

**DRAFT**

**INITIAL STUDY/  
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

**LEMOORE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT  
PROPOSED NEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL  
N. 19TH AVENUE & CINNAMON DRIVE  
LEMOORE, CALIFORNIA 93245**



November 2019

**This page intentionally left blank**

**DRAFT**

**INITIAL STUDY/  
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

**LEMOORE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT NEW  
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

**N. 19TH AVENUE & CINNAMON DRIVE**

**LEMOORE, CALIFORNIA 93245**

Submitted to:

Lemoore Union Elementary School District  
1200 W Cinnamon Drive  
Lemoore, California 93245-3418

Prepared by:

School Site Solutions  
2015 H Street  
Sacramento, CA 95811  
916-930-0736

November 2019

**This page intentionally left blank**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	i
FIGURES AND TABLES .....	ii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS .....	iii
<b>1.0 PROJECT INFORMATION.....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
<b>2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED.....</b>	<b>2-1</b>
2.1 Determination.....	2-1
<b>3.0 CEQAENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST .....</b>	<b>3-1</b>
3.1 Aesthetics.....	3-1
3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources .....	3-3
3.3 Air Quality.....	3-5
3.4 Biological Resources .....	3-10
3.5 Cultural Resources.....	3-12
3.6 Energy .....	3-14
3.7 Geology and Soils.....	3-15
3.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions .....	3-19
3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials .....	3-23
3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality.....	3-28
3.11 Land Use and Planning.....	3-32
3.12 Mineral Resources .....	3-33
3.13 Noise .....	3-34
3.14 Population and Housing.....	3-41
3.15 Public Services.....	3-42
3.16 Recreation .....	3-45
3.17 Transportation .....	3-46
3.18 Tribal Cultural Resources .....	3-53
3.19 Utilities and Service Systems .....	3-55
3.20 Wildfire.....	3-58
3.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance.....	3-60
<b>4.0 REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>4-2</b>

## APPENDICES

- A: California Emissions Estimator Model
- B: Site Plans
- C: USGS Topographic Map
- D: Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment
- E: Soils Investigation
- F: Geologic and Seismic Hazards Assessment
- G: Updated Geo-Technical Report
- H: AB 52 Letter
- I: Native American Heritage Commission District Letter
- J: Native American Heritage Commission District Response

## **APPENDICES CONTINUED**

- K: Traffic Impact Analysis
- L: Native American Heritage Commission Native American Contacts List
- M: California Department of Education Final Site Approval 2007
- N: Department of Toxic Substances Control – ENVIROSTOR - No Further Action Determination

## FIGURES AND TABLES

### FIGURES

Figure 1: Vicinity Map .....	1-3
Figure 2: Site Plan .....	1-4

### TABLES

Table 1: Special Requirements for School Site Selection and Approval .....	2-2
Table 2: Operational GHG Emissions .....	3-21
Table 3: Land Use Noise Standards .....	3-36
Table 4: Typical Construction Equipment Noise Levels .....	3-37
Table 5: Existing Intersection LOS Results .....	3-47
Table 6: Existing plus Project Intersection LOS Results .....	3-47
Table 7: Near Term Year 2023 plus Project Intersection LOS Results .....	3-48
Table 8: Cumulative Year 2040 No Project Intersection LOS Results .....	3-49
Table 9: Cumulative Year 2040 plus Project Intersection LOS Results .....	3-49

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AB	Assembly Bill
BMP	Best Management Practice
CALFIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
CAPCOA	California Air Pollution Control Officers Association
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDE	California Department of Education
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CF	Community Facilities
CH <sub>4</sub>	Methane
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CO <sub>2</sub>	Carbon dioxide
dB	Decibel
dBA	A-weighted decibel
DPM	Diesel particulate matter
DSA	Department of the State Architect
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FHSZ	Fire hazard severity zones
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
GAMAQI	Guidelines Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts
GHG	Greenhouse gas
GWP	Global Warming Potential
IS/MND	Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration
kV	Kilovolts
LOS	Level of Service
LRA	Local Responsibility Areas
LVFD	Lemoore Volunteer Fire Department
Mgd	Million gallons per day
N <sub>2</sub> O	Nitrous oxide
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
O <sub>3</sub>	Ozone
PM <sub>10</sub>	Particulate matter diameter 10 millimeters
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	Particulate matter diameter 2.5 millimeters
PPV	Peak particle velocity
PRC	Public Resources Code
SB	Senate Bill
SJVAB	San Joaquin Valley Air Basin
SJVAPCD	San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District
SMARA	Surface Mining and Reclamation Act
SPAL	Small Project Analysis Level
SRA	State Responsibility Areas
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan



SWRCB  
TAC  
Tpd  
VHFHSZ  
VMT  
WDRs

State Water Resources Control Board  
Toxic air contaminant  
Tons per day  
Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone  
Vehicle miles traveled  
Waste discharge requirements

**This page intentionally left blank**

## 1.0 PROJECT INFORMATION

**1. Project Title:**

Lemoore Union Elementary School District New Elementary School

**2. Lead Agency Name and Address:**

Lemoore Union Elementary School District  
1200 W Cinnamon Drive  
Lemoore, California 93245-3418

**3. Contact Person and Phone Number:**

Julie Fagundes, (559) 924-6816

**4. Project Location:**

N. 19th Avenue and Cinnamon Drive  
Lemoore, CA 93245

**5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**

N/A

**6. General Plan Designation:**

Community Facilities (CF)

**7. Zoning:**

Public Services and Community Facilities (CF)

**8. Description of Project:**

The project would include the construction of a New Elementary School at the northwest corner of the intersection of 19th Avenue and Cinnamon Drive (Figure 1). The proposed project would construct six single-story, wood frame, slab on grade structures. The new school would house 550 K-6 students. Building 100 would consist of Administration and Library. Building 200 would be a Multi-purpose Building, which would contain a Kitchen and Dining facility, along with a Music Classroom and a Stage, which would be used for performances and presentations. Buildings 300, 400 and 500 would contain the required classrooms, each of these buildings would house six classrooms for a total of 18 teaching stations with collaborative spaces, restrooms, and pull-out rooms. Building 600 would contain 4 Kindergarten classrooms which would be utilized as a single session. The total number of teaching stations would be 22. The total square footage of all six buildings would be approximately 49,000 square feet. The site plan indicates an area for a future classroom building, making the potential of a Master Planned Capacity of 700 students. The project also proposes development of an outdoor amphitheater, play fields, hardcourts, apparatus areas, bus loop, and parking lot (Figure 2).

Proposed offsite improvements include improvements to 19th Avenue, including street demolition to allow for new curb and gutter development, sidewalks, landscaping,

pavement reconstruction, striping and signage. The project would include a new crosswalk with flashing beacons for safe crossing across 19th Avenue at Freedom Drive. Proposed offsite utilities include storm, water, fire & sewer connections to serve the proposed school. The project would also underground the existing overhead utility poles that run along the east side of the project site along 19th Avenue.

**9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

Low-Density Residential (as designated by the City of Lemoore General Plan) is located north, south, west, and east of the project area. Within the same parcel, south of the project area is the existing District Office and parking lot. Southeast of the project area, beyond the intersection of 19th Avenue and Cinnamon Drive are residential structures and the Lemoore Sports Complex, which houses baseball/softball fields.

**10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required (e.g., permits, financial approval, or participation agreements):**

- California Department of Education, School Facilities and Transportation Unit
- Department of Toxic Substance Control
- Division of the State Architect
- California State Clearing House
- Native American Heritage Commission
- California Regional Water Quality Control Board
- City of Lemoore Public Works
- City of Lemoore Fire Department
- Kings County Health Department

**11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resource Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?**

The District requested a Sacred Lands File search from the Native American Heritage Commission. Pursuant to AB 52, the District contacted the tribal representatives. On December 19, 2019 the district received correspondence from the NAHC requesting a follow up phone call to the district's original correspondence. In the event that the tribal representatives' express interest in the project and/or the project area, the District will coordinate with the tribes to address any concerns.



Figure 1: Vicinity Map



**FUTURE CLASSROOM BUILDING SITE PLAN AT  
NEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**  
LEMOORE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL  
1" = 80'-0"



**Figure 2: Site Plan**

## 2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist in Chapter 3.0.

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources      | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy                             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils             | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions           | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & 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 type="checkbox"/> Transportation                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

## 2.1 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 by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “Potentially Significant Impact” or “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

### Special Requirements under the State School Facility Program

In addition to the CEQA Guidelines, primary and secondary public schools have several additional requirements established by the California Code of Regulations and California Education Code. **Table 1** identifies the specific health and safety requirements for a state-funded new school or a state-funded addition to an existing school site. These health and safety requirements are outlined in the California Department of Education (CDE) School Site Selection and Approval Guide. The analyses and response is included under the relevant section identified in the table below.

**Table 1: Special Requirements for School Site Selection and Approval**

Topic	Environmental Code	Environmental Checklist
<b>Air Quality</b>		
Is the boundary of the proposed school site within 500 feet of the edge of the closest traffic lane of a freeway or busy traffic corridor? If yes, would the project create an air quality health risk due to the placement of the School?	PRC § 21151.8(a)(1)(D); Ed. Code § 17213(c)(2)(C)	Section 3.3 Air Quality, Question (e)
Would the project create an air quality hazard due to the placement of a school within one-quarter mile of: (a) permitted and non-permitted facilities identified by the jurisdictional air quality control board or air pollution control district; (b) freeways and other busy traffic corridors; (c) large agricultural operations; and/or (d) a rail yard, which might reasonably be anticipated to emit hazardous air emissions, or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous material, substances, or waste?	PRC § 21151.8 (a)(2); Ed. Code § 17213 (b)	Section 3.3 Air Quality, Question (f)
<b>Geology and Soils</b>		
Does the site contain an active earthquake fault or fault trace, or is the site located within the boundaries of any special studies zone or within an area designated as geologically hazardous in the safety element of the local general plan?	CCR, Title 5 § 14010(f); Ed. Code, § 17212	Section 3.7 Geology and Soils, Question (a) (i)
Would the project involve the construction, reconstruction, or relocation of any school building on a site subject to moderate to high liquefaction?	CCR, Title 5 § 14010(i)	Section 3.7 Geology and Soils, Question (a)(iii)
Would the project involve the construction, reconstruction, or relocation of any school building on a site subject to landslides?	CCR, Title 5 § 14010(i)	Section 3.7 Geology and Soils, Question (a)(iv)
Would the project involve the construction, reconstruction, or relocation of any school building on the trace of a geological fault along which surface rupture can reasonably be expected to occur within the life of the school building?	CCR, Title 5 § 14010(f); Ed. Code § 17212	Section 3.7 Geology and Soils, Question (a)(i)
<b>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>		
Is the property line of the proposed school site less than the following distances from the edge of respective powerline easements: (1) 100 feet of a 50-133 kV line; (2) 150 feet of a 220-230 kV line; or (3) 350 feet of a 500-550 kV line?	CCR, Title 5 § 14010(c)	Section 3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Question (h)
Is the proposed school site located near an aboveground water or fuel storage tank or within 1,500 feet of an easement of an aboveground or	CCR, Title 5 § 14010(h)	Section 3.9 Hazards and



underground pipeline that can pose a safety hazard to the site?		Hazardous Materials, Question (i)
Is the proposed school site situated within 2,000 feet of a significant disposal of hazardous waste?	CCR, Title 5 § 14010(t)	Section 3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Question (d)
Does the proposed school site contain one or more pipelines, situated underground or aboveground, which carry hazardous substances, acutely hazardous materials, or hazardous wastes, unless the pipeline is a natural gas line that is used only to supply natural gas to that school or neighborhood?	PRC § 21151.8 (a)(1)(C)	Section 3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Question (i)
Is the school site in an area designated in a city, county, or city and county general plan for agricultural use and zoned for agricultural production, and if so, do neighboring agricultural uses have the potential to result in any public health and safety issues that may affect the pupils and employees at the school site? <i>(Does not apply to school sites approved by CDE prior to January 1, 1997.)</i>	Ed. Code § 17215.5 (a)	Section 3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Question (j)
Does the project site contain a current or former hazardous waste disposal site or solid waste disposal site and, if so, have the wastes been removed?	PRC § 21151.8 (a)(1)(A)	Section 3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Question (k)
Is the project site a hazardous substance release site identified by the state Department of Health Services in a current list adopted pursuant to §25356 for removal or remedial action pursuant to Chapter 6.8 of Division 20 of the Health and Safety Code?	PRC § 21151.8 (a)(1)(B)	Section 3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Question (d)
If prepared, has the risk assessment been performed with a focus on children's health posed by a hazardous materials release or threatened release, or the presence of naturally occurring hazardous materials on the school site?	Ed. Code § 17210.1 (a)(3)	Section 3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Question (c)
If a response action is necessary and proposed as part of this project, has it been developed to be protective of children's health, with an ample margin of safety?	Ed. Code § 17210.1 (a)(4)	Section 3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Question (l)
Is the proposed school site within two miles, measured by airline, of that point on an airport runway or potential runway included in an airport master plan that is nearest to the site? <i>(Does not apply to school sites acquired prior to January 1, 1966.)</i>	Ed. Code § 17215 (a)&(b)	Section 3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Question (e)
<b>Hydrology and Water Quality</b>		
Is the project site subject to flooding or dam inundation?	CCR, Title 5 § 14010(g); Ed. Code § 17212;	Section 3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality, Question (d)
<b>Land Use and Planning</b>		
Would the proposed school conflict with any existing or proposed land uses, such that a potential health or safety risk to students would be created?	CCR, Title 5 § 14010(m)	Section 3.11 Land Use and Planning, Question(b)
<b>Noise</b>		

Is the proposed school site located adjacent to or near a major arterial roadway or freeway whose noise generation may adversely affect the education program?	CCR, Title 5 § 14010(e)	Section 3.13 Noise, Question (d)
<b>Public Services</b>		
Does the site promote joint use of parks, libraries, museums, and other public services?	CCR, Title 5 § 14010(o)	Section 3.15 Public Services, Question (f)
<b>Transportation</b>		
Is the proposed school site within 1,500 feet of a railroad track easement?	CCR, Title 5 § 14010(d)	Section 3.17 Transportation, Question (e)
Is the site easily accessible from arterials and is the minimum peripheral visibility maintained for driveways per Caltrans' Highway Design Manual?	CCR, Title 5 § 14010(k)	Section 3.17 Transportation, Question (f)
Are traffic and pedestrian hazards mitigated per Caltrans' School Area Pedestrian Safety manual?	CCR, Title 5 § 14010(l)	Section 3.17 Transportation, Question (g)

### 3.0 CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

#### 3.1 AESTHETICS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, 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. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

##### 3.1.1 Impact Analysis

a. *Would the project have a substantial effect on a scenic vista?*

The City of Lemoore 2030 General Plan contains one policy related to scenic vistas. Policy CD-I-4 states: "Maintain scenic vistas to the Coalinga Mountains, other natural features, and landmark buildings." There are no natural features of scenic value, landmark buildings, nor would the project substantially alter views of the Coalinga Mountains, which are approximately 35 miles west of the project area. This impact would be less than significant.

b. *Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*

According to the California Department of Transportation, there are no officially designated or eligible state scenic highways located within the City of Lemoore. The project site has been previously graded and is devoid of trees, rock outcroppings, or historic structures. The nearest Eligible State Scenic Highway is State Route 33 in Fresno County, which is approximately 25.0 miles west of the proposed project (Esri 2017). Therefore, project construction and operation would have no impact on scenic resources within a state scenic highway.

- c. *In non-urbanized areas, would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a 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?*

Views of the project area from publicly accessible vantage points (i.e., 19th Avenue and Cinnamon Drive) currently consist of a graded field. Views of the surrounding areas contain residences, church, and the District Office in the foreground, trees and residential rooftops in the middle ground, and trees and tall buildings in the background. The proposed project includes the construction of buildings up to 28 feet in height and would underground the existing overhead utility poles on the east side of the project site (along 19th Avenue). Although the proposed project would introduce new features that would be visible from publicly accessible vantage points, construction and operation of the proposed project would be consistent with the proposed use identified in the City of Lemoore 2030 General Plan (Proposed School K-8), consistent with the visual character of the District Office, and would not degrade the visual quality of the site or surroundings. Impacts would be less than significant.

- d. *Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

Project implementation would introduce new sources of light and glare in the project area. The project would include a variety of indoor and outdoor lighting. Lighting would be provided for adequate illumination for safe access and basic security. Exterior lighting will include wall-mounted fixtures on buildings, maximum of 20-foot-high pole lights (on-site, 28-foot-high poles off-site), and bollard lighting. Pole-mounted lighting would be shielded and directional so as to direct light away from surrounding residential land uses. The project site was designated as a school in the City's General Plan and school uses are allowed under the current land use designation. As such, lighting impacts associated with a school use were analyzed in the City's General Plan EIR, which determined that impacts related to nighttime lighting from future development would be less than significant. Even though the project would introduce a new element of nighttime lighting and glare in the project area such development would be consistent with existing uses and would have a less-than-significant impact.

### 3.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 agricultural 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 Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	<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"/>

#### 3.2.1 Impact Analysis

- a. *Would the project 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?*

The project site is designated as Urban and Built-Up Land on the Kings County Important Farmland Map released by the California Department of Conservation (2016). Therefore, the project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use. The project would have no impact.

*b. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?*

The project site has a General Plan land use designation of Community Facilities and is not subject to a Williamson Act contract (DOC 2016). Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract and the project would have no impact.

*c. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?*

The project site is surrounded by residential, recreational, and school-related uses. The site's existing zoning "Public Services and Community Facilities" does not support the definitions provided by Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 42526 for timberland, PRC Section 12220(g) for forestland, or Government Code Section 51104(g) for timberland zoned for production. Therefore, no impacts related to the conversion of timberlands or forest land would occur.

*d. Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?*

As discussed in the response 3.2.1(c), the project site is surrounded by residential, recreational, and school-related uses. Implementation of the project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur.

*e. Would the project 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?*

The City of Lemoore General Plan identifies the project area as a proposed K-8 school site. No forest land is located within the project site or the vicinity of the project site. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in changes to the environment that, due to its location or nature, could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or converting forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impact would occur.

### 3.3 AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>
e. Is the boundary of the proposed school site within 500 feet of the edge of the closest traffic lane of a freeway or busy traffic corridor? If yes, would the project create an air quality health risk due to the placement of the School?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Would the project create an air quality hazard due to the placement of a school within one-quarter mile of: (a) permitted and non-permitted facilities identified by the jurisdictional air quality control board or air pollution control district; (b) freeways and other busy traffic corridors; (c) large agricultural operations; and/or (d) a rail yard, which might reasonably be anticipated to emit hazardous air emissions, or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous material, substances, or waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.3.1 Impact Analysis

a. *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*

The project site is located within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB), which includes Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Tulare Counties, and is within the jurisdictional boundaries of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). A project is nonconforming with an air quality plan if it conflicts with or delays implementation of any applicable attainment or maintenance plan. A project is conforming if it complies with all applicable SJVAPCD rules and regulations, complies with all proposed control measures that are not yet adopted from the applicable plan(s), and is consistent with the growth forecasts in the applicable plan(s) (or is directly included in the applicable plan). Zoning changes, specific plans, general plan amendments and similar land use plan changes which do not increase dwelling unit density, do not increase vehicle trips, and do

not increase vehicle miles traveled are also deemed to comply with the applicable air quality plan (SJVAPCD 2017).

For construction impacts, the pollutant of greatest concern to the SJVAPCD is respirable particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>). To aid in evaluating potentially significant construction and/or operational impacts of a project, SJVAPCD has prepared an advisory document, the Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (GAMAQI), which contains standard procedures for addressing air quality in CEQA documents (SJVAPCD, 2002), which was updated in March of 2017. The SJVAPCD recommends that significance be based on a consideration of the control measures to be implemented during project construction. Compliance with Regulation VIII (Fugitive PM<sub>10</sub> Prohibitions) and implementation of appropriate mitigation measures to control PM<sub>10</sub> emissions are considered by the Air District to be sufficient to render a project's construction-related impacts less than significant. All control measures listed in the GAMAQI Table 2 (Regulation VIII Control Measures) are required for all construction sites by regulation. Therefore, implementation of **Mitigation Measure AQ-1**, as required by the SJVAPCD would reduce construction-related impacts to less than significant.

GAMAQI presents a three-tiered approach to operational air quality analysis. The Small Project Analysis Level (SPAL) is first used to screen the project for potentially significant impacts. A project that meets the screening criteria at this level requires no further analysis and air quality impacts of the project may be deemed less than significant. If a project does not meet all the criteria at this screening level, additional screening is recommended at the Cursory Analysis Level and, if warranted, the Full Analysis Level.

GAMAQI 5-3(b) (Table 2), which SJVAPCD recommends using as part of the initial screening process, shows the maximum trips per day to be considered a SPAL project. The District projects that the proposed project would generate 1,323 additional trips, which is under the 1,707-vehicles per day threshold for the institutional land use category type project; therefore, the project meets the SPAL criterion for project type and is excluded from quantifying criteria pollutant emissions for CEQA purposes.

Therefore, the project's emissions would not exceed the construction significance thresholds with the implementation of **Mitigation Measure AQ-1** and is not expected to generate activities that could cause exceedance of the operational thresholds or violate any SJVAPCD rule or regulation. The project would not conflict with or delay the implementation of the SJVAPCD Attainment Plans. Therefore, project impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of **Mitigation Measure AQ-1**.

*b. Would the project 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?*

The SJVAB is designated as a nonattainment area for federal ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) and particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) standards and for state O<sub>3</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> standards, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> standards. Movement of soil and pollutant emissions associated with entrained dust (earth movement) and internal combustion engines used by on-site construction equipment and from off-site worker vehicles and truck trips during project construction have



the potential to release short-term criteria air pollutants. However, due to the short duration of construction activities and the implementation of **Mitigation Measure AQ-1**, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment. The project would not change the land use of the project site or produce criteria pollutant emissions during project operation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with implementation of **Mitigation Measure AQ-1**.

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

During construction, diesel equipment would be operating. Diesel particulate matter (DPM) is known to the State of California as a toxic air contaminant (TAC). The risks associated with exposure to substances with carcinogenic effects are typically evaluated based on a lifetime of chronic exposure, which is defined in the California Air Pollution Control Officers' Association (CAPCOA's) Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Program Risk Assessment Guidelines as 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, 365 days per year, for 70 years. DPM would be emitted during the short term of construction assumed for the proposed project from heavy equipment used in the construction process. Because diesel exhaust particulate matter is considered carcinogenic, long-term exposure to diesel exhaust emissions has the potential to result in adverse health impacts. Due to the short-term nature of project construction, impacts from exposure to diesel exhaust emissions during construction would be less than significant. No DPM-generating equipment, aside from potential landscape equipment, would be located on-site during operation of the proposed project; therefore, the proposed project would result in intermittent operation of DPM-generating equipment. This impact would be less than significant.

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

The CEQA guidelines indicate that a significant impact would occur if the proposed project would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Construction of the proposed project would emit diesel exhaust and volatile organic compounds, which are objectionable to some; however, emissions will disperse rapidly from the project site and the activity would be temporary. Impacts due to objectionable odors would be less than significant.

*e. Is the boundary of the proposed school site within 500 feet of the edge of the closest traffic lane of a freeway or busy traffic corridor? If yes, would the project create an air quality health risk due to the placement of the School?*

The nearest highway is State Route 41, which is located approximately 2,000 feet west of the proposed project area. Other traffic corridors in the vicinity of the project area include 19th Avenue, a two-lane arterial, and Cinnamon Drive, a two-lane collector. No freeways or busy traffic corridors are located within 500 feet of the project site. No impact would occur.

- f. *Would the project create an air quality hazard due to the placement of a school within one-quarter mile of: (a) permitted and non-permitted facilities identified by the jurisdictional air quality control board or air pollution control district; (b) freeways and other busy traffic corridors; (c) large agricultural operations; and/or (d) a rail yard, which might reasonably be anticipated to emit hazardous air emissions, or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous material, substances, or waste?*

Within one-quarter mile of the proposed project area are residential, recreational, school-related uses, and one towing and storage facility located 0.25 mile from the nearest proposed project site boundary. None of these uses would create an air quality hazard for the proposed school site. As discussed in response 3.3 (e), the nearest highway is approximately 2,000 feet (0.38 mile) from the proposed project area. And no agricultural operations are located within 0.25 mile of the proposed school site. The project area is located approximately 0.35 mile north of the proposed Cross Valley Corridor rail line, which would use the existing freight rail line to transport passengers to and from several Central Valley cities, including Lemoore. There would be no impact.

### 3.3.2 Mitigation Measures

**Mitigation Measure AQ-1:** The following measures shall be implemented by the construction contractor during construction activities:

- All disturbed areas, including storage piles, which are not being actively utilized for construction purposes, shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water, chemical stabilizer/suppressant, covered with a tarp or other suitable cover or vegetative ground cover.
- All on-site unpaved roads and off-site unpaved access roads shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.
- All land clearing, grubbing, scraping, excavation, land leveling, grading, cut and fill, and demolition activities shall be effectively controlled of fugitive dust emissions utilizing application of water or by presoaking.
- With the demolition of buildings up to six stories in height, all exterior surfaces of the building shall be wetted during demolition.
- When materials are transported off-site, all material shall be covered, or effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, and at least six inches of freeboard space from the top of the container shall be maintained.
- All operations shall limit or expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at the end of each workday. (The use of dry rotary brushes is expressly prohibited except where preceded or accompanied by sufficient wetting to limit the visible dust emissions.) (Use of blower devices is expressly forbidden.)

- Following the addition of materials to, or the removal of materials from, the surface of outdoor storage piles, said piles shall be effectively stabilized of fugitive dust emissions utilizing sufficient water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.
- Within urban areas, trackout shall be immediately removed when it extends 50 or more feet from the site and at the end of each workday.
- An owner/operator of any site with 150 or more vehicle trips per day, or 20 or more vehicle trips per day by vehicles with three or more axles shall implement measures to prevent carryout and trackout.

### 3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

#### 3.4.1 Impact Analysis

- a. *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

A search of the California Department of Wildlife’s California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) Lemoore 7.5-minute quadrangle identified five occurrences of special-status plant and animal species. However, no suitable habitat is present within the proposed project area to support the special-status species because the site has been previously graded. No native habitat is present on or adjacent to the project site. Because of the surrounding built environment, no mammals other than raccoons, domestic dogs and cats occur in the area, nor do any reptilian species. Common native and non-native bird species may find shelter and nesting opportunities within the mature street trees located in the area; however, no trees are located on the project site. Construction and operation of the proposed project would not impact species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations.

- b. *Would the project 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?*

Review of the National Wetlands Inventory indicates there are no surface waters within 0.5 mile of the project site. Therefore, no direct or indirect impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities are anticipated as a result of project activities.

- c. *Would the project 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?*

Review of the National Wetlands Inventory indicates no wetlands are mapped on the project site. Therefore, no direct or indirect impacts to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means are anticipated as a result of project activities.

- d. *Would the project 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?*

The project site has been previously graded and is surrounded by residential fencing on the north and west sides of the project site. The project site does not contain wildlife travel routes, such as a riparian strip, ridgeline, drainage, or wildlife crossings, such as a tunnel, culvert, or underpass.

The project site and adjacent areas do not support resident or migratory fish species or wildlife nursery sites. No established resident or migratory wildlife corridors occur within the project site. Therefore, the project would not interfere substantially with or impede: (1) the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, (2) established resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or (3) the use of wildlife nursery sites.

- e. *Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?*

No native trees or shrubs and no sensitive habitats are present on the project site. The proposed project would not impact trees. Therefore, the project would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

- f. *Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?*

The project site is located in a residential area that is not part of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural communities conservation plan, or other conservation plan. Therefore, construction and operation of the proposed project would have no impact to an approved habitat conservation plan.

### 3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

#### 3.5.1 Impact Analysis

- a. *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?*

The project site is undeveloped and adjacent to the existing District office and surrounding residential uses. Given that the surrounding buildings (District office and residences) are less than 50 years old and the project site does not contain any structures, the proposed project does not have the potential to be a historic resource. Therefore, no impact related to historic built resources would result with implementation of the proposed project.

- b. *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?*

The project site has been heavily disturbed by previous grading activity. Therefore, the potential for the site to contain archaeological resources is considered to be low.

However, unknown or unrecorded resources may potentially be revealed during construction activities associated with the construction of the proposed school. This may occur if ground disturbance activities penetrate deeper than previous work performed. California PRC protects archaeological, paleontological, and historical sites with a wide variety of state policies and regulations in conjunction with CEQA. Furthermore, all construction activities must comply with PRC Section 21083.2-21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and 15126.4(b), which address the protection of archaeological and historical resources. This impact would be less than significant.

- c. *Would the project disturb any humans remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?*

The project site has been mass graded. During previous ground disturbance activities, no human remains were identified or recorded onsite. In the unlikely event that human remains are discovered, during precise grading or construction activities, the project would be subject to California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and PRC Section 5097.98. California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 identify the required procedures to follow in the unlikely discovery of human remains. PRC Section 5097.98 stipulates the notification process during the discovery of Native American human remains, descendants, disposition

of human remains, and associated artifacts. Therefore, adherence to all applicable codes and regulations would result in a less-than-significant impact.

### 3.6 ENERGY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Result in a 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.6.1 Impact Analysis

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

Title 24 is designed to provide certainty and uniformity throughout California while ensuring that the efficient and non-wasteful consumption of energy is carried out through design features. Adherence to Title 24 is deemed necessary to ensure that no significant impacts occur from the inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy. The proposed buildings would be compliant with Title 24; therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. This impact would be less than significant

- b. *Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?*

Title 24 is designed to provide certainty and uniformity throughout California while ensuring that the efficient and non-wasteful consumption of energy is carried out through design features. Adherence to Title 24 is deemed necessary to ensure that no significant impacts occur from the inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy. The proposed buildings would be compliant with Title 24; therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. This impact would be less than significant.



### 3.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.7.1 Impact Analysis

a. *Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:*

- i. *Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.*

The project site is not within a designated State of California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, or within an area designated as geologically hazardous in the Safety Element of the City of Lemoore General Plan. The nearest fault is in the Nunez Fault, which is located 40 miles west of the project area. Therefore, impacts to the project area from rupture of a known earthquake fault would be less than significant.

*ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?*

The project area is located in a seismic zone which is sufficiently far from known faults and consists primarily of a stable geological formation. The nearest fault is the Nunez Fault, which is located 40 miles west of the project area. Therefore, the impact due to ground shaking would be less than significant.

*iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*

According to the City of Lemoore General Plan Safety Element: "Secondary natural hazards associated with earthquakes result from the interaction of ground shaking with existing ground instabilities, and include liquefaction, settlement or subsidence, landslides and seiches. While some of these secondary hazards are a concern to other parts of Kings County and the 5-County Seismic Study region, none are considered of particular concern to the Lemoore Planning Area because of its distance from the major regional fault (San Andreas Fault), the lack of steep slopes, and the clay composition of area soils." This impact is considered less than significant.

*iv. Landslides?*

See response 3.7 (a)(iii). This impact would be less than significant.

*b. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?*

Project construction activities, including land clearing, grading, and excavation, would disturb on-site soils, temporarily exposing them to wind and water erosion. Any construction activity affecting 1 acre or more is required to comply with the Construction General Permit (Water Quality No. 2009-0009-DWQ, as amended by Order Nos. 2010-0014-DWQ and 2012-0006-DWQ) implemented and enforced by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. The General Permit requires the project applicant to prepare and submit a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) that identifies best management practices (BMPs) to reduce construction effects on receiving water quality by implementing erosion control measures and reducing or eliminating non-stormwater discharges. A SWPPP provides a schedule for the implementation and maintenance of erosion control measures and a description of site-specific erosion control practices, such as appropriate design details and a time schedule. The SWPPP would consider the full range of erosion control BMPs. Examples of construction BMPs to reduce erosion include the use of temporary mulching, seeding, or other suitable stabilization measures to protect uncovered soils; performing clearing and earth-moving activities only during dry weather; and limiting construction access routes and stabilizing designated access points.

With implementation of existing regulations, project impacts would be less than significant.

- c. *Would the project 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?*

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Web Soil Survey, the project area is entirely underlain by Grangeville sandy loam, saline-alkali. This soil type is typically somewhat poorly drained to poorly drained. The permeability of this soil type is slow to very slow and shrink-swell potential is high. The saline-alkali soils cause high corrosivity to concrete and steel. The proposed project would be constructed on relatively level, stable soils, imported to the site, as necessary, and would not result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. This impact would be less than significant.

- d. *Would the project 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?*

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Web Soil Survey, the project area is entirely underlain by Grangeville sandy loam, saline-alkali. This soil type is typically somewhat poorly drained to poorly drained. The permeability of this soil type is slow to very slow and shrink-swell potential is high (i.e., high expansion potential). The proposed project would be constructed on relatively level, stable soils, imported to the site, as necessary, to ensure no risks to life or property. This impact would be less than significant.

- e. *Would the project 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?*

The project would not include installation of septic tanks, as the proposed project facilities would connect to the City of Lemoore sewer services. Therefore, the capability of the soils to support the operation of such tanks does not need to be evaluated. No impact would occur in association with construction and operation of the project.

- f. *Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*

The potential exists that paleontological resources could be discovered during construction activities. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure GEO-1** would reduce potential impacts to paleontological resources to a less-than-significant level.

### 3.7.1 Mitigation Measures

**Mitigation Measure GEO-1:** During construction, if paleontological resources are encountered, all ground-disturbing activities shall be redirected within 50 feet of the find until a qualified paleontologist can be contacted to evaluate the find and make recommendations. If found to be significant and proposed project activities cannot avoid the paleontological resources, a paleontological evaluation and monitoring plan, shall be implemented. Adverse impacts to paleontological resources shall be mitigated, which may include monitoring, data recovery and analysis, a final report, and the accession of all fossil material to a paleontological repository. Upon completion of project ground-disturbing activities, a report

documenting methods, findings, and recommendations shall be prepared and submitted to the paleontological repository.

### 3.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Conflict with an 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"/>

#### 3.8.1 Impact Analysis

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

Greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) are present in the atmosphere naturally, and are released by natural sources, or are formed from secondary reactions taking place in the atmosphere. However, over the last 200 years, human activities have caused substantial quantities of GHGs to be released into the atmosphere. These extra emissions are increasing GHG concentrations in the atmosphere, and enhancing the natural greenhouse effect, which is believed to be causing global climate change. The gases that are widely seen as the principal contributors to human-induced global climate change are:

- Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>)
- Methane (CH<sub>4</sub>)
- Nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O)
- Hydrofluorocarbons
- Perfluorocarbons
- Sulfur Hexafluoride

Certain gases, such as water vapor, are short-lived in the atmosphere. Others remain in the atmosphere for significant periods of time, contributing to climate change in the long term. Water vapor is excluded from the list of GHGs above because it is short-lived in the atmosphere and its atmospheric concentrations are largely determined by natural processes, such as oceanic evaporation.

These gases vary considerably in terms of Global Warming Potential (GWP), which is a concept developed to compare the ability of each GHG to trap heat in the atmosphere relative to another gas. GWP is based on several factors, including the relative effectiveness of a gas to absorb infrared radiation and the length of time that the gas remains in the atmosphere (“atmospheric lifetime”).

The GWP of each gas is measured relative to CO<sub>2</sub>, the most abundant GHG; the definition of GWP for a particular GHG is the ratio of heat trapped by one unit mass of the GHG to the ratio of heat trapped by one unit mass of CO<sub>2</sub> over a specified time period.

The SJVAPCD *Guidance for Valley Land-use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Projects under CEQA* suggests project GHG emissions would be considered less than significant if a project meets any of the following conditions: is exempt from CEQA requirements; complies with an approved GHG emission reduction plan or GHG mitigation program; or implements Best Performance Standards. Additionally, projects that demonstrate that GHG emissions would be reduced or mitigated by at least 29 percent compared to Business-as-Usual, including GHG emission reductions achieved since the 2002-2004 baseline period, would be considered less than significant.

**Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** Construction activities associated with the proposed project, such as site preparation, site grading, on-site construction vehicles, equipment hauling materials to and from the project site, and motor vehicles transporting the construction crew would produce combustion emissions from various sources. During construction, GHGs would be emitted through the operation of construction equipment and from worker and builder supply vendor vehicles, each of which typically uses fossil-based fuels to operate. The combustion of fossil-based fuels creates GHGs such as CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, and N<sub>2</sub>O. Furthermore, CH<sub>4</sub> is emitted during the fueling of heavy equipment. Exhaust emissions from on-site construction activities would vary daily as construction activity levels change.

The SJVAPCD does not have an adopted threshold of significance for construction-related GHG emissions. However, lead agencies are encouraged to quantify and disclose GHG emissions that would occur during construction. Using CalEEMod, it is estimated that construction of the proposed project would generate a total of approximately 500 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e). When considered over the 30-year life of the project, the total amortized construction emissions for the proposed project would be 16.7 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year. As such, construction of the proposed project would not generate GHG emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment and construction-related impacts would be less than significant.

**Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** Long-term GHG emissions are typically generated from mobile, area, waste, and water sources as well as indirect emissions from sources associated with energy consumption. Mobile-source GHG emissions would include project-generated haul trips to and from the site. Area-source emissions would be associated with activities such as landscaping and maintenance on the project site. Energy source emissions are typically generated at off-site utility providers as a result of increased electricity demand generated by a project. Stationary source emissions would be associated with emergency backup generators. In addition, water source emissions associated with the proposed project are generated by water supply and conveyance and water distribution.

Operational emissions were estimated using CalEEMod and the results are presented in Table 2. CalEEMod output sheets are included in Appendix A.

**Table 2: Operational GHG Emissions**

Emissions Source Category	Operational Emissions (Metric Tons per Year)				
	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub> e	Percent of Total
Area	0.004	<0.0001	0.0	0.004	0.01
Energy	45.0	<0.0001	<0.0001	45.0	99.99
Mobile	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
<b>Total Operational</b>				<b>45.004</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Source: SSS (October 2019).

The proposed project would generate approximately 45 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year of emissions, as shown in Table 2. The SJVAPCD has not established a numeric threshold for GHG emissions. Based on the emission estimates shown in Table 2, the proposed project would not result in the generation of substantial GHG emissions. As such, operation of the proposed project would not generate GHG emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment and construction-related impacts would be less than significant.

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

The City of Lemoore does not have an adopted Climate Action Plan or GHG Reduction Plan. Therefore, the following discussion evaluates the proposed project according to the goals of Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the AB 32 Scoping Plan, Executive Order B-30-15, SB 32, and AB 197.

AB 32 is aimed at reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. AB 32 requires the California Air Resource Board (CARB) to prepare a Scoping Plan that outlines the main State strategies for meeting the 2020 deadline and to reduce GHGs that contribute to global climate change. The AB 32 Scoping Plan has a range of GHG reduction actions, which include direct regulations, alternative compliance mechanisms, monetary and non-monetary incentives, voluntary actions, market-based mechanisms such as a cap-and-trade system, and an AB 32 implementation fee to fund the program.

Executive Order Executive Order B-30-15 added the immediate target of reducing GHG emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. CARB released a second update to the Scoping Plan, the 2017 Scoping Plan (CARB 2017), to reflect the 2030 target set by Executive Order B-30-15 and codified by Senate Bill (SB) 32. SB 32 affirms the importance of addressing climate change by codifying into statute the GHG emissions reductions target of at least 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 contained in Executive Order B-30-15. SB 32 builds on AB 32 and keeps the State on the path toward achieving the 2050 objective of reducing emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels. The companion bill to SB 32, AB 197, provides additional direction to CARB related to the adoption of strategies to reduce GHG emissions. Additional direction in AB 197 intended to provide easier public access to air emissions data that are collected by CARB was posted in December 2016.

As identified above, the AB 32 Scoping Plan contains GHG reduction measures that work towards reducing GHG emissions, consistent with the targets set by AB 32, Executive Order B-30-15 and codified by SB 32 and AB 197. The measures applicable to the proposed

project include energy efficiency measures, water conservation and efficiency measures, and transportation and motor vehicle measures, as discussed below.

Energy efficient measures are intended to maximize energy efficiency building and appliance standards, pursue additional efficiency efforts including new technologies and new policy and implementation mechanisms, and pursue comparable investment in energy efficiency from all retail providers of electricity in California. In addition, these measures are designed to expand the use of green building practices to reduce the carbon footprint of California's new and existing inventory of buildings. As discussed in Section 3.6(b), energy usage on the project site during construction would be temporary in nature. In addition, energy usage associated with operation of the proposed project would be relatively small in comparison to the State's available energy sources and energy impacts would be negligible at the regional level. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with applicable energy measures.

Water conservation and efficiency measures are intended to continue efficiency programs and use cleaner energy sources to move water. Increasing the efficiency of water transport and reducing water use would reduce GHG emissions. The project would implement water conservation and efficiency strategies for irrigation and potable water distribution on the site. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any of the water conservation and efficiency measures.

The goal of transportation and motor vehicle measures is to develop regional GHG emissions reduction targets for passenger vehicles. Based on the District's Demographic and Enrollment Projections, the four elementary schools within the District (Cinnamon Elementary, Engvall Elementary, Lemoore Elementary, and Meadow Lane Elementary) are approaching capacity and/or have more students living in the attendance area than the school has capacity. The District anticipates that the proposed school would accommodate the students living in the vicinity of the proposed project site but are currently attending other, more distant elementary schools. The development of the proposed project would eliminate vehicular trips associated with trips to more distant schools (estimated to be as far as 1.8 miles). If each of the 550 students reduced their commute on average 0.5 mile per day and assuming 1.8 students per household, the proposed project has the potential to reduce vehicle miles traveled by 23,375 miles per year (assuming a conservative 15 percent absentee rate). The project would not result conflict with reduction targets for passenger vehicles. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with policies and regulations that have been adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG from transportation sources.

The proposed project would comply with existing State regulations adopted to achieve the overall GHG emissions reduction goals identified in AB 32, the AB 32 Scoping Plan, Executive Order B-30-15, SB 32, and AB 197 and would be consistent with applicable state plans and programs designed to reduce GHG emissions. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs and impacts would be less than significant.



### 3.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>
h. Is the property line of the proposed school site less than the following distances from the edge of respective powerline easements: (1) 100 feet of a 50-133 kV line; (2) 150 feet of a 220-230 kV line; or (3) 350 feet of a 500-550 kV line?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Is the proposed school site located near an aboveground water or fuel storage tank or within 1,500 feet of an easement of an aboveground or underground pipeline that can pose a safety hazard to the site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Is the school site in an area designated in a city, county, or city and county general plan for agricultural use and zoned for agricultural production, and if so, do neighboring agricultural uses have the potential to result in any public health and safety issues that may affect the pupils and employees at the school site? <i>(Does not apply to school sites approved by CDE prior to January 1, 1997.)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Does the project site contain a current or former hazardous waste disposal site or solid waste disposal site and, if so, have the wastes been removed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
l. If a response action is necessary and proposed as part of this project, has it been developed to be protective of children's health, with an ample margin of safety?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### 3.9.1 Impact Analysis

- a. *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*

Construction of the proposed project would require the transport and use of small quantities of hazardous materials in the form of gasoline, diesel, and oil. There is the potential for small leaks due to refueling of construction equipment; however, implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) identified in construction specification plans would reduce the potential for accidental release of construction-related fuels and other hazardous materials. These BMPs would prevent, minimize, or remedy stormwater contamination from spills or leaks, control the amount of runoff from the site, and require proper disposal and handling of hazardous materials.

Any on-site storage, transport, or use of hazardous materials during the operation of the proposed project would comply with local, state, and federal regulatory requirements.

Therefore, impacts associated with a potential hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

- b. *Would the project 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?*

Construction of the proposed project would require the transport and use of small quantities of hazardous materials in the form of gasoline, diesel, and oil. There is the potential for accidental release of hazardous materials; however, implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) identified in construction specification plans would reduce the potential for accidental release of construction-related fuels and other hazardous materials. These BMPs would prevent, minimize, or remedy stormwater contamination from spills or leaks, control the amount of runoff from the site, and require proper disposal and handling of hazardous materials.

Any on-site storage, transport, or use of hazardous materials during the operation of the proposed project would comply with local, state, and federal regulatory requirements.

Therefore, impacts associated with a potential hazard to the public or the environment due to accidental release of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

- c. *Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*

The project must comply with the California Education Code (including Section 17521, requiring the governing board of the school district to adopt a resolution in connection with consideration of proposal for occupancy of a building to be constructed on its property and

to conduct a public meeting), and the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 5, Sections 14001 through 14012, which outlines the powers and duties and establishes standards with which the CDE, and all public school districts, must comply in the selection of new school sites.

The project site is in an undeveloped area. According to the Phase I ESA (BSK 2003) and a 2019 Geotracker and Envirostor search, there are no facilities that emit or handle hazardous materials within one-quarter mile. The Phase I ESA indicates that the site had been planted in alfalfa or a similar crop from at least the early 1950s until the early 1980s. Although the ESA did not observe evidence of the presence of toxic substances, the site had been analyzed for the presence of agricultural products (i.e., pesticides, fertilizers, soil amendments, etc.). The site has been tested for the presence of agricultural products, and according to Envirostor, no further action is required at the project site as of February 23, 2005.

Land uses surrounding the project site include residences, a church, and the District office, none of which handle or emit significant amounts of hazardous materials. Any future construction within one-quarter mile of the project site, which would take place after project implementation, would be subject to their own CEQA review.

Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

*d. Would the project 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?*

According to the Department of Toxic Substances Envirostor website, the proposed project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites. Although the site was subject of a school investigation, as of 2005, no further action is required. This impact would be less than significant.

*e. Would the project be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 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?*

The nearest public or public use airport to the project area is the Hanford Municipal Airport, which is more than 9.5 miles east of the project area. There would be no impact associated with proximity to a public airport and/or exposure of people residing or working in the area to noise from the airport.

*f. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

The City of Lemoore published an Emergency Operations Plan in 2005, which provides guidance to City staff in the event of extraordinary emergency situations associated with natural disaster and technological incidents (City of Lemoore, 2008). The proposed project

would not interfere with the City's adopted emergency response plan; therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

*g. Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?*

The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CALFIRE) developed Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZ) for State Responsibility Areas (SRA) and Local Responsibility Areas (LRA). The project site is located in an LRA area with an unzoned designation and is not located in a high, moderate, or low designation area. Therefore, the project would not result in exposure of people or structures to significant risk of loss injury or death as a result of wildland fire hazards.

*h. Is the property line of the proposed school site less than the following distances from the edge of respective powerline easements: (1) 100 feet of a 50-133 kV line; (2) 150 feet of a 220-230 kV line; or (3) 350 feet of a 500-550 kV line?*

Pursuant to CCR, Title 5, Section 14010(c), the property line for a new school site shall not be the following minimum distances from the edge of a high-voltage power line easement: 100 feet for 50-133 kV lines; 150 feet for 220-230 kV lines; and 350 feet for 500-550 kV lines. Local utility lines are located along 19th Avenue adjacent to the project site; however, these lines would be undergrounded as part of the proposed project. Because the power lines would be undergrounded and are setback a distance of more than 100 feet from the nearest classroom building, this impact would be less than significant.

*i. Is the proposed school site located near an aboveground water or fuel storage tank or within 1,500 feet of an easement of an aboveground or underground pipeline that can pose a safety hazard to the site?*

Based on an online records search (NPMS 2019), no high-pressure gas or oil pipelines occur within 1,500 feet of the project site. The project site does not contain an aboveground water tank (BSK 2003). For these reasons, construction and operation of the project would result in a less-than-significant impact with regard to safety hazards.

*j. Is the school site in an area designated in a city, county, or city and county general plan for agricultural use and zoned for agricultural production, and if so, do neighboring agricultural uses have the potential to result in any public health and safety issues that may affect the pupils and employees at the school site? (Does not apply to school sites approved by CDE prior to January 1, 1997.)*

The project site is designated as Community Facilities on the City of Lemoore General Plan Land Use Map. Parcels surrounding the project site are designated as Residential, Neighborhood Commercial, and Parks & Recreation land uses. The nearest parcels designated and zoned for agricultural use are more than 1,500 feet west of the project area (immediately west of the State Route 41).

As discussed in response 3.9.1(c), the project site had previously been under agricultural operation; however, the site has been tested for the presence of agricultural products, and

according to Envirostor, no further action is required at the project site as of February 23, 2005. This impact would be less than significant.

*k. Does the project site contain a current or former hazardous waste disposal site or solid waste disposal site and, if so, have the wastes been removed?*

The Phase I ESA prepared for the project site found no evidence of the site having been used as a waste disposal site. No impact would occur.

*l. If a response action is necessary and proposed as part of this project, has it been developed to be protective of children's health, with an ample margin of safety?*

As discussed in response 3.9.1(c), the project site had previously been under agricultural operation; however, the site has been tested for the presence of agricultural products, and according to Envirostor, no further action is required at the project site as of February 23, 2005. This impact would be less than significant.

### 3.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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:				
i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.10.1 Impact Analysis

- a. *Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?*

Development of a property may result in two types of water quality impacts: (1) short-term impacts due to construction related discharges; and (2) long-term impacts from operation or changes in site runoff characteristics. Runoff may carry on-site surface pollutants to water bodies such as lakes, streams, and rivers that ultimately drain to the ocean. Projects that increase urban runoff may indirectly increase local and regional flooding intensity and erosion.

Non-stormwater discharges could result from activities such as discharge or accidental spills of hazardous substances such as fuels, oils, petroleum hydrocarbons, concrete, paints, solvents, cleaners, or other construction materials. Erosion and construction-related wastes have the potential to temporarily degrade existing water quality and beneficial uses by altering the dissolved oxygen content, temperature, pH, suspended sediment and turbidity levels, or nutrient content, or by causing toxic effects in the aquatic environment. Therefore, if uncontrolled, project-related construction activities could violate water quality standards.

As required by the State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCB) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit (No. 2012-0006-DWQ) for stormwater discharges associated with construction and land disturbance activities, the District must develop and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that specifies Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent construction pollutants from contacting stormwater, with the intent of keeping all products of erosion from moving offsite. The District would be required to comply with the Construction General Permit because project-related construction activities would result in soil disturbances of at least 1 acre of total land area. **Mitigation Measure HYD-1** requires the preparation and implementation of a SWPPP to comply with the Construction General Permit requirements.

With implementation of **Mitigation Measure HYD-1**, the project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements (WDRs) during the construction period, and impacts would be less than significant.

*b. Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?*

The City's municipal water system extracts its water supply from underground aquifers via six active groundwater wells within the City limits and two in a wellfield approximately 5 miles north of the City. Water is conveyed from the wells to the consumers via a distribution system with pipe sizes between 6 and 16 inches in diameter. The City maintains four ground-level storage reservoirs within the distribution system, with a total capacity of 4.4 million gallons (City of Lemoore, 2017). The proposed project would make a minor contribution to the City's current demand and would comply with the City's water conservation measures and regulations. This impact would be less than significant.

*c. Would the project 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:*

*i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;*

The proposed project would not alter the course of a stream or river. However, grading and development of the vacant project site with the school buildings, walkways, sports fields and recreation areas, and parking lots would substantially and permanently alter the on-site drainage pattern thereby increasing the potential for on-site and off-site erosion and sedimentation and increasing the amount of surface runoff through the addition of impervious surfaces.

Development of impervious surfaces incrementally reduces the amount of natural soil surfaces available for the infiltration of rainfall and runoff. As a result, the frequency, volume, and flow rate of stormwater runoff increases, potentially resulting in on-site flooding, downstream flooding, or potentially contributing to runoff that exceeds the capacity of the existing drainage system in the vicinity of the project site. The majority of the project site would be covered by impervious surfaces in the form of building foundations, hardcourt areas, walkways, and parking lots. Landscaped areas and sports fields would be

undeveloped and would provide infiltration of stormwater and reduce the volume of stormwater flowing off-site.

Stormwater is currently retained on site due to lack of drainage facilities and the need to drain it. The development of the proposed project would increase the hard surface paved area of the site and require control of the stormwater that would be generated. Surface runoff would be collected with a positive flow underground storm drain that would extend to the southwest portion of the site and connect to the 24-inch storm drain in Cinnamon Drive. Because of the generally level topography of the site, the field areas that would allow for recharge, and the connection to the City storm drain, impacts associated with erosion or siltation would be less than significant.

- ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;*

See response 3.10.1(c)(i).

- 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*

See response 3.10.1(c)(i). Implementation of the proposed project would increase the amount of impervious surface within the project area; however, the project has been designed to accommodate stormwater without increasing the rate or amount of surface runoff in exceedance of the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. This impact would be less than significant.

- iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?*

The proposed project area is located in an area designated as Zone X (Area of Minimal Flood Hazard) on the FEMA Flood Map 06031C0170D (effective 9/16/2015). Due to the location of the proposed project outside of a flood hazard zone, development of the proposed project is not anticipated to impede or redirect flood flows. This impact is considered less than significant.

- d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?*

The proposed project site is not located within a FEMA designated 100-year or 500-year floodplain. In addition, the project site is generally level and is not immediately adjacent to any hillsides. As such, the risk from flooding would be low. Furthermore, no enclosed bodies of water are in close enough proximity that would create a potential risk for seiche or a tsunami at the project site. Therefore, there would be no impact related to potential hazards from inundation from flood, tsunami, or seiche.



*e. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?*

Pollutants of concern during construction include sediment, trash, petroleum products, concrete waste (dry and wet), sanitary waste, and chemicals. Each of these pollutants on its own or in combination with other pollutants can have a detrimental effect on water quality. During construction activities, excavated soil would be exposed, and there would be an increased potential for soil erosion and sedimentation compared to existing conditions. In addition, chemicals, liquid products, petroleum products (such as paints, solvents, and fuels), and concrete-related waste may be spilled or leaked during construction. These pollutants may percolate to shallow groundwater from construction activities. However, required compliance with State and local regulations regarding stormwater and dewatering during construction would ensure that the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to water quality during construction.

During operation of the proposed project, stormwater runoff would percolate into the recreational field and drain into the City's drainage system. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. This impact is considered less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure HYD-1:** Prior to ground-disturbing activities, the District shall prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that specifies best management practices (BMPs) with the intent of keeping all products of erosion from moving offsite. The SWPPP shall include a site map that shows the construction site perimeter, existing and proposed man-made facilities, stormwater collection and discharge points, general topography both before and after construction, and drainage patterns across the project site. Additionally, the SWPPP shall contain a visual monitoring program and a chemical monitoring program for non-visible pollutants to be implemented (if there is a failure of BMPs). The requirements of the SWPPP and BMPs shall be incorporated into design specifications and construction contracts. Recommended BMPs for the construction phase may include the following:

- Stockpiling and disposing of demolition debris, concrete, and soil properly;
- Protecting any existing storm drain inlets and stabilizing disturbed areas;
- Implementing erosion controls;
- Properly managing construction materials; and
- Managing waste, aggressively controlling litter, and implementing sediment controls.

### 3.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>

#### 3.11.1 Impact Analysis

a. *Would the project physically divide an established community?*

The project would be located on a vacant lot surrounded by residential and recreational uses. Connectivity between the project site and surrounding areas would be maintained, and no division of an established community would occur. Therefore, no impact would occur.

b. *Would the project 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?*

The project site is zoned as Public Services and Community Facilities (CF) and identified as a proposed K-8 school in the City of Lemoore General Plan. The project does not propose to change the site's existing zoning or land use designation. The proposed project would comply with applicable land use requirements, policies, zoning, and development standards as required by California law for school districts, and adhere to other applicable state codes and regulations.

The project site is not subject to a specific plan or local coastal program. For these reasons, the project would not conflict with any existing state, regional, county, or local laws, policies, regulations, plans or guidelines. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

### 3.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>
c. 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"/>

#### 3.12.1 Impact Analysis

- a. *Would the project 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?*

The Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) regulates surface mining in California. SMARA was adopted in 1975 to protect the State’s need for a continuing supply of mineral resources and to protect the public and environmental health. SMARA requires that all cities incorporate mapped mineral resource designations approved by the State Mining and Geology Board into their General Plans.

According to the City of Lemoore General Plan, there are no mapped mineral resources in the City and no regulated mine facilities as of July 2007 (City of Lemoore, 2008).

The proposed project would include the development of the proposed school site. Based on available data, a mineral resource loss associated with project implementation is not anticipated. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources or recovery sites. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- b. *Would the project 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?*

Refer to response 3.12.1(a). Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

### 3.13 NOISE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 2 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"/>
d. Is the proposed school site located adjacent to or near a major arterial roadway or freeway whose noise generation may adversely affect the education program?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.13.1 Impact Analysis

- a. *Would the project result in 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?*

Noise is usually defined as unwanted sound. Noise consists of any sound that may produce physiological or psychological damage and/or interfere with communication, work, rest, recreation, or sleep. Several noise measurement scales exist that are used to describe noise in a particular location. A decibel (dB) is a unit of measurement that indicates the relative intensity of a sound. Sound levels in dB are calculated on a logarithmic basis. An increase of 10 dB represents a 10-fold increase in acoustic energy, while 20 dB is 100 times more intense and 30 dB is 1,000 times more intense. Each 10 dB increase in sound level is perceived as approximately a doubling of loudness; and similarly, each 10 dB decrease in sound level is perceived as half as loud. Sound intensity is normally measured through the A-weighted sound level (dBA). This scale gives greater weight to the frequencies of sound to which the human ear is most sensitive. The A-weighted sound level is the basis for 24-hour sound measurements that better represent human sensitivity to sound at night.

As noise spreads from a source, it loses energy so that the farther away the noise receiver is from the noise source, the lower the perceived noise level would be. Geometric spreading causes the sound level to attenuate or be reduced, resulting in a 6 dB reduction in the noise level for each doubling of distance from a single point source of noise to the noise sensitive receptor of concern.

There are many ways to rate noise for various time periods, but an appropriate rating of ambient noise affecting humans also accounts for the annoying effects of sound. Equivalent

continuous sound level ( $L_{eq}$ ) is the total sound energy of time varying noise over a sample period. However, the predominant rating scales for human communities in the State of California are the  $L_{eq}$ , the community noise equivalent level (CNEL), and the day-night average level ( $L_{dn}$ ) based on dBA. CNEL is the time varying noise over a 24-hour period, with a 5 dBA weighting factor applied to the hourly  $L_{eq}$  for noises occurring from 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. (defined as relaxation hours) and 10 dBA weighting factor applied to noise occurring from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. (defined as sleeping hours).  $L_{dn}$  is similar to the CNEL scale, but without the adjustment for events occurring during the evening relaxation hours. CNEL and  $L_{dn}$  are within one dBA of each other and are normally exchangeable. The noise adjustments are added to the noise events occurring during the more sensitive hours.

A project would have a significant noise effect if it would substantially increase the ambient noise levels for adjoining areas or conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals of applicable regulatory agencies, including, as appropriate, the City of Lemoore.

The City's General Plan Noise Element provides guiding policies and implementing policies that strive to achieve an acceptable noise environment, ensure new development is compatible with the noise environment, and protect especially sensitive uses from excessive noise, including schools, hospitals, and senior care facilities. The following policies are applicable to the proposed project:

- SN-I-32: Use the community noise compatibility standards, shown in Table 8.6 [of the City of Lemoore General Plan Noise Element], as review criteria for new land uses.
- SN-I-33: Consider an increase of 5 or more dBA to be "significant" if the resulting noise level would exceed that described as "normally acceptable" in Table 8.6.
- SN-I-40: Require developers to mitigate the noise impacts of new development on adjacent properties as a condition of permit approval through appropriate means, including, but not limited to:
  - Screen and control noise sources, such as parking and loading facilities, outdoor activities, and mechanical equipment;
  - Increase setbacks for noise sources from adjacent dwellings;
  - Retain fences, walls, and landscaping that serve as noise buffers;
  - Use soundproofing materials and double-glazed windows;
  - Use open space, building orientation and design, landscaping and running water to mask sounds;
  - Control hours of operation, including deliveries and trash pickup, to minimize noise impacts; and

- As a last resort, construct noise walls along highways and arterials when compatible with aesthetic concerns and neighborhood character. This would be a developer responsibility.
- SN-I-43: Require new noise sources to use best available control technology to minimize noise emissions.
- SN-I-45: Minimize vehicular and stationary noise sources and noise emanating from temporary activities, such as those arising from construction work.

Article 9-5B-2: Noise, Odor, and Vibration Performance Standards (Noise Standards) in the City’s Municipal Code includes performance standards for all permanent and temporary land uses within the City relative to noise, odor, and vibration in order to provide compatibility between neighboring land uses by minimizing various potential impacts. The Noise Standards set land use noise standards as shown in Table 3.

**Table 3: Land Use Noise Standards**

Land Use	Noise Standards (dB CNEL)	
	Interior Noise	Exterior Noise
Residential Uses	45	65 <sup>1</sup>
Residential Uses in Mixed Use Zones	45	70
Commercial	-	70
Office	50	70
Industrial	55	75
Public Facilities	50	70
Parks	-	70
Schools	50	65

Source: City of Lemoore (2018).

<sup>1</sup> In outdoor living areas, e.g., backyards.

The Noise Standards also address construction activity noise and states that construction activities are exempt from the City’s noise standards provided that activities occur between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. Extended construction hours may only be allowed by the review authority through conditions of approval between 8:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. On Sundays and national holidays, construction activities may only be allowed by the review authority through conditions of approval between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

Certain land uses are considered more sensitive to noise than others. Examples of these sensitive land uses include residential areas, educational facilities, hospitals, childcare facilities, and senior housing. The proposed project site is surrounded by residential uses to the west, north, and south beyond Cinnamon Drive.

**Short-Term (Construction) Noise Impacts.** Project construction would result in short-term noise impacts on the nearby sensitive receptors. Maximum construction noise would be short-term, generally intermittent depending on the construction phase, and variable depending on receiver distance from the active construction zone. The duration of noise impacts generally would be from one day to several days depending on the phase of

construction. The level and types of noise impacts that would occur during construction are described below.

Short-term noise impacts would occur during grading and site preparation activities. Table 4 lists typical construction equipment noise levels ( $L_{max}$ ) recommended for noise impact assessments, based on a distance of 50 feet between the equipment and a noise receptor, obtained from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Roadway Construction Noise Model. Construction-related short-term noise levels would be higher than existing ambient noise levels currently in the project area but would no longer occur once construction of the project is completed.

**Table 4: Typical Construction Equipment Noise Levels**

Equipment Description	Acoustical Usage Factor (%)	Maximum Noise Level ( $L_{max}$ ) at 50 Feet <sup>1</sup>
Backhoes	40	80
Compactor (ground)	20	80
Compressor	40	80
Cranes	16	85
Dozers	40	85
Dump Trucks	40	84
Excavators	40	85
Flat Bed Trucks	40	84
Forklift	20	85
Front-end Loaders	40	80
Graders	40	85
Impact Pile Drivers	20	95
Jackhammers	20	85
Pick-up Truck	40	55
Pneumatic Tools	50	85
Pumps	50	77
Rock Drills	20	85
Rollers	20	85
Scrapers	40	85
Tractors	40	84
Welder	40	73

Source: Roadway Construction Noise Model (FHWA 2006).

Note: Noise levels reported in this table are rounded to the nearest whole number.

<sup>1</sup> Maximum noise levels were developed based on Spec 721.560 from the Central Artery/Tunnel (CA/T) program to be consistent with the City of Boston's Noise Code for the "Big Dig" project.

$L_{max}$  = maximum instantaneous sound level

Two types of short-term noise impacts could occur during construction of the proposed project. The first type involves construction crew commutes and the transport of construction equipment and materials to the sites, which would incrementally increase noise levels on roads leading to the sites. As shown in Table 4, there would be a relatively high single-event noise exposure potential at a maximum level of 84 dBA  $L_{max}$  with trucks passing at 50 feet.

The second type of short-term noise impact is related to noise generated during grading and construction on the project site. Construction is performed in discrete steps, or phases, each with its own mix of equipment and, consequently, its own noise characteristics. These

various sequential phases would change the character of the noise generated on site. Therefore, the noise levels vary as construction progresses. Despite the variety in the type and size of construction equipment, similarities in the dominant noise sources and patterns of operation allow construction-related noise ranges to be categorized by work phase.

Typical maximum noise levels range up to 87 dBA  $L_{max}$  at 50 feet during the noisiest construction phases. The site preparation phase, including excavation and grading of the site, tends to generate the highest noise levels because earthmoving machinery is the noisiest construction equipment. Earthmoving equipment includes excavating machinery such as backfillers, bulldozers, draglines, and front loaders. Earthmoving and compacting equipment includes compactors, scrapers, and graders. Typical operating cycles for these types of construction equipment may involve 1 or 2 minutes of full-power operation followed by 3 or 4 minutes at lower power settings.

This analysis assumes that a bulldozer, dump truck, and backhoe would be operating simultaneously during construction of the project. Based on the typical construction equipment noise levels shown in Table 4, noise levels associated with a bulldozer, dump truck, and backhoe operating simultaneously would be approximately 88 dBA  $L_{max}$  at 50 feet.

As noted above, the project is surrounded by residential uses. It is anticipated that construction activities would occur within 50 feet of the adjoining property lines. Construction noise is permitted by the City of Lemoore when activities occur between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. In addition, **Mitigation Measure NOI-1** would be required to limit construction activities to daytime hours and would reduce potential construction period noise impacts for the indicated sensitive receptors to a less-than-significant level.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measure NOI-1** would limit construction hours and require the construction contractor to implement noise-reducing measures during construction, which would reduce short-term construction noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**Operational Noise Impacts.** A significant impact would occur if the project would exceed established standards, including resulting in a substantial permanent increase in ambient exterior noise levels above levels existing without the project. In acoustics, every doubling of an equal sound energy would result in a 3 dBA increase in combined noise level (an increase of 3 dBA represents the lowest noise increase that is perceptible by humans outside of a laboratory environment). As identified above, General Plan Policy SN-I-33 states that an increase of 5 or more dBA would be significant.

Permanent increases in the ambient noise level in the project vicinity would result from vehicle noise associated with school traffic, noise made by children at play in outdoor areas, and maintenance activities.

The proposed school would be exposed to noise levels associated with traffic on Cinnamon Drive and 19th Avenue. The closest edge of the project site is approximately 300 feet from the centerline of Cinnamon Drive and 180 feet from the centerline of 19th Avenue (as measured from the nearest proposed building). Given the distance of the site from the



centerline and the volumes of traffic on Cinnamon Drive and 19th Avenue, traffic noise from adjacent roads would have a less-than-significant impact on the school.

The project would include outdoor play areas, which would create noise for adjacent land uses. No sports fields are proposed to be illuminated for nighttime use and no amplified public address systems are proposed. Noise levels associated with playing fields can generally be expected to range from 55 to 60 dB  $L_{eq}$ , with maximum noise levels ranging from 70 to 75 dB, at a distance of 100 feet from the source.

Noise associated with vocalizations would be intermittent and infrequent. This noise level is not expected to constitute a significant impact since the facilities would only be used during the daytime, when the ambient noise level in the area is higher, and since sensitivity to noise is lower during the day. The playfields would only be used during the day. The resulting noise level at the nearest noise-sensitive receptor would be 55 dB  $L_{eq}$  to 60 dB  $L_{eq}$ . The predicted noise levels from playfield activities would not exceed City's performance standard of 65 dB. With respect to ambient noise, the dominant ambient noise source in the area would be the vehicular traffic noise in the project vicinity. The routine operational use of the project site would not affect change in noise levels for existing sensitive uses. The impacts associated with routine use would be less than significant.

### **Landscape Maintenance**

Mowers, blowers, weed cutters, and tractors would be operated onsite to maintain the project landscaping. Landscape maintenance would occur between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday, consistent with the City's Noise Ordinance; therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

*b. Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?*

Construction activities that might expose persons to excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise have the potential to cause a significant impact. Ground borne vibration information related to construction/heavy equipment activities has been collected by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The Caltrans data indicates that transient vibrations (such as from demolition activity) with a peak particle velocity (PPV) of approximately 0.035 inches per second may be characterized as barely perceptible, and vibration levels up to 0.25 inches per second may be characterized as distinctly perceptible (Caltrans 2013). Caltrans (2013) uses a damage threshold of 0.2 inches per second PPV for conventional buildings.

Ground borne vibration is typically attenuated over relatively short distances. With the anticipated construction equipment, construction-related vibration levels would be approximately 0.127 inches per second PPV at 25 feet from the construction area (assuming simultaneous operation of a caisson drill, a jackhammer, and a small bulldozer). At 25 feet, this vibration would be above the threshold of "barely perceptible" level of 0.035 inches per second PPV; however, the nearest residence is approximately 15 feet from the nearest construction area. At a distance of 15 feet, the vibration level is not anticipated to exceed the distinctly perceptible level of 0.25 inches per second PPV (Caltrans 2013). The

expected vibration level at the residential buildings is also expected to be below the Caltrans damage threshold for conventional buildings. Therefore, impacts related to ground borne vibration would be less than significant.

*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 2 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?*

The nearest public or public use airport to the project area is the Hanford Municipal Airport, which is more than 9.5 miles east of the project area. There would be no impact associated with proximity to a public airport and/or exposure of people residing or working in the area to noise from the airport.

*d. Is the proposed school site located adjacent to or near a major arterial roadway or freeway whose noise generation may adversely affect the education program?*

See response 3.13.1(a). The proposed school would be exposed to noise levels associated with traffic on Cinnamon Drive and 19th Avenue. The closest edge of the project site is approximately 300 feet from the centerline of Cinnamon Drive and 180 feet from the centerline of 19th Avenue (as measured from the nearest proposed building). Given the distance of the site from the centerline and the volumes of traffic on Cinnamon Drive and 19th Avenue, traffic noise from adjacent roads would have a less-than-significant impact on the school.

### **3.13.2 Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation Measure NOI-1:** The project contractor shall implement the following measures during construction of the proposed project:

- Equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers consistent with manufacturers' standards.
- Place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the active project site.
- Locate equipment staging in areas that would create the greatest possible distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the active project site during all construction activities.
- Ensure that all general construction related activities are restricted to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday.
- Designate a "disturbance coordinator" at the District who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator would determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler) and would determine and implement reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem.

### 3.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. 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"/>

#### 3.14.1 Impact Analysis

- a. *Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?*

The project does not include the construction of dwellings or an increase in the resident population of the surrounding area. Project implementation would meet the demands of projected population growth in the project area by providing accommodation for students. Although the project would construct a new public facility, project construction was anticipated in the City of Lemoore General Plan and thus would not result in indirect growth in the project area (City of Lemoore, 2008). As such, the project would have no impact on direct or indirect population growth.

- b. *Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

The project site is currently undeveloped; therefore, no dwelling units would be displaced from project implementation. The project would have no impact.

### 3.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. 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:				
i. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
v. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the site promote joint use of parks, libraries, museums, and other public services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.15.1 Impact Analysis

a. *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:*

i. *Fire protection?*

The Lemoore Volunteer Fire Department (LVFD) has operated as an all-volunteer department since 1921. The LVFD includes one Chief, two Assistant Chiefs, four Crew Captains, seven Engineers, eleven Emergency Medical Technicians, one paid part-time Secretary, and one paid full-time maintenance worker. The department covers an area of approximately 9 square miles, with Mutual Aid Agreements with Kings County Fire, Hanford City Fire and the Naval Air Station Lemoore. Other public services provided include fire inspections, tours and demonstrations, permitting of certain hazardous materials, and investigation of hazardous materials incidents. The Fire Department regulates explosive and hazardous materials under the Uniform Fire Code, and permits the handling, storage and use of any explosive or other hazardous material (City of Lemoore 2008).

The LVFD would provide fire protection services to the project site. The project would incorporate California Fire Code requirements into project designs. These standards address access road length, dimensions, and finished surfaces for firefighting equipment; fire hydrant placement; fire flow availability and requirements; and plan submittal requirements. In addition, the California Fire Code requires that every public or private school building having an occupant load of 50 or more students or more than one

classroom have an automatic fire alarm system using the California Fire Code Signal outlined in the California Education Code (Sections 32000–32004). Furthermore, the California Education Code requires new schools to install an automatic fire sprinkler system (Section 17074.52).

Incorporation of all California Fire Code requirements into project designs would reduce the dependence on fire department equipment and personnel by reducing fire hazards. Therefore, the proposed project would not affect the LVFD's response times or other performance objectives and would not cause in the construction of new or expansion of existing fire protection facilities that result in environmental effects. The impacts on fire protection services would be less than significant.

*ii. Police protection?*

The Lemoore Police Department provides police protection to the project site. The Lemoore Police Department station is located at 657 Fox Street and currently has 31 sworn officers, 7 civilian staff members, and 30 vehicles, a ratio of 1.33 officers per 1,000 residents (City of Lemoore, 2008).

The site would be lit at night for security purposes as a way to discourage crime. It is not expected that the proposed project would substantially increase the Lemoore Police Department's calls for service. Therefore, the proposed project would not affect the Lemoore Police Department's performance objectives and would not cause the construction of new or expansion of existing police protection facilities that result in environmental effects. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact.

*iii. Schools?*

The project would not increase the demand for or cause a shortfall of school services or facilities. Rather, the proposed project would accommodate students living in the attendance area but attending schools up to 2 miles away. It is anticipated that with construction of the proposed project, the District will have sufficient capacity to serve all elementary school students within the District's boundaries. Therefore, the project would have no impact.

*v. Parks?*

The proposed project does not include the construction of structures that would increase the population in the area or that would generate a higher demand for parks or other public facilities. Therefore, the demand for parks for the project would be the same as under existing conditions. No impact to parks would occur.

*v. Other public facilities?*

The proposed project does not include the construction of structures that would increase the population in the area or that would generate a higher demand for parks or other public facilities. Therefore, the demand for public facilities for the project would be the same as under existing conditions. No impact to public facilities would occur.

*b. Does the site promote joint use of parks, libraries, museums, and other public services?*

The Civic Center Act, as defined in the State of California Education Code Sections 38130-38139, describes the uses of school facilities, including all buildings and grounds for public purposes, and the fees that may be assessed. Section 38131(b)(1) states:

“(b) The governing board of any school district may grant the use of school facilities or grounds as a civic center upon the terms and conditions the board deems proper, subject to the limitations, requirements, and restrictions set forth in this article, for any of the following purposes:(1) Public, literary, scientific, recreational, educational, or public agency meetings . . .(6) Supervised recreational activities including, but not limited to, sports league activities for youths that are arranged for and supervised by entities, including religious organizations or churches, and in which youths may participate regardless of religious belief or denomination” (California Education Code 1996).

The proposed school would be available for use per Civic Center Act requirements. Therefore, the project does promote the joint use of athletic facilities located onsite. This impact would be less than significant.

### 3.16 RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.16.1 Impact Analysis

- 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?*

The increase in use of recreational facilities is generally a result of population growth. The proposed project includes the development of a new elementary school. The project would serve the region’s existing population and would not induce population growth. Therefore, there would be no impact on existing neighborhood or regional parks and facilities.

- 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?*

Recreational facilities proposed as part of the project include sports fields and recreation areas. Construction of these facilities would result in the potentially significant physical environmental impacts, as outlined in this document. These impacts are addressed in relevant sections throughout this IS/MND in connection with discussions of the impacts of overall site development. Mitigation measures are identified for potentially significant impacts to ensure those impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant level. There are no additional significant impacts beyond those comprehensively considered throughout the other sections of this IS/MND. Therefore, physical effects associated with construction of the multi-sport physical education area would be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation identified in this IS/MND.

### 3.17 TRANSPORTATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines §15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Is the proposed school site within 1,500 feet of a railroad track easement?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Is the site easily accessible from arterials and is the minimum peripheral visibility maintained for driveways per Caltrans' Highway Design Manual?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Are traffic and pedestrian hazards mitigated per Caltrans' School Area Pedestrian Safety manual?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.17.1 Impact Analysis

- a. *Would the project conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?*

JLB Traffic Engineering, Inc. prepared the Elementary School – City of Lemoore Traffic Impact Analysis (September 17, 2019).

The JLB report summarized the roadways serving the project site:

- *Hanford-Armona Road* is an existing east-west two-lane arterial north of the proposed project.
- *19th Avenue* is an existing north-south two-lane arterial divided by a two-way left-turn lane adjacent to the proposed project's eastern boundary.
- *Liberty Drive* is an existing north-south two-lane arterial divided by a two-way left-turn lane in the vicinity of the proposed project.
- *Cinnamon Drive* is an existing east-west two-lane divided collector adjacent to the southern boundary of the proposed project.

The Traffic Impact Analysis considered five study scenarios:

- Existing Traffic Conditions
- Existing plus Project Traffic Conditions
- Near Term Year 2023 plus Project Traffic Conditions
- Cumulative Year 2040 No Project Traffic Conditions
- Cumulative Year 2040 plus Project Traffic Conditions



Impacts at study area intersections were evaluated based on Level of Service (LOS). LOS is a qualitative index of the performance of an element of the transportation system. LOS is a rating scale running from “A” to “F”, with “A” indicating no congestion of any kind and “F” indicating unacceptable congestion and delays. LOS in this study describes the operating conditions for signalized and unsignalized intersections.

The following information summarizes the findings of the analysis.

Under existing conditions, all study are intersections operate at an acceptable level of service (LOS) during both peak periods. See Table 5.

**Table 5: Existing Intersection LOS Results**

ID	Intersection	Intersection Control	AM (7-9) Peak Hour		PM (4-6) Peak Hour	
			Average Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Average Delay (sec/veh)	LOS
1	19th Avenue / Hanford-Armona Road	One-Way Stop	11.5	B	12.3	B
2	Liberty Drive / Hanford-Armona Road	Two-Way Stop	25.1	D	16.1	C
3	19th Avenue / Project Driveway 1	Does Not Exist	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	19th Avenue / Project Driveway 2	Does Not Exist	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	19th Avenue / Cinnamon Drive	All-Way Stop	22.4	C	22.1	C
6	Liberty Drive / Cinnamon Drive	Two-Way Stop	13.7	B	11.7	B

Source: JLB Traffic Engineering, Inc. 2019

Under the existing plus project scenario, the study intersection of 19th Avenue and Cinnamon Drive is projected to operate at an unacceptable level of service (LOS) during the AM peak period (Table 6).

**Table 6: Existing plus Project Intersection LOS Results**

ID	Intersection	Intersection Control	AM (7-9) Peak Hour		PM (4-6) Peak Hour	
			Average Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Average Delay (sec/veh)	LOS
1	19th Avenue / Hanford-Armona Road	One-Way Stop	12.3	B	12.6	B
2	Liberty Drive / Hanford-Armona Road	Two-Way Stop	28.9	D	16.4	C
3	19th Avenue / Project Driveway 1	One-Way Stop	28.9	D	14.2	B

4	19th Avenue / Project Driveway 2	One-Way Stop	24.2	C	11.8	B
5	19th Avenue / Cinnamon Drive	All-Way Stop	<b>50.3</b>	<b>F</b>	25.0	C
		All-Way Stop (mitigated)	33.0	D	16.1	C
6	Liberty Drive / Cinnamon Drive	Two-Way Stop	14.4	B	11.6	B

Source: JLB Traffic Engineering, Inc. 2019

To improve the LOS at the 19th Avenue / Cinnamon Drive intersection under existing conditions, **Mitigation Measure TRANS-1** would be implemented to reduce this impact to less than significant.

Under the near term year 2023 plus project scenario, three study area intersections would operate at an unacceptable LOS (Table 7).

**Table 7: Near Term Year 2023 plus Project Intersection LOS Results**

ID	Intersection	Intersection Control	AM (7-9) Peak Hour		PM (4-6) Peak Hour	
			Average Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Average Delay (sec/veh)	LOS
1	19th Avenue / Hanford-Armona Road	One-Way Stop	15.2	C	15.6	C
2	Liberty Drive / Hanford-Armona Road	Two-Way Stop	<b>95.9</b>	<b>F</b>	27.4	D
		Two-Way Stop (mitigated)	34.1	D	16.2	C
3	19th Avenue / Project Driveway 1	One-Way Stop	<b>35.0</b>	<b>E</b>	16.4	C
		Two-Way Stop (mitigated)	32.7	D	16.3	C
4	19th Avenue / Project Driveway 2	One-Way Stop	32.2	D	13.2	B
5	19th Avenue / Cinnamon Drive	All-Way Stop	<b>69.1</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>41.7</b>	<b>E</b>
		Signalized (mitigated)	31.0	C	24.4	C
6	Liberty Drive / Cinnamon Drive	Two-Way Stop	14.8	B	11.8	B

Source: JLB Traffic Engineering, Inc. 2019

To improve the LOS at the Liberty Drive / Hanford-Armona Road, 19th Avenue / Project Driveway 1, and 19th Avenue / Cinnamon Drive intersections under near term conditions, **Mitigation Measure TRANS-2** would be implemented to reduce this impact to less than significant.

Under the cumulative year 2040 no project scenario, two study area intersections would operate at an unacceptable LOS (Table 8).

**Table 8: Cumulative Year 2040 No Project Intersection LOS Results**

ID	Intersection	Intersection Control	AM (7-9) Peak Hour		PM (4-6) Peak Hour	
			Average Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Average Delay (sec/veh)	LOS
1	19th Avenue / Hanford-Armona Road	One-Way Stop	14.4	B	17.6	C
2	Liberty Drive / Hanford-Armona Road	Two-Way Stop	<b>85.7</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>47.2</b>	<b>E</b>
		All-Way Stop (improved)	21.6	C	21.2	C
3	19th Avenue / Project Driveway 1	Does Not Exist	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	19th Avenue / Project Driveway 2	Does Not Exist	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	19th Avenue / Cinnamon Drive	All-Way Stop	<b>51.6</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>59.4</b>	<b>F</b>
		All-Way Stop (improved)	33.1	D	23.6	C
6	Liberty Drive / Cinnamon Drive	Two-Way Stop	14.7	B	14.1	B

Source: JLB Traffic Engineering, Inc. 2019

With the development of the proposed project, the cumulative year 2040 intersection LOS would result in increased delay at the same project study intersections (Table 9):

**Table 9: Cumulative Year 2040 plus Project Intersection LOS Results**

ID	Intersection	Intersection Control	AM (7-9) Peak Hour		PM (4-6) Peak Hour	
			Average Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Average Delay (sec/veh)	LOS
1	19th Avenue / Hanford-Armona Road	One-Way Stop	15.9	C	18.4	C
2	Liberty Drive / Hanford-Armona Road	Two-Way Stop	<b>113.0</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>F</b>
		All-Way Stop (mitigated)	25.6	D	22.5	C
3	19th Avenue / Project Driveway 1	One-Way Stop	28.7	D	14.9	B
4	19th Avenue / Project Driveway 2	One-Way Stop	24.0	C	12.3	B
5	19th Avenue / Cinnamon Drive	All-Way Stop	<b>85.4</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>65.1</b>	<b>F</b>
		Signalized (mitigated)	33.1	C	31.8	C
6	Liberty Drive / Cinnamon Drive	Two-Way Stop	15.3	C	14.1	B

Source: JLB Traffic Engineering, Inc. 2019

To improve the LOS at the Liberty Drive / Hanford-Armona Road and 19th Avenue / Cinnamon Drive intersections under cumulative year 2040 plus project conditions,

**Mitigation Measure TRANS-2** would be implemented to reduce this impact to less than significant.

*b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines §15064.3, subdivision (b)?*

On September 27, 2013, Governor Jerry Brown signed SB 743 into law and started a process that changes the methodology of a transportation impact analysis as part of CEQA requirements. SB 743 directed the California Office of Planning and Research to establish new CEQA guidance for jurisdictions that removes the level of service (LOS) method, which focuses on automobile vehicle delay and other similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion, from CEQA transportation analysis.

Rather, vehicle miles traveled (VMT), or other measures that promote “the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses,” are now be used as the basis for determining significant transportation impacts in the State.

As discussed in response 3.8.1(b), development of the proposed project would eliminate vehicular trips associated with trips to more distant schools (estimated to be as far as 1.8 miles). If each of the 550 students reduced their commute on average 0.5 mile per day and assuming 1.8 students per household, the proposed project has the potential to reduce vehicle miles traveled by 23,375 miles per year (assuming a conservative 15 percent absentee rate). The project would not conflict with CEQA Guidelines §15064(b). This impact would be less than significant.

*c. Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*

Project ingress and egress points would be available from the 19th Avenue. Pedestrian access to the project site would be available from walkways along the frontage of 19th Avenue. Other internal walkways would connect the campus buildings and recreation areas. As the project would comply with DSA design standards, it would not include any design features that would create traffic hazards. Additionally, there are no incompatible uses, including farm operations, in the vicinity that would cause traffic hazards.

Bus drop-off areas are separated from parent drop-off areas and parking lots, according to the proposed site plan. The school would include an internal pedestrian pathway system. School development would not create barriers to pedestrians or bicyclists. All new driveway construction would be subject to approvals by the DSA. Through such plan check reviews, the project would comply with all regulations regarding roadway design, thus minimizing any potential impacts from traffic safety hazards. Project impacts would be less than significant.

*d. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?*

Project parking lots and vehicular routes, including emergency vehicle access, would be provided near all proposed buildings on-site, according to the proposed project site plan. Emergency access would not be adversely affected as a result of the project.

Arterial and collector streets are primary routes for emergency travel throughout the City. While occasional congestion is expected to occur during peak-use periods, the project would contribute a very small portion of traffic during the afternoon peak since this period is outside of the normal school day. The impact is less than significant.

*e. Is the proposed school site within 1,500 feet of a railroad track easement?*

The project area is located approximately 0.35 mile north of the proposed Cross Valley Corridor rail line, which would use the existing freight rail line to transport passengers to and from several Central Valley cities, including Lemoore. No railroad track easement is located within 1,500 feet of the proposed project.

*f. Is the site easily accessible from arterials and is the minimum peripheral visibility maintained for driveways per Caltrans' Highway Design Manual?*

The proposed project site is located on 19th Avenue and Cinnamon Drive. Direct access to the project site would be provided on 19th Avenue, located along the eastern boundary of the site. As no changes to existing streets and access driveways are proposed, no impacts related to access and peripheral visibility would occur.

*g. Are traffic and pedestrian hazards mitigated per Caltrans' School Area Pedestrian Safety manual?*

Currently, walkways exist in the vicinity of the proposed project site along Hanford-Armona Road, 19th Avenue, Liberty Drive, and Cinnamon Drive. The proposed project does not include modification to existing pedestrian facilities but would include a crosswalk with a flashing beacon for safe crossing 19th Avenue at Freedom Drive; therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

### 3.17.2 Mitigation Measures

**Mitigation Measure TRANS-1:** Prior to school occupancy and with the approval of the City of Lemoore Public Works Department, the District shall fund implementation of the following improvements at the 19th Avenue / Cinnamon Drive intersection:

- Modify the westbound through-right lane to a through lane;
- Add a westbound right-turn lane;
- Modify the northbound through-right lane to a through lane;
- Add a northbound right-turn lane;
- Modify the southbound through-right lane to a through lane; and
- Add a southbound right-turn lane.

**Mitigation Measure TRANS-2:** Prior to issuance of a Building Permit, the District shall pay a fair share to the City's Traffic Impact Fee for the following improvements at the Liberty Drive/ Hanford-Armona Road (11.54% of estimated construction costs) and 19th Avenue / Cinnamon Drive (33.67% of estimated construction costs) intersections:

- Liberty Drive / Hanford-Armona Road
  - Add a second eastbound through lane with a receiving lane east of Liberty Drive;

- Add a second westbound through lane with a receiving lane west of Liberty Drive; and
  - Implement an all-way stop control.
- 19th Avenue / Cinnamon Drive
  - Signalize the intersection with protective left-turn phasing in all directions while retaining the existing lane geometrics.

### 3.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. 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:				
i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)? Or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. 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 Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.18.1 Impact Analysis

- a. *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:*
- i. *Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)? Or*

The District requested a Sacred Lands Inventory on file with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which concluded negative results (i.e., no sacred lands were identified in the project site). Based on the list provided by the NAHC, on December 19, 2019, the District notified one Native American Tribe (Santa Rosa Rancheria Tachi Yokut Tribe) consistent with AB 52 requirements; no responses have been received. However, in the unlikely event that unrecorded resources are discovered during construction activities, compliance with the California Public Resources Code would reduce this potential impact to less than significant.

- ii. *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 Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.*

The District requested a Sacred Lands Inventory on file with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which concluded negative results (i.e., no sacred lands were identified in the project site). Based on the list provided by the NAHC, on December 19, 2019, the District notified one Native American Tribe (*Santa Rosa Rancheria Tachi Yokut Tribe*) consistent with AB 52 requirements; no responses have been received. However, in the unlikely event that unrecorded resources are discovered during construction activities, compliance with the California Public Resources Code would reduce this potential impact to less than significant.



### 3.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater 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 the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.19.1 Impact Analysis

- a. *Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

Existing water supplies in the City of Lemoore service area are sufficient to meet the demands of the proposed project. Therefore, the total projected water demand would not increase demand for water treatment facilities such that the expansion of existing or construction of new water treatment facilities would be required. The project would have a less-than-significant impact regarding water facilities.

The City Public Works Department is responsible for planning and managing sanitary sewer service in Lemoore. The existing wastewater treatment plant has a maximum capacity of 4.5 million gallons per day (mgd). Average influent flow is projected to increase to 6.3 mgd in 2030 and the facilities will require expansion or replacement to handle influent volumes (City of Lemoore 2008). Because the proposed project is identified in the City of Lemoore General Plan, it has been considered in the projected influent volumes and would not, on its own, require the construction of new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities. This impact would be considered less than significant.

The proposed project would not require the relocation or construction of new or expanded electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities. This impact would be less than significant.

*b. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?*

The City of Lemoore provides potable water to the proposed project area. The City would charge impact fees for water connection to the proposed project. This impact would be less than significant.

*c. Would the project 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?*

The City of Lemoore Public Works Department would collect and treat wastewater generated by the proposed project. The City would charge impact fees for sewer connection to the proposed project. This impact would be less than significant.

*d. Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?*

Project construction would involve site clearing and the generation of various construction wastes, including scrap lumber, scrap finishing materials, various scrap metals, and other recyclable and nonrecyclable construction-related wastes. The 2016 CALGreen Code (Title 24, Part 11 of the California Code of Regulations) requires all construction contractors to reduce construction waste and demolition debris by 65 percent. Code requirements include preparing a construction waste management plan that identifies the materials to be diverted from disposal by efficient usage, recycling, reuse on the project, or salvage for future use or sale; determining whether materials will be sorted on-site or mixed; and identifying diversion facilities where the materials collected will be taken. The code also specifies that the amount of materials diverted should be calculated by weight or volume, but not by both (California Building Standards Commission 2016). In addition, the 2016 CalGreen Code requires that 100 percent of trees, stumps, rocks, and associated vegetation and soils resulting primarily from land clearing be reused or recycled.

Additionally, project operation would result in increased long-term generation of solid waste. The project would accommodate up to approximately 700 students and 30 staff members. It is estimated that the proposed project would generate 0.23 tons per day (tpd) of solid waste. The estimated 0.23 tpd of solid waste generated by the proposed project would be less than one percent of the maximum tpd that could be received at the Kettleman Hills Facility Landfill (2,000 tpd). These totals do not account for recycling programs required by the State and City. The City provides recycling programs, such as recycling of paper, plastics, and bottles, to reduce the volume of solid waste transported to landfills. In addition, the proposed project would comply with Assembly Bill 1826, which requires recycling of organic waste. With implementation of these recycling programs, the actual amount of solid waste generated by the proposed project would be less.

The project would comply with all statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Compliance with the CalGreen Code and Assembly Bill 1826 would ensure that sufficient landfill capacity would be available to accommodate solid-waste disposal needs for future development. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact.

*e. Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939) redefined solid waste management in terms of both objectives and planning responsibilities for local jurisdictions and the state. AB 939 was adopted in an effort to reduce the volume and toxicity of solid waste that is landfilled and incinerated, by requiring local governments to prepare and implement plans to improve the management of waste resources. AB 939 required each of the cities and unincorporated portions of the counties throughout California to divert a minimum of 25 percent of the solid waste sent to landfills by 1995 and 50 percent by the year 2000. To attain goals for reductions in disposal, AB 939 established a planning hierarchy using new integrated solid waste management practices.

Section 5.408 of the 2013 California Green Building Standards Code (Title 24, California Code of Regulations, Part 11) requires that at least 50 percent of the nonhazardous construction and demolition waste from nonresidential construction operations be recycled and/or salvaged for reuse. Any businesses, including public entities, generating four cubic yards or more of commercial solid waste per week, must arrange recycling services.

The project would comply with AB 939 (Zero Waste program) and other applicable local, State, and federal solid waste disposal standards, thereby ensuring that the solid waste stream to regional landfills is reduced in accordance with existing regulations. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

### 3.20 WILDFIRE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.20.1 Impact Analysis

- a. *Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

Wildland fires occur in geographic areas that contain the types and conditions of vegetation, topography, weather, and structure density susceptible to risks associated with uncontrolled fires that can be started by lightning, improperly managed camp fires, cigarettes, sparks from automobiles, and other ignition sources.

According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) Map for Kings County, the project site is not located within a VHFHSZ. In addition, based on Figure 8-2 of the City's General Plan, the project site is not identified within a high wildfire threat area. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people to significant risk of loss, injury, or death due to wildland fires and this impact would be less than significant.

As discussed in response 3.9.1(f), implementation of the proposed project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan and would not alter any of the streets within, or adjacent to, the project site. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan and impacts would be less than significant.

- b. Would the project, 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?*

The project site is not located in or near a VHFHSZ nor is it located in or near a State Responsibility Area (SRA). Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not exacerbate wildfire risks due to slope and prevailing winds, thereby exposing project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. As a result, a less-than-significant impact would occur, and no mitigation would be required.

- c. Would the project 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?*

The proposed project would not require the installation or maintenance of infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk. No impact would occur.

- d. Would the project 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?*

Landslides and other forms of mass wasting, including mud flows, debris flows, and soil slips, occur as soil moves downslope under the influence of gravity. Landslides are frequently triggered by intense rainfall or seismic shaking but can also occur as a result of erosion and downslope runoff caused by rain following a fire. Because the proposed project site is level, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects associated with landslides. Further, the proposed project site is not located in or near a VHFHSZ nor is it located in or near a SRA. Therefore, the proposed project would not 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. As a result, a less-than-significant impact would occur, and no mitigation would be required.

### 3.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### 3.21.1 Impact Analysis

- 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?*

Implementation of the mitigation measures recommended in this Initial Study would ensure that construction and operation of the proposed project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment; reduce the habitat, population, or range of a plant or animal species; or eliminate important examples of California history or prehistory.

- b. *Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?*

The potential impacts of the proposed project are individually limited and are not cumulatively considerable. Implementation of mitigation measures recommended in this report would reduce potentially significant impacts that could become cumulatively considerable.

*c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?*

The proposed project would be constructed and operated in accordance with all applicable regulations governing hazardous materials, noise, and geotechnical considerations. Because all potentially significant impacts of the proposed project are expected to be mitigated to less-than-significant levels, it is unlikely that implementation of the proposed project would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. As a result, less-than-significant impacts would occur with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.





**This page intentionally left blank**

## 4.0 REFERENCES

- BSK. 2003. Phase I ESA Report. Proposed School Site Northwest of W. Cinnamon Drive and 19th Avenue, Lemoore, CA. May 28, 2003.
- California Air Resources Board, 2017. *California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan*. November.
- California Department of Conservation. 2016a. Kings County Important Farmland Map. \_\_\_\_\_ . 2016b. Mines Online. Available: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/mol/index.html>. Accessed October 2019.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2019. BIOS Viewer. Available: <https://apps.wildlife.ca.gov/bios/> Accessed: October 2019.
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CALFIRE). 2019. Fire Hazard Severity Zone Maps. Available: <https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/divisions/wildfire-prevention-planning-engineering/wildland-hazards-building-codes/fire-hazard-severity-zones-maps/>. Accessed October 2019.
- California Department of Toxic Substances. 2019. EnviroStor website. Available: [https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?global\\_id=54880002](https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?global_id=54880002). Accessed October 2019.
- CalRecycle. 2015. 2014 Generator-Based Characterization of Commercial Sector Disposal and Diversion in California. September 10, 2015.
- Caltrans (California Department of Transportation). 2013. Transportation- and Construction- Induced Vibration Guidance Manual. Sacramento, California: Caltrans Noise, Vibration and Hazardous Waste Management Office. September 2013.
- City of Lemoore. 2008. 2030 General Plan. Available: <https://lemoore.com/communitydevelopment/general-plan/> Accessed: October 2019.
- City of Lemoore. 2017. 2015 Urban Water Management Plan. Available: [https://lemoore.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/lemoore\\_2015\\_uwmp\\_final.pdf](https://lemoore.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/lemoore_2015_uwmp_final.pdf) Accessed: October 2019.
- Esri. 2017. California Scenic Highways. <https://www.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?useExisting=1&layers=f0259b1ad0fe4093a5604c9b838a486a>. Accessed October 2019.
- JLB Traffic Engineering. 2019. Elementary School – City of Lemoore Traffic Impact Analysis. September 17, 2019.
- National Pipeline Mapping System. 2019. Public Viewer. Available: <https://pvnpm.phmsa.dot.gov/PublicViewer/> Accessed: October 2019.

San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. 2012. Small Project Analysis Level. Available: <https://www.valleyair.org/transportation/CEQA%20Rules/SPALTables61912.pdf>. Accessed August 2019.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2009. Guidance for Valley Land-Use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Projects Under CEQA. December 17. Available: <http://www.valleyair.org/Programs/CCAP/12-17-09/3%20CCAP%20-%20FINAL%20LU%20Guidance%20-%20Dec%2017%202009.pdf> Accessed: October 2019.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2017. Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts. March 2017.

Tulare Council of Governments. 2018. Cross Valley Corridor Plan. June 2018. Available: <http://www.tularecog.org/cvcp/> Accessed: October 2019.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2019. National Wetlands Inventory. Available: <https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.html> Accessed: October 2019.

**This page intentionally left blank**

# **APPENDIX A**

## **CALEEMOD REPORT**

**This page intentionally left blank**

# **APPENDIX B**

## **SITE PLANS**

**This page intentionally left blank**



## **APPENDIX C**

### **USGS TOPOGRAPHIC MAP**

**This page intentionally left blank**

# **APPENDIX D**

## **PHASE 1 ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT**

**This page intentionally left blank**

# **APPENDIX E**

## **SOILS INVESTIGATION**

**This page intentionally left blank**

# **APPENDIX F**

## **GEO AND SEISMIC HAZARDS ASSESSMENT**

**This page intentionally left blank**



# **APPENDIX G**

## **UPDATED GEOTECHNICAL REPORT**

**This page intentionally left blank**

# **APPENDIX H**

## **AB 52 LETTER**

**This page intentionally left blank**

**APPENDIX I**

**NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION  
CORRESPONDENCE**

**This page intentionally left blank**

**APPENDIX J**

**NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION  
CORRESPONDENCE (RESPONSE)**

**This page intentionally left blank**



## **APPENDIX K**

# **TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS**

**This page intentionally left blank**

**APPENDIX L**

**CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SITE FINAL SITE  
APPROVAL 2007**

**This page intentionally left blank**

## **APPENDIX M**

# **DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL ENVIROSTOR - NO FURTHER ACTION DETERMINATION**

**This page intentionally left blank**

**APPENDIX N**

**GOOGLE EARTH IMAGE**

**PROPOSED SCHOOL SITE**

**This page intentionally left blank**

**END**



