.</i>			

As demonstrated in **Table 8-3** (Table 3 in the GHG Memo), the Project achieves an approximately 6.22% reduction in GHG emissions through compliance with current regulation. As future development is unknown, the analysis was performed assuming a worst-case emissions scenario, that is, that all future development would be developed in one phase beginning in 2020. The analysis did not include GHG reductions from compliance with Renewable Portfolio Standards for energy

<sup>86</sup> Op. Cit. 76.

<sup>87</sup> Op. Cit.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
--	--	-------------------------------	---	---	----------------------

producers or from compliance with 2019 California Building Code or Green Building Standards. Also, as future development is unknown, incorporation of project-specific design features that would reduce GHG emissions cannot be incorporated into the emissions analysis. Therefore, the emissions reductions presented above underestimate the actual reductions that would be achieved on a project-by-project basis. As such, the Project demonstrates continued progress towards the County achieving the 2017 Scoping Plan Update 2030 reduction requirements with an overall GHG reduction. Furthermore, the State anticipates increases in the number of zero emission vehicles operated in the State under the Advanced Clean Car Program. Compliance with SB 375 reduction targets for light duty vehicles will provide continued reductions in emissions from that source through SB 375's 2035 milestone year. The Project will provide a GHG emission reduction benefit as future buildout of the community will supply residents within the Lemon Cove UDB and immediate vicinity with greater shopping and employment opportunities, thereby reducing vehicle miles traveled from travelling to larger communities/cities for such opportunities. Since future development projects would undergo additional CEQA review, the Project will continue to comply with existing and future regulations, and the General Plan, Community Plan, and CAP will continue to be implemented through 2030, the growth projected for 2030 would not result in significant greenhouse gas impacts. Therefore, less than significant Project-specific impacts related to this Checklist Item will occur.

#### **Cumulative Impact Analysis: Less Than Significant Impact**

The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin. Project-related emissions would be considered to have a significant cumulative impact if project-specific impacts are determined to be significant. As previously noted, there are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) associated with the Community Plan. Future developments would be required to comply with the CAP. The Project is consistent with the Tulare County CAP and as such, is consistent with the reduction targets established in the Scoping Plan. As the proposed Project would result in less than significant Project-specific impacts, less than significant Cumulative impacts would also occur.

As previously noted, the Project is consistent with the Tulare County CAP and the reduction targets established in the Scoping Plan. As such, the Project would not generate GHG emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment. Less Than Significant Project-specific and Cumulative Impacts related to this Checklist Item will occur.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact** - Since the proposed Project is located in an unincorporated area of Tulare County, the most applicable GHG plans are the Tulare County Climate Action Plan and ARB's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan. As previously noted, the CAP, initially adopted in August 2012, serves as a guiding document for County actions to reduce GHG emissions and adapt to the potential effects of climate change. The CAP is an implementation measure of the Tulare County General Plan which provides the supporting framework for development in the County. The CAP builds on the General Plan's framework with more specific actions that will be applied to achieve emission reduction targets required by State of California legislation. The General Plan fulfills many sustainability and GHG reduction objectives at the program level. The CAP identifies the policies from the various General Plan elements that promote more efficient development, and reduce travel and energy consumption. The CAP requires projects achieve reductions in excess of the reduction identified in the Scoping Plan. The CAP identifies General Plan policies in place to assist the County in reducing GHG emissions. The 2018 CAP Update incorporates new baseline and future year inventories to reflect the latest information and updates the County's strategy to address the SB 32 2030 target. The CAP identifies the County's fair share of reductions required to maintain consistency with the State's target.

"The 2018 CAP Update includes an additional method of determining project consistency with the CAP and 2030 targets. Projects subject to CEQA review could use a checklist containing design features and measures that are needed to determine consistency. Large projects (500-unit subdivisions and 100,000 square feet of retail or equivalent intensity for other uses) and new specific plans should provide a greenhouse gas analysis report quantifying GHG emissions to demonstrate that the project emissions are at least 31 percent below 2015 levels by 2030 or 9 percent below BAU emissions in 2030. These are

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
--	--	-------------------------------	---	---	----------------------

the amounts currently required from development related sources to demonstrate consistency with SB 32 2030 targets. Smaller projects may also prepare a GHG analysis report if the checklist is not appropriate for a particular project or is deemed necessary by the project proponent or County staff. The GHG analysis should incorporate as many measures as possible from the CalEEMod mitigation component as described in Table 15 and can take credit for 2017 Scoping Plan measures that have not been incorporated into CalEEMod but that will be adopted prior to 2030 such as 50 percent RPS.

Table 17 [of the 2018 CAP] lists the overarching consistency requirements for all projects based on consistency with County land use plans that apply to the project location. Reviews for consistency with land use plans require planning staff to review projects to determine if they comply with applicable plan policies and implementation measures.”<sup>88</sup>

<b>TABLE 8-4 CEQA PROJECT REQUIREMENTS FOR CONSISTENCY WITH CAP</b>	
<b>Item</b>	<b>Required</b>
Project helps to meet the density goals from the Tulare Blueprint	Yes
Consistency with General Plan policies	Yes
Consistency with Rural Valley Lands Plan or Foothill Growth Management Plan development criteria	Yes
Consistency with Urban Growth Boundary expansion criteria	Yes
Consistency for development within Rural Community Urban Development Boundaries (UDB) and Hamlet Development Boundaries (HDB), and Legacy Development Boundaries (LDB)	Yes
<i>Note: Criteria as identified in the General Plan Planning Framework Source: 2018 CAP Update, Table 17, page 73</i>	

“A more detailed review for compliance with CAP measures is required to ensure that a project is doing its part in reducing emissions. Table 18 [of the 2018 CAP] provides a checklist containing measures that will provide reductions necessary to achieve CAP consistency. A project checklist that can be used by staff is provided as Appendix C [of the CAP].”<sup>89</sup>

<b>TABLE 8-5 CAP CONSISTENCY CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>CAP Measure</b>	<b>Compliance</b>
<b>Land Use:</b> Project is consistent with the Tulare County General Plan policies listed in the CAP applicable to GHG emissions and sustainability.	Review for compliance during project review process.
<b>Land Use—Residential:</b> Subdivisions and multifamily projects propose densities consistent with County commitments for the Tulare Blueprint. Densities in subdivisions within the boundaries of Valley rural communities must be at least 5.0 units per acre. (County R-1 zoning has a 6,000 square foot minimum lot size or 7.26 units per gross acre). Overall residential density is 5.3 units per acre for the entire County including the cities. Mountain subdivisions over 50 lots require review to determine if they are consistent with the Blueprint.	Review development plans during project review to determine if densities are consistent with Blueprint.
<b>Land Use—Non-Residential:</b> Retail and office projects should be constructed within the boundaries of Rural Communities, HDB, UDB, LDB, and in designated transportation corridors to provide needed local goods services to residents and the traveling public. Agricultural industrial projects may be constructed in rural locations as long as consistent with the General Plan.	Review development plans to ensure locations are appropriate for type of project that is proposed and consistent with County plans.
<b>Land Use Design:</b> Projects that require construction of new roads or major intersection improvements provide a fair share of improvements such as sidewalks	Include roadway improvements as conditions of approval of subdivision or commercial site plan

<sup>88</sup> Op. Cit. 73.

<sup>89</sup> Op. Cit.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
	and pedestrian friendly crossings, and bike lanes/paths connecting to schools, shopping, and other uses consistent with County development standards.				
	<b>Energy Efficiency:</b> Project complies with current version of Title 24. (Current version is 2016 Title 24)		Provide copy of the Title 24 Report demonstrating compliance with the applicable standards with Building Permit application.		
	<b>Renewable Energy:</b> Project includes solar panels or other alternative energy source meeting County Solar Ordinance or new Title 24 standards whichever is more stringent.		Include solar on building plans and provide Title 24 compliance reports with Building Permit applications.		
	<b>EV Charging:</b> Project meets charging installation/charging ready requirements of the CalGreen Code.		Include charging in building plans		
	<b>CalGreen Building Code Water:</b> Project complies with indoor and outdoor water conservation measures.		Provide copy of report showing code compliance.		
	<b>Water Conservation Landscaping:</b>		Project complies with County water conservation ordinance requirements for landscaping.		
	<b>Solid Waste:</b> Project has access to recycling service for homes and businesses meeting CalRecycle requirements.		County verify that providers are in compliance with CalRecycle regulations regarding recycling and diversion of solid waste.		
	<b>Large Employment Projects:</b> Projects that will have large numbers of employees (over 100) are required to comply with Rule 9410 Employee Trip Reduction Plans (ETRIP). Provide a copy of the ETRIP plan to the County after approval of the plan by the SJVAPCD.		Employer is responsible for compliance with Rule 9410		
	<b>Industrial Projects:</b> Industrial projects that are large employers will comply with Rule 9410. Industrial process related GHG emissions are not under the County's regulatory authority but will require permits from the SJVAPCD and may be subject to Cap-and-Trade.		Employer is responsible for compliance with Rule 9410		
<i>Note: Criteria as identified in the General Plan Planning Framework Source: 2018 CAP Update, Table 18, pages 73-74</i>					

As the County CAP requires projects to achieve reductions in excess of the reductions required in the Scoping Plan and by State legislation, projects that are consistent with the County CAP would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for reducing GHG emissions. There are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) associated with the proposed Community Plan. Future developments will be required to comply with the requirements of the Tulare County CAP. Therefore, the Project does not conflict with the reduction strategies included in the Scoping Plan. Less than significant Project-specific impacts related to this Checklist Item will occur.

### **Cumulative Impact Analysis: Less Than Significant Impact**

The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin. The Project is consistent with the applicable Scoping Plan reductions measures and the Air District's CCAP. The Project will implement applicable Tulare County General Plan and Tulare County CAP policies. As such, the Project will not conflict with applicable state, regional, and local plans, policies or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. less than significant Cumulative impacts related to this Checklist Item will occur.

### **Mitigation: None Required**

<b>9.</b>	<b>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>				
	Would the project:				
	a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

			<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
		the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				
	b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	f)	Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	g)	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Analysis:**

As noted previously, the Project is the proposed Lemon Cove Community Plan; no development proposals are being considered at this time. The Community Plan is being prepared to accommodate a growth rate of 1.3% (consistent with the Tulare County General Plan). Expansion of the Urban Development Boundary (UDB) may result in the discovery of, or over time, proposed businesses that handle hazards and hazardous materials.

The community plan does not include any specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) and will not involve any hazards or hazardous materials. Future development projects will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and, in the event a specific project may include the use of potentially hazardous materials, said project will be required to comply with all rules/regulations of the Tulare County Environmental Health Department, California



		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>Department of Toxic Substances Control, San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, and any other regulatory agency's rules and regulations.</p> <p>The following Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update policies for this resource apply to this Project:</p> <p>The General Plan has a number of policies that apply to projects within Tulare County. General Plan policies that relate to the proposed Project include: <i>HS-4.1 Hazardous Materials</i>; <i>HS-4.3 Incompatible Land Uses</i>; and <i>HS-4.4 Contamination Prevention</i>.</p> <p>a) <b>No Impact</b> - The Community Plan does not include any specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) and as such, will not, in and of itself, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The proposed Project is a Community Plan and contains no plans for development or construction; however, it does anticipate that across the planning horizon, the Lemon Cove community will continue to grow at a 1.3% rate, consistent with the Tulare County General Plan's forecast growth rate for its unincorporated communities. Future development projects, anticipated to meet this 1.3% growth rate, will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and construction-related activities may involve the use and transport of hazardous materials. These materials may include fuels, oils, mechanical fluids, and other chemicals used during construction-related activities. Construction-related activities would also be required to comply with the California fire code to reduce the risk of potential fire hazards. The Tulare County Environmental Health Services Division (TCEHSD) requires submittal of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan, if the site ever handles or stores quantities of hazardous materials in excess of 55 gallons of a liquid, 500 pounds of a solid, or 200 cubic feet of a compressed gas or any amount of a hazardous waste. Compliance with local, state and federal regulations would be adequate such that any future projects would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, this Community Plan would result in no impact to this Checklist Item.</p> <p>b) <b>No Impact</b> - As discussed in the previous checklist item, the Community Plan does not include any specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) and as such, will not, in and of itself, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Over the planning horizon, it is anticipated that residential, commercial and/or municipal infrastructure projects may require and/or generate hazardous materials as part of the construction process. Furthermore, long-term storage of hazardous materials (i.e., agricultural compounds, building supplies, etc.) may occur on residential premises or commercial supply yards upon buildout of the proposed UDB and will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Long-term construction, operational and storage-related activities involving hazardous materials would be required to comply with the California fire code to reduce the risk of potential fire hazards. The TCEHSD requires submittal of a Hazardous Materials Business Plan, if the site ever handles or stores quantities of hazardous materials in excess of 55 gallons of a liquid, 500 pounds of a solid, or 200 cubic feet of a compressed gas or any amount of a hazardous waste. Compliance with local, state and federal regulations would be adequate such that any future projects would not, upon buildout, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Therefore, the Project would result in a no impact to this Checklist Item.</p> <p>c) <b>No Impact</b> – “The Lemon Cove Community Planning Area is within the Sequoia Union School District with one (1) school located within its boundaries. Sequoia Union Elementary School is located at the 23958 Avenue 324, Lemon Cove, California.”<sup>90</sup></p>					

<sup>90</sup> Lemon Cove Background Report. Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019. Page 81.

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>The Community Plan does not include any specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) and will not, in and of itself, involve any hazards or hazardous materials. Future development projects will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and, in the event a specific future project, may include the use of potentially hazardous materials, the project will be required to comply with all rules/regulations of the Tulare County Environmental Health Department, California Department of Toxic Substances Control, San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, the California Department of Education and all applicable local, state and federal regulations with regards to hazardous emissions, materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Based on this analysis, there will be no impact as a result of adopting the Community Plan.</p> <p>d) <b>No Impact</b> - According to the State of California Department of Toxic Substances Control <i>EnviroStor</i> database map and <i>Hazardous Waste and Substance Sites List</i>, the planning area does not contain and is not proximate to a listed hazardous site, pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.<sup>91</sup> A search of the United States Environmental Protection Agency's <i>Superfund</i> database indicates that the planning area does not contain and is not near a listed hazardous site, pursuant to 26 U.S. Code § 9507.<sup>92</sup> Based on this information, it is not anticipated that the planning area will be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The Community Plan will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment and as such, no impact will result from this update.</p> <p>e) <b>No Impact</b> - According to a search in County's GIS and the Tulare County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CALUP), the nearest airport is Woodlake Airport located more than three (3) miles northwest of the Lemon Cove UDB. It is anticipated that across the planning horizon (including the proposed UDB expansion area), future growth within Lemon Cove will continue to lie outside of the Woodlake airport land use plan and beyond a two-mile radius of Woodlake airport. The Lemon Cove Community Plan will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area and as such, there will be no impact related to this Checklist item.</p> <p>f) <b>No Impact</b> - The Community Plan is consistent with policies contained in the Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update such as <i>HS – 1.1 Maintaining Emergency Services</i>, <i>HS -1.9 Emergency Access</i>, and <i>HS – 1.10 Emergency Services Near Assisted Living Housing</i>, in addition to the Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan. "The Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (MJLHMP) to assess the natural, technological, and human-caused risks to County communities, to reduce the potential impact of the hazards by creating mitigation strategies. The 2017 MJLHMP represents the County's commitment to create a safer, more resilient community by taking actions to reduce risk and by committing resources to lessen the effects of hazards on the people and property of the County."<sup>93</sup> Therefore, the Community Plan will not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. As such there will be no impact as a result of this project.</p> <p>g) <b>No Impact</b> - The planning area is located outside of a Calfire-designated wildland fire hazard zone.<sup>94</sup> Fire protection and emergency medical services are provided by the Tulare County Fire Department. The community of Lemon Cove is served by Tulare County Fire Department Station #13 located at 32490 State Route 198 in Lemon Cove, and includes</p>					

<sup>91</sup> California Department of Toxic Substances Control, 2019. Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese). [https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search.asp?PAGE=8&CMD=search&ocierp=&business\\_name=&main\\_street\\_number=&main\\_street\\_name=&city=&zip=&county=&branch=&status=ACT%20CBKLG%20CCOM%20COLUR&site\\_type=CSITES%20COPEN%20FUDS%20CLOSE&cleanup\\_type=&npl=&funding=&reporttype=CORTESE&reporttitle=HAZARDOUS+WASTE+AND+SUBSTANCES+SITE+LIST+%28CORTESE%29&federal\\_superfund=&state\\_response=&voluntary\\_cleanup=&school\\_cleanup=&operating=&post\\_closure=&non\\_operating=&corrective\\_action=&tiered\\_permit=&evaluation=&spec\\_prog=&national\\_priority\\_list=&senate=&congress=&assembly=&critical\\_pol=&business\\_type=&case\\_type=&display\\_results=&school\\_district=&pub=&hwmp=False&permitted=&pc\\_permitted=&inspections=&complaints=&censustract=&cesdecile=&ORDERBY=county&next=Next+50](https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search.asp?PAGE=8&CMD=search&ocierp=&business_name=&main_street_number=&main_street_name=&city=&zip=&county=&branch=&status=ACT%20CBKLG%20CCOM%20COLUR&site_type=CSITES%20COPEN%20FUDS%20CLOSE&cleanup_type=&npl=&funding=&reporttype=CORTESE&reporttitle=HAZARDOUS+WASTE+AND+SUBSTANCES+SITE+LIST+%28CORTESE%29&federal_superfund=&state_response=&voluntary_cleanup=&school_cleanup=&operating=&post_closure=&non_operating=&corrective_action=&tiered_permit=&evaluation=&spec_prog=&national_priority_list=&senate=&congress=&assembly=&critical_pol=&business_type=&case_type=&display_results=&school_district=&pub=&hwmp=False&permitted=&pc_permitted=&inspections=&complaints=&censustract=&cesdecile=&ORDERBY=county&next=Next+50). Accessed October, 2019.

<sup>92</sup> United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2019. Superfund. Accessed November 2019 at: <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/search-superfund-sites-where-you-live>.

<sup>93</sup> Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019. Page 92.

<sup>94</sup> Calfire FHSZ Viewer <http://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/>. Accessed October 2019.

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	
<p>one (1) Battalion; Patrol 13 &amp; Engine 13, and Water Tender 13 are assigned to this location.<sup>95</sup> As such, the Community Plan will not result in any exposure to people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death from wildland fires. There will be no impact related to this Checklist item.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Impact Analysis: No Impact</b></p> <p>The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is Tulare County. This cumulative analysis is based on the information provided in the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, General Plan Background Report, Tulare County 2030 General Plan EIR, and draft Lemon Cove Community Plan.</p> <p>Cumulative development throughout the Project area and its vicinity, under Year 2030 build out conditions will cumulatively increase the potential for exposure to existing hazards associated with State Route 201. However, as discussed earlier, the transportation of hazardous materials will continue to be regulated by federal, state, and regional agencies, and all new development will be subject to independent environmental review and all applicable regulations to minimize any potential health risks associated with state routes or other roadways. Therefore, through appropriate regulations, potential cumulative health impacts associated <i>with the build out</i> of the Project area could result in less than significant Project-specific and Cumulative Impacts related to this Checklist Item.</p> <p><b>Mitigation: None Required</b></p>						
<b>10.</b>	<b>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b>					
	Would the project:					
	a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b)	Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	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 which would:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site;				
		ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a				

<sup>95</sup> Lemon Cove Background Report, Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019. Page 79.

			<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
		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				
	d)	In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	e)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Analysis:

#### Water Quality/Quantity

As noted previously, the Project is the Lemon Cove Community Plan and no development proposals are being considered at this time. The Project is being prepared to accommodate a growth rate of 1.3% (consistent with the Tulare County General Plan). As development occurs with the proposed Urban Development Boundary (UDB), hydrology and water quality outside of the already established UDB area may, be impacted and will therefore be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

“Domestic water and sewer service in Lemon Cove is provided by the Lemon Cove Sanitary Sewer District, formed in December 1950. Table 1 [in the Community Plan, **Table 10-1** in the MND] shows the number of existing water and sewer connections, the capacity of each system, and the number of additional connections the systems can accommodate for new development (Housing Element, May 2012 and Municipal Service Review, May 2006). Maps of the sewer and water systems are currently unavailable.”<sup>96</sup>

<b>Table 10-1 Existing Infrastructure</b>					
<b>Drinking Water</b>			<b>Waste Water*</b>		
<b>No. of Existing Connections</b>	<b>Capacity</b>	<b>Available</b>	<b>No. of Existing Connections</b>	<b>Capacity</b>	<b>Available</b>
50	50	0	50	75	25

*Source: Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019.*

“The Lemon Cove Sanitary District is also responsible for providing sanitary sewer service to residents within its Boundary. It is assumed that there are 50 connections to the District’s sewer system, the same number of connections to their water system. The District owns and operates a Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) located approximately 0.7 miles north of the community. The WWTF is operated under the provisions of Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. 94-348, issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

<sup>96</sup> Lemon Cove Background Report. Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019. Pages 74 & 77.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
<p>Order No. 94-348 prescribes that the monthly average dry weather discharge flow shall not exceed 20,000 gallons per day (GPD). According to the Wastewater User Charge Survey Report FY 2004-05 (Cal EPA- State Water Resources Control Board, May 2005), the average dry weather flow at the WWTF is approximately 12,000 GPD. Using a demand of 310 GPD per connection, it is estimated that the District’s sanitary sewer treatment and disposal capabilities would allow for approximately 25 additional connections (equivalent dwelling units) to the system (see Table 1 [<b>Table 10-1</b> in the MND]). The District would need to expand the capacity of its WWTF to support any significant development projects proposed within its SOI.”<sup>97</sup></p> <p>“The Lemon Cove Sanitary District is a member of the East Kaweah Groundwater Sustainable Agency. Under SGMA, East Kaweah GSA is responsible for submitting a Groundwater Sustainable Plan (GSP) to the Department of Water Resources (DWR) by January 31, 2020. A memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is in place between the East Kaweah GSA, Mid Kaweah GSA, and Greater Kaweah GSA to coordinate throughout the SPP development phase to meet the sustainability requirements for the entire Kaweah Sub-basin.”<sup>98</sup></p> <p>“The County and East Kaweah Groundwater Sustainability Agency work collaboratively under the Tulare County General Plan to assist the Lemon Cove Sanitary District in establishing conservation measures and credits in order to sustainably grow water and sewer infrastructure consistent with the Projected Growth Rates considered in the General Plan of Tulare County”<sup>99</sup></p> <p><b><u>Storm Drainage</u></b></p> <p>Storm drainage systems should be designed so they have adequate capacity to accommodate runoff that enters the system for the design frequency and should also be designed considering future development. An inadequate roadway drainage system could result in the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Water overflowing the curb and entering adjacent property leading to damage</li> <li>✓ Accelerated roadway deterioration and public safety concerns may occur due to excessive water accumulation on roadways</li> <li>✓ Over saturation of the roadway structural section due to immersion will lead to pavement deterioration”<sup>100</sup></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Flooding</u></b></p> <p>“Flooding is a natural occurrence in the Central Valley because it is a natural drainage basin for thousands of watershed acres of Sierra Nevada and Coast Range foothills and mountains. Two kinds of flooding can occur in the Central Valley: general rainfall floods occurring in the late fall and winter in the foothills and on the valley floor; and snowmelt floods occurring in the late spring and early summer. Most floods are produced by extended periods of precipitation during the winter months. Floods can also occur when large amounts of water (due to snowmelt) enter storage reservoirs, causing an increase in the amount of water that is released.”<sup>101</sup></p>					

<sup>97</sup> Ibid. 77.

<sup>98</sup> Op. Cit. 78.

<sup>99</sup> Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019. Page 134.

<sup>100</sup> Lemon Cove Background Report. Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019. Pages 77-78.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid. 56.

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>Official floodplain maps are maintained by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). FEMA determines areas subject to flood hazards and designates these areas by relative risk of flooding on a map for each community, known as the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM). A 100-year flood is considered for purposes of land use planning and protection of property and human safety. The boundaries of the 100-year floodplain are delineated by FEMA on the basis of hydrology, topography, and modeling of flow during predicted rainstorms.<sup>102</sup></p> <p>The following Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update policies for this resource apply to this Project: There are several General Plan policies which will be implemented to avoid and/or minimize any potentially adverse impacts to hydrology/water quality such as: <i>HS-4.4 Contamination Prevention</i>; <i>WR-2.1 Protect Water Quality</i>; <i>WR-2.2 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Enforcement</i>; <i>WR-2.3 Best Management Practices (BMPs)</i>; <i>WR-2.4 Construction Site Sediment Control</i>; <i>WR-3.3 Adequate Water Availability</i>; <i>WR-3.6 Water Use Efficiency</i>; <i>HS-5.1 Development Compliance with Federal, State, and Local Agencies</i>; and <i>HS-5.2 Development in Floodplain Zones</i>.</p> <p>a) <b>No Impact</b> - The proposed planning area contains a variety of uses such as retail office, single-family and multi-family residential, hotel, recreation, limited industrial, and public facilities etc.,. Much of the Lemon Cove community is surrounded by agriculturally productive lands (refer to Agricultural and Forestry Resources Section for different types of farmland). The Community Plan does not contain specific development projects, however, over time, the Community Plan would allow for the future development of non-urban lands to urban-type uses. The expansion of the existing UDB, as proposed in the Community Plan, would add approximately 264 acres to the Project area. The proposed Zoning Districts for Lemon Cove is compatible to the Land Use Map outlined in the General Plan.</p> <p>“The Lemon Cove Sanitary District owns and operations a Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) located approximately 0.7 miles north of the community. The WWTF is operated under the provisions of Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. 94-348, issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).</p> <p>Order No. 94-348 prescribes that the monthly average dry weather discharge flow shall not exceed 20,000 gallons per day (GPD). According to the Wastewater User Charge Survey Report FY 2004-05 (Cal EPA- State Water Resources Control Board, May 2005), the average dry weather flow at the WWTF is approximately 12,000 GPD. Using a demand of 310 GPD per connection, it is estimated that the District’s sanitary sewer treatment and disposal capabilities would allow for approximately 25 additional connections (equivalent dwelling units) to the system.”<sup>103</sup></p> <p>As stated previously, the Project is the Lemon Cove Community Plan and there are no specific developments proposed as part of this project. However, future developments within the UDB area will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis to ensure the Sanitary District can accommodate proposed developments or if the developer must pay for future capacity improvements. Therefore, there will be no impact related to this Checklist item.</p> <p>b) <b>No Impact</b> - As indicated earlier, this Project is the Community Plan of Lemon Cove, with proposed increase in its UDB. As such, there are no specific developments proposed as part of this project; however, future developments within the UDB area will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Therefore, the Community Plan would not 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. As such, the Project would result in no impact to this resource.</p> <p>c) <b>No Impact</b> - As noted earlier, this project is the Lemon Cove Community Plan, with proposed expansion of its UDB. As such, there are no specific developments proposed as part of this project; therefore, the Project would not substantially</p>					

<sup>102</sup> Op. Cit.

<sup>103</sup>. Op. Cit. 77.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
--	--	-------------------------------	---	---	----------------------

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. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact to this resource (i-iii).

d) **No Impact** – According to the FEMA Flood Map, the Project site is located in an Area of Minimal Flood Hazard (Zone X)<sup>104</sup>. The project is the Community Plan of Lemon Cove, with proposed increase in its UDB, and is located in an inland location. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact to this resource.

e) **No Impact** - As indicated earlier, this project is the Lemon Cove Community Plan, with proposed increase in its UDB. As such, there are no specific developments proposed as part of this Project; therefore, the Project would not otherwise obstruct or conflict with surface or groundwater quality control or management plans. Thus, the Project would result in no impact to this resource.

#### **Cumulative Impact: No Impact**

The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is Tulare County. This cumulative analysis is based on the requirements of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lemon Cove Sanitary Service District, and Tulare County Environmental Health Division.

As noted previously, the Project is the Lemon Cove Community Plan and no development proposals are being considered at this time. The Project is being prepared to accommodate a growth rate of 1.3% (consistent with the Tulare County General Plan). As development occurs with the proposed Urban Development Boundary (UDB), hydrology and water quality outside of the already established UDB area may be impacted and will therefore be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. As such, the proposed Project will result in no Project-specific and Cumulative impacts related to this Checklist Item.

#### **Mitigation: None Required**

11.	LAND USE AND PLANNING					
	Would the project:					
	a)	Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### **Analysis:**

“Lemon Cove is a census-designated place located in the northern portion of Tulare County, approximately four miles southeast of Woodlake and eleven miles northeast of Visalia. It is generally bounded by Avenue 319 in the south, Goodale Lane in the north, Road 236 in the west, and Road 248 in the east and encompasses 0.8 square miles of land. Lemon Cove is an agriculturally oriented service community surrounded by lands in agricultural production, vacant lands, and scattered residential homes. State Route (SR) 198 and SR 216 provide primary access to the cities of Visalia and

<sup>104</sup> United States Department of Homeland Security. FEMA Flood Map Service Center.

<https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=tulare%20County%20California%20-%20searchresultsanchor#searchresultsanchor>. Accessed November 2019.



		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>Woodlake, respectively. Cities and communities surrounding Lemon Cove include Visalia to the southwest; Woodlake to the northwest; and the community of Three Rivers to the northeast. The Tulare County/Fresno County Line is located approximately 10.5 miles north of Lemon Cove.”<sup>105</sup></p> <p>The Lemon Cove Urban Development Boundary (UDB) contains approximately 404.1 acres (including Rights-of-way); the proposed amendment will increase the UDB by approximately 263.7 acres, for a total of approximately 667.8 acres (see <b>Figure 4</b>).<sup>106</sup></p> <p>“One of the most important purposes of the Lemon Cove Community Plan is to establish land use patterns and development policies and standards for the community for the planning period, through the year 2030. The general intent of the land use plan for Lemon Cove is to identify the most appropriate types and distribution of land uses for the community, based on environmental, circulation, infrastructure, services, opportunities and constraints, urban development boundary suitability analysis and other economic capacities and concerns discussed in the chapters of this Plan.”<sup>107</sup></p> <p>“The County of Tulare, through existing policies, has encouraged both incorporated and unincorporated communities to establish urban development and land use patterns, which are compact and contiguous. This policy position has reduced so-called “leap frog” development throughout the County, helping preserve agricultural lands, and minimize land use conflicts between urban and agricultural areas.”<sup>108</sup></p> <p>“The existing Land Use for the community of Lemon Cove is designated Mixed-Use (MU). At this time, the community of Lemon Cove does not have a community plan; therefore, the Tulare County General Plan Update 2030 provides the framework for development. The Goals and Policies Report reinforce, amend and expand policies with respect to development in the unincorporated area. The General Plan 2030 Update provides guidance to development within the community.”<sup>109</sup></p> <p>The following Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update policies for this resource apply to this Project: <i>LU-1.2 Innovative Development; LU-1.8 Encourage Infill Development; PF-1.3 Land Uses in UDBs/HDBs; PF-2.4 Community Plans; PF-2.6 Land Use Consistency; PF-2.7 Improvement Standards in Communities; and AQ-3.6 Mixed Land Uses.</i></p> <p>In addition to Tulare County General Plan policies, Lemon Cove Community Plan includes policies specific to the community. See the Policy Plan discussion of the Lemon Cove Community.</p> <p>a) <b>No Impact</b> - The Community Plan anticipates a 1.3% annual growth rate (consistent with the Tulare County General Plan). While the community may see the expansion of its existing UDB, no development projects are proposed with this project. Growth of the community anticipated by this Project will be encouraged within the UDB boundaries. As future development will likely occur along the expansion areas of the communities’ core, such growth will not physically divide the established community. Therefore, the Project would have no impact related to this Checklist item.</p> <p>b) <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> - The Community Plan anticipates a 1.3% annual growth rate (consistent with the Tulare County General Plan). Any improvements, developments and/or improvements made as part of the Community Plan</p>					

<sup>105</sup> Executive Summary. Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019. Page 19.

<sup>106</sup> Ibid. 24 and 160.

<sup>107</sup> Op. Cit.

<sup>108</sup> Op. Cit.

<sup>109</sup> Op. Cit.

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	
<p>would be required to comply with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations of agencies with jurisdiction over the project (such as the Tulare County General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, Valley Air District, Regional Water Quality Control Board, etc.). Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant related to this Checklist Item will occur.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Impact: Less Than Significant</b></p> <p>The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is Tulare County. This cumulative analysis is based on the information provided in the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, General Plan background Report, Tulare County 2030 General Plan EIR, and draft Lemon Cove Community Plan. As this Project is consistent with and represents implementation of the aforementioned planning documents, no Project-specific or Cumulative Impacts would occur to this resource.</p> <p><b>Mitigation: None Required</b></p>						
<b>12.</b>	<b>MINERAL RESOURCES</b>					
	Would the project:					
	a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Analysis:</p> <p>The Tulare County General Plan Background Report indicates that Mineral Resource Zones (MRZ) have been documented by the California State Geologist as existing in Tulare County.<sup>110</sup> Generally these sites are deposited along the foothill corridor of the Sierra Nevada Mountains. The Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update defines mineral resources as naturally occurring materials in the earth that can be utilized for commercial purposes.<sup>111</sup> The Background Report states that the most important minerals extracted in Tulare County are sand, gravel, crushed rock and natural gas.<sup>112</sup> According to the California Department of Conservation, the Lemon Cove planning area lies east of designated MRZ-2 and northeast of MRZ-3 zones.<sup>113</sup> MRZ-3 is described by the Department of Conservation as an area containing mineral deposits, the significance of which cannot be evaluated from available data, and MRZ-2 is described as an area with adequate information that significant mineral deposits are present or where mineral deposits are highly likely to exist.<sup>114</sup></p>						

<sup>110</sup> Tulare County General Plan Background Report. Page 10-17. Accessed November 2019 at: <http://generalplan.co.tulare.ca.us>, then locate and click on "Background Report."

<sup>111</sup> Goals and Policies Report, Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update. Page 8-2. November 2019 at: <http://generalplan.co.tulare.ca.us>

<sup>112</sup> Tulare County General Plan Background Report. Page 10-17. Accessed November 2019 at: <http://generalplan.co.tulare.ca.us>, then locate and click on "Background Report."

<sup>113</sup> California Department of Conservation, 1997. Active Aggregate Producers in the Tulare County Production – Consumption Region. Plate 1 of 7 (Map). [ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/ofr/OFR\\_97-01/OFR\\_97-01\\_Plate1.pdf](ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/ofr/OFR_97-01/OFR_97-01_Plate1.pdf).

<sup>114</sup> Ibid.

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	
<p>As noted previously, the Project is the Community Plan of Lemon Cove and no development proposals are being considered at this time. The Project is being prepared to accommodate an unincorporated community growth rate of 1.3% and is consistent with the Tulare County General Plan. As part of the Community Plan, it is anticipated that expansion of the Urban Development Boundary (UDB) will occur; however, it is not anticipated that the expansion would impact mineral resources as the expansion generally would move away from zones MRZ-2 and MRZ-3.</p> <p>The following Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update policies for this resource that apply to this Project: <i>ERM-2.1 Conserve Mineral Deposits; ERM-2.2 Recognize Mineral Deposits; ERM-2.3 Future Resource Development</i> and; <i>ERM-2.7 Minimize Adverse Impacts</i>.</p> <p>a) <b>No Impact</b> - The proposed Project area includes a mix of uses such as retail office, single-family and multi-family residential, hotel, recreation, limited industrial, and public facilities etc.<sup>115</sup> It would not lead to a loss of availability of a known mineral resource as the Community Plan does not contain projects, proposed developments or construction activity that would currently, or upon build-out, fall inside of a Mineral Resource Zone. Accounting for the County’s unincorporated 1.3 percent population growth rate, the planning area would remain confined to the proposed UDB outside of, MRZ-2 and MRZ-3. As such, no impact related to this Checklist Item will occur.</p> <p>b) <b>No Impact</b> - As noted earlier, the proposed Project area includes a mix of uses such as retail office, single-family and multi-family residential, hotel, recreation, limited industrial, and public facilities etc.,<sup>116</sup> over the course of the 2030 planning horizon and is not located in a known MRZ. As such, no impact related to this Checklist Item will occur.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Impact Analysis: No Impact</b></p> <p>The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is Tulare County. This cumulative analysis is based on the information provided in the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, General Plan background Report, Tulare County 2030 General Plan EIR, and/or Lemon Community Plan. As this Project would not occur on lands containing mineral resources, no Project-specific or Cumulative Impacts would occur to the Mineral resource.</p> <p><b>Mitigation: None Required</b></p>						
13.	NOISE					
	Would the project result in:					
	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b)	Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<sup>115</sup> Lemon Cove Background Report. Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019. Page 26.

<sup>116</sup> Ibid.

			<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Analysis:**

The State of California General Plan Guidelines identify rules for the Noise Elements of city and county General Plans, including a sound level/land-use compatibility chart that categorized, by land use, outdoor Ldn ranges in up to four categories (normally acceptable, conditionally acceptable, normally unacceptable, and clearly unacceptable). These guidelines provide the State's recommendations for city and county General Plan Noise Elements (see Figure 12 of the Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019).<sup>117</sup>

The 2010 Recirculated Environmental Impact Report (RDEIR) prepared for the Tulare County General Plan Update included data regarding freeway and railroad noise. Baseline traffic noise contours for major roads in the County were developed using Sound 32 (Caltrans' computer implementation of the FHWA Traffic Noise Prediction Model).<sup>118</sup> Table 3.5-3 in the RDEIR summarized the daily traffic volumes, and the predicted Ldn noise level at 100 feet from the roadway centerline is approximately 79 feet, and the distance from the roadway centerline to the 60-, 65-, and 70-dB-Ldn contours are 82 feet, 1,813 feet, and 3,907 feet respectively.<sup>119</sup>

"The Noise Element includes performance standards for new residential or other noise-sensitive land uses which are to be located near noise-impacted areas. The Element indicates that these uses will not be permitted unless effective design measures can be integrated into the development to mitigate the impact of noise. Table 18 [of the Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019] summarizes the daily traffic volumes on SR 198 and SR 216."<sup>120</sup>

As noted earlier, the Project is the Community Plan of Lemon Cove and no development proposals are being considered at this time. As such, implementation of the Community Plan will not in and of itself create or induce impacts from noise in the planning area; however, buildout and urban infill over the course of the 2030 planning horizon may create the conditions wherein noise issues become a factor for sensitive receptors. As development proposals are received, they will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis to determine what, if any, noise impact they may have on the community and if mitigation to minimize noise impacts are necessary.

The following Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update policies for this resource apply to this Project: *HS-8.2 Noise Impacted Areas; HS-8.3 Noise Sensitive Land Uses; HS-8.5 State Noise Standards; HS-8.6 Noise Level Criteria; HS-8.7 - Inside Noise; HS-8.8 Adjacent Uses; HS-8.9 County Equipment; HS-8.11 Peak Noise Generators; and HS-8.13 Noise Analysis.*

<sup>117</sup> Lemon Cove Background Report. Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019. Page 57.

<sup>118</sup> Ibid. 58.

<sup>119</sup> Op Cit.

<sup>120</sup> Op. Cit.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
--	--	-------------------------------	---	---	----------------------

a) **No Impact** - The proposed Project does not include any proposed development or construction-related activities, as such, it does not involve long- or short-term noise sources. During the construction phase of a development or activity, noise from construction activities (for example; earth-shaping activities, construction of roads, trenching to install water/sewer lines, etc.) would contribute to the noise environment in the immediate proposed Project vicinity. Activities involved in construction would generate maximum noise levels, as indicated in the table below, ranging from 79 to 91 dBA at a distance of 50 feet, without feasible noise control (e.g., mufflers, well maintained equipment, shielding noisier equipment parts, and/or time and activity constraints) and ranging from 75 to 80 dBA at a distance of 50 feet, with feasible noise control. Although the noise generated from earthmoving equipment may exceed the 65 dB Ldn during earthmoving operations, the impact is short-term, temporary, and will only occur during normal business hours, typically from 8:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m. Existing General Plan policies and draft Community Plan policies will be implemented to minimize noise exposure. **Table 12-1** shows typical noise levels from various construction-related equipment. Therefore, the proposed Community Plan will result in no impact to this Checklist item.

<b>Table 12-1 - Typical Construction Noise Levels</b>		
<b>Type of Equipment</b>	<b>dBA at 50 feet</b>	
	<b>Without Feasible Noise Control</b>	<b>With Feasible Noise Control<sup>1</sup></b>
Dozer or Tractor	80	75
Excavator	88	80
Scraper	88	80
Front End Loader	79	75
Backhoe	85	75
Grader	85	75
Truck	91	75

Source: U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration. 2006.  
<sup>1</sup> Feasible noise control includes the use of intake mufflers, exhaust mufflers, and engine shrouds operating in accordance with manufacturers specifications.

b) **No Impact** - Vibration is the periodic oscillation of a medium or object. Vibration sources may be continuous, such as factory machinery, or transient, such as explosions. Similar to airborne sound, ground borne vibrations may be described by amplitude and frequency. Vibration amplitudes are usually expressed in peak particle velocity (PPV) or root mean squared (RMS), as in RMS vibration velocity. The PPV and RMS (VbA) vibration velocity are normally described in inches per second (in/sec). PPV is defined as the maximum instantaneous positive or negative peak of a vibration signal and is often used in monitoring of blasting vibration because it is related to the stresses that are experienced by buildings.

121

Although PPV is appropriate for evaluating the potential for building damage, it is not always suitable for evaluating human response. As it takes some time for the human body to respond to vibration signals, it is more prudent to use vibration velocity when measuring human response. The vibration velocity level is reported in decibels relative to a level of 1x10<sup>-6</sup> inches per second and is denoted as VdB.<sup>122</sup> The typical background vibration-velocity level in residential areas is usually 50 VdB or lower.<sup>123</sup> Ground-borne vibration is normally perceptible to humans at approximately 65 VdB.<sup>124</sup> For most people, a vibration-velocity level of 75 VdB is the approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible levels (FTA 2006).<sup>125</sup>

<sup>121</sup> Federal Transit Administration. 2006. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. Chapter 7: Basic Ground-Borne Vibration Concepts. Page 7-3. Accessed November 2019 at: [https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/FTA\\_Noise\\_and\\_Vibration\\_Manual.pdf](https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/FTA_Noise_and_Vibration_Manual.pdf).

<sup>122</sup> Ibid.7-4.

<sup>123</sup> Op. Cit. 7-5.

<sup>124</sup> Op. Cit.

<sup>125</sup> Op. Cit. 7-8.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
--	--	-------------------------------	---	---	----------------------

Examples of outdoor sources of perceptible ground borne vibration are construction equipment, steel-wheeled trains, and traffic on rough roads. Construction vibrations can be transient, random, or continuous. The approximate threshold of such vibration perception is 65 VdB, while 85 VdB is the vibration acceptable only if there are an infrequent number of events per day (FTA 2006).<sup>126</sup> **Table 12-2** describes the typical construction equipment vibration levels.

<b>Table 12-2 Typical Construction Vibration Levels</b>	
Equipment	VdB at 25 feet <sup>2</sup>
Small Bulldozer	58
Jackhammer	79
<i>Source: U.S. Department of Transportation. Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. Page 12-12, Table 12-2, 2006.</i>	

The proposed Project does not include any construction-related activity; as such, it does not involve long- or short-term noise sources. Vibration from future construction-related activities will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. As construction-related activity is short term and temporary, it is not anticipated to exceed the FTA threshold for the nearest potential receptors. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact of exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.

c) **No Impact** - The proposed Project is not located within an airport land use plan or, within two miles of a public airport project nor is it within the vicinity of a private airstrip. There is no possibility of exposing people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels in or near an existing airport public or private airstrip. According to a search in County's GIS and the CALUP, the nearest airport is Woodlake Airport located more than three (3) miles northwest of the Lemon Cove UDB. As such, there will be no impact as a result of the Project.

#### **Cumulative Impact Analysis: No Impact**

The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is Tulare County. This cumulative analysis is based on the information provided in the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, General Plan background Report, Tulare County 2030 General Plan EIR, and/or Lemon Cove Community Plan.

As indicated earlier, the Project is the Lemon Cove Community Plan and does not include any development proposals. As development occurs, noise impacts will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

#### **Mitigation: None Required**

<b>14.</b>	<b>POPULATION AND HOUSING</b>				
	Would the project:				
	a)	Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<sup>126</sup> Op. Cit.

			SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
		extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				
	b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Analysis:**

As noted previously, the Project is the Community Plan of Lemon Cove and no development proposals are being considered at this time. The Project is being prepared to accommodate a growth rate of 1.3% consistent with the Tulare County General Plan. If approved, the proposed expansion to the Urban Development Boundary (UDB) will be realized; as such, it is anticipated that changes to the landscape would occur beyond the existing UDB. Further, the proposed Project is consistent with the adopted/certified Tulare County Housing Element and; the 2014 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) prepared by the Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG).

The following Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update policies for this resource that apply to this Project: *General Plan Housing Element Housing Guiding Principle 1.1; Housing Policy 1.11; Housing Policy 1.12; Housing Policy 1.16; Housing Guiding Principle 1.3; Housing Policy 1.42; Housing Guiding Principle 1.6; Housing Policy 2.11; Housing Guiding Principle 2.2; Housing Policy 2.21; Housing Policy 2.22; Housing Policy 3.15; Housing Policy 3.21; Housing Policy 3.22; Housing Policy 3.23; and Housing Policy 4.12.*

a) and b) **No Impact** - As indicated earlier, this Project is the proposed Lemon Cove Community Plan, which includes a proposed expansion of the UDB. There are no specific developments proposed as part of this project; however, future developments within the UDB area will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. As noted earlier, the is being prepared to accommodate a growth rate of 1.3% consistent with the Tulare County General Plan. If approved, the proposed expansion to the Urban Development Boundary (UDB) UDB is intended to accommodate future development consistent with the projections forecasted growth through the Year 2030 planning horizon. Potential growth and development is based on the existing land uses, census population data, and the projected 1.3% annual growth rate for unincorporated areas of Tulare County as specified in the County's General Plan.

The population growth rate as contained in the Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update is anticipated to continue at 1.3%. Proposed land use changes, rezoning, and/or UDB expansion is intended to provide more opportunities to accommodate projected growth in Lemon Cove. Therefore, the Community Plan is intended to address localized land use needs and issues while accommodating anticipated growth consistent with the Tulare County General Plan and Regional Housing Needs Plan. As such, the Community Plan will not result in substantial population growth in an area. Therefore, no impact related to this Checklist Item would occur as a result of adopting the Community Plan.

**Cumulative Impact Analysis: No Impact**

The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is Tulare County. This cumulative analysis is based on the information provided in the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, General Plan background Report, Tulare County 2030 General Plan EIR, and/or Lemon Cove Community Plan.

As noted earlier, the Project is the Lemon Cove Community Plan and does not include any development proposals. As development occurs, impacts to this resource will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. It is noted; however, the Project could result in a beneficial impact as the Community Plan can serve as a platform in providing affordable housing opportunities in Tulare County in general, but particularly in the Lemon Cove planning area.



		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	
<b>Mitigation: None Required</b>						
<b>15.</b>	<b>PUBLIC SERVICES</b>					
	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:					
	a)	Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b)	Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	c)	Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	d)	Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	e)	Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Analysis:</p> <p>As noted earlier, the Project is the Lemon Cove Community Plan and no development proposals are being considered at this time. The Project is being prepared to accommodate a growth rate of 1.3 percent and is consistent with the Tulare County General Plan. If adopted as proposed, expansion of the Urban Development Boundary will occur and changes to public or utility services outside of the established UDB area will also occur, accordingly. As the Project does not contain any development proposal, the need to expand public or utility services will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis as development occurs.</p> <p>“Fire protection and emergency medical services are provided by the Tulare County Fire Department. The community of Lemon Cove is served by the Tulare County Fire Department Station # 13 located at 32490 State Route 198 in Lemon Cove, and includes one (1) Patrol 13, Engine 13, and Water Tender 13, which are assigned to this location.”<sup>127</sup></p> <p>“Police protection in the Lemon Cove Planning Area is provided by the Tulare County Sheriff’s Department (patrol service only). The main Sheriff’s Office is located at 2404 W. Burrell Avenue, in Visalia, which serves the unincorporated areas of Tulare County.”<sup>128</sup></p> <p>“The Lemon Cove Community Planning Area is within the Sequoia Union School District with one (1) school located within its boundaries. Sequoia Union School District is located at 23958 Avenue 324, Lemon Cove, California. It offers pre-Kindergarten through 8<sup>th</sup> grade education and had a 2018-2019 enrollment of 358 students. Students in high school are bused to Exeter Union High School (Exeter Unified School District) located in Exeter, California approximately ten (10) miles from Lemon Cove. The College of the Sequoias provides community college instruction for Lemon Cove residents at its Visalia and Tulare campuses.”<sup>129</sup></p> <p>“The nearest [County-operated] park is Cutler Park located southwest of Ivanhoe at 15520 Ivanhoe Dr. in Visalia, California.”<sup>130</sup> Cutler Park is located approximately 11 miles from Lemon Cove.<sup>131</sup></p>						

<sup>127</sup> Lemon Cove Background Report. Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019. Page 77.

<sup>128</sup> Ibid 77.

<sup>129</sup> Op. Cit. 79.

<sup>130</sup> Op. Cit. 76.

<sup>131</sup> Google Earth map measured straight line from Cutler Park to Lemon Cove.

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>“The Tulare County Public Library System is comprised of interdependent branches, grouped by services, geography and usage patterns to provide efficient and economical services to the residents of the county. At present, there are 14 regional libraries and one main branch.”<sup>132</sup> The closest library to Lemon Cove is located in Visalia.<sup>133</sup></p> <p>The following Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update policies for this resource apply to this Project: <i>PFS-7.1 Fire Protection; PFS-7.2 Fire Protection Standards; PFS-7.3 Visible Signage for Roads and Buildings; PFS-7.4 Interagency Fire Protection Cooperation; and PFS-7.5 Fire Staffing and Response Time Standards.</i></p> <p>In addition to fire protection services, the General Plan contains policies to ensure police services (provided by the Tulare County Sheriff’s Office) meets the needs of the affected community such as <i>PFS-7.8 Law Enforcement Staffing Ratios; PFS-7.9 Sheriff Response Time; PFS-7.10 Interagency Law Enforcement Protection Cooperation; and PFS-7.11 Locations of Fire and Sheriff Stations/Sub-stations</i> wherein the County shall strive to locate fire and sheriff sub-stations in areas that ensure the minimum response times to service calls.</p> <p>a) <b>No Impact</b> - As previously noted, the Tulare County Fire Department has a fire sub-station in Lemon Cove (Station 13), located at 32490 State Route 198 in Lemon Cove. The Tulare County Fire Department will be responsible for reviewing service provision for this community and ensuring maintenance of acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services. The proposed Community Plan in and of itself will not significantly impact the Fire Department’s response times. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact related to this Checklist Item.</p> <p>b) <b>No Impact</b> - The Community Plan is based on the General Plan’s 1.3 percent growth rate, and it is consistent with the Tulare County General Plan. While no development projects are proposed as part of the Community Plan, future growth is anticipated to occur within the proposed Urban Development Boundary over the planning horizon. Public safety components of the Community Plan and General Plan 2030 Update require that activities related to the Community Plan comply with Tulare County’s General Plan policies and regulations. The Tulare County Sheriff’s Department will be responsible for law enforcement for this community and ensuring maintenance of acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services. The proposed Community Plan, in and of itself, will not significantly impact the Sheriff Department’s response times. Therefore, no impact as a result of this Project related to this Checklist Item will occur.</p> <p>c) <b>No Impact</b> - As the proposed Project does not involve any development proposals that could contribute to the need for expanded school facilities. The estimated growth rate applied to this community is project at 1.3% per year. It is not anticipated that the population growth of school-age children will exceed the capabilities of the Sequoia Union School District to provide school facilities. As such, there will be no impact to this resource related to this Checklist item.</p> <p>d) <b>No Impact</b> – As noted earlier in the nearest County-operated park is Cutler Park located near Visalia approximately 11 miles west of Lemon Cove. The proposed Project does not include plans for a future park within the community. As such, there will be no impact to this resource related to this Checklist item.</p> <p>e) <b>No Impact</b> - The proposed Project does not involve any development proposals that could contribute to the need for expanded electrical power, communications, natural gas services, or other public services causing an increase in consumer demand and/or subsequent service provision. Development proposals will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and</p>					

<sup>132</sup> Tulare County General Plan Background Report. Page 7-96.

<sup>133</sup> Lemon Cove Background Report. Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019. Page 80.

			SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>referred to the local electricity and gas service providers to determine the availability of the respective service. As such, the Project would result in no impact related to this Checklist item.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Impact Analysis: No Impact</b></p> <p>The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is Tulare County. This cumulative analysis is based on the information provided in the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, General Plan background Report, Tulare County 2030 General Plan EIR, and/or Lemon Cove Community Plan.</p> <p>As noted earlier, the Project is the Lemon Cove Community Plan and no development proposals are being considered at this time. As such, the proposed Project will not impact the fire or police response times, schools, parks, or other facilities. Therefore, Project-specific or Cumulative impacts related to this Checklist Item will occur.</p> <p><b>Mitigation: None Required</b></p>						
<b>16.</b>	<b>RECREATION</b>					
	a)	Would the project 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Analysis:</b></p> <p>As noted previously, the Project is the Lemon Cove Community Plan and no development proposals are being considered at this time. The Project is being prepared to accommodate a growth rate of 1.3% (consistent with the Tulare County General Plan). Changes to the UDB will occur; as such, it is likely that recreational opportunities/facilities outside of the existing UDB area; however unlikely, could occur. Also as previously indicated, adoption of the Community Plan would result in no impact as future projects are viewed as “growth accommodating” rather than growth-inducing.</p> <p>The Community Plan contains no development proposals and will not result in the need for expanded or new recreational facilities. As development occurs within the expanded UDB the need for additional park or recreational facilities will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, and as appropriate, a development proposal may result in the need for the project proponent to accommodate recreational needs. However, as this Project does not include any development proposals, the Project would result in no impact.</p> <p>a) and b) <b>No Impact</b> - The proposed Project does not include plans for a future park or other recreational facilities within the Planning area. The proposed Project will not result in an increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility will occur or be accelerated; nor will it include recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. There will be</p>						

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	
no impact to this resource as a result of this Project.						
<p><b>Cumulative Impact Analysis: No Impact</b></p> <p>The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is Tulare County. This cumulative analysis is based on the information provided in the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, General Plan background Report, Tulare County 2030 General Plan EIR, and/or Lemon Cove Community Plan.</p> <p>As noted earlier, the Project is the Lemon Cove Community Plan and no development proposals are being considered at this time. As such, the proposed Project will not impact recreational facilities. Therefore, no Project-specific or Cumulative impacts related to this Checklist Item will occur.</p> <p><b>Mitigation: None Required</b></p>						
<b>17.</b>	<b>TRANSPORTATION</b>					
	Would the project:					
	a)	Conflict with program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b)	Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	c)	Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses, (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	d)	Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Analysis:</p> <p>As noted previously, the Project is the Lemon Cove Community Plan and no development proposals are being considered at this time. The update is being prepared to accommodate a growth rate of 1.3% (consistent with the Tulare County General Plan). Changes to the UDB will occur; as such, there is the possibility of changes to circulation patterns outside of the already established UDB area. However, future projects are viewed as “growth accommodating” rather than growth-inducing and; as such, no impact will occur as a result of adopting the Community Plan.</p> <p>“State Route 198 is a regionally significant corridor between Visalia through Lemon Cove and Three Rivers to Sequoia National Park.”<sup>134</sup> “All streets in the circulation network are classified as local streets”.<sup>135</sup></p>						

<sup>134</sup> Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019. Page 173.

<sup>135</sup> Ibid.169.

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>“In recent years the concept of “Complete Streets” has evolved. Under this concept, while streets may still carry a primary functional classification, the design of streets aims to allow all modes and trip purposes to be safely accommodated to the extent feasible and as warranted by local needs and conditions.”<sup>136</sup></p> <p>“The ability of Tulare County to compete domestically and internationally on an economic basis requires an efficient and cost-effective method for distributing and receiving products. State Route 198 and SR 216, serves as an important link to Lemon Cove and other eastside and foothill communities for commercial and industrial goods movement.”<sup>137</sup></p> <p>“The level of service (LOS) for operating State highway facilities is based upon measures of effectiveness (MOEs). These MOEs describe the measures best suited for analyzing State highway facilities (i.e., freeway segments, signalized intersections, on- or off-ramps, etc.). Caltrans endeavors to maintain a target LOS at the transition between LOS “C” and LOS “D” on State highway facilities.”<sup>138</sup></p> <p>Tulare County General Plan Policy <i>TC – 1.16 County Level of Service (LOS) Standards</i> states; “The County shall strive to develop and manage its roadway system (both segments and intersections) to meet a LOS of “D” or better in accordance with the LOS definitions established by the Highway Capacity Manual.”<sup>139</sup></p> <p>“LOS is categorized by two parameters, uninterrupted flow and interrupted flow. Uninterrupted flow facilities have no fixed elements, such as traffic signals, that cause interruptions in traffic flow. Interrupted flow facilities have fixed elements that cause an interruption in the flow of traffic such as stop signs and signalized intersections.”<sup>140</sup></p> <p>“A complete street is a transportation facility that is planned, designed, operated, and maintained to provide safe mobility for all users, including bicyclists, pedestrians, transit vehicles, truckers, and motorists, appropriate to the function and context of the facility. Every complete street looks different, according to its context, community preferences, the types of road users, and their needs.”<sup>141</sup></p> <p>Integration of the Complete Streets Program in the Lemon Cove Community Circulation Element will aid to establish a comprehensive multi-modal transportation system that is efficient, environmentally and financially sound, and coordinated with the Land Use Element of the Tulare County General Plan.</p> <p>The proposed Lemon Cove Community Plan is intended to implement a multi-modal transportation system that will serve projected future travel demand, minimize congestion, and address future growth in Lemon Cove.</p> <p>The following Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update policies for this resource apply to this Project: <i>AQ-3.3 Street Design; LU- 7.1 Friendly Streets; TC-1.2 Intermodal Connectivity; TC-4.7 Bicycle/Pedestrian Trail System; and TC-5.2 Consider Non-Motorized Modes in Planning and Development.</i></p> <p>a) and b) <b>No Impact</b> - The proposed Project will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system nor will it conflict with an applicable congestion</p>					

<sup>136</sup> Op. Cit.

<sup>137</sup> Op Cit.

<sup>138</sup> Caltrans. Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies. Accessed November 2019 at: [https://nacto.org/docs/usdg/guide\\_preparation\\_traffic\\_impact\\_studies\\_caltrans.pdf](https://nacto.org/docs/usdg/guide_preparation_traffic_impact_studies_caltrans.pdf).

<sup>139</sup> Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019. Page 106.

<sup>140</sup> Ibid. 170.

<sup>141</sup> Caltrans. Complete Streets Program. Accessed November 2019 at: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/transportation-planning/office-of-smart-mobility-climate-change/smart-mobility-active-transportation/complete-streets>.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
<p>management program. Over the course of the 2030 planning horizon, development within the Planning Area is intended to accommodate the projected 1.3% population growth rate. Over the planning horizon, it is anticipated that traffic in the Planning Area will increase along with area population; however, it is also anticipated that the current street system will function adequately will continue to adequately accommodate traffic demands through the year 2030 planning horizon. New intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit will not be required by the Community Plan as it does not contain plans for development, construction or new transportation infrastructure. If future proposals are submitted that have the potential to conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system; and/or, conflict with an applicable congestion management program, a new analysis may be warranted to identify potential impacts. As such, the Community Plan will result in no impact to this Checklist Item.</p> <p>c) <b>No Impact</b> - The proposed Lemon Cove Community Plan will not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment). As noted previously, the Project is the proposed Lemon Cove Community Plan and no development proposals are being considered at this time. The proposed Plan is being prepared to accommodate a growth rate of 1.3% (consistent with the Tulare County General Plan). If proposed expansion of the Urban Development Boundary (UDB) occurs, future growth will be required to comply with applicable laws, lands use designations, zoning classifications, etc., regarding urban design and use. As such, the Project would result in no impact to this Checklist Item.</p> <p>d) <b>No Impact</b> - The Tulare County General Plan Update contains policies and guidelines that mandate, where feasible, road networks (public and private) that will provide for safe and ready access for emergency equipment and evacuation routes.<sup>142</sup> The Lemon Cove Community Plan contains no development proposals and is being prepared to accommodate a growth rate of 1.3% (consistent with the Tulare County General Plan). Changes to the Urban Development Boundary (UDB) will occur; however, any future growth will be required to comply with all laws and regulations governing emergency response that facilitate and enhance emergency access. There will be no impact related to this Checklist Item.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Impact Analysis; No Impact</b></p> <p>The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is Tulare County. This cumulative analysis is based on the information provided in the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, General Plan background Report, Tulare County 2030 General Plan EIR, and/or Lemon Cove Community Plan.</p> <p>As noted earlier, the Project is the Lemon Cove Community Plan and no development proposals (which could result in increase to traffic or transportation-related impacts) are being considered at this time. The Project is consistent the Tulare County 2030 General Plan and EIR. As such, the Project will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit. Further, it will not conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. The Project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks. It will not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses, (e.g., farm equipment) and it will not result in inadequate emergency access. Lastly, the Project will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.</p>					

<sup>142</sup> Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update. August 2012. Goals and Policy Report. (Part I) Page 10-20 Accessed November 2019 at: <http://generalplan.co.tulare.ca.us/>.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>	
Therefore, the proposed Project will not impact the transportation resource. As such, no Project-specific or Cumulative impacts related to this Checklist Item will occur.						
<b>18.</b>	<b>TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>					
	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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	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 Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Analysis:</p> <p>As noted previously, the Project is the Community Plan of Lemon Cove and no development proposals are being considered at this time. The update is being prepared to accommodate a growth rate of 1.3% (consistent with the Tulare County General Plan). Limited changes to the Urban Development Boundary (UDB) will occur and such changes would incorporate areas that have historically been under heavy agricultural production; as such, there is no possibility of changes to cultural resources outside of the already established UDB area.</p> <p>The Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center, Bakersfield (SSJVIC or Center) conducted a cultural resources records search at the request of RMA Planning Branch staff. The Center records search (dated August 6, 2019 is included in Attachment "C" of this document) included historic sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places, Historic Property Directory, California State Historical Landmarks, California Register of Historical Resources, California Inventory of Historic Resources, and California Points of Historical Interest. According to the California Historical Resources Information System, there are three (3) recorded cultural resources within the project area and eight within a one-half mile radius of the project area.</p> <p>According to the information provided by the SSJVIC, there have been 3 previous cultural resource studies conducted within the project area, TU-00985, 01498, and 01675. There have been five additional studies conducted within the one-half mile radius, TU-00049, 00108, 00135, 00378, and 00550. However, until the specific location of a development</p>						



		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>proposal occurs, the locations and nature of the resources will remain confidential and will only be shared with an applicant and remain confidential until otherwise determined by the courts.</p> <p>The following Native American tribes were contacted on August 28, 2019, in order to solicit their interest regarding tribal consultation: Kern Valley Indian Council; Santa Rosa Rancheria Tachi Yokut Tribe; Tubatulabals of Kern County; Tule River Indian Tribe; and Wuksache Indian Tribe. No responses have been received to date. The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was also contacted on July 23, 2019, with a request that they conduct a sacred lands files (SLF) search. The SLF records search was completed with negative results.</p> <p>As the Project is a Community Plan, no immediate ground disturbance will take place. Once specific projects are proposed, location specific studies can be conducted to determine the appropriateness of avoiding or minimizing impacts to cultural resources as applicable.</p> <p>The Tulare County General Plan has a number of policies that relate to the proposed Project area including <i>ERM-6.1 Evaluation of Cultural and Archaeological Resources</i>; <i>ERM-6.2 Protection of Resources with Potential State or Federal</i>; <i>ERM-6.4 Mitigation</i>; <i>ERM-6.10 Grading Cultural Resources Sites</i>; and <i>ERM-6.9 Confidentiality of Archaeological Sites</i> which allows the County to (within its authority) maintain confidentiality regarding the locations of archaeological sites in order to preserve and protect these resources from vandalism and the unauthorized removal of artifacts.</p> <p>a) and b) <b><i>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation</i></b> - As noted in Checklist Item 5 <i>Cultural Resources</i>, a CHRIS records search was conducted by the SSJVIC. There were three recorded cultural resources within the project area, eight recorded resources within one-half mile radius of the project area, and there was one unrecorded prehistoric rock art site as well. These resources consist of prehistoric era pictographs and lithic scatters, as well as historic era trash scatters, transmission lines, a hotel, a railroad, and a ditch. The records search included an examination of the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, the California Points of Historic Interest, the California Inventory of Historic Resources, or the California State Historic Landmarks (see Attachment “C”). Also, as noted earlier, three previous cultural resources studies have been completed within the project area and five additional studies have been conducted within the one-half mile radius. The Planning Area consists of a mix of uses such as retail office, single-family and multi-family residential, hotel, recreation, limited industrial, and public facilities etc.<sup>143</sup> Until an actual development project is initiated, it remains unknown if subsurface historic resources would be encountered.</p> <p>While the proposed Community Plan contains no plans for development or construction, future development within the UDB may result in the residential, commercial, and industrial uses (including streets and other infrastructure such as curbs, gutters, sidewalks, and upgrades to the existing sewer and water collection/distribution systems, etc.) over the planning horizon. Such future activity could result in impacts to historical resources within the Planning Area. However, as proposed, the Project would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical or archaeological resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. There will be potentially significant impact if historical resources are uncovered during proposed specific development project construction in the future; however, implementation of the <b>Mitigation Measures 5-1 through 5-3</b> (and also contained in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program) are included as part of this Mitigated Negative Declaration to reduce potential impacts to historical or archaeological resources to less than significant with mitigation.</p> <p>No formal cemeteries or other places of human internment are known to exist within the Project site; however, in accordance with State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resource Code Section 5097.98, if human remains are unearthed during project-specific construction as development occurs, no further disturbance shall occur until</p>					

<sup>143</sup> Lemon Cove Background Report. Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019. Page 26.

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	
<p>the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to the origin and disposition of such remains. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 48 hours of the Coroner's determination. The NAHC will then identify the person(s) thought to be the most likely descendent of the deceased Native American, who will then assist in determining what course of action shall be taken in handling the remains. Impacts to this checklist item will be less than significant with mitigation.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Impact Analysis: Less Than Significant</b></p> <p>The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is Tulare County. This cumulative analysis is based on the information provided in the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, General Plan background Report, Tulare County 2030 General Plan EIR, and/or Lemon Cove Community Plan.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that Native American remains or other cultural will be found at the proposed Project site. However, consistent with CEQA requirements, Mitigation Measures 5-1 through 5-3 are included in the unlikely event that if Native American remains are unearthed during any ground disturbance activities, or if any cultural resources are discovered, such finds will be mitigated to less than significant Project-specific and Cumulative Impacts.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure(s): See Mitigation Measures 5-1 through 5-3</b></p>						
<b>19.</b>	<b>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b>					
	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c)	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d)	Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

			<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
		the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				
	e)	Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Analysis:**

As noted in the draft Lemon Cove Community Plan, “Domestic water and sewer service in Lemon Cove is provided by the Lemon Cove Sanitary Sewer District (see Figure 17), formed in December 1950. Table 19 [Table 1 at Item 10 a) Hydrology and Water Supply in this MND] shows the number of existing water and sewer connections, the capacity of each system, and the number of additional connections the systems can accommodate for new development (Housing Element, May 2012 and Municipal Service Review, May 2006). Maps of the sewer and water systems are currently unavailable.

According to the Municipal Service Review 2006 (MSR), the Lemon Cove Sanitary District operates a water supply and distribution system under the jurisdiction of the Tulare County Environmental Health Services Division, which is responsible for the administration and enforcement of the Safe Drinking Water Act involving those systems in Tulare County with less than 200 connections. The District’s water supply and distribution system, which includes a 30,000 gallon storage tank, booster pump, and a 4,000 gallon pressure tank, supports approximately 50 active connections.”

The water system has no permanently installed treatment at this time, and there is no backup water supply on the District’s system. The District’s water system is fully metered, which is indicative of the District’s desire to promote water conservation, and continue to provide effective water service to its residents.

According to the District’s 2004 Consumer Confidence Report, water samples taken in December 2004 contained nitrate levels of 55 mg/L, which exceeds the maximum contaminant level (MCL) of 45 mg/L. The Lemon Cove Sanitary District has been issued a compliance order (No. 04-95) to address the elevated nitrate levels.

Assuming 50 equivalent dwelling units (EDUs), in order to meet Tulare County Improvement Standards the Lemon Cove Sanitary District water system would need to be capable of delivering a combined flow rate (from all source and storage facilities) of 780 gallons per minute (GPM) (500 GPM fire flow, and 280 GPM domestic demand) for a period of two hours while maintaining a minimum pressure of 25 pounds per square inch (PSI) to each lot served; The water system storage volume of 34,000 gallons would be capable of delivering a source flow of approximately 280 GPM for a period of two hours, indicating that the pumping efficiency of the District’s only well would need to be 500 GPM in order to meet the requirements of the Tulare County Improvement Standards. Prior to granting any sphere of influence (SOI) expansions, it is recommended that the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) verify that there is adequate water system capacity to meet any anticipated increased demands. It is also recommended that the District work to develop a backup water supply. The District would need to expand its water supply and distribution system to support any significant development projects proposed within its SOI.”<sup>144</sup>

“The Lemon Cove Sanitary District (see Figure 17) is also responsible for providing sanitary sewer service to residents within its Boundary. It is assumed that there are 50 connections to the District’s sewer system, the same number of connections to their water system. The District owns and operates a Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) located

<sup>144</sup> Op. Cit.

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
<p>approximately 0.7 miles north of the community. The WWTF is operated under the provisions of Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. 94-348, issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).</p> <p>Order No. 94-348 prescribes that the monthly average dry weather discharge flow shall not exceed 20,000 gallons per day (GPD). According to the Wastewater User Charge Survey Report FY 2004-05 (Cal EPA- State Water Resources Control Board, May 2005), the average dry weather flow at the WWTF is approximately 12,000 GPD. Using a demand of 310 GPD per connection, it is estimated that the District’s sanitary sewer treatment and disposal capabilities would allow for approximately 25 additional connections (equivalent dwelling units) to the system (see Table 19). The District would need to expand the capacity of its WWTF to support any significant development projects proposed within its SOI.</p> <p>The Lemon Cove Sanitary District is in the process of improving the existing wastewater treatment plant (WDR) Order No. 94-348. The wastewater treatment site consists of an existing 90-foot (northwest-southeast) by 70-foot (northeast-southwest) by 10-foot deep wastewater pond. The single two-celled, bentonite-sealed pond is currently dry. An overflow ditch lies to the east of the pond and will not be included in the Project improvements. The wastewater treatment plant is bordered by citrus groves in all directions. The District service area totals approximately 22.2 acres and includes approximately 50 connections. The existing pond was evaluated and determined to be in poor condition, thus improved disposal alternatives are necessary to maintain the highest levels of service. It was determined that an alternate disposal system within the existing footprint of the WWTP facility was feasible. The proposed upgrades to the existing WWTP includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Installation of a 20,000 gallon (10-foot diameter X 35-foot long) septic tank,</li> <li>• Installation of a 4,000 square foot leach field and associated leach lines, and</li> <li>• Connection to the existing sewer collection system (with an 8-inch influent line).</li> </ul> <p>Construction will occur as plans and funding are in place and is expected to take several months (expected to occur in 2020).<sup>145</sup></p> <p>The following Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update policies for this resource apply to this Project: <i>PFS-1.1 Existing Development; PFS-1.2 Maintain Existing Levels of Services; PFS-1.3 Impact Mitigation; PFS-1.7 Coordination with Service Providers; PFS-2.1 Water Supply; PFS-2.2 Adequate Systems; PFS-2.4 Water Connections; PFS-3.2 Adequate Capacity; PFS-3.3 New Development Requirements; and PFS-3.7 Financing.</i></p> <p>In addition to Tulare County General Plan policies, the Lemon Cove Community Plan contains policies specific to infrastructure including water supply and water systems. See the “Community Development” discussion of the Lemon Cove Community Plan.</p> <p><i>Solid Waste Disposal</i></p> <p>The Tulare County General Plan has a number of policies that apply to existing development and future development projects regarding solid waste disposal within the County of Tulare. The nearest solid waste disposal facility, the Teapot Dome Landfill, is owned and operated by the County. The Teapot Dome has the capacity to accommodate solid waste refuse generated within the planning area through the year 2025.<sup>146</sup> According to Solid Waste Management Department conversation with Mr. J. Treviño, Supervisor) the Teapot Dome landfill has a current net remaining capacity of 666,281</p>					

<sup>145</sup> Op. Cit.

<sup>146</sup> Conversation with Mr. Jonah Treviño, Tulare County Solid Waste Management Supervisor on April 16, 2019.

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<p>cubic yards or 11% of total capacity.<sup>147</sup> Per the Tulare County Solid Waste Department the Teapot Dome landfill is scheduled to close in 2025 and solid waste from the planning area will be disposed of in the Woodville landfill.<sup>148</sup> The Woodville landfill is currently under temporary closure and is not accepting waste, however the landfill is slated to open in 2022.<sup>149</sup> The Woodville landfill has a current net remaining capacity of 5,319,859 cubic yards or 64% of the landfill's total capacity.<sup>150</sup></p> <p>The adopted 2030 General Plan contains policies that would apply to existing and future development in the Project area regarding solid waste such as: <i>PFS-5.3 Solid Waste Reduction</i>; <i>PFS-5.5 Private Use of Recycled Products</i>; <i>PFS-5.6 Ensure Capacity</i>; and <i>PFS-5.7 Provisions for Solid Waste Storage, Handling, and Collection</i>.</p> <p>a) and b) <b><i>Less Than Significant Impact</i></b> - The Lemon Cove Community Plan contains no development proposals and is being prepared to accommodate a growth rate of 1.3% (consistent with the Tulare County General Plan). If adopted, the Urban Development Boundary (UDB) will be expanded to accommodate potential growth projections and will be consistent with the Tulare County General Plan. As noted earlier, , it is estimated that the PUD's current water system could support approximately 25 additional EDUs. However, also as noted earlier, as full build-out occurs over time, capacity availability and disposal elements in the collection system would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis with deficiencies being addressed by developers that wish to connect to the District's system. The Lemon Cove Sanitary District has plans and funding in place to expand capacity as noted above; with construction/expansion activities anticipated to take several months during 2020. As such, the Project would result in a less than significant impact.</p> <p>c) <b><i>Less Than Significant Impact</i></b> - The Lemon Cove Community Plan contains no development proposals and is being prepared to accommodate a growth rate of 1.3% (consistent with the Tulare County General Plan). If adopted, the Urban Development Boundary (UDB) will be expanded to accommodate potential growth projections and will be consistent with the Tulare County General Plan. As mentioned earlier, the wastewater collection system is currently in adequate operating condition. The Community Plan also acknowledges that the District is actively working toward increasing the capacity of its WWTF to support projected growth through year 2030. The Lemon Cove Community Plan contains policies encouraging the District to continue researching State and Federal grants and/or loans that may be available to help finance future improvements, and make efforts to attract development which can pay its fair share to allow further treatment capacity to the District's WWTF.</p> <p>d) <b><i>Less Than Significant Impact</i></b> - The proposed Lemon Cove Community Plan contains no development proposals and is being prepared to accommodate a growth rate of 1.3% (consistent with the Tulare County General Plan). If adopted, the Urban Development Boundary (UDB) will be expanded to accommodate potential growth projections and will be consistent with the Tulare County General Plan are not anticipated to exceed permitted capacities of area landfills.</p> <p>Tulare County Operates the Teapot Dome Landfill Disposal Site located at 20801-21169 Teapot Dome Avenue, Porterville, CA. According to the Tulare County Solid Waste Department, the Teapot Dome facility has sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs until 2025, at which time it is anticipated that the Woodville landfill will become the primary solid waste disposal facility for the planning area.<sup>151</sup> Subsequently, the planning area will be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste</p>					

<sup>147</sup> Ibid.

<sup>148</sup> Op. Cit.

<sup>149</sup> Op. Cit.

<sup>150</sup> Op. Cit.

<sup>151</sup> Op. Cit.

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	
<p>disposal needs. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact is anticipated to occur to this Checklist Item.</p> <p>e) <b>No Impact</b> - The proposed Lemon Cove Community Plan contains no development proposals and is being prepared to accommodate a growth rate of 1.3% consistent with the Tulare County General Plan. If adopted, the Urban Development Boundary (UDB) will be expanded to accommodate potential growth projections and will be consistent with the Tulare County General Plan. Upon any eventual buildout, all solid waste disposal will be required to comply with the requirements of the contracted waste hauler, which follows federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to the collection and disposal of solid waste. As such, no impact related to this Checklist Item will occur.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Impact Analysis: No Impact</b></p> <p>The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is Tulare County. This cumulative analysis is based on the information provided in the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, General Plan background Report, Tulare County 2030 General Plan EIR, and/or Lemon Cove Community Plan.</p> <p>As noted earlier, the Project is the Lemon Cove Community Plan and no development proposals are being considered at this time. As such, the proposed Project will not impact utilities. Therefore, no Project-specific or Cumulative impacts related to this Checklist Item will occur.</p> <p><b>Mitigation: None Required</b></p>						
		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	
<b>20.</b>	<b>Wildfire</b>					
	Would the project:					
	a)	Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Analysis:**

According to the State Responsibility Area (SRA) Viewer, the proposed Project site is not located in the SRA (see attachment “D”)<sup>152</sup>As noted previously, the Project is the proposed Lemon Cove Community Plan and no development proposals are being considered at this time. The Plan is being prepared to accommodate a growth rate of 1.3% (consistent with the Tulare County General Plan). The Project includes expansion of the Urban Development Boundary (UDB); as such, a case-by-case evaluation will be conducted when development proposals are received for both the existing UDB and future UDB area. However, as this Project is merely a proposed Community Plan, there is no possibility of impact to this Checklist Item within the already established UDB area.

a) **No Impact.** The Tulare County General Plan Update contains policies and guidelines that mandate where feasible, road networks (public and private) will provide for safe and ready access for emergency equipment and evacuation route.<sup>153</sup> As this is only a proposed Community Plan, no development proposals are being considered at this time. A case-by-case evaluation will be conducted when development proposals are received for both the existing UDB and future UDB area. Any future growth will be required to comply with all laws and regulations governing emergency response, both facilitating and enhancing emergency access. Thus, there will be no impact related to this Checklist Item.

b) **No Impact.** As noted previously, the Project is merely preparation of the Lemon Cove Community Plan and no development proposals are being considered at this time. The Lemon Cove community rests entirely within alluvial deposits from the Sierra Nevada foothills and mountains. Lemon Cove’s elevation is 502 feet above sea level. Thus, there is no possibility of impact to this Checklist Item within the already established UDB area.

c-d) **No Impact.** As noted previously, the Project is an the proposed Lemon Cove Community Plan and no development proposals are being considered at this time. The update is being prepared to accommodate a growth rate of 1.3% (consistent with the Tulare County General Plan). The Project includes expansion of the Urban Development Boundary (UDB); as such, a case-by-case evaluation will be conducted when development proposals are received for both the existing UDB and future UDB area. However, as this Project is merely an update to the Community Plan, there is no possibility of impact to this Checklist Item within the already established UDB area.

**Cumulative Impact Analysis: No Impact.**

The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is Tulare County. This cumulative analysis is based on the information provided in the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, Tulare County General Plan Background Report, the Tulare County 2030 General Plan EIR, and/or Lemon Cove Community Plan. For the reasons stated above, Items 20 a) through d) do not apply to the Project as it is not located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. As such, no Project-specific Impact or Cumulative Impacts will occur.

<sup>152</sup> CalFire. Accessed November 2019 at: <https://frap.fire.ca.gov/frap-projects/fhsz-in-sra-county-maps/>, then click on “Tulare.”

<sup>153</sup> Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update. August 2012. Goals and Policy Report. (Part I) Page 10-20 Accessed November 2019 at: <http://generalplan.co.tulare.ca.us/>, then locate and click on “GP Library”, then locate and click on “Goals and Policies Report”



		SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT	
<b>Mitigation: None Required.</b>						
<b>21.</b>	<b>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>					
	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Analysis:</p> <p>a) <b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation</b> – As noted earlier, The proposed Lemon Cove Community Plan contains no development proposals and is being prepared to accommodate a growth rate of 1.3% consistent with the Tulare County General Plan. If adopted, the Urban Development Boundary (UDB) will be expanded to accommodate potential growth projections and will be consistent with the Tulare County General Plan.</p> <p>As discussed in Item 4 Biological Resources, impacts associated with future development of proposed Project planning area would be less than significant, as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), for special status plant species, wildlife movement corridors, downstream water quality, and sensitive habitats. Loss of habitat for special status animal species would also be considered less than significant under CEQA. Mitigation Measures 4-1 through 4-20 contained in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program are included as part of this Mitigated Negative Declaration which are intended to prevent or minimize disturbance or accidental take of species of concern. In the unlikely event of discovery of a special species on the site, protocols established by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFW) or California Department</p>						

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
<p>of Fish and Game (DFG) will be implemented before any future construction-related activities are allowed to commence. If discovery occurs during future construction-related activities, all activities will be immediately ceased until a qualified biologist determines which course of action to implement per USFW or DFG protocols.</p> <p>As noted at Item 5 Cultural Resources and Item 17 Tribal Cultural Resources, a CHRIS records search was conducted by the SSJVIC. Four previously recorded historic-period sites have been recorded within the study area and one historic-period site identified within one-half mile of the study area. These resources consist of two historic era ditches, an historic era transmission line, an historic era commercial building, and a prehistoric era lithic and bead scatter. The records search included an examination of the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, the California Points of Historic Interest, the California Inventory of Historic Resources, or the California State Historic Landmarks (see Attachment "C"). Also, as noted earlier, three previous cultural resources studies have been completed within the project area and five additional studies have been conducted within the one-half mile radius. The planning area consists of predominantly existing residential, commercial, and agricultural uses. Future UDB expansion will encompass areas to the north, west, and southeast of the existing UDB. These areas are currently under agricultural cultivation and as such, unlikely to contain surface cultural resources. Until an actual development project is initiated, it remains unknown if subsurface historic resources would be encountered. While the proposed Community Plan contains no plans for development or construction, over the planning horizon, future development within the UDB may result in the eventual construction of additional residences, and establishment of commercial and industrial use, and streets (and other infrastructure such as curbs, gutters, sidewalks, sewer and water collection/distribution systems, etc.). Such future activity could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource were any such resources to be located within the planning area. The proposed Project would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical or archaeological resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Although no cultural resources were identified in the records search, there will, nonetheless, be a potentially significant impact if historical resources were uncovered during proposed specific development project construction; however, implementation of the Mitigation Measures 5-1, 5-2, and 5-3 (and also contained in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program) are included as part of this Mitigated Negative Declaration to reduce potential impacts to historical or archaeological resources to less than significant with mitigation.</p> <p>Therefore, the proposed Project does not 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, reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened plant or animal species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Therefore, there will be a less than significant impact with mitigation to these resources.</p> <p>b) <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> - As noted earlier, The proposed Lemon Cove Community Plan contains no development proposals and is being prepared to accommodate a growth rate of 1.3% consistent with the Tulare County General Plan. If adopted, the Urban Development Boundary (UDB) will be expanded to accommodate potential growth projections and will be consistent with the Tulare County General Plan Use and Zoning designation contained in the Community Plan. It is not growth inducing, however, development is anticipated to occur consistent with the policies contained in the Tulare County General Plan, the draft Ivanhoe Community Plan, and other agencies (for example, the Valley Air District and Regional Water Quality Control Board). As such, it will result in Less Than Significant Impacts to resources such as air quality, noise, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, hazard or hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, population and housing, pubic services, transportation/traffic, or utilities and service systems. Therefore, the proposed Project will result in less than significant impacts.</p> <p>c) <b>No Impact</b> - The proposed Project is the Lemon Cove Community Plan. It is intended to accommodate projected growth and to provide a mechanism to stimulate economic development within the existing geographic area and consistent with</p>					

		<b>SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION</b>	<b>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</b>	<b>NO IMPACT</b>
current General Plan Land Use and Zoning designations contained in the Community Plan. The proposed Project will not result in environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. There will be no adverse impact.					

## REFERENCES

- Aries Consultants Ltd. (2012). Tulare County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan. Accessed November 2019 at: <https://tularecounty.ca.gov/rma/index.cfm/rma-documents/planning-documents/tulare-county-comprehensive-airport-land-use-plan/>
- California Air Resources Board. Climate Change Scoping Plan. Accessed November 2019 at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/document/scopingplandocument.htm>.
- California Air Resources Board. California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan. Page 99. Accessed November 2019 at: [https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scoping\\_plan\\_2017.pdf](https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scoping_plan_2017.pdf).
- California Department of Conservation. (1997). Active Aggregate Producers in the Tulare County Production – Consumption Region. Plate 1 of 7 (Map). Accessed November 2019 at: [ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/ofr/OFR\\_97-01/OFR\\_97-01\\_Plate1.pdf](ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/ofr/OFR_97-01/OFR_97-01_Plate1.pdf).
- California Department of Conservation. (2018). CGS Warehouse: Regulatory Maps. Accessed November 2019 at: <http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=regulatorymaps>.
- California Department of Conservation. (2018). Fault Activity Map of California (2010). Accessed November 2019 at: <http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/>.
- California Department of Conservation. (2018). Special Publication 42 Revised 2018 Earthquake Fault Zones. A Guide for Government Agencies, Property Owners / Developers, and Geoscience Practitioners for Assessing Fault Rupture Hazards in California. Accessed November 2019 at: <ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sp/Sp42.pdf>.
- California Energy Commission. California Energy Consumption Database. Electricity Consumption by County. Energy reports. Accessed November 2019 at: <http://ecdms.energy.ca.gov/elecbycounty.aspx>.
- California Energy Commission. California Energy Consumption Database. Gas Consumption by County. Energy reports. Accessed November 2019 at: <http://ecdms.energy.ca.gov/gasbycounty.aspx>.
- California Energy Commission. California Energy Consumption Database. Electricity Consumption by County. Accessed November 2019 at: <http://ecdms.energy.ca.gov/elecbycounty.aspx>
- California Energy Commission. California Energy Consumption Database. Electricity Consumption by Planning Area. Accessed November 2019 at: <http://ecdms.energy.ca.gov/elecbyplan.aspx>
- California Energy Commission. 2008 Energy Action Plan. February 2008. Accessed November 2019 at: <https://ww2.energy.ca.gov/2008publications/CEC-100-2008-001/CEC-100-2008-001.PDF>
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). Accessed November 2019 at: <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Maps-and-Data#43018407-rarefind-5>
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire) Calfire FHSZ Viewer. Accessed November 2019 at: <http://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/>
- California Department of Parks and Recreation. 2010. Page 3.5-3. Los Angeles State Historic Park Master Development Plan Final EIR. Accessed November 2019. [https://www.parks.ca.gov/pages/22272/files/r3\\_5\\_geology\\_soils.pdf](https://www.parks.ca.gov/pages/22272/files/r3_5_geology_soils.pdf)

California Department of Parks and Recreation. 2010. Page 3.5-3. Los Angeles State Historic Park Master Development Plan Final EIR. Accessed November 2019 at:  
[https://www.parks.ca.gov/pages/22272/files/r3\\_5\\_geology\\_soils.pdf](https://www.parks.ca.gov/pages/22272/files/r3_5_geology_soils.pdf).

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). (2018). Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese). Accessed November 2019 at:  
[https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search.asp?PAGE=8&CMD=search&ocieerp=&business\\_name=&main\\_street\\_number=&main\\_street\\_name=&city=&zip=&county=&branch=&status=ACT%2CBKLG%2CCOM%2CCOLUR&site\\_type=CSITES%2COPEN%2CFUDS%2CCLOSE&cleanup\\_type=&npl=&funding=&reporttype=CO RTESE&reporttitle=HAZARDOUS+WASTE+AND+SUBSTANCES+SITE+LIST+%28CORTESE%29&federal\\_superfund=&state\\_response=&voluntary\\_cleanup=&school\\_cleanup=&operating=&post\\_closure=&non\\_operating=&corrective\\_action=&tiered\\_permit=&evaluation=&spec\\_prog=&national\\_priority\\_list=&senate=&congress=&assembly=&critical\\_pol=&business\\_type=&case\\_type=&display\\_results=&school\\_district=&pub=&hwmp=False&permitted=&pc\\_permitted=&inspections=&complaints=&censustract=&cesdecile=&ORDERBY=county&next=Next+50](https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search.asp?PAGE=8&CMD=search&ocieerp=&business_name=&main_street_number=&main_street_name=&city=&zip=&county=&branch=&status=ACT%2CBKLG%2CCOM%2CCOLUR&site_type=CSITES%2COPEN%2CFUDS%2CCLOSE&cleanup_type=&npl=&funding=&reporttype=CO RTESE&reporttitle=HAZARDOUS+WASTE+AND+SUBSTANCES+SITE+LIST+%28CORTESE%29&federal_superfund=&state_response=&voluntary_cleanup=&school_cleanup=&operating=&post_closure=&non_operating=&corrective_action=&tiered_permit=&evaluation=&spec_prog=&national_priority_list=&senate=&congress=&assembly=&critical_pol=&business_type=&case_type=&display_results=&school_district=&pub=&hwmp=False&permitted=&pc_permitted=&inspections=&complaints=&censustract=&cesdecile=&ORDERBY=county&next=Next+50).

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). Envirostor. Sites and Facilities mapping Accessed November 2019 at: [www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/](http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/).

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2002. Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies. Accessed November 2019 at:  
[http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/igr\\_ceqa\\_files/tisguide.pdf](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/igr_ceqa_files/tisguide.pdf).

Caltrans. (2018). Complete Streets Program. Accessed November 2019 at:  
<https://dot.ca.gov/programs/transportation-planning/office-of-smart-mobility-climate-change/smart-mobility-active-transportation/complete-streets>.

California Department of Water Resources. (2013). California Water Plan, Update 2013. Tulare Lake Hydrologic Region. Volume 2 Regional Reports. Accessed November 2019at:  
[https://water.ca.gov/LegacyFiles/waterplan/docs/cwpu2013/Final/Vol2\\_TulareLakeRR.pdf](https://water.ca.gov/LegacyFiles/waterplan/docs/cwpu2013/Final/Vol2_TulareLakeRR.pdf).

Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Accessed November 2019 at:  
<https://www.cdc.gov/fungal/diseases/coccidioidomycosis/maps.html>.

CDC. Accessed November 2019 at: <https://www.cdc.gov/fungal/diseases/coccidioidomycosis/definition.html>.

County of Tulare. Tulare County Administrative Office. (2018). Local Agency Management Program for Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems. Tulare County, California. January 2018. Accessed November 2019 at:  
[https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board\\_decisions/tentative\\_orders/1804/07\\_tulareco\\_lamp/3\\_tulareco\\_lamp.pdf](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/tentative_orders/1804/07_tulareco_lamp/3_tulareco_lamp.pdf).

County of Tulare. Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer. Tulare County Crop & Livestock Report 2018. Accessed November 2019 at: <https://agcomm.co.tulare.ca.us/ag/index.cfm/standards-and-quarantine/crop-reports1/crop-reports-2011-2020/2018-crop-report/>.

County of Tulare. Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update. Accessed November 2019 at:  
<http://generalplan.co.tulare.ca.us/>.

County of Tulare. Tulare County. (2010). Background Report Tulare County General Plan. Accessed November 2019 at: <http://generalplan.co.tulare.ca.us/documents.html>. , locate “Background Report February 2010 Draft” and click it.

County of Tulare. Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update Recirculated Draft EIR. 3.4 Energy and Global Climate Change. February 2010. Page 3.4-13 Accessed November 2019 at: <http://generalplan.co.tulare.ca.us/>, then locate and click on “GP Library”, then locate and click on “Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report.”

County of Tulare. Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update. August 2012. Goals and Policy Report. (Part I) Page 10-20 Accessed November 2019 at: <http://generalplan.co.tulare.ca.us/>, then locate and click on “GP Library”, then locate and click on “Goals and Policies Report”

County of Tulare. Tulare County Climate Action Plan. December 2018 Update. Page 1. Accessed November 2019 at: <http://generalplan.co.tulare.ca.us/>, then locate and click on “Climate Action Plan February 2010 Draft” or Google: Tulare County Climate Action Plan

County of Tulare. Draft Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019.

County of Tulare. Health and Human Services Agency, Environmental Health Division. Hazardous Material Business Plan. Accessed November 2019 at: <https://tularecountyeh.org/eh/index.cfm/our-services/hazardous-materials-cupa/hazardous-materials-business-plan-hmbp/> and <https://tularecountyeh.org/eh/index.cfm/guidance-library/hazmat-cupa/hazardous-materials-business-plan-hmbp/business-plan-faqs/>.

County of Tulare. Resource Management Agency (RMA). (2014). Tulare County Housing Element Action Program 9 Existing Infrastructure April 2014. Website accessed November 2019: <https://tularecounty.ca.gov/rma/index.cfm/rma-documents/planning-documents/tulare-county-action-program-9-pdf/>

County of Tulare. Solid Waste Department. Conversation with Mr. Jonah Treviño, Tulare County Solid Waste Management Supervisor on April 16, 2019.

Natural Resources Agency. Governor’s Office of Planning. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Sections 15002(g) and 15382.

San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. Air Quality Plans. Accessed November 2019 at: [http://valleyair.org/Air\\_Quality\\_Plans/air-quality-plans.htm](http://valleyair.org/Air_Quality_Plans/air-quality-plans.htm).

San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts. Accessed November 2019 at: [www.valleyair.org/Programs/CCAP/CCAP\\_idx.htm](http://www.valleyair.org/Programs/CCAP/CCAP_idx.htm)

San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (Air District). Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (GAMAQI). Table 2 and Section 7.12. Page 65. Accessed November 2019 at: <http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/0714-GAMAQI-Criteria-Pollutant-Thresholds-of-Significance.pdf>

SB 1037 (Kehoe, Chapter 366, Statutes of 2005) and AB 2021 (Levine, Chapter 734, Statutes of 2006)

State Water Resources Control Board (WRCB). GeoTracker. Sites and Facilities mapping website. Accessed November 2019 at: <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>.

United States Department of Homeland Security. Federal Emergency Management Agency. (2018). Flood Zones. Definition/Description. Accessed November 2019 at: <https://www.fema.gov/flood-zones>.

United States Department of Homeland Security. Federal Emergency Management Agency. (2018). Mudflows And Mudslides? It Makes A Difference To Insurers. Accessed November 2019 at: <https://www.fema.gov/news-release/2004/06/28/mudflows-and-mudslides-it-makes-difference-insurers>.

Federal Transit Administration. (2006). Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. Chapter 7: Basic Ground-Borne Vibration Concepts. Accessed November 2019 at:

[https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/FTA\\_Noise\\_and\\_Vibration\\_Manual.pdf](https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/FTA_Noise_and_Vibration_Manual.pdf).

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2018). What is a tsunami? Accessed November 2019 at:

<https://oceanservice.noaa.gov/facts/tsunami.html>.

Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG). (2014). Regional Transportation Plan & Sustainable Communities Strategy. For Tulare County – 18th Edition. Adopted June 30, 2014. Website:

<http://www.tularecog.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/Final-2014-Regional-Transportation-Plan-Sustainable-Communities-Strategy-FULL-DOCUMENT.pdf>. Accessed November 2019.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. (2013). Dam Safety Action Classification (DSAC) Ratings. Accessed November 2019 at:

[https://www.spl.usace.army.mil/Portals/17/docs/DamSafety/damsafety\\_actionsclassification.pdf](https://www.spl.usace.army.mil/Portals/17/docs/DamSafety/damsafety_actionsclassification.pdf).

United States Army Corps of Engineers. (2018). Dam Safety Program. Accessed November 2019:

<http://www.spk.usace.army.mil/Missions/Civil-Works/Dam-Safety-Program/>.

United States Army Corps of Engineers. (2018). Success Dam Safety Modification Study. Accessed November 2019:

<http://www.spk.usace.army.mil/Missions/Civil-Works/Success-Dam/>.

United States Department of Agriculture. (2018). Natural Resources Conservation Service. Areas of Interest.

Accessed November 2019 at: <https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>.

United States Department of Commerce. United States Census Bureau. American FactFinder. 2017 American Community Survey. 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Demographic and Housing Estimates (DP05) and Selected Housing Characteristics (DP04). Accessed November 2019 at:

[https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community\\_facts.xhtml](https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml). , then enter “Lemon Cove CDP, California”

United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2019. Superfund. Accessed November 2019 at:

<https://www.epa.gov/superfund/search-superfund-sites-where-you-live>.

United States Environmental Protection Agency. Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS) Search

Accessed November 2019 at: <https://www.epa.gov/enviro/sems-search>.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon. “Recovery Plan for Upland Species in the San Joaquin Valley.” 1998. Prepared by Region 1 Accessed in November 2019 at:

[https://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery\\_plan/980930a.pdf](https://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery_plan/980930a.pdf)

United States Fish and Wildlife Service. Accessed November 2019 at:

<https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.HTML>.

United States Geologic Service. “Reported Historic Asbestos Mines, Historic Asbestos Prospects, and Other Natural Occurrences of Asbestos in California.” Accessed November 2019 at: <http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2011/1188/>.

United States Geological Survey. (2018). Do All Faults Cause Earthquakes? Accessed November 2019 at:

[https://geomaps.wr.usgs.gov/sfgeo/quaternary/stories/all\\_faults.html](https://geomaps.wr.usgs.gov/sfgeo/quaternary/stories/all_faults.html).

United States Geological Survey. (2018). What is Quaternary? Accessed November 2019 at:

[https://geomaps.wr.usgs.gov/sfgeo/quaternary/stories/what\\_is.html](https://geomaps.wr.usgs.gov/sfgeo/quaternary/stories/what_is.html).



United States Geological Survey. Accessed November 2019 at: <https://maps.waterdata.usgs.gov/mapper/index.html>

United States Department of the Interior. National Park Service. (2018). National Register of Historic Places. Accessed November 2019 at: <https://www.nps.gov/maps/full.html?mapId=7ad17cc9-b808-4ff8-a2f9-a99909164466>..

United States Government Publishing Office. (2017). 40 CFR Appendix I To Part 204 - Appendix I To Part 204. Accessed November 2019 at: <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/search/pagedetails.action?collectionCode=CFR&browsePath=Title+40%2FChapter%2FSubchapter+G%2FPart+204%2FAppendix+I+to+Part+204&granuleId=CFR-1996-title40-vol6-part204-appI&packageId=CFR-1996-title40-vol6&collapse=true&fromBrowse=true>.

United States Department of Homeland Security. FEMA. Flood Map Service Center. Accessed November 2019 at: <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=tulare%20County%20California%20-%20searchresultsanchor#searchresultsanchor>.

United States Department of Transportation. Federal Transit Administration. 2006. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. Chapter 7: Basic Ground-Borne Vibration Concepts. Page 7-3. Accessed November 2019 at: [https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/FTA\\_Noise\\_and\\_Vibration\\_Manual.pdf](https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/FTA_Noise_and_Vibration_Manual.pdf).

## **Attachment “A”**

---

# **Air Quality, Energy, and Greenhouse Gas Technical Memorandums**

[This page intentionally left blank]

# **Air Quality Technical Memorandum**

[This page intentionally left blank]



# RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY

5961 SOUTH MOONEY BLVD

VISALIA, CA 93277

PHONE (559) 624-7000

FAX (559) 730-2653

Aaron R. Bock

Reed Schenke

Sherman Dix

Economic Development and Planning

Public Works

Fiscal Services

---

## TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM AIR QUALITY ASSESSMENT

**DATE:** November 1, 2019

**TO:** Hector Guerra, Chief Environmental Planner

**FROM:** Jessica Willis, Planner IV

**SUBJECT:** Air Quality Assessment for the Lemon Cove Community Plan (GPA 17-007, PZC 17-007, PZC 19-016, PZC 19-017)

---

### PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ASSESSMENT

This document is intended to assist Tulare County Resource Management Agency (RMA) staff in the preparation of the Air Quality component of the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) being prepared for the Lemon Cove Community Plan (Project). The assessment is intended to provide sufficient detail regarding potential impacts of Project implementation and to identify mitigation measures, if necessary, to reduce potentially significant impacts.

The air quality assessment provided in this document was prepared to evaluate whether the air pollutant emissions generated from implementation of the Project (i.e., future development projects) would cause significant impacts to air quality and health risks to nearby receptors. The air quality assessment was conducted within the context of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA, California Public Resources Code Sections 21000, et seq.). The assessment is intended to provide the County of Tulare (County) with sufficient detail regarding potential impacts of Project implementation and to identify mitigation measures, if necessary, to reduce potentially significant impacts.

The estimated emissions are compared to federal and state ambient air quality standards (AAQS) and the thresholds of significance established by the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (Air District). The methodology for the air quality assessment follows the Air District recommendations for quantification of emissions and evaluation of potential impacts as provided in their guidance document *Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts* (GAMAQI), adopted March 19, 2015.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Air District. Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts. March 19, 2015.  
[http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/GAMAQI\\_3-19-15.pdf](http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/GAMAQI_3-19-15.pdf). Accessed November 1, 2019.

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Lemon Cove is currently designated an Unincorporated Community in the 2030 Tulare County General Plan. The objective of the Lemon Cove Community Plan (Plan) is to develop a plan, which can accurately reflect the needs and priorities of the unincorporated community of Lemon Cove. The Land Use and Circulation portions of this Plan provide the mechanism to minimize or avoid the potential adverse impacts of urban growth. The development of an orderly, harmonious land use pattern and appropriate implementation measures are designed to reduce potential conflict between neighboring uses across Tulare County's 2030 planning horizon, consistent with the Tulare County 2030 General Plan Update. The Plan is needed to increase the availability of infrastructure funding, such as drinking water system improvements (wells, water distribution piping, storage tanks, etc.), wastewater system (such as piping, lift stations, etc.), and public work/safety improvements (such as curbs, gutters, sidewalks, etc.), and to stimulate economic development within the community.

Tulare County is proposing new land use and zoning designations within an expanded UDB. The proposed Community Plan, if adopted, will update these designations to be consistent with the General Plan, and will bring existing non-compliant properties into conformity with the Tulare County Zoning Ordinance. The Community Plan also includes the Complete Streets and Road Maintenance programs and the community's anticipated growth through year 2030 based on the existing land uses, census population data, and the projected 1.3% annual growth rate in unincorporated areas of Tulare County. Other than the Complete Streets and Road Maintenance Programs, there are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) proposed as part of this Project. As an unknown number of proposals may occur within the lifetime of the Plan, the Plan is intended to direct the density, intensity, and types of growth needed to meet the needs of the community. Future developments within the Project planning area will be required to undergo additional CEQA evaluation on a project-by-project basis at such time development is proposed to determine potential environmental impacts.

### **Complete Streets and Road Maintenance**

The Lemon Cove Complete Streets and Road Maintenance Programs are included in the Circulation Element of the proposed Community Plan. The Complete Streets Program has thoroughly analyzed the alternative forms of transportation, including transit, bicycle ways, and pedestrian circulation. Improvements proposed in the Complete Streets Program include, but are not limited to, installation of streetlights, bus shelters, street signage and striping, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, drainage system, and utilities. Road maintenance activities vary by road segment dependent upon the condition of the road and may include chip seal, overlay resurfacing, and asphalt reconstructions.

### **Growth Projections**

There are no specific development projects proposed with the Lemon Cove Community Plan; however, the Plan does include updates to land use designations that could increase the buildout potential of the planning area. Population and residential growth through planning horizon year 2030 was estimated by applying a 1.3% annual growth rate, consistent with the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, to the 2017 baseline population and housing data, as provided in the United



States Census Bureau 2017 American Community Survey (ACS).<sup>2</sup> Non-residential growth was estimated through planning horizon year 2030 for a worst-case emissions scenario by applying a 1.3% annual growth rate to the existing uses and assuming all parcels have been improved with structures at a floor to area ratio of 0.20. Using these assumptions for baseline conditions provides a conservative (larger) overall growth estimate. **Table 1** summarizes the projected growth of the community through horizon Year 2030.

<b>Table 1. Projected Growth through Year 2030</b>								
	Residential <sup>1</sup>		Commercial / Public / Other <sup>2</sup>		Retail <sup>2</sup>		Industrial <sup>2</sup>	
Year	Population	Dwelling Units	Square Feet	Acres	Square Feet	Acres	Square Feet	Acres
2017	232	115	277,129	31.81	65,079	7.47	15,507	1.78
2030	274	136	327,797	37.63	76,977	8.84	18,343	2.11
Overall Growth	42	21	50,668	5.85	11,898	1.37	2,835	0.33
<sup>1</sup> Projections based on 2017 American Community Survey data applying an annual growth rate of 1.3%.								
<sup>2</sup> Projections based on existing land uses assuming developments/improvements with a Floor to Area Ratio of 0.2 and annual growth rate of 1.3%.								

## SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS

CEQA Guidelines define a significant effect on the environment as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project.<sup>3</sup> To determine if a project would have a significant impact on air quality and climate change, the type, level, and impact of criteria pollutant and GHG emissions generated by the project must be evaluated. Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines provides the criteria (as Checklist Items) for evaluating potential impacts on the environment. The CEQA criteria and the Air District's significance thresholds and guidance for evaluation are provided below.

### Air Quality Plans

The Air District has established thresholds of significance for criteria pollutant emissions. These thresholds are based on District New Source Review (NSR) offset requirements for stationary sources. "Stationary sources in the District are subject to some of the toughest regulatory requirements in the nation. Emission reductions achieved through implementation of District offset requirements are a major component of the District's air quality plans. Thus, projects with emissions below the thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants would be determined to "Not conflict or obstruct implementation of the District's air quality plan".<sup>4</sup>

The Air District has three sets of significance thresholds based on the source of the emissions. According to the GAMAQI, "The District identifies thresholds that separate a project's short-term emissions from its long-term emissions. The short-term emissions are mainly related to the

---

<sup>2</sup> United States Census Bureau. American FactFinder. 2017 American Community Survey. 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Demographic and Housing Estimates (DP05) and Selected Housing Characteristics (DP04). [https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community\\_facts.xhtml](https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml). November 1, 2019.

<sup>3</sup> CEQA §§ 15002(g), 15382

<sup>4</sup> Air District, GAMAQI, Section 7.12, Page 65.

construction phase of a project and are recognized to be short in duration. The long-term emissions are mainly related to the activities that will occur indefinitely as a result of project operations.”<sup>5</sup>

Long-term (operational) emissions are further separated into permitted and non-permitted equipment and activities. Stationary (permitted) sources that comply or will comply with Air District rules and regulations are generally not considered to have a significant air quality impact. Specifically, the GAMAQI states, “District Regulation II ensures that stationary source emissions will be reduced or mitigated to below the District’s significance thresholds... District implementation of New Source Review (NSR) ensures that there is no net increase in emissions above specified thresholds from New and Modified Stationary Sources for all nonattainment pollutants and their precursors. Furthermore, in general, permitted sources emitting more than the NSR Offset Thresholds for any criteria pollutant must offset all emission increases in excess of the thresholds....”<sup>6</sup>

The Air District’s significance thresholds are provided in **Table 2**.

<b>Table 2. Air District Criteria Pollutant Significance Thresholds</b>			
<b>Pollutant/ Precursor</b>	<b>Construction Emissions</b>	<b>Operational Emissions</b>	
		<b>Permitted Equipment and Activities</b>	<b>Non- Permitted Equipment and Activities</b>
	<b>Emissions (tpy)</b>	<b>Emissions (tpy)</b>	<b>Emissions (tpy)</b>
<b>CO</b>	100	100	100
<b>NO<sub>x</sub></b>	10	10	10
<b>ROG</b>	10	10	10
<b>SO<sub>x</sub></b>	27	27	27
<b>PM<sub>10</sub></b>	15	15	15
<b>PM<sub>2.5</sub></b>	15	15	15
Source: Air District, GAMAQI, Table 2, page 80; and <a href="http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/0714-GAMAQI-Criteria-Pollutant-Thresholds-of-Significance.pdf">http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/0714-GAMAQI-Criteria-Pollutant-Thresholds-of-Significance.pdf</a> , accessed November 1, 2019.			

## **Air Quality Violations**

“Determination of whether project emissions would violate any ambient air quality standard is largely a function of air quality dispersion modeling. If project emissions would not exceed State and Federal ambient air quality standards at the project’s property boundaries, the project would be considered to not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. The need to perform an air quality dispersion modeling analysis for any project (urban development, commercial, or industrial projects) is determined on a case-by-case basis depending on the level of emissions associated with the proposed project. If such modeling is found necessary, the project consultant should check with the District to determine the appropriate model and input data to use in the analysis. Specific information for assessing

---

<sup>5</sup> Air District, GAMAQI, Section 8.1, Page 75

<sup>6</sup> Air District, GAMAQI, Section 8.2.1, Page 76

significance, including screening tools and modeling guidance is available on-line at the District's website [www.valleyair.org](http://www.valleyair.org).<sup>7</sup>

“The thresholds of significance for Ambient Air Quality are based on the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) and National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS). A project would be considered to have a significant impact if its emissions are predicted to cause or contribute to a violation of an ambient air quality standard by exceeding any of the following:

1. Any of the CAAQS, or
2. Any of the NAAQS, and if available, the associated Significant Impact Level (SIL).<sup>8</sup>

**Table 3** provides the California and National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

<b>Table 3. Ambient Air Quality Standards</b>				
<b>Pollutant</b>	<b>Averaging Time</b>	<b>California Standards</b>	<b>National Standards</b>	
		<b>Concentration</b>	<b>Primary</b>	<b>Secondary</b>
<b>Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>)</b>	1 Hour	0.09 ppm (180 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	---	Same as Primary
	8 Hour	0.070 ppm (137 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	0.070 ppm* (137 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	
<b>Respirable Particulate Matter (PM<sub>10</sub>)</b>	24 Hour	50 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	150 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	Same as Primary
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	20 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	---	
<b>Fine Particulate Matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>)</b>	24 Hour	---	35 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	Same as Primary
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	12 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	12.0 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	15.0 µg/m <sup>3</sup>
<b>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</b>	1 Hour	20 ppm (23 mg/m <sup>3</sup> )	35 ppm (40 mg/m <sup>3</sup> )	---
	8 Hour	9.0 ppm (10 mg/m <sup>3</sup> )	9 ppm (10 mg/m <sup>3</sup> )	---
	8 Hour (Lake Tahoe)	6 ppm (7 mg/m <sup>3</sup> )	---	---
<b>Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>)</b>	1 Hour	0.18 ppm (339 µg /m <sup>3</sup> )	100 ppb (188 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	Same as Primary
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	0.030 ppm (57 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	0.053 ppm (100 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	
<b>Sulfur Dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>)</b>	1 Hour	0.25 ppm (655 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	75 ppb (196 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	---
	3 Hour	---	---	0.5 ppm (1300 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )
	24 Hour	0.04 ppm (105 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	0.14 ppm (for certain areas)	---
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	---	0.030 ppm (for certain areas)	---

<sup>7</sup> Air District, GAMAQI, Section 7.13, Page 65

<sup>8</sup> Air District, GAMAQI, Section 8.4, Page 90

Table 3. Ambient Air Quality Standards				
Pollutant	Averaging Time	California Standards	National Standards	
		Concentration	Primary	Secondary
Lead	30 Day Average	1.5 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	---	---
	Calendar Quarter	---	1.5 µg/m <sup>3</sup> (for certain areas)	Same as Primary
	Rolling 3-Month Average	---	0.15 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	
Visibility Reducing Particles	8 Hour	Extinction of 0.23/km; visibility of 10 miles or more	No National Standards	
Sulfates	24 Hour	25 µg/m <sup>3</sup>		
Hydrogen Sulfide	1 Hour	0.03 ppm (42 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )		
Vinyl Chloride	24 Hour	0.01 ppm (26 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )		
* The standard at the time of the GAMAQI was 0.075 ppm; the standard presented here was finalized on October 26, 2015. Abbreviations: ppm = parts per million; mg/m <sup>3</sup> = milligram per cubic meter; µg/m <sup>3</sup> = micrograms per cubic meter. Sources: Air District, GAMAQI, Table 3, page 91; ARB, <a href="http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/aaqs2.pdf">http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/aaqs2.pdf</a> , accessed November 1, 2019.				

“The District ISR rule exempts small development projects (see Table 4 [of the GAMAQI]) from project-specific mitigation requirements. The District performed extensive analysis to identify small projects for which additional mitigation is not feasible. For instance, the exemptions include small residential housing developments of less than 50 units and commercial developments of less than 2,000 square feet. All projects on the exemption list emit less than 2 tons per year of either PM<sub>10</sub> or NO<sub>x</sub>, which is substantially lower than the District’s 10-ton per year significance thresholds. Furthermore, as the tailpipe emissions from motor vehicles continue to decline, these projects will emit even less today than was estimated in 2005 when this rule was adopted. In addition, two tons per year is expected to result in daily emissions of less than the 100 lb/day screening level for either NO<sub>x</sub> or PM<sub>10</sub> that the District has concluded that projects under the ISR exemption thresholds will have a less than significant impact on air quality. Consequently, projects below ISR applicability thresholds are not expected to exceed the thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants emissions (see Section 8.3 [of the GAMAQI]). In addition, projects below the ISR applicability thresholds are not expected to violate any air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation and will not exceed the thresholds of significance for ambient air quality. In this case, the District concludes no emission calculation is needed and no ambient air quality analysis is required.”<sup>9</sup>

**Table 4** provides the Air District’s ambient air quality analysis (AAQA) screening levels for development projects. For projects that exceed the screening thresholds identified in Table 4, the Air District provides further guidance on how to evaluate the 100 pound per day screening level in their guidance document *Ambient Air Quality Analysis Project Daily Emissions Assessment*.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Air District, GAMAQI, Section 8.4.4, Page 95

<sup>10</sup> Air District, <http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/CEQA%20Rules/Ambient-Air-Quality-Analysis-Project-Daily-Emissions-Assessment.pdf>, accessed November 1, 2019.

Table 4: AAQA Screening Levels For Development Project	
Development Project Type	Space / Size
Residential	50 dwelling units
Commercial	2,000 square feet
Light Industrial	25,000 square feet
Heavy Industrial	100,000 square feet
Medical Office	20,000 square feet
General Office	39,000 square feet
Educational	9,000 square feet
Governmental	10,000 square feet
Recreational	20,000 square feet
Transportation / Transit	Construction exhaust emissions equal or exceeding 2.0 tons NO <sub>x</sub> or 2.0 tons PM <sub>10</sub>
Source: Air District, GAMAQI, Table 4, page 96	

### **Cumulative Increase in Emissions**

“By its very nature, air pollution is largely a cumulative impact. The nonattainment status of regional pollutants is a result of past and present development. Future attainment of State and Federal ambient air quality standards is a function of successful implementation of the District’s attainment plans. Consequently, the District’s application of thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants is relevant to the determination of whether a project’s individual emissions would have a cumulatively significant impact on air quality. A Lead Agency may determine that a project’s incremental contribution to a cumulative effect is not cumulatively considerable if the project will comply with the requirements in a previously approved plan or mitigation program, including, but not limited to an air quality attainment or maintenance plan that provides specific requirements that will avoid or substantially lessen the cumulative problem within the geographic area in which the project is located [CCR §15064(h)(3)]. Thus, if project specific emissions exceed the thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants the project would be expected to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the District is in non-attainment under applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standards. This does not imply that if the project is below all such significance thresholds, it cannot be cumulatively significant.”<sup>11</sup>

**Table 5** provides the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin attainment status for federal and state ambient air quality standards.

---

<sup>11</sup> Air District, GAMAQI, Section 7.14, Pages 65-66

<b>Table 5. San Joaquin Valley Attainment Status</b>		
<b>Pollutant</b>	<b>Designation</b>	
	<b>Federal Standards</b>	<b>State Standards</b>
Ozone—1-hour	No Federal Standard	Nonattainment/Severe
Ozone—8-hour	Nonattainment/Extreme	Nonattainment
PM <sub>10</sub>	Attainment	Nonattainment
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	Nonattainment	Nonattainment
Carbon monoxide	Attainment/Unclassified	Attainment/Unclassified
Nitrogen dioxide	Attainment/Unclassified	Attainment
Sulfur dioxide	Attainment/Unclassified	Attainment
Lead (Particulate)	No Designation/Classification	Attainment
Hydrogen sulfide	No Federal Standard	Unclassified
Sulfates	No Federal Standard	Attainment
Visibility-reducing particles	No Federal Standard	Unclassified
Vinyl chloride	No Federal Standard	Attainment
Source: Air District, <a href="http://www.valleyair.org/aqinfo/attainment.htm">http://www.valleyair.org/aqinfo/attainment.htm</a> , accessed November 1, 2019.		

## **Exposure Risks**

The location of a project is a major factor in determining whether the project will result in localized air quality impacts. The potential for adverse air quality impacts increases as the distance between the source of emissions and receptors decreases. From a health risk perspective, there are two (2) categories of projects that have the potential to cause long-term health risks impacts:

- Type A Projects: Land use projects that will place new toxic sources in the vicinity of existing receptors. This category includes sources of toxic emissions such as gasoline dispensing facilities, asphalt batch plants, warehouse distribution centers, freeways and high traffic roads, and other stationary sources that emit toxic substances.
- Type B Projects: Land use projects that will place new receptors in the vicinity of existing toxic sources. This category includes residential, commercial, and institutional developments proposed in the vicinity of existing sources such as stationary sources, freeways and high traffic roads, rail yards, and warehouse distribution centers.<sup>12</sup>

“Various tools already exist to perform a screening analysis from stationary sources impacting receptors (Type A projects) as developed for the AB2588 Hot Spots and air district permitting programs. Screening tools may include prioritization charts, AERSCREEN and various spreadsheets. For projects being impacted by existing sources (Type B projects), one screening tool is contained in the ARB Handbook: *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective*. The document includes a table entitled “*Recommendations on Siting New Sensitive Land Uses Such As Residences, Schools, Daycare Centers, Playgrounds, or Medical Facilities*” with recommended buffer distances associated with various types of common sources. If a proposed project is located within an established buffer distance to any of the listed

<sup>12</sup> Air District, GAMAQI, Section 6.5, Page 44

sources, a health risk screening and/or assessment should be performed to assess risk to potential sensitive receptors. These guidelines are intended only for projects that are impacted by a single source. Another useful tool is the CAPCOA Guidance Document: *Health Risk Assessments for Proposed Land Use Projects*. CAPCOA prepared the guidance to assist Lead Agencies in complying with CEQA requirements. The guidance document describes when and how a health risk assessment should be prepared and what to do with the results.”<sup>13</sup>

**Table 6** presents the Air District’s and ARB’s siting recommendations for projects proposing sensitive land uses.

<b>Table 6: ARB Recommendations on Siting New Sensitive Land Uses</b>	
<b>Source Category</b>	<b>Advisory Recommendations</b>
Freeways and High-Traffic Roads	Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 500 feet of a freeway, urban roads with 100,000 vehicles/day, or rural roads with 50,000 vehicles/day.
Distribution Centers	Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of a distribution center (that accommodates more than 100 trucks per day, more than 40 trucks with operating transport refrigeration units (TRUs) per day, or where TRU unit operations exceed 300 hours per week).  Take into account the configuration of existing distribution centers and avoid locating residences and other new sensitive land uses near entry and exit points.
Rail Yards	Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of a major service and maintenance rail yard. Within one mile of a rail yard, consider possible siting limitations and mitigation approaches.
Ports	Avoid siting of new sensitive land uses immediately downwind of ports in the most heavily impacted zones. Consult local air districts or the ARB on the status of pending analyses of health risks.
Refineries	Avoid siting new sensitive land uses immediately downwind of petroleum refineries. Consult with local air districts and other local agencies to determine an appropriate separation.
Chrome Platers	Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of a chrome plater.
Dry Cleaners Using Perchloroethylene	Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 300 feet of any dry cleaning operation. For operations with two or more machines, provide 500 feet. For operations with 3 or more machines, consult with the local air district.  Do not site new sensitive land uses in the same building with perchloroethylene dry cleaning operations.
Gasoline Dispensing Facilities	Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 300 feet of a large gas station (defined as a facility with a throughput of 3.6 million gallons per year or greater). A 50 foot separation is recommended for typical gas dispensing facilities.
Sources: Air Resources Board, <i>Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective</i> , Page 4, Table 1-1, <a href="https://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/handbook.pdf">https://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/handbook.pdf</a> , accessed November 1, 2019. California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, <i>Health Risk Assessments for Proposes Land Use Projects</i> , Page 9, Table 2, <a href="http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/CAPCOA_HRA_LU_Guidelines_8-6-09.pdf">http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/CAPCOA_HRA_LU_Guidelines_8-6-09.pdf</a> , accessed November 1, 2019.	

<sup>13</sup> Air District, GAMAQI, Section 6.5, Page 45

“Determination of whether project emissions would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations is a function of assessing potential health risks. Sensitive receptors are facilities that house or attract children, the elderly, people with illnesses, or others who are especially sensitive to the effects of air pollutants. Hospitals, schools, convalescent facilities, and residential areas are examples of sensitive receptors. When evaluating whether a development proposal has the potential to result in localized impacts, Lead Agency staff need to consider the nature of the air pollutant emissions, the proximity between the emitting facility and sensitive receptors, the direction of prevailing winds, and local topography. Lead Agencies are encouraged to use the screening tools for Toxic Air Contaminant presented in section 6.5 (Potential Land Use Conflicts and Exposure of Sensitive Receptors [pages 44 – 45 of the GAMAQI]) to identify potential conflicts between land use and sensitive receptors and include the result of their analysis in the referral document.”<sup>14</sup>

### **Nuisance Odors**

“Due to the subjective nature of odor impacts, the number of variables that can influence the potential for an odor impact, and the variety of odor sources, there are no quantitative or formulaic methodologies to determine the presence of a significant odor impact. Rather, the District recommends that odor analyses strive to fully disclose all pertinent information. The intensity of an odor source’s operations and its proximity to sensitive receptors influences the potential significance of odor emissions. The District has identified some common types of facilities that have been known to produce odors in the San Joaquin Valley. These are presented in Chapter 8 [of the GAMAQI] along with a reasonable distance from the source within which, the degree of odors could possibly be significant.”<sup>15</sup>

Two situations create a potential for odor impact. The first occurs when a new odor source is located near an existing receptor. The second occurs when a new receptor locates near an existing source of odor. “An analysis of potential odor impacts should be conducted for the following two situations:

1. Generators – projects that would potentially generate odorous emissions proposed to locate near existing sensitive receptors or other land uses where people may congregate, and
2. Receivers – residential or other sensitive receptor projects or other projects built for the intent of attracting people locating near existing odor sources.”<sup>16</sup>

“The intensity of an odor source’s operations and its proximity to sensitive receptors influences the potential significance of odor emissions. The District has identified some common types of facilities that have been known to produce odors in the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin. These are presented in Table 6 (Screening Levels For Potential Odor Sources) [of the GAMAQI] along with a reasonable distance from the source within which, the degree of odors could possibly be significant. Table 6 (Screening Levels for Potential Odor Sources) [of the GAMAQI], can be used as a screening tool to qualitatively assess a project’s potential to adversely affect area receptors. This list of facilities is not all-inclusive. The Lead Agency should evaluate facilities

---

<sup>14</sup> Air District, GAMAQI, Section 7.15, Page 66

<sup>15</sup> Air District, GAMAQI, Section 7.16, Pages 66-67

<sup>16</sup> Air District, GAMAQI, Section 8.6, Page 102



not included in the table or projects separated by greater distances if warranted by local conditions or special circumstances. If the proposed project would result in sensitive receptors being located closer than the screening level distances, a more detailed analysis should be provided.”<sup>17</sup>

**Table 7** presents the Air District’s screening levels for potential nuisance odor sources.

<b>Table 7. Air District Screening Levels for Potential Odor Sources</b>	
<b>Odor Generator / Type of Facility</b>	<b>Distance</b>
Wastewater Treatment Facilities	2 miles
Sanitary Landfill	1 mile
Transfer Station	1 mile
Composting Facility	1 mile
Petroleum Refinery	2 miles
Asphalt Batch Plant	1 mile
Chemical Manufacturing	1 mile
Fiberglass Manufacturing	1 mile
Painting/Coating Operations (e.g., auto body shop)	1 mile
Food Processing Facility	1 mile
Feed Lot/Dairy	1 mile
Rendering Plant	1 mile
Sources: Air District, GAMAQI, Table 6, page 103; and <a href="http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/GAMAQI-2015/GAMAQI-Criteria-Pollutant-Thresholds-of-Odors.pdf">http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/GAMAQI-2015/GAMAQI-Criteria-Pollutant-Thresholds-of-Odors.pdf</a> .	

## IMPACT EVALUATION

### a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Project Impact Analysis: *Less Than Significant Impact*

Air quality plans (also known as AQPs or attainment plans) and subsequent rules are used to bring the applicable air basin into attainment with federal AAQS designed to protect the health and safety of residents within that air basin. In order to show attainment of the standards, the Air District analyzes the growth projections in the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB), contributing factors in the formation and emission of air pollutants, and existing and future emissions controls. The Air District then formulates an AQP which details the Air District’s control strategy to reach attainment. The Air District’s 2016 Plan for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard, 2013 Plan for the Revoked 1-Hour Ozone Standard, 2007 Ozone Plan, 2007 PM<sub>10</sub> Maintenance Plan and Request for Redesignation, 2008 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan, 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan, 2015 Plan for the 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Standard, and the 2016 Moderate Area Plan for the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Standard outline a number of control strategies to help the SJVAPCD reach attainment for the revoked

---

<sup>17</sup> Air District, GAMAQI, Section 8.6, Pages 102-103

federal 1-hour ozone standard, the 24-hour PM<sub>10</sub> standard, and the federal and state PM<sub>2.5</sub> standards, respectively. The 2008 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan, 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan, and 2015 Plan for the 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Standard focus specifically on PM<sub>2.5</sub>, although the control strategies from previous PM<sub>10</sub> plans (particularly those related to fugitive dust control) have already improved the SJVAB ambient PM<sub>2.5</sub> levels. Therefore, because fugitive dust controls continue to be addressed in the PM<sub>10</sub> plan, the plans contain a comprehensive list of strict regulatory and incentive-based measures to reduce directly-emitted PM<sub>2.5</sub> and precursor emissions. The San Joaquin Valley Air Basin is in attainment for CO, SO<sub>2</sub>, and lead, so there are no attainment plans for those pollutants.<sup>18</sup> The proposed Project will be required to comply with all applicable Air District rules and regulations including, but not limited to, Regulation VIII (Fugitive PM<sub>10</sub> Prohibitions) requirements and District Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Review).

As previously noted, the Air District has determined that projects with emissions below the thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants (see **Table 2**) would “Not conflict or obstruct implementation of the District’s air quality plan.”<sup>19</sup> There are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) associated with the Community Plan. However, the Plan does include updates to land use designations that could increase the buildout potential of the planning area. As such, projected growth estimates for population, housing, and non-residential land uses are based on the 1.3% annual growth rate projected for the County in the Tulare County 2030 General Plan. To assess a worst-case growth scenario, the 1.3% growth rate was applied to the existing 2017 base year population and housing data (as provided in the United States Census Bureau 2017 American Community Survey) and the existing non-residential uses within the community (assuming that all developed properties have been improved with structures at a floor-to-area ratio of 0.2) to determine the amount of development that could occur by 2030. The projected growth through 2030 is presented in **Table 1**.

The future buildout of the Project would result in short-term, temporary, and intermittent construction-related and long-term operations-related criteria air pollutant emissions. Consistent with the Air District guidance, Project-related construction and operation emissions have been estimated using CalEEMod, Version 2016.3.2 (the most recent version of the model). The CalEEMod modeling results can be found in Attachment “A”. Construction phasing, off-road construction equipment and on-road employee, hauling, and vendor vehicle estimates utilized model default values. Model defaults were also utilized for operational activities, except where Project-specific information could be input. The following changes to default values were used:

- *Project Characteristics – Land Use Setting*: Although the future development will be located within the Urban Development Boundary, the rural land use was selected as the Project is within a relatively sparsely developed area.
- *Land Use – Lot Acreage*: Non-residential acreage is greater than the model default as the projected growth is based on the acreage of existing land uses. The acreage represents a 1.3% annual growth rate based on developed/improved properties.
- *Operational-Mobile – Fleet Mix*: The “District Accepted Fleet Mix for Residential Projects” was used for the operational year (2021).

---

<sup>18</sup> More information on Air District air quality plans can be found online at [http://valleyair.org/Air\\_Quality\\_Plans/air-quality-plans.htm](http://valleyair.org/Air_Quality_Plans/air-quality-plans.htm).

<sup>19</sup> Air District, GAMAQI, Section 7.12, Page 65.

- *Mitigation – Construction:* Water exposed area 3 times per day and unpaved road vehicle speed of 15 miles per hour were selected to account for compliance with Air District Regulation VIII requirements.
- *Mitigation – Traffic:* The following items were selected: low density suburban project setting; improve destination accessibility with the job center at 4 miles from the site; and improve pedestrian network onsite.
- *Mitigation – Area:* The following items were selected: No hearth was selected because residents rely on the use of propane tanks to provide gas services and to account for compliance with Air District Rule 4901 (Wood Burning Fireplaces and Wood Burning Heaters); and 3% was used for electronic lawnmower, electric leaf blower, and electric chainsaw, consistent with Air District approved changes.
- *Mitigation – Water:* Low-flow bathroom faucets, kitchen faucets, toilets and showers were selected to account for Title 24 and Green Building Code requirements; and use of water-efficient irrigation systems was selected to account for the County’s Model Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance (also referred to as MWEL0)

**Table 8** provides the construction-related criteria pollutant emissions and **Table 9** provides the operations-related criteria pollutant emissions associated with the projected growth.

<b>Table 8. Annual Construction Emissions Estimates (Mitigated)</b>						
Construction Year	Estimated Emissions, tons per year					
	ROG	NOx	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	Total PM <sub>10</sub>	Total PM <sub>2.5</sub>
2020	0.36	3.41	2.70	4.99e-003	0.31	0.22
2021	0.91	1.07	1.06	1.93e-003	0.08	0.06
Construction Total	1.27	4.48	3.76	6.92e-003	0.39	0.28
SJVAPCD Threshold	10	10	100	27	15	15
Threshold Exceeded	No	No	No	No	No	No
<i>Source: See Attachment “A” of this document.</i>						

<b>Table 9. Annual Operational Emissions Estimates (Mitigated)</b>						
Construction Year	Estimated Emissions, tons per year					
	ROG	NOx	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	Total PM <sub>10</sub>	Total PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Operations at Buildout	0.86	2.84	4.06	0.01	0.97	0.27
SJVAPCD Threshold	10	10	100	27	15	15
Threshold Exceeded	No	No	No	No	No	No
<i>Source: See Attachment “A” of this document.</i>						

As previously noted, there are no specific development projects associated with the Community Plan that would result in emissions exceeding Air District thresholds of significance. The Air District evaluates significance of short-term (construction) emissions independent of long-term (operational) emissions. As demonstrated in Tables 8 and 9, the estimated Project-related

emissions during construction and operations will not exceed the Air District's CEQA significance thresholds for any criteria pollutant. Future developments will be subject to additional CEQA review and will be evaluated at the time of submittal. The County will consult with the Air District on a project-by-project basis as new developments are proposed to evaluate potential impacts based on project-specific details and determine whether a localized pollutant analysis (such as an Ambient Air Quality Analysis or Health Risk Assessment) would be required. Future developments will comply with all applicable Air District rules and regulations including, but not limited to, Regulation VIII (Fugitive PM<sub>10</sub> Prohibition), Rule 2201 (New and Modified Stationary Source Review), and Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Review). Furthermore, the Air District has used an average annual growth rate for Tulare County ranging from 1.44% to 1.94%.<sup>20</sup> The 1.3% annual growth rate applied in the Lemon Cove Community Plan is lower than the growth rates applied in the applicable Air Quality Plans (AQPs). As such, Project-related emissions would be included in the AQPs emissions inventories. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable AQPs. The Project will have a ***Less Than Significant Project-specific Impact*** related to this Checklist Item.

Cumulative Impact Analysis:      ***Less Than Significant Impact***

The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is the San Joaquin Air Basin. The emissions analysis demonstrates the Project will not exceed the Air District's thresholds of significance. As such, the Project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plans. Furthermore, the County will consult with the Air District on a project-by-project basis, and future developments will be required to implement all applicable General Plan policies and to comply with all applicable Air District rules and regulations. Therefore, the Project will result in a ***Less Than Significant Cumulative Impact*** related to this Checklist Item.

Mitigation Measures:      ***None Required***

Conclusion:      ***Less Than Significant Impact***

As previously noted, the Project will not exceed the Air District's thresholds of significance and therefore, will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plans. Therefore, ***Less Than Significant Project-specific and Cumulative Impacts*** related to this Checklist Item will occur.

- b) Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?**

Project Impact Analysis:      ***Less Than Significant Impact***

The Project would be considered to have a significant cumulative impact on air quality if project-specific impacts are determined to be significant. As previously noted, the emissions analysis confirms that Project-specific emissions are below the Air District's thresholds of significance at a project-specific level, and that the Project will not cause or contribute to an existing air quality violation. Furthermore, the County will consult with the Air District on a project-by-project basis

---

<sup>20</sup> Earlimart Community Plan 2017 Update Environmental Impact Report, Page 3.3-31

to ensure that future developments are implemented consistent with Air District rules and regulations, including but not limited to, Regulation VIII (Fugitive PM<sub>10</sub> Prohibition), Rule 2201 (New and Modified Stationary Source Review), and Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Review). The Project will be required to implement all applicable General Plan policies and to comply with all applicable Air District rules and regulations. Therefore, because the Project would have ***Less Than Significant Project-specific Impacts***, the Project will have a ***Less Than Significant Cumulative Impact*** on air quality.

Cumulative Impact Analysis:      ***Less Than Significant Impact***

The Project would be considered to have a significant cumulative impact on air quality if project-specific impacts are determined to be significant. Because project-specific impacts are less than significant, the Project will have a ***Less Than Significant Cumulative Impact*** on air quality.

Mitigation Measures:                      ***None Required***

Conclusion:                                      ***Less Than Significant Impact***

As previously noted, Project-related criteria pollutant emissions fall below the Air District's significance thresholds and the Project will be required to implement all applicable General Plan policies and to comply with all applicable Air District rules and regulations. Therefore, the Project will have a ***Less Than Significant Cumulative Impact*** related to this Checklist Item.

**c) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

Project Impact Analysis:                      ***Less Than Significant Impact***

Sensitive receptors are those individuals who are sensitive to air pollution and include children, the elderly, and persons with pre-existing respiratory or cardiovascular illness. The Air District considers a sensitive receptor to be a location that houses or attracts children, the elderly, people with illnesses, or others who are especially sensitive to the effects of air pollutants. Examples of sensitive receptors include schools, parks and playgrounds, daycare centers, nursing homes, hospitals, and residential dwelling units.<sup>21</sup>

**Construction-Related Emissions**

***Construction Equipment TACs/HAPs:*** Particulate emissions from diesel powered construction equipment are considered a TAC by the California Air Resources Board. There are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) associated with the Community Plan. However, future development projects have the potential to temporarily expose receptors to increased pollutant emission concentrations from diesel powered construction equipment during the short-term construction phase. However, construction emissions are temporary and would cease upon completion of construction activities. The short-term nature of construction-related emissions would not expose nearby receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. ***Less Than Significant Project-specific Impacts*** related to this Checklist Item will occur.

---

<sup>21</sup> Air District, *Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts*, page 10

**Dust-borne TACs/HAPs:** There are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) associated with the Community Plan. However, future development projects have the potential to temporarily expose nearby receptors to fugitive particulate (dust) emissions during the short-term construction phase or from landscaping activities once the development project is operational. As of November 2019, there were no listings within the Project planning area in the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List.<sup>22</sup> A query performed on the DTSC *Envirostor* indicated that there are no superfund, state response, voluntary cleanup, school cleanup or corrective actions within five (5) miles of the Project planning area.<sup>23</sup> A query of the State Water Resources Control Board (WRCB) *GeoTracker* Site and Facilities mapping programs revealed seven (7) leaking underground storage tank (LUST) sites within the Project planning area; however, all of these sites are designated as having cleanup being completed and case closed.<sup>24</sup> A query performed on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) *Superfund Enterprise Management System* (SEMS) website found that there are no listed polluted sites within the Project planning area.<sup>25</sup> Therefore, fugitive dust emissions resulting from earthmoving activities during construction or landscaping activities during operations, would not expose future residents or nearby receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. **Less Than Significant Project-specific Impacts** related to this Checklist Item will occur.

There are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) associated with the Community Plan. However, future development projects have the potential to temporarily expose nearby residences to other airborne hazards from generation of fugitive dust emissions during construction-related earthmoving activities. Although not specifically required by CEQA, the following discussions related to valley fever and asbestos are included to satisfy requirements for full disclosure of potential Project-related impacts and are for information purposes only.

**Valley Fever:** Valley fever, or coccidioidomycosis, is an infection caused by inhalation of the spores of the fungus, *Coccidioides immitis* (*C. immitis*). According to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), the San Joaquin Valley is considered an endemic area for valley fever.<sup>26</sup> “The fungus is known to live in the soil in the southwestern United States and parts of Mexico and Central and South America. The fungus was also recently found in south-central Washington. People can get Valley fever by breathing in the microscopic fungal spores from the air in these areas. Most people who breathe in the spores don’t get sick, but some people do. Usually, people who get sick with Valley fever will get better on their own within weeks to months, but some people will need antifungal medication. Certain groups of people are at higher risk for developing the severe forms of the infection, and these people typically need antifungal treatment. It’s difficult to prevent exposure to *Coccidioides* in areas where it’s common in the

---

<sup>22</sup> DTSC. Hazardous Waste and Substance Site List.

[https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search.asp?page=8&cmd=search&business\\_name=&main\\_street\\_name=&city=&zip=&county=&status=ACT%2CBKLG%2CCOM&branch=&site\\_type=CSITES%2COPEN%2CFUDS%2CCLOSE&npl=&funding=&reporttitle=HAZARDOUS+WASTE+AND+SUBSTANCES+SITE+LIST&reporttype=CORTESE&federal\\_superfund=&state\\_response=&voluntary\\_cleanup=&school\\_cleanup=&operating=&post\\_closure=&non\\_operating=&corrective\\_action=&tiered\\_permit=&evaluation=&spec\\_prog=&national\\_priority\\_list=&senate=&congress=&assembly=&critical\\_pol=&business\\_type=&case\\_type=&searchtype=&hwmp\\_site\\_type=&cleanup\\_type=&ocierp=&hwmp=False&permitted=&pc\\_permitted=&inspections=&complaints=&censustract=&cesdecile=&school\\_district=&orderby=county](https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search.asp?page=8&cmd=search&business_name=&main_street_name=&city=&zip=&county=&status=ACT%2CBKLG%2CCOM&branch=&site_type=CSITES%2COPEN%2CFUDS%2CCLOSE&npl=&funding=&reporttitle=HAZARDOUS+WASTE+AND+SUBSTANCES+SITE+LIST&reporttype=CORTESE&federal_superfund=&state_response=&voluntary_cleanup=&school_cleanup=&operating=&post_closure=&non_operating=&corrective_action=&tiered_permit=&evaluation=&spec_prog=&national_priority_list=&senate=&congress=&assembly=&critical_pol=&business_type=&case_type=&searchtype=&hwmp_site_type=&cleanup_type=&ocierp=&hwmp=False&permitted=&pc_permitted=&inspections=&complaints=&censustract=&cesdecile=&school_district=&orderby=county)  
Accessed November 1, 2019.

<sup>23</sup> DTSC. Envirostor. Sites and Facilities mapping website. <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/>, Accessed November 1, 2019.

<sup>24</sup> WRCB, GeoTracker, Sites and Facilities mapping website. <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>, Accessed November 1, 2019.

<sup>25</sup> EPA, SEMS Search, <https://www.epa.gov/enviro/sems-search>, accessed May 15, 2018.

<sup>26</sup> CDC, <https://www.cdc.gov/fungal/diseases/coccidioidomycosis/maps.html>, accessed November 1, 2019.

environment, but people who are at higher risk for severe Valley fever should try to avoid breathing in large amounts of dust if they're in these areas.”<sup>27</sup>

Construction-related activities generate fugitive dust that could potentially contain *C. immitis* spores. The Project will be required to implement General Plan Policy AQ-4.2 (Dust Suppression Measures), which was specifically designed to address impacts from the generation of dust emitted into the air. The Project will be required to comply with Air District Regulation VIII (Fugitive PM10 Prohibitions) requirements, including submittal of construction notification and/or dust control plan(s), which minimize the generation of fugitive dust during construction-related activities. Therefore, implementation of General Plan policies and compliance with Air District rules and regulations would reduce the chance of exposure to valley fever during construction-related activities. ***Less Than Significant Project-specific Impacts*** related to this Checklist Item will occur.

***Naturally Occurring Asbestos:*** In areas containing naturally occurring asbestos, earthmoving construction-related activities, such as grading and trenching, could expose receptors to windblown asbestos. According to a United States Geological Soil Survey map of areas where naturally occurring asbestos in California are likely to occur, the Project is not located in an area known to contain naturally occurring asbestos.<sup>28</sup> The Project planning area and the immediate vicinity has been previously disturbed by agricultural operations and by rural residential and commercial/retail development. Future development projects will be required to implement General Plan Policy AQ-4.2 (Dust Suppression Measures) to comply with Air District Regulation VIII (Fugitive PM10 Prohibitions) requirements, thereby reducing the chance of exposure to valley fever during construction-related activities. Therefore, ***Less Than Significant Project-specific Impacts*** related to this Checklist Item will occur.

### **Operations-Related Emissions**

***Operations from Future Development:*** There are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) associated with the Community Plan that would be a source of TAC or HAP emissions. However, construction- and operation-related activities associated with future development projects may require the transport and use of hazardous materials. Consumer products and gasoline are regulated by the State and use of these products would not pose a significant risk to residents or nearby receptors. Medium- and Heavy-duty diesel trucks would be a source of diesel particulate matter, which is considered to be a TAC. The County will work with the Air District on a project-by-project basis to determine whether health risk assessments would be required for projects generating diesel truck trips travelling through the Project planning area, and for other equipment that may require Air District permits. Furthermore, future applicants will be required to comply with all local, state, and federal policies related to emission of TACs/HAPs in the event such pollutants require control efforts to minimize their impacts. Tulare County Environmental Health Division will require a Hazardous Waste Business Plan if materials exceed 55 gallons (liquids), 500 pounds (solids), or 200 cubic feet (compressed gas) handled or stored on site.<sup>29</sup> As such, the Project will not expose sensitive

---

<sup>27</sup> CDC, <https://www.cdc.gov/fungal/diseases/coccidioidomycosis/definition.html>, accessed November 1, 2019.

<sup>28</sup> USGS, *Reported Historic Asbestos Mines, Historic Asbestos Prospects, and Other Natural Occurrences of Asbestos in California*, <http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2011/1188/>, accessed July 25, 2018.

<sup>29</sup> Tulare County Health and Human Services Agency, Environmental Health Division. Hazardous Material Business Plan. <https://tularecountyeh.org/eh/index.cfm/our-services/hazardous-materials-cupa/hazardous-materials-business-plan-hmbp/> and



receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. ***Less Than Significant Project-specific Impacts*** related to this Checklist Item will occur.

***Existing Sources:*** There are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) associated with the Community Plan that would be a source of TAC or HAP emissions, and the location of future development projects in close proximity to sensitive receptors cannot be determined until future projects are identified. To ensure that development within the Project planning area does not expose sensitive receptors to significant impacts from TAC emissions, the County will review individual projects on a project-by-project basis to determine if ARB's Air Quality Land Use Handbook screening criteria presented in **Table 6** are exceeded. Projects that exceed the screening criteria will be subject to analysis using screening models or may require dispersion modeling and a health risk assessment. Tulare County will also consult with the Air District during the CEQA process for guidance on the appropriate screening tools and modeling protocols for future development projects within the Plan area. Therefore, existing sources of TAC/HAP emissions would not expose receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. ***Less Than Significant Project-specific Impacts*** related to this Checklist Item will occur.

***Existing Agricultural Operations:*** The Project planning area is located in a rural area with urban built up land as well as active agricultural operations. Agricultural operations typically include the use of chemicals on crops for activities such as pest control, damage control, weed abatement, etc. However, these chemicals are regulated by the State and would not pose a significant risk to the existing and future residents within the Project planning area. Furthermore, the Tulare County General Plan includes Policy AG-1.14 Right-to-Farm Noticing which requires new property owners to acknowledge and accept the inconveniences associated with normal farming activities. Future development projects adjacent to agricultural lands will be required to sign a "Right to Farm" notice. ***Less Than Significant Project-specific Impacts*** related to this Checklist Item will occur.

Cumulative Impact Analysis:      ***Less Than Significant Impact***

The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin. The Tulare County General Plan includes policies, which were specifically designed to engage responsible agencies in the CEQA process, to reduce air pollutant emissions through project design, require compliance with emission-reducing regulations, and to address potential impacts from siting incompatible uses in close proximity to each other. Applicable General Plan policies will be implemented for the Project. The County will consult with the Air District on a project-by-project basis as new developments are proposed to evaluate project-specific impacts based on project-specific details and to determine whether a health risk assessment would be needed. Compliance with applicable Air District rules and regulations would further reduce potential impacts from exposure to TAC and HAP emissions, as well as valley fever and asbestos. As such, the development of the proposed Project would not expose the public to substantial pollutant concentrations. Therefore, a ***Less Than Significant Cumulative Impact*** related to this Checklist Item will occur.

Mitigation Measures:      ***None Required***



Conclusion: *Less Than Significant Impact*

There are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) associated with the Community Plan. As such, the Project is not a source of, nor are there any known existing sources of, HAPs or TACs within the Project vicinity. Therefore, the proposed Project would not expose the public to substantial pollutant concentrations. *Less Than Significant Project-specific and Cumulative Impacts* related to this Checklist Item will occur.

**d) Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?)**

Project Impact Analysis: *Less Than Significant Impact*

Two situations create a potential for odor impact. The first occurs when a new odor source is located near an existing sensitive receptor. The second occurs when a new sensitive receptor locates near an existing source of odor. There are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) associated with the Community Plan that would be a source of nuisance odors. However, as the Community Plan is built out, dependent upon the location and nature of operations, potential exists for odor impacts to occur resulting from existing and/or new agricultural, commercial, and industrial land uses.

Potential odor sources associated with construction-related activities could originate from diesel exhaust from construction equipment and fumes from architectural coating and paving operations. However, construction-related odors, if perceptible, would dissipate as they mix with the surrounding air and would be of very limited duration. As such, objectionable odors during construction would not affect a substantial number of people.

As presented in **Table 7**, the Air District has determined the common land use types that are known to produce odors in the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin. As previously noted, there are no specific development projects associated with the Community Plan. However, the existing agricultural uses in the vicinity of the community could be a source of nuisance odors. All projects, with the exception of agricultural operations, are subject to Air District Rule 4102 (Nuisance). Therefore, odors from agriculture-related operations would not be subject to complaint reporting. There is potential for these agricultural operations to generate objectionable odors; however, these odors would be temporary or seasonal. Furthermore, the Tulare County General Plan includes Policy AG-1.14 Right-to-Farm Noticing which requires new property owners to acknowledge and accept the inconveniences associated with normal farming activities. If future developments are proposed adjacent to active agricultural uses, future residents will be required to sign a “Right to Farm” notice. To ensure potential nuisance odor impacts are addressed, if proposed developments were to result in sensitive receptors being located closer than the recommended distances to any odor generator identified in **Table 7**, a more detailed analysis, is recommended. The detailed analysis would involve contacting the Air District’s Compliance Division for information regarding odor complaints Implementation of the applicable General Plan policies and compliance with applicable Air District rules and regulations specifically designed to address air quality and odor impacts, would reduce potential odor impacts. Therefore, the Project would not create or expose existing residents to

objectionable odors. ***Less Than Significant Project-specific Impacts*** related to this Checklist Item will occur.

Cumulative Impact Analysis:      ***Less Than Significant Impact***

The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin. As there are no development projects proposed with the Project, the Project does not include any new sources of odors. Future developments will be subject to Air District Rule 4102 (Nuisance) and General Plan Policy AG-1.14 Right-to-Farm Noticing will be implemented. As such, the Project will not expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors. Therefore, ***Less Than Significant Cumulate Impacts*** related to this Checklist Item will occur.

Mitigation Measures:                      ***None Required***

Conclusion:                                      ***Less Than Significant Impact***

The Project is not a source of nuisance odors, nor are there existing sources of permanent odors in the Project vicinity that would affect future residents. As such, the Project will not expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors. Therefore, ***Less Than Significant Project-specific and Cumulative Impacts*** related to this Checklist Item will occur.

# **Energy Technical Memorandum**

[This page intentionally left blank]



# RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY

5961 SOUTH MOONEY BLVD  
VISALIA, CA 93277  
PHONE (559) 624-7000  
FAX (559) 730-2653

Aaron R. Bock  
Reed Schenke  
Sherman Dix

Economic Development and Planning  
Public Works  
Fiscal Services

---

## TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM ENERGY ASSESSMENT

**DATE:** November 6, 2019

**TO:** Hector Guerra, Chief Environmental Planner

**FROM:** Jessica Willis, Planner IV

**SUBJECT:** Energy Assessment for the Lemon Cove Community Plan (GPA 17-007, PZC 17-007, PZC 19-016, PZC 19-017)

---

### PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ASSESSMENT

This document is intended to assist Tulare County Resource Management Agency (RMA) staff in the preparation of the Energy component of the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) being prepared for the Lemon Cove Community Plan (Project). The assessment is intended to provide sufficient detail regarding potential impacts of Project implementation and to identify mitigation measures, if necessary, to reduce potentially significant impacts.

The assessment provided in this document was prepared to evaluate whether future buildout of the Project would result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. The energy assessment was conducted within the context of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA, California Public Resources Code Sections 21000, et seq.). The assessment is intended to provide the County of Tulare (County) with sufficient detail regarding potential impacts of Project implementation and to identify mitigation measures, if necessary, to reduce potentially significant impacts.

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Lemon Cove is currently designated an Unincorporated Community in the 2030 Tulare County General Plan. The objective of the Lemon Cove Community Plan (Plan) is to develop a plan, which can accurately reflect the needs and priorities of the unincorporated community of Lemon Cove. The Land Use and Circulation portions of this Plan provide the mechanism to minimize or avoid the potential adverse impacts of urban growth. The development of an orderly, harmonious land use pattern and appropriate implementation measures are designed to reduce potential conflict between neighboring uses across Tulare County's 2030 planning horizon, consistent with the Tulare County 2030 General Plan Update. The Plan is needed to increase the availability of infrastructure funding, such as drinking water system improvements (wells, water distribution piping, storage tanks, etc.), wastewater system (such as piping, lift stations, etc.), and public

work/safety improvements (such as curbs, gutters, sidewalks, etc.), and to stimulate economic development within the community.

Tulare County is proposing new land use and zoning designations within an expanded UDB. The proposed Community Plan, if adopted, will update these designations to be consistent with the General Plan, and will bring existing non-compliant properties into conformity with the Tulare County Zoning Ordinance. The Community Plan also includes the Complete Streets and Road Maintenance programs and the community's anticipated growth through year 2030 based on the existing land uses, census population data, and the projected 1.3% annual growth rate in unincorporated areas of Tulare County. Other than the Complete Streets and Road Maintenance Programs, there are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) proposed as part of this Project. As an unknown number of proposals may occur within the lifetime of the Plan, the Plan is intended to direct the density, intensity, and types of growth needed to meet the needs of the community. Future developments within the Project planning area will be required to undergo additional CEQA evaluation on a project-by-project basis at such time development is proposed to determine potential environmental impacts.

### **Complete Streets and Road Maintenance**

The Lemon Cove Complete Streets and Road Maintenance Programs are included in the Circulation Element of the proposed Community Plan. The Complete Streets Program has thoroughly analyzed the alternative forms of transportation, including transit, bicycle ways, and pedestrian circulation. Improvements proposed in the Complete Streets Program include, but are not limited to, installation of streetlights, bus shelters, street signage and striping, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, drainage system, and utilities. Road maintenance activities vary by road segment dependent upon the condition of the road and may include chip seal, overlay resurfacing, and asphalt reconstructions.

### **Growth Projections**

There are no specific development projects proposed with the Lemon Cove Community Plan; however, the Plan does include updates to land use designations that could increase the buildout potential of the planning area. Population and residential growth through planning horizon year 2030 was estimated by applying a 1.3% annual growth rate, consistent with the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, to the 2017 baseline population and housing data, as provided in the United States Census Bureau 2017 American Community Survey (ACS).<sup>1</sup> Non-residential growth was estimated through planning horizon year 2030 for a worst-case emissions scenario by applying a 1.3% annual growth rate to the existing uses and assuming all parcels have been improved with structures at a floor to area ratio of 0.20. Using these assumptions for baseline conditions provides a conservative (larger) overall growth estimate. **Table 1** summarizes the projected growth of the community through horizon Year 2030.

---

<sup>1</sup> United States Census Bureau. American FactFinder. 2017 American Community Survey. 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Demographic and Housing Estimates (DP05) and Selected Housing Characteristics (DP04). [https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community\\_facts.xhtml](https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml). November 1, 2019.

<b>Table 1. Projected Growth through Year 2030</b>								
	Residential <sup>1</sup>		Commercial / Public / Other <sup>2</sup>		Retail <sup>2</sup>		Industrial <sup>2</sup>	
Year	Population	Dwelling Units	Square Feet	Acres	Square Feet	Acres	Square Feet	Acres
2017	232	115	277,129	31.81	65,079	7.47	15,507	1.78
2030	274	136	327,797	37.63	76,977	8.84	18,343	2.11
Overall Growth	42	21	50,668	5.85	11,898	1.37	2,835	0.33
<sup>1</sup> Projections based on 2017 American Community Survey data applying an annual growth rate of 1.3%.								
<sup>2</sup> Projections based on existing land uses assuming developments/improvements with a Floor to Area Ratio of 0.2 and annual growth rate of 1.3%.								

## SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS

CEQA Guidelines define a significant effect on the environment as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project.<sup>2</sup> To determine if a project would have a significant impact on energy resources, the project's size, location, orientation, equipment and vehicle use, and any renewable energy features incorporated into the project must be evaluated. The analysis is subject to the rule of reason and shall focus on energy demand that is caused by the project. Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines provides the criteria (as Checklist Items) for evaluating potential impacts on the environment. The project would have a significant impact on energy resources if it would:

- Result in significant environmental effects due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy.
- Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

## IMPACT EVALUATION

- a) Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?**

Project Impact Analysis:                      *Less Than Significant Impact*

The proposed Project consists of a Community Plan for the unincorporated community of Lemon Cove. The objective of the Plan is to develop a plan, which can accurately reflect the needs and priorities of the unincorporated community of Lemon Cove. The Land Use and Circulation portions of this Plan provide the mechanism to minimize or avoid the potential adverse impacts of urban growth. The Plan contains various policies that encourage future development to incorporate energy efficient features into the project design, require the County to participate in energy reduction programs when feasible, and encourages the development of alternative energy resources, such as wind and solar facilities, when appropriately sited. Furthermore, no development projects are proposed as part of the Plan. As such, the Plan itself will not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. However, the Plan does

<sup>2</sup> CEQA §§ 15002(g), 15382

include updates to land use designations that could increase the buildout potential of the planning area.

### Electricity and Natural Gas

“Southern California Edison provides electric service to the majority of Tulare County, including the majority of the San Joaquin Valley and the foothills. Natural gas service is primarily provided by The Gas Company (formerly Southern California Gas Company). Pacific Gas & Electric also serves northern Tulare County’s electric needs on limited basis. The electrical facilities network includes both overhead and underground lines, with new development required to install underground service lines. All utility providers indicate that additional service should be available to new development, depending on the necessary load of the services requested.”<sup>3</sup>

Electrical service for the Project study area is provided by Southern California Edison (SCE). The Project study area is not supplied with natural gas services and residents rely on the use of propane to supply their fuel needs. However, the analysis presented below presents the theoretical natural gas usage that would occur if services were available.

In 2018, SCE provided 102,520,762.59 gigawatt-hours (GWh) of electricity to approximately 15 million customers across a service area of 15 counties in a 50,000 square mile area within Central, Coastal and Southern California.<sup>4</sup> In the same year, SoCal Gas provided a total of 7,195.95 million therms of natural gas to nearly 21.8 million customers across a service area of 12 counties in a 24,000 square mile area within Central and Southern California.<sup>5</sup> Within the County, total demand for SCE electrical services was 4,433.98 GWh, and total demand for SoCal Gas natural gas services was 157.29 million therms in 2018. Total state and countywide energy demands, including per capita calculations of energy demands based on 2018 populations, are provided in **Table 2**. The energy demands presented include all residential and nonresidential customers.

<b>Table 2</b>					
<b>2018 County and State Energy Demands (All Users)</b>					
	<b>2018 Population<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Total 2018 Energy Demand</b>		<b>2018 Energy Demand Per Capita</b>	
		<b>Electricity (MWh)<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Natural Gas (therms)<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Electricity (MWh)</b>	<b>Natural Gas (therms)</b>
State	39,557,045	281,120,193.430	12,638,157,740	7.11	319.49
Service Area	---	102,520,762.582	7,195,951,252	---	---
Tulare County	465,861	4,433,976.762	157,285,390	9.52	337.62

---

<sup>3</sup> Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update Recirculated Draft EIR. 3.4 Energy and Global Climate Change. February 2010. Page 3.4-14. <http://generalplan.co.tulare.ca.us/documents/generalplan2010/RecirculatedDraftEIR.pdf>. Accessed October 2019.

<sup>4</sup> Southern California Edison. [https://newsroom.edison.com/internal\\_redirect/cms.ipressroom.com.s3.amazonaws.com/166/files/20193/SCE%20Service%20Area%20Fact%20Sheet\\_Ver2\\_04252019.pdf](https://newsroom.edison.com/internal_redirect/cms.ipressroom.com.s3.amazonaws.com/166/files/20193/SCE%20Service%20Area%20Fact%20Sheet_Ver2_04252019.pdf). Accessed October 2019.

<sup>5</sup> SoCalGas. Company Profile. <https://www.socalgas.com/about-us/company-profile>. Accessed October 2019.



1 US Census population estimates as of July 1, 2018.

2 Converted to MWh as CEC Energy Reports expresses in Millions of kWh (GWh).

3 Converted to Therms as CEC Energy Reports expresses in Millions of Therms.

Sources: California Energy Commission. Energy Consumption Database. <http://ecdms.energy.ca.gov/>. Accessed October 2019.

<http://ecdms.energy.ca.gov/elecbycounty.aspx>

<http://ecdms.energy.ca.gov/gasbycounty.aspx>

<http://ecdms.energy.ca.gov/elecbyplan.aspx>

<http://ecdms.energy.ca.gov/gasbyplan.aspx>

U.S. Census Bureau. American FactFinder. Community Facts.

[https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community\\_facts.xhtml](https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml). Accessed October 2019.

Implementation of the proposed Project would result in the commitment of additional energy resources, including consumption of natural gas and electricity through operation of the Project. As provided in **Table 3**, operation of the proposed Project is estimated to result in the demand for 15,032 therms per year (therms/yr) of natural gas, and 803 megawatt-hours per year (MWh/yr) of electricity based on CalEEMod modeling results (see Attachment “A”).

<b>Table 3</b>			
<b>Estimated (mitigated) Project Electricity and Natural Gas Demands (All Users)</b>			
Proposed Land Use	Proposed Project <sup>1</sup>		
	Square Feet / Population <sup>2</sup>	Electricity Demand (MWh/yr) <sup>3</sup>	Natural Gas Demand (therms/yr) <sup>4</sup>
Non-residential Uses	65,401	632.97	9,864.30
Residential Uses	60	169.58	5,167.88
<b>Project Total</b>	---	<b>802.55</b>	<b>15,032.18</b>
Project Average Per Capita/Year	---	13.38	250.54
<p>1 Proposed Project demand includes ‘mitigation measures’ in the CalEEMod runs.</p> <p>2 The projected Project population based on existing population data is 42 residents; however, because default CalEEMod population is greater and the energy usage is based on the model’s population, the model population is used for this analysis</p> <p>3 1,000 megawatt-hours (MWh) = 1 gigawatt-hours (GWh)</p> <p>4 1 therm = 100 thousand British Thermal Units (BTU)</p> <p>Source: CalEEMod output files provided in Attachment A of this MND.</p>			

Comparison of **Tables 2** and **3** indicate that electricity demand per capita for the Project (13.38 MWh/yr) is higher than Tulare County (9.52 MWh/yr) and State (7.11 MWh/yr) demands per capita. The natural gas demand per capita for the Project (250.54 therm/yr) is lower than both the Tulare County (337.62 therm/yr) and State (319.49 therm/yr) demands per capita. As previously noted, there are no development projects included in the Plan; as such, project-specific energy reducing features have not been included in the analysis. As future development project are identified, energy efficiency and conservation measures will be implemented in conjunction with Project design, including measures resulting from federal, State, and local mandates, as well as voluntary measures proposed by the project applicant. Compliance with the California Building Standards Code and CALGreen are considered demonstrable evidence of efficient use of energy. In addition, the progressive enhancements in building energy efficiency mandates resulting from regular updates to the California building codes will result in lower electrical and natural gas

consumption from the totals shown in **Table 3**. Energy would also be indirectly conserved through water efficient landscaping requirements. Solid waste recycling requirements applicable to both project construction and operation would reduce energy consumed in solid waste disposal. As such, it is anticipated that the Project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during construction and operation.

### Vehicle Fuel Consumption

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) reports that approximately 25.65 million automobiles, 8.01 million trucks, 434,671 trailer coaches (motor home/RV), 857,677 motorcycles, and 755,976 other vehicles (miscellaneous and fee exempt vehicles) were registered in the state in 2017, resulting in a total estimated 344.3 billion vehicles miles traveled (VMT). Within Tulare County, an estimated 3.67 million vehicle miles were traveled in 2016.

Operation of the Project would result in the daily consumption of vehicle fuel as residents and visitors would travel to and from the Project site. In order to estimate fuel consumption, it is necessary to estimate vehicle type(s), daily distance(s) travelled (in vehicle miles travelled (VMT)), and average fuel economy by vehicle type(s). According to the Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG), all of Tulare County averaged 10,650,825 million VMT/day.<sup>6</sup>

**Table 4** provides a comparison of State, County, and Project annual VMT (based on available 2017 data). As provided in **Table 4**, Project operation is anticipated to result in the generation of 636,813 VMT annually, or approximately 0.017 percent of the County's and 0.0002 percent of the State's 2017 annual VMT.

<b>Table 4</b>				
<b>Vehicle Miles Traveled</b>				
	Population	Total Annual VMT	Daily VMT (365 days/year)	Daily VMT per Capita
State of California	38,982,847 <sup>1</sup>	344,300,000,000 <sup>2</sup>	943,287,671	24.20
Tulare County	471,686 <sup>3</sup>	3,686,282,000 <sup>3</sup>	10,099,403	21.40
Proposed Project <sup>4</sup>	60	636,813	1745	29.08
1 Source: American FactFinder. State of California. (2017)				
2 Source: Caltrans Fact Booklet, June 2019. The 2019 report provided data for year 2017.				
3 Source: Caltrans. Tulare County Transportation Quick Facts (2017)				
4 Source: Project population and VMT see CalEEMod reports (Attachment A)				

**Tables 5 and 6** provides the vehicle fleet mix, VMT, and fuel consumption from the non-residential and residential components of the Project, respectively. Using vehicle fleet mix data provided in Attachment A and average fuel economy information provided by the Bureau of Transportation Statistics, the Project-generated annual VMT would result in the consumption of approximately 128,828 gallons of fuel per year.

---

<sup>6</sup> Tulare County Association of Government. E-mail received from Roberto Brady, Principal Regional Planner. August 6, 2019.

**Table 5**  
**Estimated Operational Fuel Consumption – Non-Residential<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Vehicle Type</b>	<b>Percent of Vehicle Trips<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Mitigated Annual VMT<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>National Average Fuel Economy (miles/gallon)<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Total Annual Fuel Consumption (gallons)</b>
Passenger Car	51.67	972,338	23.96	40,582
Light-Duty Vehicle	34.70	653,038	22.04	29,630
Light-Duty Truck/Van	4.86	91,535	17.40	5,261
Heavy-Duty Truck	7.82	147,213	6.64	22,171
Motorcycles	0.43	8,142	43.89	186
Buses	0.43	8,026	6.33	1,268
Other Vehicles	0.08	1,432	7.69	186
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1,881,725</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>99,282</b>

1 U.S. Department of Energy. Alternative Fuels Data Center. Average Fuel Economy of Major Vehicle Categories <https://afdc.energy.gov/data/10310>. Accessed October 2019.

2 Percentage of Vehicle Trips and Fleet Mix information provided by Attachment A. Passenger Car is the LDA fleet mix trip percentage column; Light Duty Vehicles is the sum of the LDT1, LDT2, and MDV fleet mix trip percentage columns; Light Duty Truck is the sum of LHD1, LHD2, and MHD fleet mix trip percentage columns; Heavy Duty Truck is the HHD fleet mix trip percentage columns, Buses is the sum of OBUS, SBUS and UBUS fleet mix trip percentage columns, Other is the MH fleet mix trip percentage column.

3 Annual VMT calculated from total mitigated VMT, which incorporates Project design features; See CalEEMod reports in Attachment A.

4 Average fuel economy based on average 2016 U.S. vehicle fuel efficiency (mpg) from Table 4-11: Light Duty Vehicle, Short Wheel Base and Motorcycle Fuel Consumption and Travel; Table 4-12: Average Light Duty Vehicle, Long Wheel Base Fuel Consumption and Travel, and Table 4-13: Single-Unit 2-Axle 6-Tire or More Truck Fuel Consumption and Travel of the National Transportation Statistics.

**Table 6**  
**Estimated Operational Fuel Consumption –Residential<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Vehicle Type</b>	<b>Percent of Vehicle Trips<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Mitigated Annual VMT<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>National Average Fuel Economy (miles/gallon)<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Total Annual Fuel Consumption (gallons)</b>
Passenger Car	53.73	342,160	23.96	14,280
Light-Duty Vehicle	42.13	268,289	22.04	12,173
Light-Duty Truck/Van	1.13	7,196	17.40	414
Heavy-Duty Truck	2.06	13,118	6.64	1,976
Motorcycles	0.26	1,656	43.89	38
Buses	0.53	3,375	6.33	533
Other Vehicles	0.16	1,019	7.69	132
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>636,813</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>29,546</b>

1 U.S. Department of Energy. Alternative Fuels Data Center. Average Fuel Economy of Major Vehicle Categories <https://afdc.energy.gov/data/10310>. Accessed October 2019.

2 Percentage of Vehicle Trips and Fleet Mix information provided by Attachment A. Passenger Car is the LDA fleet mix trip percentage column; Light Duty Vehicles is the sum of the LDT1, LDT2, and MDV fleet mix trip percentage columns; Light Duty Truck is the sum of LHD1, LHD2, and MHD fleet mix trip percentage columns; Heavy Duty Truck is the HHD fleet mix trip percentage columns, Buses is the sum of OBUS, SBUS and UBUS fleet mix trip percentage columns, Other is the MH fleet

**Table 6**  
**Estimated Operational Fuel Consumption –Residential<sup>1</sup>**

mix trip percentage column.
3 Annual VMT calculated from total mitigated VMT, which incorporates Project design features; See CalEEMod reports in Attachment A.
4 Average fuel economy based on average 2016 U.S. vehicle fuel efficiency (mpg) from Table 4-11: Light Duty Vehicle, Short Wheel Base and Motorcycle Fuel Consumption and Travel; Table 4-12: Average Light Duty Vehicle, Long Wheel Base Fuel Consumption and Travel, and Table 4-13: Single-Unit 2-Axle 6-Tire or More Truck Fuel Consumption and Travel of the National Transportation Statistics.

Daily VMT per capita for the Project (29.08 VMT) is slightly higher than Tulare County (21.41 VMT) and State (24.20) averages. VMT is used as an important indicator of the impact on the local circulation system and of a project's air quality impacts. Air quality impacts as described in the Air Quality section of this MND showed the impacts to be less than significant, and that Greenhouse Gas impacts comply with the County's Climate Action Plan. As future development projects are identified, project design features will be added for compliance with federal, State, and County regulations, which ultimately reduce VMT. The Project includes a Complete Streets component that identify where sidewalks, curbs, and gutters will connect existing uses; future developments will be required to comply with Tulare County building standards for sidewalks, streets, and parking lots. With the implementation of mandatory and voluntary VMT-reducing measures in future developments, the Project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Impacts are less than significant.

#### Energy Conservation Standards

Operation of the proposed Project would result in the demand for approximately 15,032 therms/yr of natural gas and 803 MWh/yr of electricity (see **Table 3**), and 128,828 gallons/yr of vehicle fuel (see **Tables 5** and **6**). Based on existing energy demands, the Project's estimated operational demand for electricity represents 0.018 percent of SCE's and 0.0096 percent of SoCal Gas' total 2018 energy demands for the County. Further, additional vehicle fuel demand under operation of the Project would result in an increase in statewide fuel demand by less than 0.0006 percent.<sup>7</sup>

Based on comparisons of the Project's energy demands with statewide and regional demand and service capacity in total and per capita (**Table 3**), the proposed Project is not expected to result in the use of a large amount of energy in an unnecessary, wasteful, or inefficient manner, nor would it affect regional supplies or peak/base periods of demand as the estimated energy demand is typical for a Project of this size, and would result in a negligible increase in regional energy demands. As such, the proposed Project would not necessitate the expansion of existing facilities or construction of new energy generation or transmission facilities. Furthermore, future development projects would be required to implement and be consistent with existing energy design standards at the local and state level. The Project would be subject to energy conservation requirements in the California Energy Code and CALGreen. Adherence to state code requirements would ensure that the Project would not result in wasteful and inefficient use of non-renewable resources due to building operation.

---

<sup>7</sup> Based on State of California 2016 annual consumption of 15,507,693,865 gallons of gasoline. See Federal Highway Administration Table MF-33GA. <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policyinformation/motorfuel/jun17/jun17.pdf>. Accessed October 2019.

When considering the potential for the Project to result in greater conservation of electricity, natural gas, and transportation fuel through the implementation of proposed Project design features and required mitigation measures not quantified above, the proposed Project has a low potential to result in adverse impacts on energy resources and conservation. Therefore, the direct impacts to energy resources and conservation are less than significant.

No development projects are proposed as part of the Plan. Future developments within the Project planning area will be required to undergo additional CEQA evaluation on a project-by-project basis at such time development is proposed to determine potential environmental impacts. Therefore, the Project will not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. The Project will have a ***Less Than Significant Project-specific Impact*** related to this Checklist Item.

Cumulative Impact Analysis:      ***Less Than Significant Impact***

The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is Tulare County. The proposed Project would incrementally contribute to adverse impacts on energy resource demand and conservation when considering the cumulative impact of concurrently planned projects; however, future development projects within the Project study area will be required to comply with local, regional, state, and federal policies designed to reduce wasteful energy consumption, and improve overall energy conservation and sustainability. For instance, all local projects involving the development of new buildings must be designed to conform to CALGreen and the 2019 California Energy Code. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts would result in a significantly considerable wasteful use of energy resources, such that the Project, and other cumulative projects, would have a cumulative effect on energy conservation. The proposed Project will not have a direct or cumulative impact, or create wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Therefore, the Project will result in a ***Less Than Significant Cumulative Impact*** related to this Checklist Item.

Mitigation Measures:      ***None Required***

Conclusion:      ***Less Than Significant Impact***

As previously noted, the Project will not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Therefore, ***Less Than Significant Project-specific and Cumulative Impacts*** related to this Checklist Item will occur.

**b) Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?**

Project Impact Analysis:      ***No Impact***

The proposed Project is development of a Community Plan. The Plan contains various policies that encourage future development to incorporate energy efficient features into the project design, require the County to participate in energy reduction programs when feasible, and encourages the development of alternative energy resources, such as wind and solar facilities, when appropriately sited. Furthermore, no development projects are proposed as part of the Plan.

As such, the Plan itself will not result in conflicts or obstructions with state or local plan for energy consumption.

The following Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update policies for this resource apply to this Project: *ERM-4.1 Energy Conservation and Efficiency Measures* wherein the County encourages the use of solar energy, solar hot water panels, and other energy conservation and efficiency features; *ERM-4.3 Local and State Programs* wherein the County shall participate, to the extent feasible, in local and State programs that strive to reduce the consumption of natural or man-made energy sources; *ERM-4.3 Local and State Programs* wherein the County shall participate, to the extent feasible, in local and State programs that strive to reduce the consumption of natural or man-made energy sources; and *ERM-4.6 Renewable Energy* wherein the County shall support efforts, when appropriately sited, for the development and use of alternative energy resources, including renewable energy such as wind and solar, biofuels and co-generation. As the Plan requires future development to comply with and implement the General Plan 2030 Update within the community, the Project does not conflict with any local plan for energy consumption.

Energy efficiency and conservation measures will be implemented on a project-by-project basis in conjunction with project design and operation, including measures resulting from federal, State, and local mandates, as well as voluntary measures proposed by project applicants. Government-mandated measures include increasingly stringent state and federal regulatory actions addressing vehicle fuel economies and vehicle emissions standards. Compliance with the California Building Standards Code and CALGreen requirements are considered demonstrable evidence of efficient use of energy. In addition, the progressive enhancements in building energy efficiency mandates resulting from regular updates to the California building codes will result in lower electrical and natural gas consumption from those identified in Checklist Item a) above. Energy would also be indirectly conserved through water efficient landscaping requirements consistent with the Tulare County Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance. Stringent solid waste recycling requirements applicable to both project construction and operation would reduce energy consumed in solid waste disposal. In summary, future developments will implement all mandatory federal, State, and local conservation measures and, project design features and voluntary energy conservation measures will further reduce energy demands. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. The Project will have ***No Project-specific Impact*** related to this Checklist Item.

Cumulative Impact Analysis:      ***No Impact***

The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is Tulare County. The proposed Project would incrementally contribute to adverse impacts on energy resource demand and conservation when considering the cumulative impact of concurrently planned projects; however, future development projects within the Project study area will be required to comply with local, regional, state, and federal policies designed to reduce energy consumption and improve overall energy conservation and sustainability. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct any plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. The Project will result in a ***No Cumulative Impact*** related to this Checklist Item.

Mitigation Measures:                      ***None Required***

Conclusion:                                      ***No Impact***

As previously noted, the Project will not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Therefore, ***No Project-specific and Cumulative Impacts*** related to this Checklist Item will occur.

[This page intentionally left blank]



# **Greenhouse Gas Technical Memorandum**

[This page intentionally left blank]



# RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY

5961 SOUTH MOONEY BLVD  
VISALIA, CA 93277  
PHONE (559) 624-7000  
FAX (559) 730-2653

Aaron R. Bock  
Reed Schenke  
Sherman Dix

Economic Development and Planning  
Public Works  
Fiscal Services

## TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM GREENHOUSE GAS ASSESSMENT

**DATE:** November 1, 2019

**TO:** Hector Guerra, Chief Environmental Planner

**FROM:** Jessica Willis, Planner IV

**SUBJECT:** Greenhouse Gas Assessment for the Lemon Cove Community Plan (GPA 17-007, PZC 17-007, PZC 19-016, PZC 19-017)

### PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ASSESSMENT

This document is intended to assist Tulare County Resource Management Agency (RMA) staff in the preparation of the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) component of the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) being prepared for the Lemon Cove Community Plan (Project). The assessment is intended to provide sufficient detail regarding potential impacts of Project implementation and to identify mitigation measures, if necessary, to reduce potentially significant impacts.

The GHG assessment was prepared to evaluate whether the estimated GHG emissions generated from the implementation of the Project (i.e., future development projects) would cause significant impacts on global climate change. The assessment was conducted within the context of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA, California Public Resources Code Sections 21000, et seq.). The methodology for the GHG assessment follows Air District recommendations for quantification of GHG emissions and evaluation of potential impacts on global climate change as provided in their guidance documents:

- *Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (GAMAQI)*, adopted March 19, 2015.<sup>1</sup>
- *Guidance for Valley Land-use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Project under CEQA*, adopted December 17, 2009.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Air District. Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts. March 19, 2015. [http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/GAMAQI\\_3-19-15.pdf](http://www.valleyair.org/transportation/GAMAQI_3-19-15.pdf). Accessed November 1, 2019.

<sup>2</sup> Air District. Guidance for Valley Land-use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Project under CEQA. December 17, 2009. <https://www.valleyair.org/Programs/CCAP/12-17-09/3%20CCAP%20-%20FINAL%20LU%20Guidance%20-%20Dec%2017%202009.pdf>. Accessed November 1, 2019.

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Lemon Cove is currently designated an Unincorporated Community in the 2030 Tulare County General Plan. The objective of the Lemon Cove Community Plan (Plan) is to develop a plan, which can accurately reflect the needs and priorities of the unincorporated community of Lemon Cove. The Land Use and Circulation portions of this Plan provide the mechanism to minimize or avoid the potential adverse impacts of urban growth. The development of an orderly, harmonious land use pattern and appropriate implementation measures are designed to reduce potential conflict between neighboring uses across Tulare County's 2030 planning horizon, consistent with the Tulare County 2030 General Plan Update. The Plan is needed to increase the availability of infrastructure funding, such as drinking water system improvements (wells, water distribution piping, storage tanks, etc.), wastewater system (such as piping, lift stations, etc.), and public work/safety improvements (such as curbs, gutters, sidewalks, etc.), and to stimulate economic development within the community.

Tulare County is proposing new land use and zoning designations within an expanded UDB. The proposed Community Plan, if adopted, will update these designations to be consistent with the General Plan, and will bring existing non-compliant properties into conformity with the Tulare County Zoning Ordinance. The Community Plan also includes the Complete Streets and Road Maintenance programs and the community's anticipated growth through year 2030 based on the existing land uses, census population data, and the projected 1.3% annual growth rate in unincorporated areas of Tulare County. Other than the Complete Streets and Road Maintenance Programs, there are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) proposed as part of this Project. As an unknown number of proposals may occur within the lifetime of the Plan, the Plan is intended to direct the density, intensity, and types of growth needed to meet the needs of the community. Future developments within the Project planning area will be required to undergo additional CEQA evaluation on a project-by-project basis at such time development is proposed to determine potential environmental impacts.

### **Complete Streets and Road Maintenance**

The Lemon Cove Complete Streets and Road Maintenance Programs are included in the Circulation Element of the proposed Community Plan. The Complete Streets Program has thoroughly analyzed the alternative forms of transportation, including transit, bicycle ways, and pedestrian circulation. Improvements proposed in the Complete Streets Program include, but are not limited to, installation of streetlights, bus shelters, street signage and striping, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, drainage system, and utilities. Road maintenance activities vary by road segment dependent upon the condition of the road and may include chip seal, overlay resurfacing, and asphalt reconstructions.

### **Growth Projections**

There are no specific development projects proposed with the Lemon Cove Community Plan; however, the Plan does include updates to land use designations that could increase the buildout potential of the planning area. Population and residential growth through planning horizon year 2030 was estimated by applying a 1.3% annual growth rate, consistent with the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, to the 2017 baseline population and housing data, as provided in the United

States Census Bureau 2017 American Community Survey (ACS).<sup>3</sup> Non-residential growth was estimated through planning horizon year 2030 for a worst-case emissions scenario by applying a 1.3% annual growth rate to the existing uses and assuming all parcels have been improved with structures at a floor to area ratio of 0.20. Using these assumptions for baseline conditions provides a conservative (larger) overall growth estimate. **Table 1** summarizes the projected growth of the community through horizon Year 2030.

<b>Table 1. Projected Growth through Year 2030</b>								
	Residential <sup>1</sup>		Commercial / Public / Other <sup>2</sup>		Retail <sup>2</sup>		Industrial <sup>2</sup>	
Year	Population	Dwelling Units	Square Feet	Acres	Square Feet	Acres	Square Feet	Acres
2017	232	115	277,129	31.81	65,079	7.47	15,507	1.78
2030	274	136	327,797	37.63	76,977	8.84	18,343	2.11
Overall Growth	42	21	50,668	5.85	11,898	1.37	2,835	0.33
<sup>1</sup> Projections based on 2017 American Community Survey data applying an annual growth rate of 1.3%.								
<sup>2</sup> Projections based on existing land uses assuming developments/improvements with a Floor to Area Ratio of 0.2 and annual growth rate of 1.3%.								

## SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS

CEQA Guidelines define a significant effect on the environment as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project.<sup>4</sup> To determine if a project would have a significant impact on climate change, the type, level, and impact of GHG emissions generated by the Project must be evaluated. Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines provides the criteria (as Checklist Items) for evaluating potential impacts on the environment. The CEQA criteria and the Air District's significance thresholds and guidance for evaluation are provided below.

### 2008 Climate Change Scoping Plan

The California State Legislature adopted Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32) on September 27, 2006. AB 32 focuses on reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020 and to 80% below 1990 levels by the year 2050. Pursuant to the requirements in AB 32, the ARB adopted the Climate Change Scoping Plan (2008 Scoping Plan), which outlines actions recommended to obtain that goal. The 2008 Scoping Plan calls for an “ambitious but achievable” reduction in California’s GHG emissions, cutting emissions approximately 29% from BAU emission levels projected for 2020, or about 10% from 2008 levels. On a per capita basis, that means reducing annual

---

<sup>3</sup> United States Census Bureau. American FactFinder. 2017 American Community Survey. 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Demographic and Housing Estimates (DP05) and Selected Housing Characteristics (DP04). [https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community\\_facts.xhtml](https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml). Accessed November 1, 2019.

<sup>4</sup> CEQA §§ 15002(g), 15382

emissions of 14 tons of carbon dioxide for every man, woman, and child in California down to about 10 tons per person by 2020.<sup>5</sup>

### **2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan**

The California State Legislature adopted Senate Bill 32 (SB 32) on September 8, 2016. SB 32 focuses on reducing GHG emissions to 40% below 1990 levels by the year 2030. Pursuant to the requirements in SB 32, the ARB adopted the Climate Change Scoping Plan Update (2017 Scoping Plan), which outlines actions recommended to obtain that goal. ARB recommends statewide targets of no more than six (6) metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e per capita by 2030 and no more than two (2) metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e per capita by 2050.<sup>6</sup>

### **Air District Guidance**

“On December 17, 2009, the District’s Governing Board adopted the District Policy: *Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for Stationary Source Projects Under CEQA When Serving as the Lead Agency*. The District’s Governing Board also approved the guidance document: *Guidance for Valley Land-Use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Projects Under CEQA*. In support of the policy and guidance document, District staff prepared a staff report: *Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions Under the California Environmental Quality Act*. These documents adopted in December of 2009 continue to be the relevant policies to address GHG emissions under CEQA. As these documents may be modified under a separate process, the latest versions should be referenced to determine the District’s current guidance at the time of analyzing a particular project.”<sup>7</sup>

“It is widely recognized that no single project could generate enough GHG emissions to noticeably change the global climate temperature. However, the combination of GHG emissions from past, present and future projects could contribute substantially to global climate change. Thus, project specific GHG emissions should be evaluated in terms of whether or not they would result in a cumulatively significant impact on global climate change. GHG emissions, and their associated contribution to climate change, are inherently a cumulative impact issue. Therefore, project-level impacts of GHG emissions are treated as one-in-the-same as cumulative impacts.

In summary, the staff report evaluates different approaches for assessing significance of GHG emission impacts. As presented in the report, District staff reviewed the relevant scientific information and concluded that the existing science is inadequate to support quantification of the extent to which project specific GHG emissions would impact global climate features such as average air temperature, average rainfall, or average annual snow pack. In other words, the District was not able to determine a specific quantitative level of GHG emissions increase, above which a project would have a significant impact on the environment, and below which would have an insignificant impact. This is readily understood, when one considers that global climate change is the result of the sum total of GHG emissions, both manmade and natural that occurred in the past; that is occurring now; and will occur in the future.

---

<sup>5</sup> Climate Change Scoping Plan website: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/document/scopingplandocument.htm>. Accessed November 1, 2019.

<sup>6</sup> ARB, California’s 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan, Page 99, [https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scoping\\_plan\\_2017.pdf](https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scoping_plan_2017.pdf). Accessed November 1, 2019.

<sup>7</sup> Air District, GAMAQI, Section 8.9, Page 110

In the absence of scientific evidence supporting establishment of a numerical threshold, the District policy applies performance based standards to assess project-specific GHG emission impacts on global climate change. The determination is founded on the principal that projects whose emissions have been reduced or mitigated consistent with the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as “AB 32”, should be considered to have a less than significant impact on global climate change. For a detailed discussion of the District’s establishment of thresholds of significance for GHG emissions, and the District’s application of said thresholds, the reader is referred to the above referenced staff report, District Policy, and District Guidance documents.”<sup>8</sup>

“As presented in Figure 6 (Process of Determining Significance of Greenhouse Gas Emissions) [of the GAMAQI], the policy provides for a tiered approach in assessing significance of project specific GHG emission increases.

- Projects complying with an approved GHG emission reduction plan or GHG mitigation program which avoids or substantially reduces GHG emissions within the geographic area in which the project is located would be determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact for GHG emissions. Such plans or programs must be specified in law or approved by the Lead Agency with jurisdiction over the affected resource and supported by a CEQA compliant environmental review document adopted by the Lead Agency. Projects complying with an approved GHG emission reduction plan or GHG mitigation program would not be required to implement Best Performance Standards (BPS).
- Projects implementing BPS would not require quantification of project specific GHG emissions. Consistent with CEQA Guideline, such projects would be determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact for GHG emissions.
- Projects not implementing BPS would require quantification of project specific GHG emissions and demonstration that project specific GHG emissions would be reduced or mitigated by at least 29%, compared to Business as Usual (BAU), including GHG emission reductions achieved since the 2002-2004 baseline period, consistent with GHG emission reduction targets established in ARB’s AB 32 Scoping Plan. Projects achieving at least a 29% GHG emission reduction compared to BAU would be determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact for GHG.

The District guidance for development projects also relies on the use of BPS. For development projects, BPS includes project design elements, land use decisions, and technologies that reduce GHG emissions. Projects implementing any combination of BPS, and/or demonstrating a total 29 percent reduction in GHG emissions from business-as-usual (BAU), would be determined to have a less than cumulatively significant impact on global climate change.”<sup>9</sup>

The Air District’s *Guidance for Valley Land-use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Project under CEQA* states, “Projects implementing Best Performance Standards in accordance with this guidance would be determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact on global climate change and would not require project specific quantification of GHG emissions. Projects exempt from the requirements of CEQA, and projects complying with an approved GHG emission reduction plan or mitigation program would also be determined

---

<sup>8</sup> Air District, GAMAQI, Section 8.9.1, Pages 111-112

<sup>9</sup> Air District, GAMAQI, Section 8.9.1, Page 112

to have a less than significant individual or cumulative impact. Such plans or programs must be specified in law or adopted by the public agency with jurisdiction over the affected resources and have a certified final CEQA document. Projects not implementing BPS would require quantification of project specific GHG emissions. To be determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact on global climate changes, such projects must be determined to have reduced or mitigated GHG emissions by 29%, consistent with GHG emission reduction targets established in ARB's AB 32 Scoping Plan. Furthermore, quantification of GHG emissions would be expected for all projects for which the lead agency has determined that an Environmental Impact Report is required, regardless of whether the project incorporates Best Performance Standards.”<sup>10</sup>

“If total GHG emissions reductions measures add up to 29% or more, are enforceable, and are required as a part of the development's approval process, the project achieves the Best Performance Standard (BPS) for the respective type of development project. Thus, the GHG emissions from the development project would be determined to have a less than individually and cumulatively significant impact on global climate change for CEQA purposes.”<sup>11</sup>

“By definition, BPS for development projects is achieving a project-by-project 29% reduction in GHG emissions, compared to BAU. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that Lead Agencies implementing the proposed *Guidance for Valley Land-use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Projects under CEQA* threshold will achieve an overall reduction in GHG emissions consistent with AB 32 emission reduction targets...”<sup>12</sup>

**Figure 1** provides a visual summary of the Air District's process for determining significance of project-related GHG emissions.

---


<sup>10</sup> Air District, Guidance for Valley Land-use Agencies, Page 4

<sup>11</sup> Air District, Guidance for Valley Land-use Agencies, Pages 7-8

<sup>12</sup> Air District, Guidance for Valley Land-use Agencies, Page 8



**Figure 1. Process of Determining Significance of Greenhouse Gas Emissions**



Source: Air District, GAMAQI, Figure 6, Page 113

The Air District’s guidance document was adopted to provide a basis for lead agencies to establish significance thresholds consistent with ARB’s 2008 Scoping Plan. The Air District currently does not have a recommendation for establishing thresholds or assessing significance consistent with the reduction requirements established in ARB’s 2017 Scoping Plan Update, which requires a 33.2% reduction from BAU to achieve the 2030 target. As such, Tulare County prepared and adopted the Tulare County 2018 Climate Action Plan (CAP) Update.

“The CAP serves as a guiding document for County of Tulare (“County”) actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the potential effects of climate change. The CAP is an implementation measure of the 2030 General Plan Update. The General Plan provides the supporting framework for development in the County to produce fewer greenhouse gas emissions during Plan buildout. The CAP builds on the General Plan’s framework with more specific actions that will be applied to achieve emission reduction targets consistent with California legislation.”<sup>13</sup>

“The County of Tulare (County) adopted the Tulare County Climate Action Plan (CAP) in August 2012. The CAP includes provisions for an update when the State of California Air Resources Board (CARB) adopts a Scoping Plan Update that provides post-2020 targets for the State and an updated strategy for achieving a 2030 target. Governor Brown signed Senate Bill (SB) 32 on September 8, 2016 which contains the new 2030 target. The CARB 2017 Scoping Plan Update for the Senate Bill (SB) 32 2030 targets was adopted by the CARB on December

<sup>13</sup> Tulare County Climate Action Plan, December 2018 Update. Page 1.  
<http://generalplan.co.tulare.ca.us/documents/GP/001Adopted%20Tulare%20County%20General%20Plan%20Materials/220Climate%20Action%20Plan/CLIMATE%20ACTION%20PLAN%202018%20UPDATE.pdf>. Accessed November 1, 2019.

14, 2017 which provided new emission inventories and a comprehensive strategy for achieving the 2030 target (CARB 2017a). With the adoption of the 2017 Scoping Plan, the County proceeded with the 2018 CAP Update that is provided in this document.

The 2018 CAP Update incorporates new baseline and future year inventories to reflect the latest information and updates the County's strategy to address the SB 32 2030 target. The 2030 target requires the State to reduce emissions by 40 percent below 1990 levels from the 2017 Scoping Plan and County data. The CAP identifies the County's fair share of reductions required to maintain consistency with the State target."<sup>14</sup>

## IMPACT EVALUATION

### **a) Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?**

Project Impact Analysis:                      *Less Than Significant Impact*

The Air District has determined that projects consistent with an adopted Climate Action Plan (CAP) would be considered to have a less than significant impact on the environment. The Tulare County CAP was initially adopted in August 2012 and serves as a guiding document for County actions to reduce GHG emissions and adapt to the potential effects of climate change. The CAP is an implementation measure of the Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update (General Plan) which provides the supporting framework for development in the County. The CAP builds on the General Plan's framework with more specific actions that will be applied to achieve emission reduction targets required by State of California legislation. The General Plan fulfills many sustainability and GHG reduction objectives at the program level. The CAP identifies the policies from the various General Plan elements that promote more efficient development, and reduce travel and energy consumption. The CAP requires projects achieve reductions in excess of the reduction identified in the Scoping Plan. The CAP identifies General Plan policies in place to assist the County in reducing GHG emissions. The 2018 CAP Update incorporates new baseline and future year inventories to reflect the latest information and updates the County's strategy to address the SB 32 2030 target. The CAP identifies the County's fair share of reductions required to maintain consistency with the State's target.

The CAP thresholds for determining consistency with the CAP are 500 dwelling units, 100,000 square feet of retail, or equivalent intensity for other uses. These thresholds are the amounts currently required from development related sources within the County to demonstrate consistency with SB 32 2030 targets. Projects exceeding the consistency thresholds must comply with the requirements of the CAP, which requires a GHG analysis report demonstrating emission reductions of at least 31% below 2015 levels by 2030 or a 9% reduction from 2030 BAU emissions. As the CAP implements the County's strategy to achieve the State's 2030 reduction targets, projects below the consistency thresholds have been determined to be consistent with the State's targets and do not require GHG emissions quantification. Projects below the consistency thresholds would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

There are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) associated with the Community Plan. As such, the proposed Project will not result in GHG emissions until specific development occurs. Future developments would be required to comply with the CAP. The CAP states, “The 2018 CAP Update includes an additional method of determining project consistency with the CAP and 2030 targets. Projects subject to CEQA review could use a checklist containing design features and measures that are needed to determine consistency. Large projects (500-unit subdivisions and 100,000 square feet of retail or equivalent intensity for other uses) and new specific plans should provide a greenhouse gas analysis report quantifying GHG emissions to demonstrate that the project emissions are at least 31 percent below 2015 levels by 2030 or 9 percent below BAU emissions in 2030. These are the amounts currently required from development related sources to demonstrate consistency with SB 32 2030 targets. Smaller projects may also prepare a GHG analysis report if the checklist is not appropriate for a particular project or is deemed necessary by the project proponent or County staff. The GHG analysis should incorporate as many measures as possible from the CalEEMod mitigation component as described in Table 15 [of the 2018 CAP] and can take credit for 2017 Scoping Plan measures that have not been incorporated into CalEEMod but that will be adopted prior to 2030 such as 50 percent RPS.”<sup>15</sup>

“The County has already approved a substantial number of lots for development. Development of some of these lots will be limited by various factors such as water supply, sewer/septic capability, road capacity, etc. that cannot be addressed during the planning horizon due to lack of resources. This means that the County expects that new development proposals will be received that are more likely to develop before existing lots are developed because the rural community, landowner, or developer has the resources to provide all improvements and services required for the site. As a rough estimate, this analysis assumes that 40 percent of the development will occur on existing lots and 60 percent will occur in new developments. Development occurring on existing lots will be subject to existing conditions of the approved subdivision and zoning standards. Development occurring in new subdivisions and projects [after 2012] would be subject to additional measures required to mitigate significant impacts. The County will encourage developers of existing lots [established prior to 2012] to implement measures that reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but it has no authority to require additional reductions beyond those required by State regulation, the building code, and local ordinance.”<sup>16</sup>

“Commercial and industrial development in Tulare County during the 2020 and 2030 planning timeframes will comply with increasingly stringent State energy efficiency regulations in most projects. For industrial projects where the SJVAPCD is a Responsible Agency, the project will be expected to implement Best Performance Standards included in the SJVAPCD Guidelines for Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions on the processes and stationary equipment that emit greenhouse gases to levels that meet or exceed State targets and may be subject to Cap-and-Trade Program requirements.”<sup>17</sup>

There are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) associated with the Community. As indicated in **Table 1**, projected future growth based on the County’s 1.3% annual growth rate is 21 residential units, 62,566 sf of commercial/retail/office space, and 2,668 sf of industrial space. Projected growth through horizon year 2030 is below the

---

<sup>15</sup> Op. Cit. 73

<sup>16</sup> Op. Cit. 76

<sup>17</sup> Op. Cit. 76

CAP consistency thresholds of 500 dwelling units, 100,000 square feet of retail, or equivalent intensity for other uses. As the Project falls below the CAP consistency thresholds, the Project would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. However, the air quality emissions reports include quantification of GHG emissions (see Attachment “A”). Project-related emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), Version 2016.3.2, and are summarized and provided below for informational purposes only. **Table 2** provides the Project’s construction-related GHG emission while **Table 3** provides the operations-related GHG emissions.

The Air District does not have a recommendation for lead agencies in assessing the significance of construction related GHG emissions. Emissions from construction would be temporary; however, to account for the construction emissions, the emissions were amortized based on the average life of all future development (30 years) and added to the operational emissions.

<b>TABLE 2. CONSTRUCTION-RELATED GHG EMISSIONS (mitigated)</b>	
	CO <sub>2e</sub> Emissions (metric tons per year)
Construction Total	608.90
<b>Amortized Annual Emissions</b>	<b>20.30</b>
<i>Note: Amortized emissions are based on a 30-year life for all developments. Source: See Attachment “A”.</i>	

<b>TABLE 3. OPERATIONS-RELATED GHG EMISSIONS (metric tons per year)</b>			
	CO <sub>2e</sub> Emissions (unmitigated)	CO <sub>2e</sub> Emissions (mitigated)	% Reduction
Total Operations	1,787.06	1,674.65	6.29
Amortized Annual Emissions	20.30	20.30	0.00
Total Project Emissions	1,807.36	1,694.95	6.22
<i>Note: Amortized emissions are based on a 30-year life for all developments. Source: See Attachment “A”.</i>			

As demonstrated in Table 3, the Project achieves an approximately 6.22% reduction in GHG emissions through compliance with current regulation. As future development is unknown, the analysis was performed assuming a worst-case emissions scenario, that is, that all future development would be developed in one phase beginning in 2020. The analysis did not include GHG reductions from compliance with Renewable Portfolio Standards for energy producers or from compliance with 2019 California Building Code or Green Building Standards. Also, as future development is unknown, incorporation of project-specific design features that would reduce GHG emissions cannot be incorporated into the emissions analysis. Therefore, the emissions reductions presented above underestimate the actual reductions that would be achieved on a project-by-project basis. As such, the Project demonstrates continued progress towards the County achieving the 2017 Scoping Plan Update 2030 reduction requirements with an overall GHG reduction. Furthermore, the State anticipates increases in the number of zero emission

vehicles operated in the State under the Advanced Clean Car Program. Compliance with SB 375 reduction targets for light duty vehicles will provide continued reductions in emissions from that source through SB 375's 2035 milestone year. The Project will provide a GHG emission reduction benefit as future buildout of the community will supply residents within the Lemon Cove UDB and immediate vicinity with greater shopping and employment opportunities, thereby reducing vehicle miles traveled from travelling to larger communities/cities for such opportunities. Since future development projects would undergo additional CEQA review, the Project will continue to comply with existing and future regulations, and the General Plan, Community Plan, and CAP will continue to be implemented through 2030, the growth projected for 2030 would not result in significant greenhouse gas impacts. Therefore, ***Less Than Significant Project-specific Impacts*** related to this Checklist Item will occur.

Cumulative Impact Analysis:      ***Less Than Significant Impact***

The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin. Project-related emissions would be considered to have a significant cumulative impact if project-specific impacts are determined to be significant. As previously noted, there are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) associated with the Community Plan. Future developments would be required to comply with the CAP. The Project is consistent with the Tulare County CAP and as such, is consistent with the reduction targets established in the Scoping Plan. As the proposed Project would result in Less Than Significant Project-specific Impacts, ***Less Than Significant Cumulative Impacts*** would also occur.

Mitigation Measures:      ***None Required***

Conclusion:      ***Less Than Significant Impact***

As previously noted, the Project is consistent with the Tulare County CAP and the reduction targets established in the Scoping Plan. As such, the Project would not generate GHG emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment. ***Less Than Significant Project-specific and Cumulative Impacts*** related to this Checklist Item will occur.

**b) Would the project conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?**

Impact Analysis:      ***Less Than Significant Impact***

Since the proposed Project is located in an unincorporated area of Tulare County, the most applicable GHG plans are the Tulare County Climate Action Plan and ARB's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan. As previously noted, the CAP, initially adopted in August 2012, serves as a guiding document for County actions to reduce GHG emissions and adapt to the potential effects of climate change. The CAP is an implementation measure of the Tulare County General Plan which provides the supporting framework for development in the County. The CAP builds on the General Plan's framework with more specific actions that will be applied to achieve emission reduction targets required by State of California legislation. The General Plan fulfills many sustainability and GHG reduction objectives at the program level. The CAP identifies the policies from the various General Plan elements that promote more efficient development, and reduce travel and energy consumption. The CAP requires projects achieve reductions in excess

of the reduction identified in the Scoping Plan. The CAP identifies General Plan policies in place to assist the County in reducing GHG emissions. The 2018 CAP Update incorporates new baseline and future year inventories to reflect the latest information and updates the County's strategy to address the SB 32 2030 target. The CAP identifies the County's fair share of reductions required to maintain consistency with the State's target.

"The 2018 CAP Update includes an additional method of determining project consistency with the CAP and 2030 targets. Projects subject to CEQA review could use a checklist containing design features and measures that are needed to determine consistency. Large projects (500-unit subdivisions and 100,000 square feet of retail or equivalent intensity for other uses) and new specific plans should provide a greenhouse gas analysis report quantifying GHG emissions to demonstrate that the project emissions are at least 31 percent below 2015 levels by 2030 or 9 percent below BAU emissions in 2030. These are the amounts currently required from development related sources to demonstrate consistency with SB 32 2030 targets. Smaller projects may also prepare a GHG analysis report if the checklist is not appropriate for a particular project or is deemed necessary by the project proponent or County staff. The GHG analysis should incorporate as many measures as possible from the CalEEMod mitigation component as described in Table 15 and can take credit for 2017 Scoping Plan measures that have not been incorporated into CalEEMod but that will be adopted prior to 2030 such as 50 percent RPS.

Table 17 [of the 2018 CAP] lists the overarching consistency requirements for all projects based on consistency with County land use plans that apply to the project location. Reviews for consistency with land use plans require planning staff to review projects to determine if they comply with applicable plan policies and implementation measures."<sup>18</sup>

<b>TABLE 4. CEQA PROJECT REQUIREMENTS FOR CONSISTENCY WITH CAP</b>	
<b>Item</b>	<b>Required</b>
Project helps to meet the density goals from the Tulare Blueprint	Yes
Consistency with General Plan policies	Yes
Consistency with Rural Valley Lands Plan or Foothill Growth Management Plan development criteria	Yes
Consistency with Urban Growth Boundary expansion criteria	Yes
Consistency for development within Rural Community Urban Development Boundaries (UDB) and Hamlet Development Boundaries (HDB), and Legacy Development Boundaries (LDB)	Yes
Note: Criteria as identified in the General Plan Planning Framework Source: 2018 CAP Update, Table 17, page 73	

"A more detailed review for compliance with CAP measures is required to ensure that a project is doing its part in reducing emissions. Table 18 [of the 2018 CAP] provides a checklist containing measures that will provide reductions necessary to achieve CAP consistency. A project checklist that can be used by staff is provided as Appendix C."<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> .Op. Cit. 73.

<sup>19</sup> Op. Cit. 73

**TABLE 5. CAP CONSISTENCY CHECKLIST**

<b>CAP Measure</b>	<b>Compliance</b>
<b>Land Use:</b> Project is consistent with the Tulare County General Plan policies listed in the CAP applicable to GHG emissions and sustainability.	Review for compliance during project review process.
<b>Land Use—Residential:</b> Subdivisions and multifamily projects propose densities consistent with County commitments for the Tulare Blueprint. Densities in subdivisions within the boundaries of Valley rural communities must be at least 5.0 units per acre. (County R-1 zoning has a 6,000 square foot minimum lot size or 7.26 units per gross acre). Overall residential density is 5.3 units per acre for the entire County including the cities. Mountain subdivisions over 50 lots require review to determine if they are consistent with the Blueprint.	Review development plans during project review to determine if densities are consistent with Blueprint.
<b>Land Use—Non-Residential:</b> Retail and office projects should be constructed within the boundaries of Rural Communities, HDB, UDB, LDB, and in designated transportation corridors to provide needed local goods services to residents and the traveling public. Agricultural industrial projects may be constructed in rural locations as long as consistent with the General Plan.	Review development plans to ensure locations are appropriate for type of project that is proposed and consistent with County plans.
<b>Land Use Design:</b> Projects that require construction of new roads or major intersection improvements provide a fair share of improvements such as sidewalks and pedestrian friendly crossings, and bike lanes/paths connecting to schools, shopping, and other uses consistent with County development standards.	Include roadway improvements as conditions of approval of subdivision or commercial site plan
<b>Energy Efficiency:</b> Project complies with current version of Title 24. (Current version is 2016 Title 24)	Provide copy of the Title 24 Report demonstrating compliance with the applicable standards with Building Permit application.
<b>Renewable Energy:</b> Project includes solar panels or other alternative energy source meeting County Solar Ordinance or new Title 24 standards whichever is more stringent.	Include solar on building plans and provide Title 24 compliance reports with Building Permit applications.
<b>EV Charging:</b> Project meets charging installation/charging ready requirements of the CalGreen Code.	Include charging in building plans
<b>CalGreen Building Code Water:</b> Project complies with indoor and outdoor water conservation measures.	Provide copy of report showing code compliance.
<b>Water Conservation Landscaping:</b>	Project complies with County water conservation ordinance requirements for landscaping.
<b>Solid Waste:</b> Project has access to recycling service for homes and businesses meeting CalRecycle requirements.	County verify that providers are in compliance with CalRecycle

	regulations regarding recycling and diversion of solid waste.
<b>Large Employment Projects:</b> Projects that will have large numbers of employees (over 100) are required to comply with Rule 9410 Employee Trip Reduction Plans (ETRIP). Provide a copy of the ETRIP plan to the County after approval of the plan by the SJVAPCD.	Employer is responsible for compliance with Rule 9410
<b>Industrial Projects:</b> Industrial projects that are large employers will comply with Rule 9410. Industrial process related GHG emissions are not under the County's regulatory authority but will require permits from the SJVAPCD and may be subject to Cap-and-Trade.	Employer is responsible for compliance with Rule 9410
Note: Criteria as identified in the General Plan Planning Framework Source: 2018 CAP Update, Table 18, pages 73-74	

As the County CAP requires projects to achieve reductions in excess of the reductions required in the Scoping Plan and by State legislation, projects that are consistent with the County CAP would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for reducing GHG emissions. There are no specific development projects (such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses) associated with the proposed Community Plan. Future developments will be required to comply with the requirements of the Tulare County CAP. Therefore, the Project does not conflict with the reduction strategies included in the Scoping Plan. ***Less Than Significant Project-specific Impacts*** related to this Checklist Item will occur.

Cumulative Impact Analysis: ***Less Than Significant Impact***

The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin. The Project is consistent with the applicable Scoping Plan reductions measures and the Air District's CCAP. The Project will implement applicable Tulare County General Plan and Tulare County CAP policies. As such, the Project will not conflict with applicable state, regional, and local plans, policies or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. ***Less Than Significant Cumulative Impacts*** related to this Checklist Item will occur.

Mitigation Measures: ***None Required***

Conclusion: ***Less Than Significant Impact***

As the proposed Project is consistent with aforementioned plans, policies, and regulations, ***Less Than Significant Project-specific and Cumulative Impacts*** related to this Checklist Item would occur.



# SUMMARY TABLES

[This page intentionally left blank]

TABLE 1. Population Growth

Year	Population	Total Housing
2017	232	115
2018	235	116
2019	238	118
2020	241	120
2021	244	121
2022	247	123
2023	251	124
2024	254	126
2025	257	128
2026	261	129
2027	264	131
2028	267	133
2029	271	134
2030	274	136
<b>Total Growth</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>21</b>

Growth based on 2017 ACS data and 1.3% annual growth rate.

TABLE 2. Projected Housing Needs

	% Total Units	Total Units	Population	Increase from 2017	
				Units	Population
<b>Baseline Year 2017</b>					
Single-family homes	87.0%	100	202	---	---
Multi-family homes	7.8%	9	18	---	---
Mobile homes	5.2%	6	12	---	---
Other	0.0%	0	0	---	---
<b>Total Units</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>Operational Year 2020</b>					
Single-family homes	72.6%	104	210	4	8
Multi-family homes	13.4%	9	19	0	1
Mobile homes	13.1%	6	13	0	0
Other	0.9%	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Units</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Horizon Year 2030</b>					
Single-family homes	72.6%	118	239	18	37
Multi-family homes	13.4%	11	21	2	3
Mobile homes	13.1%	7	14	1	2
Other	0.9%	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Units</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>42</b>

Housing unit types and percentages based on 2017 ACS data; growth based on 1.3% annual growth rate.

TABLE 3. Commercial Growth

Year	FAR	Total Acres	Bldg. Acres	Bldg. SF
2017	0.20	31.81	6.36	277,129
2018	0.20	32.22	6.44	280,731
2019	0.20	32.64	6.53	284,381
2020	0.20	33.07	6.61	288,078
2021	0.20	33.50	6.70	291,823
2022	0.20	33.93	6.79	295,617
2023	0.20	34.37	6.87	299,460
2024	0.20	34.82	6.96	303,353
2025	0.20	35.27	7.05	307,296
2026	0.20	35.73	7.15	311,291
2027	0.20	36.20	7.24	315,338
2028	0.20	36.67	7.33	319,437
2029	0.20	37.14	7.43	323,590
2030	0.20	37.63	7.53	327,797
<b>Projected Commercial Growth</b>		<b>5.82</b>	<b>1.16</b>	<b>50,668</b>

TABLE 4. Retail Growth

Year	FAR	Total Acres	Bldg. Acres	Bldg. SF
2017	0.20	7.47	1.49	65,079
2018	0.20	7.57	1.51	65,925
2019	0.20	7.67	1.53	66,782
2020	0.20	7.77	1.55	67,650
2021	0.20	7.87	1.57	68,529
2022	0.20	7.97	1.59	69,420
2023	0.20	8.07	1.61	70,323
2024	0.20	8.18	1.64	71,237
2025	0.20	8.28	1.66	72,163
2026	0.20	8.39	1.68	73,101
2027	0.20	8.50	1.70	74,051
2028	0.20	8.61	1.72	75,014
2029	0.20	8.72	1.74	75,989
2030	0.20	8.84	1.77	76,977
<b>Projected Retail Growth</b>		<b>1.37</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>11,898</b>

TABLE 5. Industrial Growth

Year	FAR	Total Acres	Bldg. Acres	Bldg. SF
2017	0.20	1.78	0.36	15,507
2018	0.20	1.80	0.36	15,709
2019	0.20	1.83	0.37	15,913
2020	0.20	1.85	0.37	16,120
2021	0.20	1.87	0.37	16,330
2022	0.20	1.90	0.38	16,542
2023	0.20	1.92	0.38	16,757
2024	0.20	1.95	0.39	16,975
2025	0.20	1.97	0.39	17,195
2026	0.20	2.00	0.40	17,419
2027	0.20	2.03	0.41	17,645
2028	0.20	2.05	0.41	17,875
2029	0.20	2.08	0.42	18,107
2030	0.20	2.11	0.42	18,343
<b>Projected Industrial Growth</b>		<b>0.33</b>	<b>0.07</b>	<b>2,835</b>

Non-residential growth projections are based on existing land uses within the proposed UDB planning area (assumes a floor to area ratio of 0.20 and 60/40 ratio of commercial to retail uses).

TABLE 6. Complete Streets

Segment	Roadway	Limits		Distance (miles)	Repair Code	Repair Time (days)
		From	To			
1	Avenue 324	Road 236	Road 248	1.5	GRX	6.00
2	Avenue 328	SR 198	Road 248	0.15	GRX	0.60
3	Avenue 330	SR 198	East End	0.4	CHIP	0.40
4	Lemon Road	SR 198	Avenue 330	0.1	CHIP	0.10
Total				2.15		7.10

**Table 7. Project Energy Usage**

Phase	Year	Annual VMT	Natural Gas kBTU/yr	Natural Gas MWh/yr	Electricity kWh/yr	Electricity MWh/yr
Non-Residential Uses		1,881,725	986,429.6	9,864.30	632,972.60	632.9726
Residential Uses		636,813	516,788.4	5,167.88	169,575.26	169.575
<b>Total</b>		<b>2,518,538</b>	<b>1,503,218.0</b>	<b>15,032.18</b>	<b>802,547.86</b>	<b>802.548</b>

**Table 8. Electricity Conversions (Total - All Uses)**

	GWh/yr	MWh/yr	kWh/yr	
State	281,120.193430	281,120,193.430	281,120,193,430	0.0003
So. Cal. Edison	102,520.762582	102,520,762.582	102,520,762,582	0.0008
Tulare County	4,433.976762	4,433,976.762	4,433,976,762	0.0181
Project	0.802548	802.548	802,548	

**Table 9. Natural Gas Conversions (Total - All Uses)**

	Millions of Therms	Therms	BTU	kBTU	
State	12,638.157740	12,638,157,740	1,263,815,774,000,000	1,263,815,774,000	0.0001
So. Cal. Gas	7,195.951252	7,195,951,252	719,595,125,200,000	719,595,125,200	0.0002
Tulare County	157.285390	157,285,390	15,728,539,000,000	15,728,539,000	0.0096
Project	0.015032	15,032	1,503,218,000	1,503,218	

**Table 10. Energy Usage Per Capita (Total - All Uses)**

	Population	Electricity MWh/Person	Natural Gas Therms/Person
State	39,557,045	7.11	319.49
So. Cal. Gas	---	---	---
Tulare County	465,861	9.52	337.62
Project	60	13.38	250.54

Note: The population for the State and County are based on 2018 American Community Survey Data; the Project population is based on the CalEEMod estimates, which are greater than the projected population based on the existing population in the community.

Table 11. FLEET MIX

	LDA	LDT1	LDT2	MDV	LHD1	LHD2	MHD	HHD	OBUS	UBUS	MCY	SBUS	MH
Non-Residential	0.5167	0.0335	0.1724	0.1411	0.0223	0.0054	0.0209	0.0782	0.0018	0.0013	0.0043	0.0011	0.0008
Residential	0.5373	0.2000	0.1671	0.0542	0.0014	0.0009	0.0090	0.0206	0.0000	0.0044	0.0026	0.0009	0.0016

Table 12. VMT Per Capita

	Population	Annual VMT	Daily VMT	Project %	Daily VMT per Capita
State	38,982,847	344,300,000,000	943,287,671	0.0002	24.20
County	471,686	3,686,282,000	10,099,403	0.017	21.41
Project	60	636,813	1,745	---	29.08
State & County population based on ACS data; Project population is CalEEMod estimated population					

Table 13. Project Fuel Consumption

	Fuel Economy (mile/gal)	Non-Residential					Residential					Project Total		
		Fleet	VMT	Annual Fuel Consumption	Avg. Daily Fuel Consumption	Avg. Daily Fuel Consumption per Unit	Fleet	VMT	Annual Fuel Consumption	Avg. Daily Fuel Consumption	Avg. Daily Fuel Consumption per Unit	Annual Fuel Consumption (gal)	Avg. Daily Fuel Consumption (gal)	Avg. Daily Fuel Consumption per Unit (gal)
				(gal)	(gal)	(gal/1,000 sf)			(gal)	(gal)	(gal/house)			
Passenger Car	23.96	51.67%	972,338	40,582	111.18	1.70	53.73%	342,160	14,280	39.12	1.86	54,862	150.31	3.56
LD Vehicles	22.04	34.70%	653,038	29,630	81.18	1.24	42.13%	268,289	12,173	33.35	1.59	41,802	114.53	2.83
LD Truck	17.4	4.86%	91,535	5,261	14.41	0.22	1.13%	7,196	414	1.13	0.05	5,674	15.55	0.27
HD Truck	6.64	7.82%	147,213	22,171	60.74	0.93	2.06%	13,118	1,976	5.41	0.26	24,146	66.15	1.19
Motorcycle	43.89	0.43%	8,142	186	0.51	0.01	0.26%	1,656	38	0.10	0.00	223	0.61	0.01
Buses	6.33	0.43%	8,026	1,268	3.47	0.05	0.53%	3,375	533	1.46	0.07	1,801	4.93	0.12
Other	7.69	0.08%	1,432	186	0.51	0.01	0.16%	1,019	132	0.36	0.02	319	0.87	0.03
<b>TOTAL</b>	---	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,881,725</b>	<b>99,282</b>	<b>272.01</b>	<b>4.16</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>636,813</b>	<b>29,546</b>	<b>80.95</b>	<b>3.85</b>	<b>128,828</b>	<b>352.95</b>	<b>0.87</b>

"Monthly Gasoline/Gasohol Reported by States - 2016" [Table MF-33GA] <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policyinformation/motorfuel/jun17/jun17.pdf>

California Annual Total (gal) 15,507,693,865 42,486,832.51

project % 0.0006

[This page intentionally left blank]

# CALEEMOD REPORT

[This page intentionally left blank]



## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

## Lemon Cove Community Plan

### Tulare County, Annual

## 1.0 Project Characteristics

### 1.1 Land Usage

Land Uses	Size	Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
General Office Building	50.67	1000sqft	5.85	50,668.00	0
Strip Mall	11.90	1000sqft	1.37	11,898.00	0
General Light Industry	2.84	1000sqft	0.33	2,835.00	0
Single Family Housing	18.00	Dwelling Unit	5.84	32,400.00	51
Apartments Low Rise	2.00	Dwelling Unit	0.13	2,000.00	6
Mobile Home Park	1.00	Dwelling Unit	0.13	1,200.00	3

### 1.2 Other Project Characteristics

Urbanization	Rural	Wind Speed (m/s)	2.2	Precipitation Freq (Days)	51
Climate Zone	7			Operational Year	2021
Utility Company	Southern California Edison				
CO2 Intensity (lb/MWhr)	702.44	CH4 Intensity (lb/MWhr)	0.029	N2O Intensity (lb/MWhr)	0.006

### 1.3 User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

## Project Characteristics -

Land Use - acres estimated from existing land uses (based on 0.20 FAR)

Fleet Mix - Residential fleet per "District Accepted Fleet Mix for Residential Projects" (online on 11/1/19)

Construction Off-road Equipment Mitigation - compliance with Regulation VIII

Mobile Land Use Mitigation - Lemon Cove is approx. 4 miles SE of City of Woodlake

Area Mitigation - residential users use propane for fuel; electric equipment per District defaults

Water Mitigation - per 2019 Title 24 & Green Building Codes; County MWEL0 for irrigation

Woodstoves -

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblConstDustMitigation	WaterUnpavedRoadVehicleSpeed	0	15
tblFleetMix	HHD	0.08	0.02
tblFleetMix	HHD	0.08	0.02
tblFleetMix	HHD	0.08	0.02
tblFleetMix	LDA	0.52	0.54
tblFleetMix	LDA	0.52	0.54
tblFleetMix	LDA	0.52	0.54
tblFleetMix	LDT1	0.03	0.20
tblFleetMix	LDT1	0.03	0.20
tblFleetMix	LDT1	0.03	0.20
tblFleetMix	LDT2	0.17	0.17
tblFleetMix	LDT2	0.17	0.17
tblFleetMix	LDT2	0.17	0.17
tblFleetMix	LHD1	0.02	1.4000e-003
tblFleetMix	LHD1	0.02	1.4000e-003
tblFleetMix	LHD1	0.02	1.4000e-003
tblFleetMix	LHD2	5.4340e-003	9.0000e-004

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

tblFleetMix	LHD2	5.4340e-003	9.0000e-004
tblFleetMix	LHD2	5.4340e-003	9.0000e-004
tblFleetMix	MCY	4.3270e-003	2.6000e-003
tblFleetMix	MCY	4.3270e-003	2.6000e-003
tblFleetMix	MCY	4.3270e-003	2.6000e-003
tblFleetMix	MDV	0.14	0.05
tblFleetMix	MDV	0.14	0.05
tblFleetMix	MDV	0.14	0.05
tblFleetMix	MH	7.6100e-004	1.6000e-003
tblFleetMix	MH	7.6100e-004	1.6000e-003
tblFleetMix	MH	7.6100e-004	1.6000e-003
tblFleetMix	MHD	0.02	9.0000e-003
tblFleetMix	MHD	0.02	9.0000e-003
tblFleetMix	MHD	0.02	9.0000e-003
tblFleetMix	OBUS	1.8220e-003	0.00
tblFleetMix	OBUS	1.8220e-003	0.00
tblFleetMix	OBUS	1.8220e-003	0.00
tblFleetMix	SBUS	1.1320e-003	9.0000e-004
tblFleetMix	SBUS	1.1320e-003	9.0000e-004
tblFleetMix	SBUS	1.1320e-003	9.0000e-004
tblFleetMix	UBUS	1.3110e-003	4.4000e-003
tblFleetMix	UBUS	1.3110e-003	4.4000e-003
tblFleetMix	UBUS	1.3110e-003	4.4000e-003
tblLandUse	LandUseSquareFeet	50,670.00	50,668.00
tblLandUse	LandUseSquareFeet	11,900.00	11,898.00
tblLandUse	LandUseSquareFeet	2,840.00	2,835.00
tblLandUse	LotAcreage	1.16	5.85

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

tblLandUse	LotAcreage	0.27	1.37
tblLandUse	LotAcreage	0.07	0.33
tblProjectCharacteristics	UrbanizationLevel	Urban	Rural

## 2.0 Emissions Summary

---

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**2.1 Overall Construction****Unmitigated Construction**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year	tons/yr										MT/yr					
2020	0.3626	3.4050	2.7020	4.9900e-003	0.2725	0.1741	0.4466	0.1176	0.1627	0.2803	0.0000	436.5828	436.5828	0.1013	0.0000	439.1140
2021	0.9088	1.0734	1.0597	1.9300e-003	0.0246	0.0550	0.0796	6.6300e-003	0.0516	0.0583	0.0000	168.9029	168.9029	0.0353	0.0000	169.7841
Maximum	0.9088	3.4050	2.7020	4.9900e-003	0.2725	0.1741	0.4466	0.1176	0.1627	0.2803	0.0000	436.5828	436.5828	0.1013	0.0000	439.1140

**Mitigated Construction**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year	tons/yr										MT/yr					
2020	0.3626	3.4050	2.7020	4.9900e-003	0.1380	0.1741	0.3122	0.0544	0.1627	0.2171	0.0000	436.5824	436.5824	0.1013	0.0000	439.1135
2021	0.9088	1.0734	1.0597	1.9300e-003	0.0246	0.0550	0.0796	6.6300e-003	0.0516	0.0583	0.0000	168.9028	168.9028	0.0353	0.0000	169.7839
Maximum	0.9088	3.4050	2.7020	4.9900e-003	0.1380	0.1741	0.3122	0.0544	0.1627	0.2171	0.0000	436.5824	436.5824	0.1013	0.0000	439.1135

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	45.26	0.00	25.55	50.86	0.00	18.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

Quarter	Start Date	End Date	Maximum Unmitigated ROG + NOX (tons/quarter)	Maximum Mitigated ROG + NOX (tons/quarter)
1	1-1-2020	3-31-2020	1.4820	1.4820
2	4-1-2020	6-30-2020	0.7540	0.7540
3	7-1-2020	9-30-2020	0.7623	0.7623
4	10-1-2020	12-31-2020	0.7635	0.7635
5	1-1-2021	3-31-2021	0.6777	0.6777
6	4-1-2021	6-30-2021	0.9365	0.9365
7	7-1-2021	9-30-2021	0.3746	0.3746
		Highest	1.4820	1.4820

## 2.2 Overall Operational

Unmitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Area	0.6034	0.0281	1.2892	3.7400e-003		0.1857	0.1857		0.1857	0.1857	24.6606	9.3532	34.0138	0.1157	1.7000e-004	36.9562
Energy	8.1100e-003	0.0722	0.0508	4.4000e-004		5.6000e-003	5.6000e-003		5.6000e-003	5.6000e-003	0.0000	335.9263	335.9263	0.0121	3.6500e-003	337.3178
Mobile	0.3832	2.8401	4.0283	0.0143	1.0096	0.0130	1.0226	0.2711	0.0123	0.2833	0.0000	1,324.8823	1,324.8823	0.0660	0.0000	1,326.5317
Waste						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	16.8239	0.0000	16.8239	0.9943	0.0000	41.6805
Water						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	3.7792	28.2572	32.0364	0.3893	9.4100e-003	44.5727
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.9947</b>	<b>2.9404</b>	<b>5.3682</b>	<b>0.0185</b>	<b>1.0096</b>	<b>0.2043</b>	<b>1.2139</b>	<b>0.2711</b>	<b>0.2035</b>	<b>0.4746</b>	<b>45.2637</b>	<b>1,698.4189</b>	<b>1,743.6826</b>	<b>1.5774</b>	<b>0.0132</b>	<b>1,787.0589</b>

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**2.2 Overall Operational****Mitigated Operational**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Area	0.4781	1.8000e-003	0.1557	1.0000e-005		8.6000e-004	8.6000e-004		8.6000e-004	8.6000e-004	0.0000	0.2536	0.2536	2.5000e-004	0.0000	0.2597
Energy	8.1100e-003	0.0722	0.0508	4.4000e-004		5.6000e-003	5.6000e-003		5.6000e-003	5.6000e-003	0.0000	335.9263	335.9263	0.0121	3.6500e-003	337.3178
Mobile	0.3762	2.7644	3.8539	0.0136	0.9495	0.0124	0.9619	0.2549	0.0116	0.2666	0.0000	1,257.0552	1,257.0552	0.0639	0.0000	1,258.6530
Waste						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	16.8239	0.0000	16.8239	0.9943	0.0000	41.6805
Water						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	3.0234	23.6788	26.7022	0.3115	7.5300e-003	36.7351
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.8624</b>	<b>2.8384</b>	<b>4.0604</b>	<b>0.0141</b>	<b>0.9495</b>	<b>0.0188</b>	<b>0.9684</b>	<b>0.2549</b>	<b>0.0181</b>	<b>0.2730</b>	<b>19.8473</b>	<b>1,616.9138</b>	<b>1,636.7611</b>	<b>1.3820</b>	<b>0.0112</b>	<b>1,674.6460</b>

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
<b>Percent Reduction</b>	<b>13.30</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>24.36</b>	<b>24.14</b>	<b>5.95</b>	<b>90.79</b>	<b>20.23</b>	<b>5.95</b>	<b>91.11</b>	<b>42.47</b>	<b>56.15</b>	<b>4.80</b>	<b>6.13</b>	<b>12.38</b>	<b>15.50</b>	<b>6.29</b>

**3.0 Construction Detail****Construction Phase**

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

Phase Number	Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Num Days Week	Num Days	Phase Description
1	Demolition	Demolition	1/1/2020	1/28/2020	5	20	
2	Site Preparation	Site Preparation	1/29/2020	2/11/2020	5	10	
3	Grading	Grading	2/12/2020	3/24/2020	5	30	
4	Building Construction	Building Construction	3/25/2020	5/18/2021	5	300	
5	Paving	Paving	5/19/2021	6/15/2021	5	20	
6	Architectural Coating	Architectural Coating	6/16/2021	7/13/2021	5	20	

**Acres of Grading (Site Preparation Phase): 0**

**Acres of Grading (Grading Phase): 75**

**Acres of Paving: 0**

**Residential Indoor: 72,090; Residential Outdoor: 24,030; Non-Residential Indoor: 98,102; Non-Residential Outdoor: 32,701; Striped Parking Area: 0 (Architectural Coating – sqft)**

**OffRoad Equipment**



## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount	Usage Hours	Horse Power	Load Factor
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	1	6.00	78	0.48
Demolition	Excavators	3	8.00	158	0.38
Demolition	Concrete/Industrial Saws	1	8.00	81	0.73
Grading	Excavators	2	8.00	158	0.38
Building Construction	Cranes	1	7.00	231	0.29
Building Construction	Forklifts	3	8.00	89	0.20
Building Construction	Generator Sets	1	8.00	84	0.74
Paving	Pavers	2	8.00	130	0.42
Paving	Rollers	2	8.00	80	0.38
Demolition	Rubber Tired Dozers	2	8.00	247	0.40
Grading	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	8.00	247	0.40
Building Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	7.00	97	0.37
Grading	Graders	1	8.00	187	0.41
Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	8.00	97	0.37
Paving	Paving Equipment	2	8.00	132	0.36
Site Preparation	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	4	8.00	97	0.37
Site Preparation	Rubber Tired Dozers	3	8.00	247	0.40
Building Construction	Welders	1	8.00	46	0.45
Grading	Scrapers	2	8.00	367	0.48

Trips and VMT

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Count	Worker Trip Number	Vendor Trip Number	Hauling Trip Number	Worker Trip Length	Vendor Trip Length	Hauling Trip Length	Worker Vehicle Class	Vendor Vehicle Class	Hauling Vehicle Class
Demolition	6	15.00	0.00	0.00	16.80	6.60	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Site Preparation	7	18.00	0.00	0.00	16.80	6.60	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Grading	8	20.00	0.00	0.00	16.80	6.60	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Building Construction	9	30.00	13.00	0.00	16.80	6.60	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Paving	6	15.00	0.00	0.00	16.80	6.60	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Architectural Coating	1	6.00	0.00	0.00	16.80	6.60	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT

**3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction**

Water Exposed Area

Reduce Vehicle Speed on Unpaved Roads

**3.2 Demolition - 2020****Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.0331	0.3320	0.2175	3.9000e-004		0.0166	0.0166		0.0154	0.0154	0.0000	33.9986	33.9986	9.6000e-003	0.0000	34.2386
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.0331</b>	<b>0.3320</b>	<b>0.2175</b>	<b>3.9000e-004</b>		<b>0.0166</b>	<b>0.0166</b>		<b>0.0154</b>	<b>0.0154</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>33.9986</b>	<b>33.9986</b>	<b>9.6000e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>34.2386</b>

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**3.2 Demolition - 2020****Unmitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	9.8000e-004	7.0000e-004	6.9500e-003	2.0000e-005	1.8600e-003	1.0000e-005	1.8700e-003	4.9000e-004	1.0000e-005	5.1000e-004	0.0000	1.5797	1.5797	5.0000e-005	0.0000	1.5809
<b>Total</b>	<b>9.8000e-004</b>	<b>7.0000e-004</b>	<b>6.9500e-003</b>	<b>2.0000e-005</b>	<b>1.8600e-003</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>1.8700e-003</b>	<b>4.9000e-004</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>5.1000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>1.5797</b>	<b>1.5797</b>	<b>5.0000e-005</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>1.5809</b>

**Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.0331	0.3320	0.2175	3.9000e-004		0.0166	0.0166		0.0154	0.0154	0.0000	33.9986	33.9986	9.6000e-003	0.0000	34.2385
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.0331</b>	<b>0.3320</b>	<b>0.2175</b>	<b>3.9000e-004</b>		<b>0.0166</b>	<b>0.0166</b>		<b>0.0154</b>	<b>0.0154</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>33.9986</b>	<b>33.9986</b>	<b>9.6000e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>34.2385</b>

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**3.2 Demolition - 2020****Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	9.8000e-004	7.0000e-004	6.9500e-003	2.0000e-005	1.8600e-003	1.0000e-005	1.8700e-003	4.9000e-004	1.0000e-005	5.1000e-004	0.0000	1.5797	1.5797	5.0000e-005	0.0000	1.5809
<b>Total</b>	<b>9.8000e-004</b>	<b>7.0000e-004</b>	<b>6.9500e-003</b>	<b>2.0000e-005</b>	<b>1.8600e-003</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>1.8700e-003</b>	<b>4.9000e-004</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>5.1000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>1.5797</b>	<b>1.5797</b>	<b>5.0000e-005</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>1.5809</b>

**3.3 Site Preparation - 2020****Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Fugitive Dust					0.0903	0.0000	0.0903	0.0497	0.0000	0.0497	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0204	0.2121	0.1076	1.9000e-004		0.0110	0.0110		0.0101	0.0101	0.0000	16.7153	16.7153	5.4100e-003	0.0000	16.8505
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.0204</b>	<b>0.2121</b>	<b>0.1076</b>	<b>1.9000e-004</b>	<b>0.0903</b>	<b>0.0110</b>	<b>0.1013</b>	<b>0.0497</b>	<b>0.0101</b>	<b>0.0598</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>16.7153</b>	<b>16.7153</b>	<b>5.4100e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>16.8505</b>

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**3.3 Site Preparation - 2020****Unmitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	5.9000e-004	4.2000e-004	4.1700e-003	1.0000e-005	1.1100e-003	1.0000e-005	1.1200e-003	3.0000e-004	1.0000e-005	3.0000e-004	0.0000	0.9478	0.9478	3.0000e-005	0.0000	0.9485
<b>Total</b>	<b>5.9000e-004</b>	<b>4.2000e-004</b>	<b>4.1700e-003</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>1.1100e-003</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>1.1200e-003</b>	<b>3.0000e-004</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>3.0000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.9478</b>	<b>0.9478</b>	<b>3.0000e-005</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.9485</b>

**Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Fugitive Dust					0.0352	0.0000	0.0352	0.0194	0.0000	0.0194	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0204	0.2121	0.1076	1.9000e-004		0.0110	0.0110		0.0101	0.0101	0.0000	16.7153	16.7153	5.4100e-003	0.0000	16.8505
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.0204</b>	<b>0.2121</b>	<b>0.1076</b>	<b>1.9000e-004</b>	<b>0.0352</b>	<b>0.0110</b>	<b>0.0462</b>	<b>0.0194</b>	<b>0.0101</b>	<b>0.0295</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>16.7153</b>	<b>16.7153</b>	<b>5.4100e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>16.8505</b>

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**3.3 Site Preparation - 2020****Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	5.9000e-004	4.2000e-004	4.1700e-003	1.0000e-005	1.1100e-003	1.0000e-005	1.1200e-003	3.0000e-004	1.0000e-005	3.0000e-004	0.0000	0.9478	0.9478	3.0000e-005	0.0000	0.9485
<b>Total</b>	<b>5.9000e-004</b>	<b>4.2000e-004</b>	<b>4.1700e-003</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>1.1100e-003</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>1.1200e-003</b>	<b>3.0000e-004</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>3.0000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.9478</b>	<b>0.9478</b>	<b>3.0000e-005</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.9485</b>

**3.4 Grading - 2020****Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Fugitive Dust					0.1301	0.0000	0.1301	0.0540	0.0000	0.0540	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0668	0.7530	0.4794	9.3000e-004		0.0326	0.0326		0.0300	0.0300	0.0000	81.7264	81.7264	0.0264	0.0000	82.3872
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.0668</b>	<b>0.7530</b>	<b>0.4794</b>	<b>9.3000e-004</b>	<b>0.1301</b>	<b>0.0326</b>	<b>0.1627</b>	<b>0.0540</b>	<b>0.0300</b>	<b>0.0840</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>81.7264</b>	<b>81.7264</b>	<b>0.0264</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>82.3872</b>

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**3.4 Grading - 2020****Unmitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.9600e-003	1.4000e-003	0.0139	3.0000e-005	3.7200e-003	2.0000e-005	3.7400e-003	9.9000e-004	2.0000e-005	1.0100e-003	0.0000	3.1593	3.1593	1.0000e-004	0.0000	3.1617
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.9600e-003</b>	<b>1.4000e-003</b>	<b>0.0139</b>	<b>3.0000e-005</b>	<b>3.7200e-003</b>	<b>2.0000e-005</b>	<b>3.7400e-003</b>	<b>9.9000e-004</b>	<b>2.0000e-005</b>	<b>1.0100e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>3.1593</b>	<b>3.1593</b>	<b>1.0000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>3.1617</b>

**Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Fugitive Dust					0.0507	0.0000	0.0507	0.0210	0.0000	0.0210	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0668	0.7530	0.4794	9.3000e-004		0.0326	0.0326		0.0300	0.0300	0.0000	81.7263	81.7263	0.0264	0.0000	82.3871
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.0668</b>	<b>0.7530</b>	<b>0.4794</b>	<b>9.3000e-004</b>	<b>0.0507</b>	<b>0.0326</b>	<b>0.0834</b>	<b>0.0210</b>	<b>0.0300</b>	<b>0.0510</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>81.7263</b>	<b>81.7263</b>	<b>0.0264</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>82.3871</b>

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**3.4 Grading - 2020****Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.9600e-003	1.4000e-003	0.0139	3.0000e-005	3.7200e-003	2.0000e-005	3.7400e-003	9.9000e-004	2.0000e-005	1.0100e-003	0.0000	3.1593	3.1593	1.0000e-004	0.0000	3.1617
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.9600e-003</b>	<b>1.4000e-003</b>	<b>0.0139</b>	<b>3.0000e-005</b>	<b>3.7200e-003</b>	<b>2.0000e-005</b>	<b>3.7400e-003</b>	<b>9.9000e-004</b>	<b>2.0000e-005</b>	<b>1.0100e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>3.1593</b>	<b>3.1593</b>	<b>1.0000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>3.1617</b>

**3.5 Building Construction - 2020****Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.2141	1.9378	1.7017	2.7200e-003		0.1128	0.1128		0.1061	0.1061	0.0000	233.9261	233.9261	0.0571	0.0000	235.3528
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.2141</b>	<b>1.9378</b>	<b>1.7017</b>	<b>2.7200e-003</b>		<b>0.1128</b>	<b>0.1128</b>		<b>0.1061</b>	<b>0.1061</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>233.9261</b>	<b>233.9261</b>	<b>0.0571</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>235.3528</b>



## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**3.5 Building Construction - 2020****Unmitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	4.9000e-003	0.1535	0.0304	3.4000e-004	7.8500e-003	8.3000e-004	8.6700e-003	2.2700e-003	7.9000e-004	3.0600e-003	0.0000	32.6204	32.6204	1.6100e-003	0.0000	32.6606
Worker	0.0198	0.0141	0.1404	3.5000e-004	0.0375	2.5000e-004	0.0378	9.9700e-003	2.3000e-004	0.0102	0.0000	31.9092	31.9092	9.6000e-004	0.0000	31.9333
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.0247</b>	<b>0.1676</b>	<b>0.1708</b>	<b>6.9000e-004</b>	<b>0.0454</b>	<b>1.0800e-003</b>	<b>0.0465</b>	<b>0.0122</b>	<b>1.0200e-003</b>	<b>0.0133</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>64.5296</b>	<b>64.5296</b>	<b>2.5700e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>64.5938</b>

**Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.2141	1.9378	1.7017	2.7200e-003		0.1128	0.1128		0.1061	0.1061	0.0000	233.9258	233.9258	0.0571	0.0000	235.3526
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.2141</b>	<b>1.9378</b>	<b>1.7017</b>	<b>2.7200e-003</b>		<b>0.1128</b>	<b>0.1128</b>		<b>0.1061</b>	<b>0.1061</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>233.9258</b>	<b>233.9258</b>	<b>0.0571</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>235.3526</b>

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**3.5 Building Construction - 2020****Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	4.9000e-003	0.1535	0.0304	3.4000e-004	7.8500e-003	8.3000e-004	8.6700e-003	2.2700e-003	7.9000e-004	3.0600e-003	0.0000	32.6204	32.6204	1.6100e-003	0.0000	32.6606
Worker	0.0198	0.0141	0.1404	3.5000e-004	0.0375	2.5000e-004	0.0378	9.9700e-003	2.3000e-004	0.0102	0.0000	31.9092	31.9092	9.6000e-004	0.0000	31.9333
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.0247</b>	<b>0.1676</b>	<b>0.1708</b>	<b>6.9000e-004</b>	<b>0.0454</b>	<b>1.0800e-003</b>	<b>0.0465</b>	<b>0.0122</b>	<b>1.0200e-003</b>	<b>0.0133</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>64.5296</b>	<b>64.5296</b>	<b>2.5700e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>64.5938</b>

**3.5 Building Construction - 2021****Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.0932	0.8542	0.8122	1.3200e-003		0.0470	0.0470		0.0442	0.0442	0.0000	113.5023	113.5023	0.0274	0.0000	114.1868
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.0932</b>	<b>0.8542</b>	<b>0.8122</b>	<b>1.3200e-003</b>		<b>0.0470</b>	<b>0.0470</b>		<b>0.0442</b>	<b>0.0442</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>113.5023</b>	<b>113.5023</b>	<b>0.0274</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>114.1868</b>

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**3.5 Building Construction - 2021****Unmitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	1.9400e-003	0.0678	0.0129	1.7000e-004	3.8100e-003	1.9000e-004	4.0000e-003	1.1000e-003	1.8000e-004	1.2800e-003	0.0000	15.6852	15.6852	7.4000e-004	0.0000	15.7037
Worker	8.8500e-003	6.0900e-003	0.0612	1.7000e-004	0.0182	1.2000e-004	0.0183	4.8400e-003	1.1000e-004	4.9500e-003	0.0000	14.9964	14.9964	4.1000e-004	0.0000	15.0067
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.0108</b>	<b>0.0739</b>	<b>0.0741</b>	<b>3.4000e-004</b>	<b>0.0220</b>	<b>3.1000e-004</b>	<b>0.0223</b>	<b>5.9400e-003</b>	<b>2.9000e-004</b>	<b>6.2300e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>30.6816</b>	<b>30.6816</b>	<b>1.1500e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>30.7104</b>

**Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.0932	0.8542	0.8122	1.3200e-003		0.0470	0.0470		0.0442	0.0442	0.0000	113.5021	113.5021	0.0274	0.0000	114.1867
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.0932</b>	<b>0.8542</b>	<b>0.8122</b>	<b>1.3200e-003</b>		<b>0.0470</b>	<b>0.0470</b>		<b>0.0442</b>	<b>0.0442</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>113.5021</b>	<b>113.5021</b>	<b>0.0274</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>114.1867</b>

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**3.5 Building Construction - 2021****Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	1.9400e-003	0.0678	0.0129	1.7000e-004	3.8100e-003	1.9000e-004	4.0000e-003	1.1000e-003	1.8000e-004	1.2800e-003	0.0000	15.6852	15.6852	7.4000e-004	0.0000	15.7037
Worker	8.8500e-003	6.0900e-003	0.0612	1.7000e-004	0.0182	1.2000e-004	0.0183	4.8400e-003	1.1000e-004	4.9500e-003	0.0000	14.9964	14.9964	4.1000e-004	0.0000	15.0067
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.0108</b>	<b>0.0739</b>	<b>0.0741</b>	<b>3.4000e-004</b>	<b>0.0220</b>	<b>3.1000e-004</b>	<b>0.0223</b>	<b>5.9400e-003</b>	<b>2.9000e-004</b>	<b>6.2300e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>30.6816</b>	<b>30.6816</b>	<b>1.1500e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>30.7104</b>

**3.6 Paving - 2021****Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.0126	0.1292	0.1465	2.3000e-004		6.7800e-003	6.7800e-003		6.2400e-003	6.2400e-003	0.0000	20.0235	20.0235	6.4800e-003	0.0000	20.1854
Paving	0.0000					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.0126</b>	<b>0.1292</b>	<b>0.1465</b>	<b>2.3000e-004</b>		<b>6.7800e-003</b>	<b>6.7800e-003</b>		<b>6.2400e-003</b>	<b>6.2400e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>20.0235</b>	<b>20.0235</b>	<b>6.4800e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>20.1854</b>

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**3.6 Paving - 2021****Unmitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	9.0000e-004	6.2000e-004	6.2500e-003	2.0000e-005	1.8600e-003	1.0000e-005	1.8700e-003	4.9000e-004	1.0000e-005	5.0000e-004	0.0000	1.5302	1.5302	4.0000e-005	0.0000	1.5313
<b>Total</b>	<b>9.0000e-004</b>	<b>6.2000e-004</b>	<b>6.2500e-003</b>	<b>2.0000e-005</b>	<b>1.8600e-003</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>1.8700e-003</b>	<b>4.9000e-004</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>5.0000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>1.5302</b>	<b>1.5302</b>	<b>4.0000e-005</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>1.5313</b>

**Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.0126	0.1292	0.1465	2.3000e-004		6.7800e-003	6.7800e-003		6.2400e-003	6.2400e-003	0.0000	20.0235	20.0235	6.4800e-003	0.0000	20.1854
Paving	0.0000					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.0126</b>	<b>0.1292</b>	<b>0.1465</b>	<b>2.3000e-004</b>		<b>6.7800e-003</b>	<b>6.7800e-003</b>		<b>6.2400e-003</b>	<b>6.2400e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>20.0235</b>	<b>20.0235</b>	<b>6.4800e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>20.1854</b>

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**3.6 Paving - 2021****Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	9.0000e-004	6.2000e-004	6.2500e-003	2.0000e-005	1.8600e-003	1.0000e-005	1.8700e-003	4.9000e-004	1.0000e-005	5.0000e-004	0.0000	1.5302	1.5302	4.0000e-005	0.0000	1.5313
<b>Total</b>	<b>9.0000e-004</b>	<b>6.2000e-004</b>	<b>6.2500e-003</b>	<b>2.0000e-005</b>	<b>1.8600e-003</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>1.8700e-003</b>	<b>4.9000e-004</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>5.0000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>1.5302</b>	<b>1.5302</b>	<b>4.0000e-005</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>1.5313</b>

**3.7 Architectural Coating - 2021****Unmitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Archit. Coating	0.7888					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	2.1900e-003	0.0153	0.0182	3.0000e-005		9.4000e-004	9.4000e-004		9.4000e-004	9.4000e-004	0.0000	2.5533	2.5533	1.8000e-004	0.0000	2.5576
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.7910</b>	<b>0.0153</b>	<b>0.0182</b>	<b>3.0000e-005</b>		<b>9.4000e-004</b>	<b>9.4000e-004</b>		<b>9.4000e-004</b>	<b>9.4000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>2.5533</b>	<b>2.5533</b>	<b>1.8000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>2.5576</b>

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**3.7 Architectural Coating - 2021****Unmitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	3.6000e-004	2.5000e-004	2.5000e-003	1.0000e-005	7.4000e-004	0.0000	7.5000e-004	2.0000e-004	0.0000	2.0000e-004	0.0000	0.6121	0.6121	2.0000e-005	0.0000	0.6125
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.6000e-004</b>	<b>2.5000e-004</b>	<b>2.5000e-003</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>7.4000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>7.5000e-004</b>	<b>2.0000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>2.0000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.6121</b>	<b>0.6121</b>	<b>2.0000e-005</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.6125</b>

**Mitigated Construction On-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Archit. Coating	0.7888					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	2.1900e-003	0.0153	0.0182	3.0000e-005		9.4000e-004	9.4000e-004		9.4000e-004	9.4000e-004	0.0000	2.5533	2.5533	1.8000e-004	0.0000	2.5576
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.7910</b>	<b>0.0153</b>	<b>0.0182</b>	<b>3.0000e-005</b>		<b>9.4000e-004</b>	<b>9.4000e-004</b>		<b>9.4000e-004</b>	<b>9.4000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>2.5533</b>	<b>2.5533</b>	<b>1.8000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>2.5576</b>

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**3.7 Architectural Coating - 2021****Mitigated Construction Off-Site**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	3.6000e-004	2.5000e-004	2.5000e-003	1.0000e-005	7.4000e-004	0.0000	7.5000e-004	2.0000e-004	0.0000	2.0000e-004	0.0000	0.6121	0.6121	2.0000e-005	0.0000	0.6125
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.6000e-004</b>	<b>2.5000e-004</b>	<b>2.5000e-003</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>	<b>7.4000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>7.5000e-004</b>	<b>2.0000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>2.0000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.6121</b>	<b>0.6121</b>	<b>2.0000e-005</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.6125</b>

**4.0 Operational Detail - Mobile****4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile**

Improve Destination Accessibility

Improve Pedestrian Network



## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Mitigated	0.3762	2.7644	3.8539	0.0136	0.9495	0.0124	0.9619	0.2549	0.0116	0.2666	0.0000	1,257.055 2	1,257.055 2	0.0639	0.0000	1,258.653 0
Unmitigated	0.3832	2.8401	4.0283	0.0143	1.0096	0.0130	1.0226	0.2711	0.0123	0.2833	0.0000	1,324.882 3	1,324.882 3	0.0660	0.0000	1,326.531 7

## 4.2 Trip Summary Information

Land Use	Average Daily Trip Rate			Unmitigated	Mitigated
	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual VMT	Annual VMT
General Light Industry	19.79	3.75	1.93	57,761	54,324
General Office Building	558.89	124.65	53.20	1,172,286	1,102,535
Strip Mall	527.41	500.28	243.12	770,724	724,866
Apartments Low Rise	13.18	14.32	12.14	47,484	44,659
Mobile Home Park	4.99	5.00	4.36	17,639	16,590
Single Family Housing	171.36	178.38	155.16	611,977	575,564
Total	1,295.62	826.37	469.91	2,677,871	2,518,537

## 4.3 Trip Type Information

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

Land Use	Miles			Trip %			Trip Purpose %		
	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	Primary	Diverted	Pass-by
General Light Industry	14.70	6.60	6.60	59.00	28.00	13.00	92	5	3
General Office Building	14.70	6.60	6.60	33.00	48.00	19.00	77	19	4
Strip Mall	14.70	6.60	6.60	16.60	64.40	19.00	45	40	15
Apartments Low Rise	16.80	7.10	7.90	38.40	22.60	39.00	86	11	3
Mobile Home Park	16.80	7.10	7.90	38.40	22.60	39.00	86	11	3
Single Family Housing	16.80	7.10	7.90	38.40	22.60	39.00	86	11	3

**4.4 Fleet Mix**

Land Use	LDA	LDT1	LDT2	MDV	LHD1	LHD2	MHD	HHD	OBUS	UBUS	MCY	SBUS	MH
General Light Industry	0.516727	0.033517	0.172440	0.141085	0.022326	0.005434	0.020884	0.078233	0.001822	0.001311	0.004327	0.001132	0.000761
General Office Building	0.516727	0.033517	0.172440	0.141085	0.022326	0.005434	0.020884	0.078233	0.001822	0.001311	0.004327	0.001132	0.000761
Strip Mall	0.516727	0.033517	0.172440	0.141085	0.022326	0.005434	0.020884	0.078233	0.001822	0.001311	0.004327	0.001132	0.000761
Apartments Low Rise	0.537300	0.200000	0.167100	0.054200	0.001400	0.000900	0.009000	0.020600	0.000000	0.004400	0.002600	0.000900	0.001600
Mobile Home Park	0.537300	0.200000	0.167100	0.054200	0.001400	0.000900	0.009000	0.020600	0.000000	0.004400	0.002600	0.000900	0.001600
Single Family Housing	0.537300	0.200000	0.167100	0.054200	0.001400	0.000900	0.009000	0.020600	0.000000	0.004400	0.002600	0.000900	0.001600

**5.0 Energy Detail**

Historical Energy Use: N

**5.1 Mitigation Measures Energy**

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Electricity Mitigated						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	255.7088	255.7088	0.0106	2.1800e-003	256.6237
Electricity Unmitigated						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	255.7088	255.7088	0.0106	2.1800e-003	256.6237
NaturalGas Mitigated	8.1100e-003	0.0722	0.0508	4.4000e-004		5.6000e-003	5.6000e-003		5.6000e-003	5.6000e-003	0.0000	80.2174	80.2174	1.5400e-003	1.4700e-003	80.6941
NaturalGas Unmitigated	8.1100e-003	0.0722	0.0508	4.4000e-004		5.6000e-003	5.6000e-003		5.6000e-003	5.6000e-003	0.0000	80.2174	80.2174	1.5400e-003	1.4700e-003	80.6941

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas****Unmitigated**

	NaturalGas Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Apartments Low Rise	33360.4	1.8000e-004	1.5400e-003	6.5000e-004	1.0000e-005		1.2000e-004	1.2000e-004		1.2000e-004	1.2000e-004	0.0000	1.7802	1.7802	3.0000e-005	3.0000e-005	1.7908
General Light Industry	47628	2.6000e-004	2.3300e-003	1.9600e-003	1.0000e-005		1.8000e-004	1.8000e-004		1.8000e-004	1.8000e-004	0.0000	2.5416	2.5416	5.0000e-005	5.0000e-005	2.5567
General Office Building	870983	4.7000e-003	0.0427	0.0359	2.6000e-004		3.2400e-003	3.2400e-003		3.2400e-003	3.2400e-003	0.0000	46.4790	46.4790	8.9000e-004	8.5000e-004	46.7552
Mobile Home Park	20221	1.1000e-004	9.3000e-004	4.0000e-004	1.0000e-005		8.0000e-005	8.0000e-005		8.0000e-005	8.0000e-005	0.0000	1.0791	1.0791	2.0000e-005	2.0000e-005	1.0855
Single Family Housing	463207	2.5000e-003	0.0213	9.0800e-003	1.4000e-004		1.7300e-003	1.7300e-003		1.7300e-003	1.7300e-003	0.0000	24.7185	24.7185	4.7000e-004	4.5000e-004	24.8654
Strip Mall	67818.6	3.7000e-004	3.3200e-003	2.7900e-003	2.0000e-005		2.5000e-004	2.5000e-004		2.5000e-004	2.5000e-004	0.0000	3.6191	3.6191	7.0000e-005	7.0000e-005	3.6406
<b>Total</b>		<b>8.1200e-003</b>	<b>0.0722</b>	<b>0.0507</b>	<b>4.5000e-004</b>		<b>5.6000e-003</b>	<b>5.6000e-003</b>		<b>5.6000e-003</b>	<b>5.6000e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>80.2174</b>	<b>80.2174</b>	<b>1.5300e-003</b>	<b>1.4700e-003</b>	<b>80.6941</b>

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas****Mitigated**

	NaturalGas Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Apartments Low Rise	33360.4	1.8000e-004	1.5400e-003	6.5000e-004	1.0000e-005		1.2000e-004	1.2000e-004		1.2000e-004	1.2000e-004	0.0000	1.7802	1.7802	3.0000e-005	3.0000e-005	1.7908
General Light Industry	47628	2.6000e-004	2.3300e-003	1.9600e-003	1.0000e-005		1.8000e-004	1.8000e-004		1.8000e-004	1.8000e-004	0.0000	2.5416	2.5416	5.0000e-005	5.0000e-005	2.5567
General Office Building	870983	4.7000e-003	0.0427	0.0359	2.6000e-004		3.2400e-003	3.2400e-003		3.2400e-003	3.2400e-003	0.0000	46.4790	46.4790	8.9000e-004	8.5000e-004	46.7552
Mobile Home Park	20221	1.1000e-004	9.3000e-004	4.0000e-004	1.0000e-005		8.0000e-005	8.0000e-005		8.0000e-005	8.0000e-005	0.0000	1.0791	1.0791	2.0000e-005	2.0000e-005	1.0855
Single Family Housing	463207	2.5000e-003	0.0213	9.0800e-003	1.4000e-004		1.7300e-003	1.7300e-003		1.7300e-003	1.7300e-003	0.0000	24.7185	24.7185	4.7000e-004	4.5000e-004	24.8654
Strip Mall	67818.6	3.7000e-004	3.3200e-003	2.7900e-003	2.0000e-005		2.5000e-004	2.5000e-004		2.5000e-004	2.5000e-004	0.0000	3.6191	3.6191	7.0000e-005	7.0000e-005	3.6406
<b>Total</b>		<b>8.1200e-003</b>	<b>0.0722</b>	<b>0.0507</b>	<b>4.5000e-004</b>		<b>5.6000e-003</b>	<b>5.6000e-003</b>		<b>5.6000e-003</b>	<b>5.6000e-003</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>80.2174</b>	<b>80.2174</b>	<b>1.5300e-003</b>	<b>1.4700e-003</b>	<b>80.6941</b>

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**5.3 Energy by Land Use - Electricity****Unmitigated**

	Electricity Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kWh/yr	MT/yr			
Apartments Low Rise	9272.18	2.9543	1.2000e-004	3.0000e-005	2.9649
General Light Industry	6690.6	2.1318	9.0000e-005	2.0000e-005	2.1394
General Office Building	505160	160.9548	6.6400e-003	1.3700e-003	161.5306
Mobile Home Park	5610.08	1.7875	7.0000e-005	2.0000e-005	1.7939
Single Family Housing	154693	49.2885	2.0300e-003	4.2000e-004	49.4649
Strip Mall	121122	38.5920	1.5900e-003	3.3000e-004	38.7300
<b>Total</b>		<b>255.7089</b>	<b>0.0105</b>	<b>2.1900e-003</b>	<b>256.6236</b>

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**5.3 Energy by Land Use - Electricity****Mitigated**

	Electricity Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kWh/yr	MT/yr			
Apartments Low Rise	9272.18	2.9543	1.2000e-004	3.0000e-005	2.9649
General Light Industry	6690.6	2.1318	9.0000e-005	2.0000e-005	2.1394
General Office Building	505160	160.9548	6.6400e-003	1.3700e-003	161.5306
Mobile Home Park	5610.08	1.7875	7.0000e-005	2.0000e-005	1.7939
Single Family Housing	154693	49.2885	2.0300e-003	4.2000e-004	49.4649
Strip Mall	121122	38.5920	1.5900e-003	3.3000e-004	38.7300
<b>Total</b>		<b>255.7089</b>	<b>0.0105</b>	<b>2.1900e-003</b>	<b>256.6236</b>

**6.0 Area Detail****6.1 Mitigation Measures Area**

Use Electric Lawnmower

Use Electric Leafblower

Use Electric Chainsaw

No Hearths Installed

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Mitigated	0.4781	1.8000e-003	0.1557	1.0000e-005		8.6000e-004	8.6000e-004		8.6000e-004	8.6000e-004	0.0000	0.2536	0.2536	2.5000e-004	0.0000	0.2597
Unmitigated	0.6034	0.0281	1.2892	3.7400e-003		0.1857	0.1857		0.1857	0.1857	24.6606	9.3532	34.0138	0.1157	1.7000e-004	36.9562

## 6.2 Area by SubCategory

Unmitigated

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Architectural Coating	0.0789					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Consumer Products	0.3945					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Hearth	0.1252	0.0263	1.1323	3.7300e-003		0.1848	0.1848		0.1848	0.1848	24.6606	9.0974	33.7580	0.1155	1.7000e-004	36.6941
Landscaping	4.7900e-003	1.8100e-003	0.1569	1.0000e-005		8.6000e-004	8.6000e-004		8.6000e-004	8.6000e-004	0.0000	0.2559	0.2559	2.5000e-004	0.0000	0.2621
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.6034</b>	<b>0.0281</b>	<b>1.2892</b>	<b>3.7400e-003</b>		<b>0.1857</b>	<b>0.1857</b>		<b>0.1857</b>	<b>0.1857</b>	<b>24.6606</b>	<b>9.3532</b>	<b>34.0138</b>	<b>0.1157</b>	<b>1.7000e-004</b>	<b>36.9562</b>



## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**6.2 Area by SubCategory****Mitigated**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Architectural Coating	0.0789					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Consumer Products	0.3945					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Hearth	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Landscaping	4.7200e-003	1.8000e-003	0.1557	1.0000e-005		8.6000e-004	8.6000e-004		8.6000e-004	8.6000e-004	0.0000	0.2536	0.2536	2.5000e-004	0.0000	0.2597
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.4781</b>	<b>1.8000e-003</b>	<b>0.1557</b>	<b>1.0000e-005</b>		<b>8.6000e-004</b>	<b>8.6000e-004</b>		<b>8.6000e-004</b>	<b>8.6000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.2536</b>	<b>0.2536</b>	<b>2.5000e-004</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.2597</b>

**7.0 Water Detail****7.1 Mitigation Measures Water**

Install Low Flow Bathroom Faucet

Install Low Flow Kitchen Faucet

Install Low Flow Toilet

Install Low Flow Shower

Use Water Efficient Irrigation System

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	MT/yr			
Mitigated	26.7022	0.3115	7.5300e-003	36.7351
Unmitigated	32.0364	0.3893	9.4100e-003	44.5727

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**7.2 Water by Land Use****Unmitigated**

	Indoor/Outdoor Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	Mgal	MT/yr			
Apartments Low Rise	0.130308 / 0.0821507	0.3576	4.2600e-003	1.0000e-004	0.4948
General Light Industry	0.65675 / 0	1.3406	0.0215	5.1000e-004	2.0303
General Office Building	9.00577 / 5.51966	24.5390	0.2944	7.1100e-003	34.0178
Mobile Home Park	0.065154 / 0.0410754	0.1788	2.1300e-003	5.0000e-005	0.2474
Single Family Housing	1.17277 / 0.739357	3.2185	0.0383	9.3000e-004	4.4530
Strip Mall	0.881463 / 0.540252	2.4018	0.0288	7.0000e-004	3.3296
<b>Total</b>		<b>32.0364</b>	<b>0.3893</b>	<b>9.4000e-003</b>	<b>44.5727</b>

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**7.2 Water by Land Use****Mitigated**

	Indoor/Outdoor Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	Mgal	MT/yr			
Apartments Low Rise	0.104246 / 0.0771395	0.2988	3.4100e-003	8.0000e-005	0.4086
General Light Industry	0.5254 / 0	1.0725	0.0172	4.1000e-004	1.6242
General Office Building	7.20462 / 5.18297	20.4868	0.2355	5.7000e-003	28.0729
Mobile Home Park	0.0521232 / 0.0385698	0.1494	1.7000e-003	4.0000e-005	0.2043
Single Family Housing	0.938218 / 0.694256	2.6894	0.0307	7.4000e-004	3.6774
Strip Mall	0.70517 / 0.507296	2.0052	0.0231	5.6000e-004	2.7477
<b>Total</b>		<b>26.7022</b>	<b>0.3115</b>	<b>7.5300e-003</b>	<b>36.7351</b>

**8.0 Waste Detail****8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste**

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**Category/Year**

	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
	MT/yr			
Mitigated	16.8239	0.9943	0.0000	41.6805
Unmitigated	16.8239	0.9943	0.0000	41.6805

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**8.2 Waste by Land Use****Unmitigated**

	Waste Disposed	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	tons	MT/yr			
Apartments Low Rise	0.92	0.1868	0.0110	0.0000	0.4627
General Light Industry	3.52	0.7145	0.0422	0.0000	1.7702
General Office Building	47.12	9.5649	0.5653	0.0000	23.6967
Mobile Home Park	0.46	0.0934	5.5200e-003	0.0000	0.2313
Single Family Housing	18.36	3.7269	0.2203	0.0000	9.2333
Strip Mall	12.5	2.5374	0.1500	0.0000	6.2863
<b>Total</b>		<b>16.8239</b>	<b>0.9943</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>41.6805</b>

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

**8.2 Waste by Land Use****Mitigated**

	Waste Disposed	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	tons	MT/yr			
Apartments Low Rise	0.92	0.1868	0.0110	0.0000	0.4627
General Light Industry	3.52	0.7145	0.0422	0.0000	1.7702
General Office Building	47.12	9.5649	0.5653	0.0000	23.6967
Mobile Home Park	0.46	0.0934	5.5200e-003	0.0000	0.2313
Single Family Housing	18.36	3.7269	0.2203	0.0000	9.2333
Strip Mall	12.5	2.5374	0.1500	0.0000	6.2863
<b>Total</b>		<b>16.8239</b>	<b>0.9943</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>41.6805</b>

**9.0 Operational Offroad**

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Days/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type
----------------	--------	-----------	-----------	-------------	-------------	-----------

**10.0 Stationary Equipment****Fire Pumps and Emergency Generators**

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Hours/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type
----------------	--------	-----------	------------	-------------	-------------	-----------

**Boilers**

## Lemon Cove Community Plan - Tulare County, Annual

Equipment Type	Number	Heat Input/Day	Heat Input/Year	Boiler Rating	Fuel Type
----------------	--------	----------------	-----------------	---------------	-----------

**User Defined Equipment**

Equipment Type	Number
----------------	--------

**11.0 Vegetation**

---



# **Attachment “B”**

---

## **Biological Resources Technical Memorandum**

[This page intentionally left blank]



# RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY

5961 SOUTH MOONEY BLVD  
VISALIA, CA 93277  
PHONE (559) 624-7000  
FAX (559) 730-2653

Aaron R. Bock	Economic Development and Planning
Reed Schenke	Public Works
Sherman Dix	Fiscal Services

---

## TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM BIOLOGICAL SPECIES EVALUATION

DATE: November 6, 2019  
TO: Hector Guerra, Chief Environmental Planner  
FROM: Jessica Willis, Planner IV  
SUBJECT: Biological Species Evaluation for Lemon Cove Community Plan (GPA 17-007, PZC 17-007, PZC 19-016, PZC 19-017)

---

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The objective in preparing of the Lemon Cove Community Plan is to develop a plan which can accurately reflect the needs and priorities of the unincorporated community of Lemon Cove and assist in fostering future economic development opportunities and grants. Lemon Cove, an unincorporated community, has localized land use needs and issues that should be addressed in a more specific manner particular to its community, geographic features, location of major roadways, such as State Route 198, population characteristics, availability of water, and other issues unique to the community's area. Therefore, the Lemon Cove Community Plan 2019 has been prepared with an emphasis on these considerations with particular focus on land use and circulation.

### PROJECT LOCATION

Project site is located in the northern portion of Tulare County, approximately four (4) miles southeast of the City of Woodlake and eleven (11) miles northeast of the City Visalia. The community is generally bounded by Avenue 319 in the south, Goodale Lane in the north, Road 236 in the west, and Road 248 in the east (see Figure 1).

United States Geological Survey 7.5-minute Quadrangle(s): Woodlake and Rocky Hill

Public Land Survey System: Section(s) 02, 03, 10, 11, Township 18 South, Range 27 East, Mount Diablo Base and Meridian

Latitude/Longitude: 36° 22' 53" N / 119° 01' 33" W (at SR 198, approximately 650 feet south of Avenue 328)

### SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES EVALUATION

The most recent California Department of Fish and Wildlife's (CDFW) California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), RareFind 5 and Biogeographic Information and Observation System (BIOS) mapping applications were accessed on November 5, 2019.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> CDFW. <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Maps-and-Data#43018407-rarefind-5>

## 9-Quad CNDDDB Results

The Project is located within the Woodlake and Rocky Hill Quadrangles. To identify special status species within the 9-quadrangle Project area, twelve (12) quads were reviewed (Stokes Mountain, Auckland, Shadequarter Mountain, Ivanhoe, Woodlake, Kaweah, Exeter, Rocky Hill, Chicken coop Canyon, Cairns Corner, Lindsay, and Frazier Valley). Based on the information in the CNDDDB and BIOS, there are forty-nine (49) special status species and six (6) natural plant communities of special concern within the 9-quadrangle Project area.

## Project Quad Results

Based on the information in the CNDDDB and BIOS, within the Woodlake and Rocky Hill quadrangles there are nineteen (19) special status species and two (2) natural plant communities of special concern within the general Project vicinity.

## Project Area Results

Two (2) special status animal species (*Bombus crotchii*, Crotch bumble bee and *Rana boylei*, foothill yellow-legged frog) have been recorded within the Project study area (i.e., the existing Lemon Cove Urban Development Boundary (UDB) and the proposed expanded UDB)(see Figure 2). The Crotch bumble bee is presumed extant (still in existence or surviving) while the foothill yellow-legged frog is considered extirpated (a species that has been locally eliminated but is not extinct) within the Project study area. The one (1) special status plant species (*Pseudobahia peirsonii*, San Joaquin adobe sunburst) identified in Figure 2 is located outside of the Project study area.

The following special status plant and animal species and natural plant communities have not been recorded within the Project study area, but have been recorded within 2.5 miles of the Project study area (see Figure 3).

- *Brodiaea insignis* (Kaweah brodiaea)
- *Diplacus pictus* (calico monkeyflower)
- *Delphinium recurvatum* (recurved larkspur)
- *Eryngium spinosepalum* (spiny-sepaled button-celery)
- *Pseudobahia peirsonii* (San Joaquin adobe sunburst)
- *Agelaius tricolor* (tri-colored blackbird)
- *Ardea herodias* (great blue heron)
- *Branchinecta lynchi* (vernal pool fairy shrimp)
- *Emys marmorata* (western pond turtle)
- *Eumops perotis californicus* (western mastiff bat)
- *Gymnogyps californianus* (California condor)
- *Haliaeetus leucocephalus* (bald eagle)
- *Spea hammondi* (western spadefoot)
- Northern Claypan Vernal Pool
- Sycamore Alluvial Woodland

Although only one (1) special status species (Crotch bumble bee) has been recorded and is considered extant in the Project study area, there is a possibility that migratory birds and raptors may be present or that currently undeveloped areas within the UDB could provide habitat or foraging areas. Therefore, future development projects within the UDB subject to subsequent CEQA analysis will be required to implement applicable mitigation measure(s) to reduce potential impacts on special status species to less than significant.

### **Measures for Special Status Plant Species**

BIO-1: (*Pre-construction Survey*) A qualified biologist/botanist shall conduct pre-construction surveys for special status plant species in accordance with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) *Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities* (2009). This protocol includes identification of reference populations to facilitate the likelihood of field investigation occurring during the appropriate floristic period. Surveys should be timed to coincide with flowering periods for species that could occur (March-May). In the absence of protocol-level surveys being performed, additional surveys may be necessary.

- If special status plant species are not identified during pre-construction surveys, no further action is required.
- If special status plant species are detected during pre-construction surveys, the biologist/botanist will supervise establishment of a minimum 50-foot no disturbance buffer from the outer edge of the plant population. If buffers cannot be maintained, the Sacramento Field Office of the USFWS and the Fresno Field Office of CDFW shall be contacted immediately to identify the appropriate minimization actions to be taken as appropriate for the species identified and to determine permitting needs.

### **Measures for Special Status Animal Species**

BIO-2: (*Pre-construction Survey*) A qualified biologist will conduct pre-construction surveys during the appropriate periods for special status animal species in accordance with CDFW guidance and recommendations. In the absence of protocol-level surveys being performed, additional surveys may be necessary.

- If special status animal species are not identified during pre-construction surveys, no further action is required.
- If special status animal species are detected during pre-construction surveys, the Sacramento Field Office of the USFWS and the Fresno Field Office of CDFW shall be contacted immediately to identify the appropriate avoidance and minimization actions to be taken as applicable for the species identified and to determine permitting needs.

### **Measures for Special Status Species Identified in Pre-construction Surveys**

BIO-3: (*Employee Education Program*) Prior to the start of construction, the applicant shall retain a qualified biologist/botanist to conduct a tailgate meeting to train all construction staff that will be involved with the project on the special status species

that occur, or may occur, on the project site. This training will include a description of the species and its habitat needs; a report of the occurrence of the species in the project area; an explanation of the status of the species and its protection under the Endangered Species Act; and a list of the measures being taken to reduce impacts to the species during project construction and implementation.

### Measures for Nesting Raptors and Migratory Birds

BIO-4: (***Avoidance***) In order to avoid impacts to nesting raptors and migratory birds, individual Projects within the Project will be constructed, where possible, outside the nesting season (between September 1st and January 31st).

BIO-5: (***Pre-construction Survey***) If Project activities must occur during the nesting season (February 1-August 31), the proponent is responsible for ensuring that implementation does not violate the Migratory Bird Treaty Act or relevant Fish and Game Code. A qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys for active raptor and migratory bird nests within 10 days of the onset of these activities. The survey will include the proposed work area(s) and surrounding lands within 500 feet for all nesting raptors and migratory birds; with the exception of Swainson's hawk. The Swainson's hawk survey will utilize the Swainson's Hawk Technical Advisory Committee *Recommended Timing and Methodology for Swainson's Hawk Nesting Surveys in California's Central Valley* (2000) methodology which will extend to ½-mile outside of work area boundaries. If no nesting pairs are found within the survey area, no further mitigation is required.

BIO-6: (***Pre-construction Survey***) A qualified biologist will conduct pre-construction surveys in accordance with the Swainson's Hawk Technical Advisory Committee *Recommended Timing and Methodology for Swainson's Hawk Nesting Surveys in California's Central Valley* (2000) which employs the following:

Survey Period	Survey Dates	Survey Time	Number of Surveys Needed
I	January – March 20	All day	1
II	March 20 – April 5	Sunrise – 1000; 1600 to Sunset	3
III	April 5 – April 20	Sunrise – 1200; 1630 – Sunset	3
IV	April 21 – June 10	Monitoring sites only	Initiating surveys is not recommended
V	June 10 – July 30	Sunrise – 1200; 1600 – Sunset	3

If project activities must occur during the nesting season (February 1-August 31), the project proponent and/or their contractor is responsible for ensuring that implementation does not violate the Migratory Bird Treaty Act or relevant Fish and Game Code, and a qualified biologist will conduct pre-onstruction surveys for active raptor and migratory bird nests within 10 days of the onset of these activities. The survey will include the proposed work area(s) and surrounding lands within

500 feet for all nesting raptors and migratory birds save Swainson's hawk; the Swainson's hawk survey will extend to ½ mile outside of work area boundaries. If no nesting pairs are found within the survey area, no further mitigation is required.

- BIO-7: (**Buffers**) Should any active nests be discovered near proposed work areas, a qualified biologist will determine appropriate construction setback distances and a behavioral baseline of all identified nests based on applicable CDFW guidelines and/or the biology of the affected species. Within these buffers, the biologist will continue monitoring to detect behavioral changes. If adverse behavioral changes occur, the activity causing the changes will cease and CDFW will be consulted to determine if avoidance and minimization measures need to be modified to adequately protect the impacted birds. Construction-free buffers will be identified on the ground with flagging, fencing, or by other easily visible means, and will be maintained until the biologist has determined that the young have fledged (i.e., when a bird's feathers and wing muscles are sufficiently developed for flight). Unless a variance is approved by CDFW, the buffer shall not be less than 250 feet around active nests of non-listed bird species and not less than 500 feet around active nests of non-listed raptor species until the birds have fledged. Unless a variance is approved by CDFW, a ½ mile distance shall be used for SWHA, until the birds have "fledged".

### Measures for Roosting Bats

- BIO-8: (**Temporal Avoidance**) To avoid potential impacts to maternity bat roosts, removal of buildings and trees should occur outside of the period between April 1 and September 30, the time frame within which colony-nesting bats generally assemble, give birth, nurse their young, and ultimately disperse.
- BIO-9: (**Pre-construction Survey**) If removal of buildings or trees is to occur between April 1 and September 30 (general maternity bat roost season), then within 30 days prior to these activities, a qualified biologist will survey affected buildings and trees for the presence of bats. The biologist will look for individuals, guano, and staining, and will listen for bat vocalizations. If necessary, the biologist will wait for nighttime emergence of bats from roost sites. If no bats are observed to be roosting or breeding, then no further action would be required, and construction could proceed.
- BIO-10: (**Minimization**) If a non-breeding bat colony is detected during pre-construction surveys, a minimum 50-foot no-disturbance buffer area will be established around the colony and the Fresno Field Office of the CDFW shall be notified immediately by phone and in writing to determine the best course of action. If avoidance (including a reduced buffer area) is not feasible, a Bat Eviction Plan shall be prepared by a qualified biologist and approved by the CDFW prior to start of construction. The individuals will be humanely evicted via partial dismantlement of trees or structures prior to full removal under the direction of a qualified biologist to ensure that no harm or "take" of any bats occurs as a result of construction activities.

**BIO-11: (*Avoidance of Maternity Roosts*)** If a maternity colony is detected during pre-construction surveys, a disturbance-free buffer will be established around the colony and remain in place until a qualified biologist deems that the nursery is no longer active. The disturbance-free buffer will range from a minimum of 50 feet as determined appropriate by the qualified biologist in consultation with the CDFW.

#### WATERS OF THE STATE AND U.S.

In addition to the CDFW BIOS mapping application, the most recent United States Geological Survey (USGS) National Water Information System (NWIS) and United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) mapping applications were accessed on November 5, 2019.<sup>2,3</sup> Based on the information in the CDFW BIOS map (see Figure 2), the USGS NWIS map (see Figure 4), and USFWS NWI map (see Figure 5), the following waterways and wetlands are located within the Project study area or in close proximity.

- **Foothill Ditch:** The ditch (classified as riverine) is located along the northwestern boundary of the Project study area, adjacent and parallel to the proposed expanded UDB (crossing SR 216 at SR 198); the ditch is also approximately 1,500 feet west of the existing UDB.
- **Kaweah River:** The river (classified as riverine and freshwater forested/shrub wetland) is approximately 1,800 feet west of the Project study area at its nearest point (northwest of Wutchumna Hill).
- **Saint John's River:** The river (classified as riverine, with an area classified as freshwater emergent wetland) is approximately 3,800 feet north of the southern region of the Project study area.
- **Lemoncove Ditch:** This ditch (classified as freshwater pond bounded with freshwater emergent wetland) is located approximately 700 feet east of the Project study area (on the north side of Avenue 328 and approximately 1,500 feet east of SR 198).
- **Other Waterways:** A waterway (classified as riverine and branching off the Lemoncove Ditch wetland) is located approximately 300 feet east of the proposed UDB (near Avenue 330 and Road 248). A waterway branching off Foothill Ditch (classified as riverine) transects the southwestern most portion of the Project study area in two locations.
- **Other Water Bodies:** A freshwater pond is located approximately 300 feet east of the Project study area (approximately 1,500 feet east of SR 198 and 500 feet north of Avenue 324); and various small bodies are located to the south and west of the study area.

There are no development projects proposed with this Project. Future projects will be evaluated on a project-by-project basis as they are identified. Best management practices, including compliance with all applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements, which includes a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP), will be required during construction activities. A grading and drainage plan will be submitted and approved by the Tulare County Resource Management Agency (RMA) Engineering Branch. However, to ensure that potential jurisdictional waters are not adversely impacted by future development within the Project study area (the proposed expanded UDB), the following mitigation measure will be required for projects located adjacent to the waterways and water bodies identified in the BIOS, NWIS and

---

<sup>2</sup> USGS. <https://maps.waterdata.usgs.gov/mapper/index.html>

<sup>3</sup> USFWS. <https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.HTML>




NWI mapping applications. Therefore, the Project will not result in significant impact to any riparian habitats or other protected wetlands.

BIO-12: (***Consultation***) Prior to the start of ground disturbance activities, the applicant shall consult with the Fresno Field Office of the CDFW and/or the Sacramento Field Office of the USFWS to determine if a Wetland Delineation and a Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement will be required.

[This page intentionally left blank]

**Figure 1. Project Location**



[This page intentionally left blank]


**Figure 2. CNDDDB Map Showing Special Status Species and State Waters  
(Withing Immediate Vicinity of Project Study Area)**



[This page intentionally left blank]




**Figure 3. CNDDDB Map Showing Special Status Species  
(Within Approximately 3 Miles of Project Study Area)**



[This page intentionally left blank]




**Figure 4. USGS NWIS Map Showing Federal Jurisdictional Waters**



[This page intentionally left blank]

Figure 5. USFWS NWI Map Showing Federal Jurisdictional Waters



[This page intentionally left blank]

# **Attachment “C”**

---

## **Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources**

[This page intentionally left blank]

## CHRIS SEARCH RESULTS

[This page intentionally left blank]





**To:** Hector Guerra  
Tulare County Resource Management Agency  
5961 South Mooney Blvd.  
Visalia, CA 93277

**Record Search 19-291**  
Tulare County  
Resource Management Agency

AUG 12 2019

**Date:** August 6, 2019

**Re:** Lemon Cove Community Plan

**County:** Tulare

**Map(s):** Rocky Hill & Woodlake 7.5'

### **CULTURAL RESOURCES RECORDS SEARCH**

The California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) contracts with the California Historical Resources Information System's (CHRIS) regional Information Centers (ICs) to maintain information in the CHRIS inventory and make it available to local, state, and federal agencies, cultural resource professionals, Native American tribes, researchers, and the public. Recommendations made by IC coordinators or their staff regarding the interpretation and application of this information are advisory only. Such recommendations do not necessarily represent the evaluation or opinion of the State Historic Preservation Officer in carrying out the OHP's regulatory authority under federal and state law.

The following are the results of a search of the cultural resource files at the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center. These files include known and recorded cultural resources sites, inventory and excavation reports filed with this office, and resources listed on the National Register of Historic Places, Historic Property Directory, California State Historical Landmarks, California Register of Historical Resources, California Inventory of Historic Resources, and California Points of Historical Interest. Due to processing delays and other factors, not all of the historical resource reports and resource records that have been submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation are available via this records search. Additional information may be available through the federal, state, and local agencies that produced or paid for historical resource management work in the search area.

### **PRIOR CULTURAL RESOURCE STUDIES CONDUCTED WITHIN THE PROJECT AREA AND THE ONE-HALF MILE RADIUS**

According to the information in our files, there have been three previous cultural resource studies conducted within the project area, TU-00985, 01498, and 01675. There have been five additional studies within the one-half mile radius, TU-00049, 00108, 00135, 00378, and 00550.

**KNOWN/RECORDED CULTURAL RESOURCES WITHIN THE PROJECT AREA AND THE ONE-HALF MILE RADIUS**

There are three recorded cultural resources within the project area, P-54-004007, 004034, and 004615. There are eight known resources within the one-half mile radius, P-54-000027, 000316, 000319, 005027, 005098, 005099, 005299, and one unrecorded prehistoric rock art site. These resources consist of prehistoric era pictographs and lithic scatters, as well as historic era trash scatters, transmission lines, a hotel, a railroad, and a ditch.

Resource P-54-004007 is the Pogue Hotel, located at 32792 Sierra Drive. This resource has been given a National Register status code of 1D, indicating it is a contributor to a district or multiple resource property listed in the National Register of Historic Places by the Keeper. It is also listed in the California Register of Historical Resources. There are no other recorded cultural resources within the project area that are listed in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, the California Points of Historical Interest, California Inventory of Historic Resources, or the California State Historic Landmarks.

**COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

We understand this project consists of a Community Plan for the community of Lemon Cove. Further, we understand no immediate ground disturbance will take place as a result of this plan. Therefore, no further cultural resource investigation is recommended at this time. However, prior to any future ground disturbance project activities, we recommend a new record search be conducted so our office can then make project specific recommendations for further cultural resources study, if needed. A list of qualified consultants can be found at [www.chrisinfo.org](http://www.chrisinfo.org).

We also recommend that you contact the Native American Heritage Commission in Sacramento. They will provide you with a current list of Native American individuals/organizations that can assist you with information regarding cultural resources that may not be included in the CHRIS Inventory and that may be of concern to the Native groups in the area. The Commission can consult their "Sacred Lands Inventory" file in order to determine what sacred resources, if any, exist within this project area and the way in which these resources might be managed. Finally, please consult with the lead agency on this project to determine if any other cultural resource investigation is required. If you need any additional information or have any questions or concerns, please contact our office at (661) 654-2289.

By:



Celeste M. Thomson, Coordinator

Date: August 6, 2019

Please note that invoices for Information Center services will be sent under separate cover from the California State University, Bakersfield Accounting Office.

## SACRED LANDS FILE SEARCH RESULTS

[This page intentionally left blank]



The NAHC also recommends, but does not require that lead agencies include in their notification letters, information regarding any cultural resources assessment that has been completed on the area of potential affect (APE), such as:

1. The results of any record search that may have been conducted at an Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), including, but not limited to:
  - A listing of any and all known cultural resources have already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE, such as known archaeological sites;
  - Copies of any and all cultural resource records and study reports that may have been provided by the Information Center as part of the records search response;
  - Whether the records search indicates a low, moderate or high probability that unrecorded cultural resources are located in the APE; and
  - If a survey is recommended by the Information Center to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.
2. The results of any archaeological inventory survey that was conducted, including:
  - Any report that may contain site forms, site significance, and suggested mitigation measures.

All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum, and not be made available for public disclosure in accordance with Government Code Section 6254.10.
3. The result of the Sacred Lands File (SFL) check conducted through the NAHC was negative.
4. Any ethnographic studies conducted for any area including all or part of the APE; and
5. Any geotechnical reports regarding all or part of the APE.

Lead agencies should be aware that records maintained by the NAHC and CHRIS is not exhaustive, and a negative response to these searches does not preclude the existence of a tribal cultural resource. A tribe may be the only source of information regarding the existence of a tribal cultural resource.

This information will aid tribes in determining whether to request formal consultation. In the event, that they do, having the information beforehand well help to facilitate the consultation process.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from tribes, please notify the NAHC. With your assistance, we can assure that our consultation list remains current.

If you have any questions, please contact me at my email address: [steven.quinn@nahc.ca.gov](mailto:steven.quinn@nahc.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Steven Quinn". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Steven Quinn  
Associate Governmental Program Analyst

Attachment

**Native American Heritage Commission  
Native American Contacts List  
8/14/2019**

Kern Valley Indian Community  
Julie Turner, Secretary  
P.O. Box 1010  
Lake Isabella ,CA 93240  
(661) 340-0032 Cell

Kawaiisu  
Tubatulabal

Wuksache Indian Tribe/Eshom Valley Band  
Kenneth Woodrow, Chairperson  
1179 Rock Haven Ct.  
Salinas ,CA 93906  
kwood8934@aol.com  
(831) 443-9702

Foothill Yokuts  
Mono  
Wuksache

Kern Valley Indian Community  
Robert Robinson, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 1010  
Lake Isabella ,CA 93240  
bbutterbredt@gmail.com  
(760) 378-2915 Cell

Tubatulabal  
Kawaiisu

Santa Rosa Rancheria Tachi Yokut Tribe  
Rueben Barrios Sr., Chairperson  
P.O. Box 8  
Lemoore ,CA 93245  
(559) 924-1278  
(559) 924-3583 Fax

Tache  
Tachi  
Yokut

Tubatulabals of Kern Valley  
Robert L. Gomez, Jr., Tribal Chairperson  
P.O. Box 226  
Lake Isabella ,CA 93240  
(760) 379-4590  
(760) 379-4592 Fax

Tubatulabal

Tule River Indian Tribe  
Neil Peyron, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 589  
Porterville ,CA 93258  
neil.peyron@tulerivertribe-nsn.gov  
(559) 781-4271  
(559) 781-4610 Fax

Yokuts

**This list is current as of the date of this document and is based on the information available to the Commission on the date it was produced.**

**Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code, or Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.**

**This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans Tribes for the proposed:  
Lemon Cove Community Plan Project.**

[This page intentionally left blank]



# TRIBAL CONSULTATION

Consultation Notice – Lemon Cove Community Plan															
TRIBE CONTACTED	REQUEST TYPE		DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED					DELIVERY METHOD / DATE			CONSULTATION PERIOD		CONSULTATION / ACTIONS		
	AB 52	SB 18	Maps	Project Description	SLF Search Results	CHRIS Results	Other	E-mail	FedEx	Certified US Mail	Return Receipt Date	Date Period Ends	Date	TYPE	Summary
SACRED LAND FILE (SLF) REQUEST															
Native American Heritage Commission	X	X	X	X			Request Form	7/23/19						8/14/19 Email	Response to SLF request including response letter and tribal listing
CONSULTATION REQUEST LETTERS															
Kern Valley Indian Council Robert Robinson, Co-Chairperson PO Box 1010 Lake Isabella, CA 93240	X	X	X	X			Cover Letter and Project Notification Form			8/29/19 7013060000 0216980650	9/24/19	10/24/19 (AB 52) 12/23/19 (SB 18)			Mail returned, unclaimed and unable to forward. Called (760) 378-2915 and sent email to <a href="mailto:butterbredt@gmail.com">butterbredt@gmail.com</a> on 9/24/19. Waiting for response.  No response as of 11/6/19.
Kern Valley Indian Council Julie Turner, Secretary P. Box 1010 Lake Isabella, CA 93240	X	X	X	X			Cover Letter and Project Notification Form			8/29/19 7013060000 0216980667	9/24/19	10/24/19 (AB 52) 12/23/19 (SB 18)		9/24/19	Mail returned, unclaimed and unable to forward. Called (661) 340-0032 and sent email to <a href="mailto:meindiangirl@sbcglobal.net">meindiangirl@sbcglobal.net</a> on 9/24/19. Waiting for response.  Turner replied email 9/24/19 and stated that they do not have any comments on this project since it's outside of their traditional territory.
Santa Rosa Rancheria Tachi Yokut Tribe Bianca Arias, Administrative Assistant P. O. Box 8 Lemoore, CA 93245	X	X	X	X			Cover Letter and Project Notification Form			8/29/19 7013060000 0216980629	8/30/19	9/29/19 (AB52) 11/28/19 (SB 18)			No response as of 11/6/19.
Santa Rosa Rancheria Tachi Yokut Tribe Cultural Department Greg Cuara, Cultural Specialist P. O. Box 8 Lemoore, CA 93245	X	X	X	X			Cover Letter and Project Notification Form			8/29/19 7013060000 0216980643	8/30/19	9/29/19 (AB52) 11/28/19 (SB 18)			No response as of 11/6/19.
Santa Rosa Rancheria Tachi Yokut Tribe Cultural Department Shana Powers, Director P. O. Box 8 Lemoore, CA 93245	X	X	X	X			Cover Letter and Project Notification Form			8/29/19 7013060000 0216980636	8/30/19	9/29/19 (AB52) 11/28/19 (SB 18)			No response as of 11/6/19.
Tubatulabals of Kern Valley Robert L. Gomez, Jr., Chairperson P. O. Box 226 Lake Isabella, CA 93240	X	X	X	X			Cover Letter and Project Notification Form			8/29/19 7013060000 0216980674	9/10/19	10/10/19 (AB 52) 12/9/19 (SB 18)			No response as of 11/6/19.
Tule River Indian Tribe Neil Peyron, Chairperson P. O. Box 589 Porterville, CA 93258	X	X	X	X			Cover Letter and Project Notification Form			8/29/19 7013060000 0216980698	9/3/19	10/3/19 (AB 52) 12/2/19 (SB 18)			No response as of 11/6/19.
Tule River Indian Tribe Department of Environmental Protection Felix Chrisman, Tribal Archaeologist P. O. Box 589 Porterville, CA 93258	X	X	X	X			Cover Letter and Project Notification Form			8/29/19 7013060000 0216980681	9/3/19	10/3/19 (AB 52) 12/2/19 (SB 18)			No response as of 11/6/19.

Consultation Notice – Lemon Cove Community Plan															
TRIBE CONTACTED	REQUEST TYPE		DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED					DELIVERY METHOD / DATE			CONSULTATION PERIOD		CONSULTATION / ACTIONS		
	AB 52	SB 18	Maps	Project Description	SLF Search Results	CHRIS Results	Other	E-mail	FedEx	Certified US Mail	Return Receipt Date	Date Period Ends	Date	TYPE	Summary
Tule River Indian Tribe Environmental Department Kerri Vera, Director P. O. Box 589 Porterville, CA 93258	X	X	X	X			Cover Letter and Project Notification Form			8/29/19  7013060000 0216980704	9/3/19	10/3/19 (AB 52)  12/2/19 (SB 18)			No response as of 11/6/19.
Wuksache Indian Tribe/Eshom Valley Band Kenneth Woodrow, Chairperson 1179 Rock Haven Ct. Salinas, CA 93906	X	X	X	X			Cover Letter and Project Notification Form			8/29/19  7013060000 0216980711	8/31/19	9/30/19 (AB52)  11/29/19 (SB 18)			No response as of 11/6/19.

[This page intentionally left blank]

# TRIBAL CONSULTATION REQUEST LETTERS

[This page intentionally left blank]



# RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY

5961 SOUTH MOONEY BLVD

VISALIA, CA 93277

PHONE (559) 624-7000

FAX (559) 730-2653

Aaron R. Bock

Reed Schenke

Sherman Dix

Economic Development and Planning

Public Works

Fiscal Services

REED SCHENKE, DIRECTOR

MICHAEL WASHAM, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR

August 28, 2019

Santa Rosa Rancheria Tachi Yokut Tribe  
Bianca Arias  
P.O. Box 8  
Lemoore, CA 93245

RE: Project Notification Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18 for the Lemon Cove Community Plan

Dear Ms. Arias,

Pursuant to the provisions of AB 52 and SB 18, as the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the County of Tulare hereby extends an invitation to consult on the CEQA review of the Lemon Cove Community Plan (Project) in order to assist with identifying and/or preserving and/or mitigating project impacts to Native American cultural places including:

- Native American sanctified cemetery, place of worship, religious or ceremonial site, or sacred shrine; and
- Native American historic, cultural, or sacred site that is listed or may be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources including historic or prehistoric ruins and any burial ground, archaeological, or historic site.

In accordance with CEQA (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.), the County of Tulare Resource Management Agency (RMA) will be preparing a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) to evaluate the potential environmental effects associated with the Project.

## **Sacred Lands File Search**

The County requested a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search through the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on July 23, 2019, for the Project. The SLF search returned on August 14, 2019, with negative results; however, the NAHC recommended consultation with your Tribe. Results of the SLF search will be made available upon the release of the MND for public review. However, results may be made available to your Tribal Representatives if a written request for consultation is submitted to the County within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter.

## **California Historical Resources Information System**

A California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) search for the project area was requested through the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center (SSJVIC) on July 23, 2019. The CHRIS search dated August 6, 2019, indicated that there are three (3) recorded resources within the project area (site), and there are eight (8) known resources within the ½ mile radius. These resources consist of prehistoric era pictographs and lithic scatters, as well as historic era trash scatters, transmission lines, a hotel, a railroad, and a ditch. As such, the County is requesting consultation with your Tribe to determine whether a Cultural Resources Study will be required. The results of the CHRIS search may be made available to your Tribal Representatives if a written request for consultation is received. Should the County not receive a response to this request within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter, it will be presumed that there are no cultural resources of concern and a Cultural Resources Study will not be required.

If your Tribe desires to consult with the County on the review of this project, please respond in writing within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter. Written correspondence can be mailed to the address provided above or e-mailed to the addresses provided below.

**If the County does not receive a response to this notification, it will be presumed that your Tribe has declined the opportunity to consult on this project pursuant to AB 52 and SB 18.**

Thank you for your consideration on this matter and please do not hesitate to contact me by phone or e-mail should you have any questions or need additional information. If you need immediate assistance and I am unavailable, please contact, Hector Guerra, Chief of Environmental Planning, by phone at (559) 624-7121, or by email at [hguerra@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:hguerra@co.tulare.ca.us).

Sincerely,



Jessica Willis  
Planner IV  
(559) 624-7121  
[JWillis@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:JWillis@co.tulare.ca.us)

Attachment: Tribal Consultation Notice





# RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY

5961 SOUTH MOONEY BLVD  
VISALIA, CA 93277  
PHONE (559) 624-7000  
FAX (559) 730-2653

Aaron R. Bock	Economic Development and Planning
Reed Schenke	Public Works
Sherman Dix	Fiscal Services

REED SCHENKE, DIRECTOR

MICHAEL WASHAM, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR

August 28, 2019

Santa Rosa Rancheria Tachi Yokut Tribe  
Shana Powers, Director  
P.O. Box 8  
Lemoore, CA 93245

RE: Project Notification Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18 for the Lemon Cove Community Plan

Dear Ms. Powers,

Pursuant to the provisions of AB 52 and SB 18, as the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the County of Tulare hereby extends an invitation to consult on the CEQA review of the Lemon Cove Community Plan (Project) in order to assist with identifying and/or preserving and/or mitigating project impacts to Native American cultural places including:

- Native American sanctified cemetery, place of worship, religious or ceremonial site, or sacred shrine; and
- Native American historic, cultural, or sacred site that is listed or may be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources including historic or prehistoric ruins and any burial ground, archaeological, or historic site.

In accordance with CEQA (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.), the County of Tulare Resource Management Agency (RMA) will be preparing a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) to evaluate the potential environmental effects associated with the Project.

## **Sacred Lands File Search**

The County requested a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search through the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on July 23, 2019, for the Project. The SLF search returned on August 14, 2019, with negative results; however, the NAHC recommended consultation with your Tribe. Results of the SLF search will be made available upon the release of the MND for public review. However, results may be made available to your Tribal Representatives if a written request for consultation is submitted to the County within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter.

## **California Historical Resources Information System**

A California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) search for the project area was requested through the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center (SSJVIC) on July 23, 2019. The CHRIS search dated August 6, 2019, indicated that there are three (3) recorded resources within the project area (site), and there are eight (8) known resources within the ½ mile radius. These resources consist of prehistoric era pictographs and lithic scatters, as well as historic era trash scatters, transmission lines, a hotel, a railroad, and a ditch. As such, the County is requesting consultation with your Tribe to determine whether a Cultural Resources Study will be required. The results of the CHRIS search may be made available to your Tribal Representatives if a written request for consultation is received. Should the County not receive a response to this request within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter, it will be presumed that there are no cultural resources of concern and a Cultural Resources Study will not be required.

If your Tribe desires to consult with the County on the review of this project, please respond in writing within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter. Written correspondence can be mailed to the address provided above or e-mailed to the addresses provided below.

**If the County does not receive a response to this notification, it will be presumed that your Tribe has declined the opportunity to consult on this project pursuant to AB 52 and SB 18.**

Thank you for your consideration on this matter and please do not hesitate to contact me by phone or e-mail should you have any questions or need additional information. If you need immediate assistance and I am unavailable, please contact, Hector Guerra, Chief of Environmental Planning, by phone at (559) 624-7121, or by email at [hguerra@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:hguerra@co.tulare.ca.us).

Sincerely,



Jessica Willis  
Planner IV  
(559) 624-7121  
[JWillis@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:JWillis@co.tulare.ca.us)

Attachment: Tribal Consultation Notice





# RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY

5961 SOUTH MOONEY BLVD  
VISALIA, CA 93277  
PHONE (559) 624-7000  
FAX (559) 730-2653

Aaron R. Bock	Economic Development and Planning
Reed Schenke	Public Works
Sherman Dix	Fiscal Services

REED SCHENKE, DIRECTOR

MICHAEL WASHAM, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR

August 28, 2019

Santa Rosa Rancheria Tachi Yokut Tribe  
Cultural Department  
Greg Cuara, Cultural Specialist  
P.O. Box 8  
Lemoore, CA 93245

RE: Project Notification Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18 for the Lemon Cove Community Plan

Dear Mr. Cuara,

Pursuant to the provisions of AB 52 and SB 18, as the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the County of Tulare hereby extends an invitation to consult on the CEQA review of the Lemon Cove Community Plan (Project) in order to assist with identifying and/or preserving and/or mitigating project impacts to Native American cultural places including:

- Native American sanctified cemetery, place of worship, religious or ceremonial site, or sacred shrine; and
- Native American historic, cultural, or sacred site that is listed or may be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources including historic or prehistoric ruins and any burial ground, archaeological, or historic site.

In accordance with CEQA (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.), the County of Tulare Resource Management Agency (RMA) will be preparing a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) to evaluate the potential environmental effects associated with the Project.

## **Sacred Lands File Search**

The County requested a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search through the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on July 23, 2019, for the Project. The SLF search returned on August 14, 2019, with negative results; however, the NAHC recommended consultation with your Tribe. Results of the SLF search will be made available upon the release of the MND for public review. However, results may be made available to your Tribal Representatives if a written request for consultation is submitted to the County within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter.

## **California Historical Resources Information System**

A California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) search for the project area was requested through the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center (SSJVIC) on July 23, 2019. The CHRIS search dated August 6, 2019, indicated that there are three (3) recorded resources within the project area (site), and there are eight (8) known resources within the ½ mile radius. These resources consist of prehistoric era pictographs and lithic scatters, as well as historic era trash scatters, transmission lines, a hotel, a railroad, and a ditch. As such, the County is requesting consultation with your Tribe to determine whether a Cultural Resources Study will be required. The results of the CHRIS search may be made available to your Tribal Representatives if a written request for consultation is received. Should the County not receive a response to this request within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter, it will be presumed that there are no cultural resources of concern and a Cultural Resources Study will not be required.

If your Tribe desires to consult with the County on the review of this project, please respond in writing within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter. Written correspondence can be mailed to the address provided above or e-mailed to the addresses provided below.

**If the County does not receive a response to this notification, it will be presumed that your Tribe has declined the opportunity to consult on this project pursuant to AB 52 and SB 18.**

Thank you for your consideration on this matter and please do not hesitate to contact me by phone or e-mail should you have any questions or need additional information. If you need immediate assistance and I am unavailable, please contact, Hector Guerra, Chief of Environmental Planning, by phone at (559) 624-7121, or by email at [hguerra@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:hguerra@co.tulare.ca.us).

Sincerely,



Jessica Willis  
Planner IV  
(559) 624-7121  
[JWillis@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:JWillis@co.tulare.ca.us)

Attachment: Tribal Consultation Notice





# RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY

5961 SOUTH MOONEY BLVD

VISALIA, CA 93277

PHONE (559) 624-7000

FAX (559) 730-2653

Aaron R. Bock

Reed Schenke

Sherman Dix

Economic Development and Planning

Public Works

Fiscal Services

REED SCHENKE, DIRECTOR

MICHAEL WASHAM, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR

August 28, 2019

Kern Valley Indian Community  
Robert Robinson, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 1010  
Lake Isabella, CA 93240

RE: Project Notification Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18 for the Lemon Cove Community Plan

Dear Chairperson Robinson,

Pursuant to the provisions of AB 52 and SB 18, as the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the County of Tulare hereby extends an invitation to consult on the CEQA review of the Lemon Cove Community Plan (Project) in order to assist with identifying and/or preserving and/or mitigating project impacts to Native American cultural places including:

- Native American sanctified cemetery, place of worship, religious or ceremonial site, or sacred shrine; and
- Native American historic, cultural, or sacred site that is listed or may be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources including historic or prehistoric ruins and any burial ground, archaeological, or historic site.

In accordance with CEQA (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.), the County of Tulare Resource Management Agency (RMA) will be preparing a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) to evaluate the potential environmental effects associated with the Project.

## **Sacred Lands File Search**

The County requested a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search through the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on July 23, 2019, for the Project. The SLF search returned on August 14, 2019, with negative results; however, the NAHC recommended consultation with your Tribe. Results of the SLF search will be made available upon the release of the MND for public review. However, results may be made available to your Tribal Representatives if a written request for consultation is submitted to the County within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter.

## **California Historical Resources Information System**

A California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) search for the project area was requested through the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center (SSJVIC) on July 23, 2019. The CHRIS search dated August 6, 2019, indicated that there are three (3) recorded resources within the project area (site), and there are eight (8) known resources within the ½ mile radius. These resources consist of prehistoric era pictographs and lithic scatters, as well as historic era trash scatters, transmission lines, a hotel, a railroad, and a ditch. As such, the County is requesting consultation with your Tribe to determine whether a Cultural Resources Study will be required. The results of the CHRIS search may be made available to your Tribal Representatives if a written request for consultation is received. Should the County not receive a response to this request within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter, it will be presumed that there are no cultural resources of concern and a Cultural Resources Study will not be required.

If your Tribe desires to consult with the County on the review of this project, please respond in writing within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter. Written correspondence can be mailed to the address provided above or e-mailed to the addresses provided below.

**If the County does not receive a response to this notification, it will be presumed that your Tribe has declined the opportunity to consult on this project pursuant to AB 52 and SB 18.**

Thank you for your consideration on this matter and please do not hesitate to contact me by phone or e-mail should you have any questions or need additional information. If you need immediate assistance and I am unavailable, please contact, Hector Guerra, Chief of Environmental Planning, by phone at (559) 624-7121, or by email at [hguerra@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:hguerra@co.tulare.ca.us).

Sincerely,



Jessica Willis  
Planner IV  
(559) 624-7121  
[JWillis@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:JWillis@co.tulare.ca.us)

Attachment: Tribal Consultation Notice





# RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY

5961 SOUTH MOONEY BLVD  
VISALIA, CA 93277  
PHONE (559) 624-7000  
FAX (559) 730-2653

Aaron R. Bock  
Reed Schenke  
Sherman Dix

Economic Development and Planning  
Public Works  
Fiscal Services

REED SCHENKE, DIRECTOR

MICHAEL WASHAM, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR

August 28, 2019

Kern Valley Indian Community  
Julie Turner, Secretary  
P.O. Box 1010  
Lake Isabella, CA 93240

RE: Project Notification Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18 for the Lemon Cove Community Plan

Dear Ms. Turner,

Pursuant to the provisions of AB 52 and SB 18, as the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the County of Tulare hereby extends an invitation to consult on the CEQA review of the Lemon Cove Community Plan (Project) in order to assist with identifying and/or preserving and/or mitigating project impacts to Native American cultural places including:

- Native American sanctified cemetery, place of worship, religious or ceremonial site, or sacred shrine; and
- Native American historic, cultural, or sacred site that is listed or may be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources including historic or prehistoric ruins and any burial ground, archaeological, or historic site.

In accordance with CEQA (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.), the County of Tulare Resource Management Agency (RMA) will be preparing a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) to evaluate the potential environmental effects associated with the Project.

## **Sacred Lands File Search**

The County requested a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search through the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on July 23, 2019, for the Project. The SLF search returned on August 14, 2019, with negative results; however, the NAHC recommended consultation with your Tribe. Results of the SLF search will be made available upon the release of the MND for public review. However, results may be made available to your Tribal Representatives if a written request for consultation is submitted to the County within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter.

## **California Historical Resources Information System**

A California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) search for the project area was requested through the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center (SSJVIC) on July 23, 2019. The CHRIS search dated August 6, 2019, indicated that there are three (3) recorded resources within the project area (site), and there are eight (8) known resources within the ½ mile radius. These resources consist of prehistoric era pictographs and lithic scatters, as well as historic era trash scatters, transmission lines, a hotel, a railroad, and a ditch. As such, the County is requesting consultation with your Tribe to determine whether a Cultural Resources Study will be required. The results of the CHRIS search may be made available to your Tribal Representatives if a written request for consultation is received. Should the County not receive a response to this request within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter, it will be presumed that there are no cultural resources of concern and a Cultural Resources Study will not be required.

If your Tribe desires to consult with the County on the review of this project, please respond in writing within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter. Written correspondence can be mailed to the address provided above or e-mailed to the addresses provided below.

**If the County does not receive a response to this notification, it will be presumed that your Tribe has declined the opportunity to consult on this project pursuant to AB 52 and SB 18.**

Thank you for your consideration on this matter and please do not hesitate to contact me by phone or e-mail should you have any questions or need additional information. If you need immediate assistance and I am unavailable, please contact, Hector Guerra, Chief of Environmental Planning, by phone at (559) 624-7121, or by email at [hguerra@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:hguerra@co.tulare.ca.us).

Sincerely,



Jessica Willis  
Planner IV  
(559) 624-7121  
[JWillis@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:JWillis@co.tulare.ca.us)

Attachment: Tribal Consultation Notice





# RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY

5961 SOUTH MOONEY BLVD

VISALIA, CA 93277

PHONE (559) 624-7000

FAX (559) 730-2653

Aaron R. Bock

Reed Schenke

Sherman Dix

Economic Development and Planning

Public Works

Fiscal Services

REED SCHENKE, DIRECTOR

MICHAEL WASHAM, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR

August 28, 2019

Tubatulabals of Kern Valley  
Robert L Gomez, Jr., Tribal Chairperson  
P.O. Box 226  
Lake Isabella, CA 93240

RE: Project Notification Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18 for the Lemon Cove Community Plan

Dear Chairperson Gomez,

Pursuant to the provisions of AB 52 and SB 18, as the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the County of Tulare hereby extends an invitation to consult on the CEQA review of the Lemon Cove Community Plan (Project) in order to assist with identifying and/or preserving and/or mitigating project impacts to Native American cultural places including:

- Native American sanctified cemetery, place of worship, religious or ceremonial site, or sacred shrine; and
- Native American historic, cultural, or sacred site that is listed or may be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources including historic or prehistoric ruins and any burial ground, archaeological, or historic site.

In accordance with CEQA (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.), the County of Tulare Resource Management Agency (RMA) will be preparing a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) to evaluate the potential environmental effects associated with the Project.

### **Sacred Lands File Search**

The County requested a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search through the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on July 23, 2019, for the Project. The SLF search returned on August 14, 2019, with negative results; however, the NAHC recommended consultation with your Tribe. Results of the SLF search will be made available upon the release of the MND for public review. However, results may be made available to your Tribal Representatives if a written request for consultation is submitted to the County within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter.

## **California Historical Resources Information System**

A California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) search for the project area was requested through the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center (SSJVIC) on July 23, 2019. The CHRIS search dated August 6, 2019, indicated that there are three (3) recorded resources within the project area (site), and there are eight (8) known resources within the ½ mile radius. These resources consist of prehistoric era pictographs and lithic scatters, as well as historic era trash scatters, transmission lines, a hotel, a railroad, and a ditch. As such, the County is requesting consultation with your Tribe to determine whether a Cultural Resources Study will be required. The results of the CHRIS search may be made available to your Tribal Representatives if a written request for consultation is received. Should the County not receive a response to this request within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter, it will be presumed that there are no cultural resources of concern and a Cultural Resources Study will not be required.

If your Tribe desires to consult with the County on the review of this project, please respond in writing within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter. Written correspondence can be mailed to the address provided above or e-mailed to the addresses provided below.

**If the County does not receive a response to this notification, it will be presumed that your Tribe has declined the opportunity to consult on this project pursuant to AB 52 and SB 18.**

Thank you for your consideration on this matter and please do not hesitate to contact me by phone or e-mail should you have any questions or need additional information. If you need immediate assistance and I am unavailable, please contact, Hector Guerra, Chief of Environmental Planning, by phone at (559) 624-7121, or by email at [hguerra@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:hguerra@co.tulare.ca.us).

Sincerely,



Jessica Willis  
Planner IV  
(559) 624-7121  
[JWillis@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:JWillis@co.tulare.ca.us)

Attachment: Tribal Consultation Notice





# RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY

5961 SOUTH MOONEY BLVD  
VISALIA, CA 93277  
PHONE (559) 624-7000  
FAX (559) 730-2653

Aaron R. Bock	Economic Development and Planning
Reed Schenke	Public Works
Sherman Dix	Fiscal Services

REED SCHENKE, DIRECTOR

MICHAEL WASHAM, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR

August 28, 2019

Tule River Indian Tribe  
Department of Environmental Protection  
Felix Christman, Archaeological Monitor  
P.O. Box 589  
Porterville, CA 93258

RE: Project Notification Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18 for the Lemon Cove Community Plan

Dear Mr. Christman,

Pursuant to the provisions of AB 52 and SB 18, as the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the County of Tulare hereby extends an invitation to consult on the CEQA review of the Lemon Cove Community Plan (Project) in order to assist with identifying and/or preserving and/or mitigating project impacts to Native American cultural places including:

- Native American sanctified cemetery, place of worship, religious or ceremonial site, or sacred shrine; and
- Native American historic, cultural, or sacred site that is listed or may be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources including historic or prehistoric ruins and any burial ground, archaeological, or historic site.

In accordance with CEQA (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.), the County of Tulare Resource Management Agency (RMA) will be preparing a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) to evaluate the potential environmental effects associated with the Project.

## **Sacred Lands File Search**

The County requested a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search through the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on July 23, 2019, for the Project. The SLF search returned on August 14, 2019, with negative results; however, the NAHC recommended consultation with your Tribe. Results of the SLF search will be made available upon the release of the MND for public review. However, results may be made available to your Tribal Representatives if a written request for consultation is submitted to the County within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter.

## **California Historical Resources Information System**

A California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) search for the project area was requested through the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center (SSJVIC) on July 23, 2019. The CHRIS search dated August 6, 2019, indicated that there are three (3) recorded resources within the project area (site), and there are eight (8) known resources within the ½ mile radius. These resources consist of prehistoric era pictographs and lithic scatters, as well as historic era trash scatters, transmission lines, a hotel, a railroad, and a ditch. As such, the County is requesting consultation with your Tribe to determine whether a Cultural Resources Study will be required. The results of the CHRIS search may be made available to your Tribal Representatives if a written request for consultation is received. Should the County not receive a response to this request within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter, it will be presumed that there are no cultural resources of concern and a Cultural Resources Study will not be required.

If your Tribe desires to consult with the County on the review of this project, please respond in writing within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter. Written correspondence can be mailed to the address provided above or e-mailed to the addresses provided below.

**If the County does not receive a response to this notification, it will be presumed that your Tribe has declined the opportunity to consult on this project pursuant to AB 52 and SB 18.**

Thank you for your consideration on this matter and please do not hesitate to contact me by phone or e-mail should you have any questions or need additional information. If you need immediate assistance and I am unavailable, please contact, Hector Guerra, Chief of Environmental Planning, by phone at (559) 624-7121, or by email at [hguerra@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:hguerra@co.tulare.ca.us).

Sincerely,



Jessica Willis  
Planner IV  
(559) 624-7121  
[JWillis@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:JWillis@co.tulare.ca.us)

Attachment: Tribal Consultation Notice





# RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY

5961 SOUTH MOONEY BLVD  
VISALIA, CA 93277  
PHONE (559) 624-7000  
FAX (559) 730-2653

Aaron R. Bock  
Reed Schenke  
Sherman Dix

Economic Development and Planning  
Public Works  
Fiscal Services

REED SCHENKE, DIRECTOR

MICHAEL WASHAM, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR

August 28, 2019

Tule River Indian Tribe  
Neil Peyron, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 589  
Porterville, CA 93258

RE: Project Notification Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18 for the Lemon Cove Community Plan

Dear Chairperson Peyron,

Pursuant to the provisions of AB 52 and SB 18, as the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the County of Tulare hereby extends an invitation to consult on the CEQA review of the Lemon Cove Community Plan (Project) in order to assist with identifying and/or preserving and/or mitigating project impacts to Native American cultural places including:

- Native American sanctified cemetery, place of worship, religious or ceremonial site, or sacred shrine; and
- Native American historic, cultural, or sacred site that is listed or may be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources including historic or prehistoric ruins and any burial ground, archaeological, or historic site.

In accordance with CEQA (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.), the County of Tulare Resource Management Agency (RMA) will be preparing a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) to evaluate the potential environmental effects associated with the Project.

## **Sacred Lands File Search**

The County requested a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search through the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on July 23, 2019, for the Project. The SLF search returned on August 14, 2019, with negative results; however, the NAHC recommended consultation with your Tribe. Results of the SLF search will be made available upon the release of the MND for public review. However, results may be made available to your Tribal Representatives if a written request for consultation is submitted to the County within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter.

## **California Historical Resources Information System**

A California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) search for the project area was requested through the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center (SSJVIC) on July 23, 2019. The CHRIS search dated August 6, 2019, indicated that there are three (3) recorded resources within the project area (site), and there are eight (8) known resources within the ½ mile radius. These resources consist of prehistoric era pictographs and lithic scatters, as well as historic era trash scatters, transmission lines, a hotel, a railroad, and a ditch. As such, the County is requesting consultation with your Tribe to determine whether a Cultural Resources Study will be required. The results of the CHRIS search may be made available to your Tribal Representatives if a written request for consultation is received. Should the County not receive a response to this request within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter, it will be presumed that there are no cultural resources of concern and a Cultural Resources Study will not be required.

If your Tribe desires to consult with the County on the review of this project, please respond in writing within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter. Written correspondence can be mailed to the address provided above or e-mailed to the addresses provided below.

**If the County does not receive a response to this notification, it will be presumed that your Tribe has declined the opportunity to consult on this project pursuant to AB 52 and SB 18.**

Thank you for your consideration on this matter and please do not hesitate to contact me by phone or e-mail should you have any questions or need additional information. If you need immediate assistance and I am unavailable, please contact, Hector Guerra, Chief of Environmental Planning, by phone at (559) 624-7121, or by email at [hguerra@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:hguerra@co.tulare.ca.us).

Sincerely,



Jessica Willis  
Planner IV  
(559) 624-7121  
[JWillis@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:JWillis@co.tulare.ca.us)

Attachment: Tribal Consultation Notice





# RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY

5961 SOUTH MOONEY BLVD  
VISALIA, CA 93277  
PHONE (559) 624-7000  
FAX (559) 730-2653

Aaron R. Bock	Economic Development and Planning
Reed Schenke	Public Works
Sherman Dix	Fiscal Services

REED SCHENKE, DIRECTOR

MICHAEL WASHAM, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR

August 28, 2019

Tule River Indian Tribe  
Environmental Department  
Kerri Vera, Director  
P.O. Box 589  
Porterville, CA 93258

RE: Project Notification Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18 for the Lemon Cove Community Plan

Dear Ms. Vera,

Pursuant to the provisions of AB 52 and SB 18, as the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the County of Tulare hereby extends an invitation to consult on the CEQA review of the Lemon Cove Community Plan (Project) in order to assist with identifying and/or preserving and/or mitigating project impacts to Native American cultural places including:

- Native American sanctified cemetery, place of worship, religious or ceremonial site, or sacred shrine; and
- Native American historic, cultural, or sacred site that is listed or may be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources including historic or prehistoric ruins and any burial ground, archaeological, or historic site.

In accordance with CEQA (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.), the County of Tulare Resource Management Agency (RMA) will be preparing a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) to evaluate the potential environmental effects associated with the Project.

## **Sacred Lands File Search**

The County requested a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search through the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on July 23, 2019, for the Project. The SLF search returned on August 14, 2019, with negative results; however, the NAHC recommended consultation with your Tribe. Results of the SLF search will be made available upon the release of the MND for public review. However, results may be made available to your Tribal Representatives if a written request for consultation is submitted to the County within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter.

## **California Historical Resources Information System**

A California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) search for the project area was requested through the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center (SSJVIC) on July 23, 2019. The CHRIS search dated August 6, 2019, indicated that there are three (3) recorded resources within the project area (site), and there are eight (8) known resources within the ½ mile radius. These resources consist of prehistoric era pictographs and lithic scatters, as well as historic era trash scatters, transmission lines, a hotel, a railroad, and a ditch. As such, the County is requesting consultation with your Tribe to determine whether a Cultural Resources Study will be required. The results of the CHRIS search may be made available to your Tribal Representatives if a written request for consultation is received. Should the County not receive a response to this request within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter, it will be presumed that there are no cultural resources of concern and a Cultural Resources Study will not be required.

If your Tribe desires to consult with the County on the review of this project, please respond in writing within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter. Written correspondence can be mailed to the address provided above or e-mailed to the addresses provided below.

**If the County does not receive a response to this notification, it will be presumed that your Tribe has declined the opportunity to consult on this project pursuant to AB 52 and SB 18.**

Thank you for your consideration on this matter and please do not hesitate to contact me by phone or e-mail should you have any questions or need additional information. If you need immediate assistance and I am unavailable, please contact, Hector Guerra, Chief of Environmental Planning, by phone at (559) 624-7121, or by email at [hguerra@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:hguerra@co.tulare.ca.us).

Sincerely,



Jessica Willis  
Planner IV  
(559) 624-7121  
[JWillis@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:JWillis@co.tulare.ca.us)

Attachment: Tribal Consultation Notice





# RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY

5961 SOUTH MOONEY BLVD  
VISALIA, CA 93277  
PHONE (559) 624-7000  
FAX (559) 730-2653

Aaron R. Bock	Economic Development and Planning
Reed Schenke	Public Works
Sherman Dix	Fiscal Services

REED SCHENKE, DIRECTOR

MICHAEL WASHAM, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR

August 28, 2019

Wuksache Indian Tribe/Eshom Valley Band  
Kenneth Woodrow, Chairperson  
1179 Rock Haven Ct.  
Salinas, CA 93906

RE: Project Notification Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18 for the Lemon Cove Community Plan

Dear Chairperson Woodrow,

Pursuant to the provisions of AB 52 and SB 18, as the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the County of Tulare hereby extends an invitation to consult on the CEQA review of the Lemon Cove Community Plan (Project) in order to assist with identifying and/or preserving and/or mitigating project impacts to Native American cultural places including:

- Native American sanctified cemetery, place of worship, religious or ceremonial site, or sacred shrine; and
- Native American historic, cultural, or sacred site that is listed or may be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources including historic or prehistoric ruins and any burial ground, archaeological, or historic site.

In accordance with CEQA (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.), the County of Tulare Resource Management Agency (RMA) will be preparing a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) to evaluate the potential environmental effects associated with the Project.

## **Sacred Lands File Search**

The County requested a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search through the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on July 23, 2019, for the Project. The SLF search returned on August 14, 2019, with negative results; however, the NAHC recommended consultation with your Tribe. Results of the SLF search will be made available upon the release of the MND for public review. However, results may be made available to your Tribal Representatives if a written request for consultation is submitted to the County within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter.

## **California Historical Resources Information System**

A California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) search for the project area was requested through the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center (SSJVIC) on July 23, 2019. The CHRIS search dated August 6, 2019, indicated that there are three (3) recorded resources within the project area (site), and there are eight (8) known resources within the ½ mile radius. These resources consist of prehistoric era pictographs and lithic scatters, as well as historic era trash scatters, transmission lines, a hotel, a railroad, and a ditch. As such, the County is requesting consultation with your Tribe to determine whether a Cultural Resources Study will be required. The results of the CHRIS search may be made available to your Tribal Representatives if a written request for consultation is received. Should the County not receive a response to this request within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter, it will be presumed that there are no cultural resources of concern and a Cultural Resources Study will not be required.

If your Tribe desires to consult with the County on the review of this project, please respond in writing within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter. Written correspondence can be mailed to the address provided above or e-mailed to the addresses provided below.

**If the County does not receive a response to this notification, it will be presumed that your Tribe has declined the opportunity to consult on this project pursuant to AB 52 and SB 18.**

Thank you for your consideration on this matter and please do not hesitate to contact me by phone or e-mail should you have any questions or need additional information. If you need immediate assistance and I am unavailable, please contact, Hector Guerra, Chief of Environmental Planning, by phone at (559) 624-7121, or by email at [hguerra@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:hguerra@co.tulare.ca.us).

Sincerely,



Jessica Willis  
Planner IV  
(559) 624-7121  
[JWillis@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:JWillis@co.tulare.ca.us)

Attachment: Tribal Consultation Notice



# AB 52 PROJECT NOTIFICATION AND TRIBAL CONSULTATION REQUEST

**Project Title:** Lemon Cove Community Plan

**Project Location:** East and West of State Route 198, North of Avenue 330 to South of Avenue 324

**USGS 7.5 Minute Quadrangle(s):** Woodlake & Rocky Hill

**PLSS:** Sections 2, 3, 10, 11, Township 18 South, Range 27 East, MDB&M.

**Project Description:** On April 4, 2017, the Tulare County Board of Supervisors (BOS) approved the Planning Branch proposal to update the Lemon Cove Community Plan (GPI 17-001). The existing Lemon Cove Urban Development Boundary (UDB) and proposed Study Area Boundary are delineated in Attachment 1. The existing UDB may be proposed for expansion to include the full extent of the proposed study area, but the final recommendations pertaining to the areas proposed for expansion are unknown at this time. However, it is anticipated that the northern boundary (or a portion thereof) may be extended north to State Route 216, and the southern boundary (or a portion thereof) may be extended southwest to Road 228.

The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration being prepared for the Lemon Cove Community Plan Update will identify the proposed UDB boundaries and will assess the potential project impacts from the proposed UDB, land use, and zoning changes within the project Study Area Boundary.

Future estimated growth is based on a projected annual population growth rate of 1.3% as identified in the Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update. Additional growth beyond the 1.3% annual growth rate will require further growth analysis pursuant to CEQA. The Lemon Cove Community Plan Update components will become consistent with the General Plan 2030 Update, and will include the following primary goals and objectives.

- 1) Land Use and Environmental Planning - Promote development within planning areas next to the Regional State Route 198 and State Route 216 Corridors in order to implement the following General Plan goals:
  - a) Ensure that the text and mapping of the Community Plan Designations and Zoning Reclassifications address various development matters such as encouraging Agricultural Adaptive Reuse activities, recognizing Non-Conforming Use activities, and facilitating Ministerial Permit approvals;
  - b) Encourage infill development within Urban Development Boundaries, thereby discouraging leapfrog development within Tulare County;
  - c) Reduce development pressure on agriculturally-designated lands within the Valley Floor, thereby encouraging agricultural production to flourish;
  - d) Reduce vehicle miles travelled throughout the County, thereby positively affecting air quality and greenhouse gas reduction; and
  - e) Help to improve the circulation, transit and railroad transportation system within this community, including, but not limited to, laying the groundwork for the construction of key projects such as Safe Routes to Schools, Complete Streets, and Bike Lanes/Pedestrian Paths.



- 2) Improvements for a “disadvantaged community” - It is expected that the community planning areas will be improved for the following reasons:
  - a) With faster project processing resulting from an updated community plan, increased employment opportunities are more likely to be provided by the private sector as proposed project developments can be approved as expeditiously as possible;
  - b) Increased housing grant awards are more likely to occur based on updated community plans that are consistent with the policies of the recently adopted (December 2015) General Plan Update and Housing Element; and
  - c) With updated community plans, enhanced infrastructure grant awards are more likely, thereby providing access to funding to install or upgrade road, water, wastewater, and storm water facilities.
- 3) Strengthening Relationship with TCAG - An important benefit of this expedited community plan process will be the opportunity for RMA to strengthen the County’s relationship with the Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG), in that this and other community plans will help to facilitate the funding and implementation of several key transportation programs such as Safe Routes to Schools, Complete Streets, and Bike/Pedestrian Projects.

By pursuing these transportation programs through a heightened collaborative process, the likelihood of getting actual projects in the ground will be realized faster than historically achieved. In doing so, these communities and others can become safer and healthier by providing a more efficient transportation network.

**Request for Consultation:** Pursuant to the provisions of AB 52 and SB 18, as the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the County of Tulare hereby extends an invitation to consult on the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review of the Lemon Cove Community Plan in order to assist with identifying and/or preserving and/or mitigating project impacts to Native American cultural places and tribal cultural resources.

If your Tribe desires to consult with the County on the review of this project, please respond in writing within thirty (30) days of receipt of this notification. Written correspondence can be mailed to the following addresses:

US Post: Tulare County Resource Management Agency  
Environmental Planning Division  
Attn: Jessica Willis / Hector Guerra  
5961 S. Mooney Blvd.  
Visalia, CA 93277-9394

E-mail: [JWillis@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:JWillis@co.tulare.ca.us) and [HGuerra@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:HGuerra@co.tulare.ca.us)

If you need further assistance or have any questions, please feel free to contact Jessica Willis by phone at (559) 624-7122, or Hector Guerra at (559) 624-7121.


**If the County does not receive a response to this notification, it will be presumed that your Tribe has declined the opportunity to consult on this project pursuant to AB 52 and SB 18.**






[This page intentionally left blank]





[This page intentionally left blank]





[This page intentionally left blank]

**From:** Cheng Chi  
**To:** bbutterbredt@gmail.com  
**CC:** Jessica Willis  
**Date:** 9/24/2019 11:00 AM  
**Subject:** Project Notification Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18 for the Lemon Cove Community Plan

Good morning Mr. Robinson.

I called your cell phone earlier but could not reach you. Please allow me to send this email to you and check if this is still a valid email that you use regularly.

Almost a month ago I sent a consultation request notification to you for the Lemon Cove project through certified mail. The small package was returned to us with the label showing "Unclaimed" and "Unable to Forward."

Please verify if your address is still:

Kern Valley Indian Council  
P.O. Box 1010  
Lake Isabella, CA 93240

Please respond to this email so I know this is still a valid email to reach. I will then send the materials to you through email. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Tim

Cheng (Tim) Chi  
Planner II  
County Of Tulare  
Resource Management Agency  
5961 South Mooney Blvd.  
Visalia, CA 93277  
(559) 624-7086  
cchi@co.tulare.ca.us

[This page intentionally left blank]

**From:** Cheng Chi  
**To:** bbutterbredt@gmail.com  
**CC:** Jessica Willis  
**Date:** 9/24/2019 4:31 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Address verification KVIC\_Project Notification Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18 for the Lemon Cove Community Plan  
**Attachments:** Lemon Cove AB52 and SB18.pdf

Thank you for your reply Mr. Robinson.

Allow me to send you the materials that were sent to you regarding the Lemon Cove project last time in the attachment.

Best Regards,

Cheng (Tim) Chi  
Planner II  
County Of Tulare  
Resource Management Agency  
5961 South Mooney Blvd.  
Visalia, CA 93277  
(559) 624-7086  
cchi@co.tulare.ca.us

>>> Robert Robinson <[bbutterbredt@gmail.com](mailto:bbutterbredt@gmail.com)> 9/24/2019 2:13 PM >>>

This address is correct.  
Robert Robinson, Chairman, THPO  
Sent from my iPhone

[This page intentionally left blank]

**From:** Cheng Chi  
**To:** meindiagirl@sbcglobal.net  
**CC:** Jessica Willis  
**Date:** 9/24/2019 10:56 AM  
**Subject:** Project Notification Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18 for the Lemon Cove Community Plan

Good morning Ms. Turner.

I called your cell phone earlier but could not reach you. Please allow me to send this email to you and check if this is still a valid email that you use regularly.

Almost a month ago I sent a consultation request notification to you for the Lemon Cove project through certified mail. The small package was returned to us with the label showing "Unclaimed" and "Unable to Forward."

Please respond to this email so I know this is still a valid email to reach. I will then send the materials to you through email. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Tim

Cheng (Tim) Chi  
Planner II  
County Of Tulare  
Resource Management Agency  
5961 South Mooney Blvd.  
Visalia, CA 93277  
(559) 624-7086  
cchi@co.tulare.ca.us

[This page intentionally left blank]



**From:** Cheng Chi  
**To:** meindiagirl@outlook.com  
**CC:** Jessica Willis  
**Date:** 9/24/2019 1:43 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Project Notification Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18 for the Lemon Cove Community Plan

Thank you for your reply Ms. Turner.

Please also allow me to check with you if you like us to send mails to you with a different mailing address in the future. If so, please provide me with the address you would like us to use in the future. NAHC list still shows the mailing address for you below. If you want us to send mails to you through a different mailing address in the future (we can change that on our end solely), please also notify NAHC to have it updated. Thank you.

Kern Valley Indian Council

P.O. Box 1010  
Lake Isabella, CA 93240

Sincerely,

Cheng (Tim) Chi  
Planner II  
County Of Tulare  
Resource Management Agency  
5961 South Mooney Blvd.  
Visalia, CA 93277  
(559) 624-7086  
cchi@co.tulare.ca.us

>>> AT&T response <[meindiagirl@sbcglobal.net](mailto:meindiagirl@sbcglobal.net)> 9/24/2019 11:15 AM >>>

Hello

I do not get the mail at the P.O. Box Robert Robinson is in charge if that. And I don't have any comment about on this project. Out of our area of traditional territory.

Julie Turner

On Tue Sep 24 2019 11:03:00 GMT-0700 (PDT), Cheng Chi <[CChi@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:CChi@co.tulare.ca.us)> wrote:

Please verify if your address is still:

Kern Valley Indian Council  
P.O. Box 1010  
Lake Isabella, CA 93240

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Tim

Cheng (Tim) Chi  
Planner II  
County Of Tulare  
Resource Management Agency  
5961 South Mooney Blvd.  
Visalia, CA 93277  
(559) 624-7086  
[cchi@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:cchi@co.tulare.ca.us)

>>> Cheng Chi 9/24/2019 10:56 AM >>>

Good morning Ms. Turner.

I called your cell phone earlier but could not reach you. Please allow me to send this email to you and check if this is still a valid email that you use regularly.

Almost a month ago I sent a consultation request notification to you for the Lemon Cove project through certified mail.

The small package was returned to us with the label showing "Unclaimed" and "Unable to Forward."

Please respond to this email so I know this is still a valid email to

reach. I will then send the materials to you through email.  
Thank you.

Sincerely,

Tim


Cheng (Tim) Chi  
Planner II  
County Of Tulare  
Resource Management Agency  
5961 South Mooney Blvd.  
Visalia, CA 93277  
(559) 624-7086  
[cchi@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:cchi@co.tulare.ca.us)

# **Attachment “D”**


---

## **Wildfire Maps**

[This page intentionally left blank]



Source: CalFire Fire Hazards Severity Zones (FHSZ) Viewer, <https://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/>.



Source: CalFire State Responsibility Areas (SRA) Viewer. <https://bof.fire.ca.gov/projects-and-programs/state-responsibility-area-viewer/>

[This page intentionally left blank]

## **Attachment “E”**

---

# **Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

[This page intentionally left blank]



## Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval		When Monitoring is to Occur	Frequency of Monitoring	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Method to Verify Compliance	Verification of Compliance		
						Initials	Date	Remarks
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES								
Measures for Special Status Plant Species								
4-1	Pre-construction Survey – See Attached Tech Memo							
Measures for Special Status Animal Species								
4-2	Pre-construction Survey – See Attached Tech Memo							
Measures for Special Status Plant and Animal Species Identified in Pre-construction Surveys								
4-3	Employee Education Program – See Attached Tech Memo							
Measures for Nesting Raptors and Migratory Birds								
4-4	Avoidance – See Attached Tech Memo							
4-5	Pre-construction Survey – See Attached Tech Memo							
4-6	Pre-construction Survey – See Attached Tech Memo							
4-7	Buffers – See Attached Tech Memo							
Measures for Roosting Bats								
4-8	Temporal Avoidance – See Attached Tech Memo							
4-9	Pre-construction Survey – See Attached Tech Memo							
4-10	Minimization – See Attached Tech Memo							
4-11	Avoidance of Maternity Roosts – See Attached Tech Memo							
Measures for Wetlands								
4-12	Pre-construction Survey – See Attached Tech Memo							
CULTURAL RESOURCES								
5-1	If, in the course of construction or operation within the Project area, any archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources are uncovered.							

## Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval		When Monitoring is to Occur	Frequency of Monitoring	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Method to Verify Compliance	Verification of Compliance		
						Initials	Date	Remarks
	discovered, or otherwise detected or observed, activities within fifty (50) feet of the find shall be ceased. A qualified archaeologist/paleontologist shall be contacted and advise the County of the site's significance. If the findings are deemed significant by the Tulare County Resources Management Agency, appropriate mitigation measures shall be required prior to any resumption of work in the affected area of the proposed Project. Where feasible, mitigation achieving preservation in place will be implemented. Preservation in place may be accomplished by, but is not limited to: planning construction to avoid archaeological/paleontological sites or covering archaeological/paleontological sites with a layer of chemically stable soil prior to building on the site. If significant resources are encountered, the feasibility of various methods of achieving preservation in place shall be considered, and an appropriate method of achieving preservation in place shall be selected and implemented, if feasible. If preservation in place is not feasible, other mitigation shall be implemented to minimize impacts to the site, such as data recovery efforts that will adequately recover scientifically consequential information from and about the site. Mitigation shall be consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(b)(3).							
5-2	If cultural/archeological/paleontological resources are encountered during project-specific construction or land modification							

## Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval		When Monitoring is to Occur	Frequency of Monitoring	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Method to Verify Compliance	Verification of Compliance		
						Initials	Date	Remarks
	activities, work shall stop and the County shall be notified at once to assess the nature, extent, and potential significance of any cultural resources. If such resources are determined to be significant, appropriate actions shall be determined. Depending upon the nature of the find, mitigation could involve avoidance, documentation, or other appropriate actions to be determined by a qualified archaeologist. For example, activities within 50 feet of the find shall be ceased.							
5-3	<p>Consistent with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code and (CEQA Guidelines) Section 15064.5, if human remains of Native American origin are discovered during Project construction, it is necessary to comply with State laws relating to the disposition of Native American burials, which fall within the jurisdiction of the Native American Heritage Commission (Public Resources Code Sec. 5097). In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the following steps should be taken:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The Tulare County Coroner / Sheriff must be contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required; and</li> </ol> </li> </ol>							

## Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval		When Monitoring is to Occur	Frequency of Monitoring	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Method to Verify Compliance	Verification of Compliance		
						Initials	Date	Remarks
	<p>b. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American:</p> <p>i. The coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours.</p> <p>ii. The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descended from the deceased Native American.</p> <p>iii. The most likely descendent may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code section 5097.98, or</p> <p>2. Where the following conditions occur, the landowner or his authorized representative shall reburial the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.</p> <p>a. The Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a most likely descendent or the most likely descendent failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission.</p>							

## Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval		When Monitoring is to Occur	Frequency of Monitoring	Agency Responsible for Monitoring	Method to Verify Compliance	Verification of Compliance		
						Initials	Date	Remarks
	b. The descendant fails to make a recommendation; or c. The landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendent.							
<b>TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>								
18-1	See 5-1							
18-2	See 5-2							
18-1	See 5-3							

[This page intentionally left blank]