Initial Study for Tulelake Veterans Park Expansion Project

Tulelake, CA

Initial Study

Prepared for:
City of Tulelake
May 2019

421 Commercial Street
Klamath Falls, OR 97601
andrea@rabeconsulting.com
(541) 891 - 2137

PROJECT DESCRIPTION 3
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED 6
EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS 7
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST 8
1. Aesthetics 8
2. Agriculture and Forestry Resources 11
3. Air Quality 14
4. Biological Resources 17
5. Cultural Resources 20
6. Energy 25
7. Geology and Soils 27
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions 31
9. Hazards and Hazardous Materials 33
10. Hydrology and Water Quality 37
11. Land Use and Planning 41
12. Mineral Resources 43
13. Noise 44
14. Population and Housing 47
15. Public Services 48
16. Recreation 50
17. Transportation/Traffic 52
18. Utilities and Service Systems 54
19. Mandatory Findings of Significance 57
REPORT PREPARERS AND REFERENCES 59
A. REPORT PREPARERS 59
B. REFERENCES 59

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. **Project title:**
   Tulelake Veterans Park Expansion

2. **Lead agency name and address:**
   City of Tulelake
   591 Main Street
   Tulelake, California 96134

3. **Contact person and phone number:**
   Brett Nystrom
   City Manager
   (530) 667-5522
   tulelakepublicworks@cot.net
   City of Tulelake
   591 Main Street
   Tulelake, California 96134

4. **Project Location:**
   The proposed project is located on two parcels located at 300 Main Street, Tulelake, California, Siskiyou County (APN 050-061-090 and 050-061-080). Parcel 09 is 0.28 acres and parcel 08 is 0.18 acres. Combined, these parcels are 0.46 acres. The project area is centered on Section 35 of Township 48 North, Range 4 East. The area is zoned for commercial use. The project site is located at the intersection of Main Street and Modoc Avenue (Figure 1).

5. **Project sponsor's name and address:**
   City of Tulelake
   591 Main Street
   Tulelake, California 96134

6. **General Plan designation:**
   Commercial and Park

7. **Zoning:**
   Commercial Development

8. **Description of project:**
   The City of Tulelake proposes to develop the vacant Tax Lots 090 and 080 to become an expanded segment of the current Tulelake Veterans Park. This proposed expansion would convert two, vacant lots into a public greenspace devoted to the commemoration of the United States Veterans, expanding the current Tulelake Veterans Park by 0.46 acres, making the park approximately 0.60 acres.

   The scope of work will include: removal of the existing asphalt and concrete, replaced by topsoil to existing grade, the addition of another bathroom to service the bigger park, the construction of an 80 foot, slit face block wall 6 feet high (Memorial Wall) with a metal frame to hold plaques that the City has been storing. The centerpiece will be a Gazebo with benches around it for

visitors. The City is working with a local artist to construct an archway at the entrance of the park with the emblems of the 5 branches of the service, along with two benches that look like geese. A sundial will be constructed on the west side of the park. A dog park will be on the right side of the park for visitors that have animals with them. The proposed landscaping will have trees added along with non-invasive turf, shrubs, plants, and ground cover. Last, solar lighting will be included in the project. The walkways will be decomposed granite.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The subject property (henceforth 'Property') is located in the north-eastern side of the city of Tulelake in Siskiyou County, California. Tulelake lies south of the Oregon-California border, with the Tule Lake Wildlife Refuge located west of the city. The city of Tulelake lies in the Tule Lake Basin, on the outskirts of the Klamath Lake Basin (USDA NRCS 2019b). Lost River runs north/south along the west side of Tulelake and flows into Tule Lake.

The Property is located within city limits of Tulelake at the intersection of Main Street and Modoc Avenue. The current Tulelake Veterans Park is located immediately south of the Property. The current Veterans Park is composed of paved walkways with a manicured lawn. A bench is located on the west side of the park, with a bathroom located on the east side. Plaques in the park commemorate all veterans and those lost from the community.

The Property is irregular in shape, having the northern side shaped by the intersection of Main Street and Modoc Avenue (Figure 1), the west is bordered by Main Street, and Modoc Avenue borders the east side.

Tax Lot 090 is approximately 0.28 acres and Tax Lot 080 is approximately 0.18 acres. These tax lots were formerly Bill's Shell Station in the late 1970's through mid-1980's. It consisted of four, 2,000 Underground Storage Tanks and an office with associated equipment. In the late 1980's, the four Underground Storage Tanks were removed and filled with a sand slurry. Sometime between 2011 and 2012, the building was removed from the property, leaving the entire aboveground portion of the property covered in asphalt and concrete. The entire property is covered in asphalt and cement: no topsoil was observed.

The area surrounding the subject property are zoned as commercial, with various businesses ranging from a sporting goods store, to a mini mart inhabiting the buildings around the project area.

Vegetation on the current Tulelake Veterans Park is comprised of a manicured lawn, six trees (five pine trees and one deciduous tree), various flowers and shrubs. The subject property has three deciduous trees on the northern side of the property.

The project area is part of the County Regional Park and Open Space Management Area and is designated as Commercial use.

10. Other public agencies whose approval may be required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

Not Applicable

FIGURE 1


Tulelake Park Expansion
300 Main Street
Legend
Tulelake Veterans Park Expansion Proposal
139
First St
B St
C St
Main St
4th St
Modoc Ave
Google Earth
© 2018 Google
300 ft
N

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" or "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages

.

☐Aesthetics	☐Agricultural/Forest Resources	☐Air Quality
☐Biological Resources	☐Cultural Resources	☐Energy
☐Geology and Soils	☐Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐Hazards/Hazardous Materials
☐Hydrology/Water Quality	☐Land Use/ Planning	☐Minerals
☐Noise	☐Population and Housing	☐Public Services
☐Recreation	☐Transportation/Traffic	☐Utilities/Service Systems
☐Mandatory Findings of Significance		

Determination (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

€ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

X I find that although he 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 "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

€ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

/s/ Brett Nystrom	9/9/2019
Signature	Date
Brett Nystrom	City of Tulelake
Printed Name	Lead Agency

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

The section identifies the potential environmental impacts of this project by answering questions from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the Environmental Checklist Form. The environmental issues evaluated in this chapter include:

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural/Forest Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Geology/Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards/Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Land Use/Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population/Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

All analyses take account the entire action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts. Impacts are categorized as follows:

No Impact: when adequately supported if referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved. A No Impact Answer is explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards.

Less Than Significant Impact: The impact would not result in the substantial adverse change in the environment. This impact level does not require mitigation measures.

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: An impact that may have a “substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15382). However, the incorporation of mitigation measures that are specified after analysis would reduce the project-related impact to a less than significant level.

Potentially Significant Impact: An impact that is “potentially significant” but for which mitigation measures cannot be immediately suggested or the effectiveness of potential mitigation measures cannot be determined with certainty, because more in-depth analysis of the issue and potential impact is needed. In such cases, an EIR is required.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Aesthetics				
Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Affected Environment

The subject property is an easily accessed, flat lot located within the city limits of Tulelake, California in Siskiyou County. The City of Tulelake is situated in a relatively flat area at an elevation of 4,045 feet. The city is located in what once was the center lakebed of Tule Lake, which stretched west to Sheepy Peak Ridge, to 13 miles east. This lake was relatively shallow and comprised over 100,000 acres before it was drained and approximately 60,000 acres converted into farmland and the current city.

The subject property is currently a vacant, asphalt and cement covered lot, bordered by the current Veterans park to the south, Modoc Avenue along the east side, Main Street along the west side, and the Modoc Avenue and Main street intersection on the north side. There is a slight rise on the northern half of the property where the former Shell station stood. One disposal receptacle is on the southwest corner of the property and appears to be emptied periodically.

There are three streetlights on the subject property: one on the southwest corner, one on the north side (centered), and one on the east side (centered). These streetlights are also functioning as powerline poles that run in generally north-south directions.

The current Tulelake Veterans Park has a picnic table, three benches, a manicured lawn with flower beds, three refuse receptacles, and two public restrooms. There is lighting from the streetlight on the west side of the park, and a light above each of the doors to the public restrooms. This park is

frequented by the local residents and visitors of Tulelake and functions as a green space within the city limits.

Across Main Street are vacant buildings, with street-parking spaces. Across Modoc Avenue, are three restaurants and a fenced lot with overgrown vegetation. North of the property, across the intersection, are a mini-mart and the town supermarket and liquor store.

Due to the property's location and the surrounding buildings, there is a limited view of the surrounding area. To the north, the surrounding hills can be viewed between the supermarket and the mini mart.

Discussion

a) *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is in a relatively flat area along the confluence of Modoc Avenue and Main Street, Tulelake, California. Proposed park facilities would be no taller than the adjacent residential structures. The City of Tulelake has not designated any scenic vistas in the vicinity of the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas. This impact is considered less than significant.

b) *Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State Scenic Highway?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is located within the vicinity of one State Scenic Highway: Volcanic Legacy Scenic Byway (California Highway 139) runs northwest/southeast through Oregon and California (America's Scenic Byways 2019). The proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including trees and is not located near any rock outcroppings or historic buildings (COHP 2018). Therefore, no significant impacts to scenic resources would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

c) *Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Development of the proposed project would result in a visual change to the project site. However, development would be minimal and would be in keeping with the character of the current Tulelake Veterans Park, located immediately to the south of the proposed project area. The proposed project would add aesthetic value to the community due to what the expanded Tulelake Veterans park would provide: a place of community, improve physical and psychological health of all community members of various abilities and ages, and provides a larger green space. This impact would be less than significant.

d) *Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Streetlights, vehicle head and taillights, and lighting associated with the existing businesses are the existing sources of light and glare in the project area. The proposed project would involve expansion of the existing Tulelake Veterans Park. The proposed project would install solar lights to illuminate the walkways within the park expansion. This would not have a

substantial adverse effect on the day or nighttime views in the area as it is currently illuminated by streetlights and the installed lighting at the current Veterans Park.

Mitigation Measures

None required due to no negative impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

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 forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, no non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12223(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?

Affected Environment

The project site is classified by the California Soil Resource as having an erosion factor of 5 and being very poorly drained (CSR 2019). Soils are classified as the Tulebasin: a mucky, silty, clay loam with lacustrine deposits derived from igneous and sedimentary rock (WSS 2019). Due to the poor drainage, this soil would not be suitable for woodland or farmlands under its natural conditions.

According to the Web Soil Survey (2019), the subject property has a high flooding and ponding rating. This can be attributed to the history of the area. The city of Tulelake is built on the former lakebed of Tule Lake. Prior to being drained, the lake once spanned west to Sheepy Peak Ridge, to approximately 13 miles east. Approximately 60,000 acres of the lake was converted to farmland and the current location of the city of Tulelake.

Discussion

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 a non-agricultural use?*

No Impact. The proposed project area is in an area categorized as 'Urban and Built-Up Land' (CDOC 2019c). This classification is defined as land occupied by structures with a building density of at least 1 unit to 1.5 acres, or residential, industrial, and commercial zones (CDOC 2019c). The property is located in a commercially zoned area within city limits. The proposed project would convert the subject property to a portion of the existing Tulelake Veterans Park. There will be no impact to farmland.

b) *Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?*

No Impact. The project site is not zoned for agricultural use and is not under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

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))?*

No Impact. The project area contains no forest or timberland and is not zoned for forest land, timberland, or timberland production. There will be no impact.

d) *Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to no-forest use?*

No Impact. See response (c) above.

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?*

No Impact. The proposed project would not involve other changes in the existing environment, which could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. The proposed project is not growth inducing; it is proposed to serve existing demand for recreation facilities within the Tulelake community. As described above, the proposed project would result in the conversion of a small vacant lot to the current Tulelake Veterans Park.

Mitigation Measures

None required due to no negative impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Affected Environment

The project site is located in the Northeast Plateau Air Basin region (County of Siskiyou California 2019). The state air quality is overseen by the California Air Resources Board district with regulatory oversight of local air quality control districts. The local air quality control district is the Siskiyou County Air Pollution Control District (SCAPCD). According to SCAPCD, the primary sources of air pollution are wildfires, managed burning and disposal, wood burning stoves, unpaved road dust, farming operations, and motor vehicles.

The SCAPCD adopts and enforces controls on stationary sources of air pollutants through its permit and inspection programs and regulates agricultural and non-agricultural burning. Other SCAPCD responsibilities include monitoring air quality, preparing air quality plans, and responding to citizen air quality complaints (County of Siskiyou California 2019).

Currently, the Siskiyou County is in attainment/unclassified for ozone and particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5) as of November 2017 (California air Resources Board 2019).

Discussion

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Less Than Significant Impact. Siskiyou County SCAPCD monitors and reports the air quality of the county through the air quality monitor site located in Yreka, California. This district monitors local air quality and has jurisdiction over the project area and enforces air quality plans. This project is not expected to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the air quality plan in Siskiyou County.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in response (a), based on project-related emission estimates, the proposed project would not result in substantial impacts to the levels of any criteria pollutants either during operation or construction of the proposed project.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less Than Significant Impact. Sensitive receptors are facilities or land uses that include members of the population that are particularly sensitive to the effects of air pollutants, such as children, the elderly, and people with illnesses. Sensitive receptors adjacent to the project site include neighboring businesses and their customers, visitors to the adjacent Tulelake Veterans Park, and residential areas adjacent to the commercial properties. As described in response (a) above, the proposed project would generate short-term construction emissions from particulate matter. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-1 would reduce potential impacts related to particulate matter and fugitive dust to a level below significance.

Construction of the proposed project may expose surrounding sensitive receptors to airborne particulates and fugitive dust as well as a small quantity of construction equipment pollutants (i.e. diesel-fueled vehicles and equipment). As described in response (a) above, impacts would be of short duration.

Sensitive receptors are not expected to be exposed to substantial long-term pollutant concentrations, and no significant air quality impacts would result from the proposed project.

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project would not generate emissions adversely affection a substantial number of people. As described in responses (a)-(c) above, the project would be short in nature and generate minimal airborne particulates that could be exposed to sensitive receptors with implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-1.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure AIR-1: The following controls shall be implemented at the construction site to control construction emissions:

- All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
- All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.

- All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per week. The use of dry power sweeping shall be prohibited.
- All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible.
- Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points regarding maximum idling time.
- All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
- The contractor shall post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Siskiyou County Air Pollution District's office phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
4. Biological Resources Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation	☐	☐	☐	☒

policy or ordinance?

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Affected Environment

As described above, the proposed park expansion project is located on a commercial zoned lot in the city of Tulelake, California. The project would expand the current Tulelake Veterans park by 0.46 acres. The lot currently is a heavily disturbed area from the former Bill's Shell Station. The entire property is covered in asphalt and cement.

The area where the city of Tulelake is situated was once the lakebed of Tule Lake. The lake has since been drained and is a national wildlife refuge located approximately 1.5 miles south of the city. The Lost River, located northwest of the city, flows into Tule Lake. Because of the project site proximity to the river and lake, a search was conducted on the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB). The project is located within the Tulelake quadrangle of the CNDDB. There are 15 species which are state or federally listed, threatened, or identified as species of special concern within the Tulelake CNDDB quadrangle. These species include: the golden eagle, prairie falcon, greater sandhill crane, bank swallow, tricolored blackbird, greater sage-grouse, short-eared owl, short-nose sucker, Lost River sucker, crotch bumble bee, Morrison bumble bee, gray wolf, American badger, montane pea-clam and the Columbia yellow cress.

Discussion

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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

No Impact. As described above, the project area is located on a commercially zoned lot within the city limits of Tulelake. The site is previously disturbed and will not have an adverse effect on any species as the project area is not located within the habitat of the listed species, but rather in the entirety of the Tulelake quadrangle, to include the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge, located outside of the city of Tulelake.

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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

No Impact. As described in (a) above, the site is not located in a riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

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?*

No Impact. As described above in (a) and (b), the site is not located in a wetland and will not have an adverse effect to a wetland, marsh, vernal pool, etc.

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?*

No Impact. As described in previous responses (a)-(c), the site is not located in an area that would interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

e) *Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?*

No Impact. As described in previous responses, the site is not located in an area that would conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

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?*

No Impact. The project site is not located within any lands covered by the Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

Mitigation Measures

None required due to no negative impacts.

	Potentially significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. Cultural Resources Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code §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 Resource Code § 5020.1 (k)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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 Resource Code §5024.1 in applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code §5024.1	☐	☐	☐	☒

the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Affected Environment

An initial record check of the California Office of Historic Preservation Listed California Historical Resources was conducted by Rabe Consulting on April 29, 2019 and found no properties listed on or within a 1-mile radius of the proposed project. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(3) states, 'Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources…" No historic properties, buildings, structures, objects, etc. have been identified, noted, or recorded on or around the project area.

AB 52 (enacted July 1, 2015) established that "a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have as significant effect on the environment" (Public Resources Code Section 21084.2). It further states that the lead agency shall establish measures to avoid impacts that would alter the significant characteristics of a tribal cultural resource, when feasible (PRC Section 21084.3).

Public Resources Code Section 21074 (a) (1) (A) and (B) defines tribal cultural resources as "sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe" and meets either of the following criteria:

1. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1 (k), or
2. 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 © of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying these criteria, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

AB52 also establishes a formal consultation process for California cities, counties, and tribes regarding tribal cultural resources. Under AB 52, lead agencies are required to "begin consultation with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project."

The City of Tulelake is in the ancestral territory of the Shasta, Karuk, Klamath and Modoc peoples. Tribal consultation letters describing the project proposal and project location were sent to the Karuk Tribe, Klamath Tribes, Quartz Valley Indian Community, Shasta Indian Nation, and Shasta Nation Tribes on July 23, 2019. The Klamath Tribes responded on July 29, 2019, stating a survey is not necessary because the site area and the surrounding area have been previously disturbed. The Karuk Tribe, Quartz Valley Indian Community, Shasta Indian Nation, Shasta Nation Tribes did not respond.

Discussion

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The project area contains no recorded resources listed in the California Office of Historic Preservation's *Historic Properties Directory,* the *National Register of Historic Place,* the *California Register of Historical Resources.* Due to the property having been heavily disturbed from four, 2,000-gallon Underground Storage Tanks (UST's) installed in 1971 when the lot was inhabited by the former Bill's Shell Station, and then removed and the voids filled with a sand slurry in 1987 after the closing of the business and the building torn down, the possibility of discovering an historic property is extremely low. However, intact subsurface historic-period and prehistoric archaeological sites that may qualify as historical resources may be located within the project area. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-1, described in the Mitigation Measures of this section, would reduce potential impacts from construction activities to a less-than-significant level.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The project site contains no recorded archaeological resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(3)(c) and CEQA Section 21083.2. See section (a) above for further information of property. However, intact subsurface archaeological deposits, which may qualify as archaeological resources, may be located within the project site, however disturbed. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-2, described below in the Mitigation Measures section, would reduce potential impacts to unidentified archaeological resources to a less-than-significant level.

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. No recorded human remains have been identified within the project site from previous disturbance. See section (a) above for property disturbance information. Though the property has had ground disturbing activities in the past, remains may exist in the project area. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-3, described in the Mitigation Measures of this section, would ensure that potential impacts to human remains would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

d) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code §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 Resource Code § 5020.1 (k)?

No Impact. The project area is not listed, nor eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resource Code § 5020.1 (k).

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 Resource Code §5024.1 in applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code §5024.1 the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

No Impact. The City of Tulelake is the lead agency and has not determined a resource or resources within the project area to be a significant resource to a California Native American tribe. On July 18, 2019, Rabe Consulting contacted the Associate Governmental Program Analyst for the Native American Heritage Commission, for a list of Tribes to contact. They responded to Rabe Consulting with a list of Tribes on July 18, 2019. The list of Tribes included, the Karuk Tribe, Klamath Tribes, Quartz Valley Indian Community, Shasta Indian Nation, and Shasta Nation Tribes. Tribal consultation letters were sent to the Karuk Tribe, Klamath Tribes, Quartz Valley Indian Community, Shasta Indian Nation, and Shasta Nation tribes on July 23, 2019. The Klamath Tribes responded on July 29, 2019, stating a survey is not necessary because the site area and the surrounding area have been previously disturbed. The Karuk Tribe, Quartz Valley Indian Community, Shasta Indian Nation, Shasta Nation Tribes did not respond.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CULT-1: If prehistoric or historical archaeological deposits or features are discovered during project activities, all work within 25 feet of the discovery shall be redirected until a qualified archaeologist assess the situation and provides recommendations. Adverse effects to archaeological deposits should be avoided by project activities. If such deposits cannot be avoided, they shall be evaluated for the California Register of Historical Resources eligibility. If the resources are not eligible, avoidance is not necessary. If the resources are eligible, they will need to be avoided by adverse effects or such effects must be mitigated. Mitigation may consist of, but is not necessarily limited to, systematic recovery and analysis of archaeological deposits; recording the resource; preparation of a report of findings; accessing recovered archaeological materials at an appropriate curation facility; and public outreach, such as brochures or displays at libraries and museums. Upon completion of the assessment, the archaeologist shall prepare a report documenting the methods and results and provide recommendations for the treatment of the archaeological materials discovered. The report shall be submitted to the City and the Northwest Information Center.

Mitigation Measure CULT-2: If archaeological deposits are identified during project activities, a qualified archaeologist shall first determine whether such deposits are historical resources as defined in Section 15064.5. If the deposit qualifies as a unique archaeological resource, it will need to be avoided by adverse effects or such effects must be mitigated. Mitigation may consist of, but is not necessarily limited to, systematic recovery and analysis of archaeological deposits; recording the resource; preparation of a report of findings; accessing recovered archaeological materials at an appropriate curation facility; and public outreach, such as brochures or displays at libraries and museums. Upon completion of the assessment, the archaeologist shall prepare a report documenting the methods and results and provide recommendations for the treatment of the archaeological materials discovered. The report shall be submitted to the City and the Northwest Information Center.

Mitigation Measure CULT-3: In the event that human remains are encountered, work within 25 feet of the discovery shall be redirected at the County Coroner notified immediately. At the same time, a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted to assess the situation and consult with agencies as appropriate. Project personnel should not collect or move any human remains and associated materials. If the human remains are of Native American origin, the coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of this identification. The Native American Heritage Commission will identify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) to inspect the site and provide recommendations for the proper treatment of the remains and associated grave goods. Upon completion of the assessment, the archaeologist shall prepare a report documenting the methods and results and provide recommendations for the treatment of the human remains and any associated cultural materials, as appropriate and in coordination with the recommendations of the MLD. The report shall be submitted to the City and the Northwest Information Center.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. Energy Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Affected Environment

The CEQA Guidelines Appendix F states that energy consuming equipment and processes, which will be used during construction or operation, such as energy requirements of the project by fuel type and end use; energy conservation equipment and design features; energy supplies that would serve the project; and total estimated daily vehicle trips to be generated by the project and the additional energy consumed per trip by mode; shall be taken into consideration when evaluating energy impacts.

The proposed project would follow policies and regulations set forth by the Siskiyou County in the General Plan. The proposed project would install solar powered lighting and public restrooms, which will be built to accommodate visitors.

Discussion

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Less than Significant Impact. As described above, the project is located within city limits on a commercially zoned, vacant lot. Energy used during construction will be non-renewable in the form of diesel-powered vehicles and equipment. The park will have solar powered lighting, and two private restrooms will be installed.

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

No Impact. As described above, the project would have solar powered lighting installed and would not conflict or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Mitigation Measures

None required due to no negative impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. Geology and Soils 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-Proilo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv. Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the	☐	☐	☐	☒

disposal of wastewater?

f)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Affected Environment

The project area is situated in the Modoc Plateau geomorphic province, between the Saddle Blanket Fault Zone to the immediate east, the Gillem Fault system to the immediate west, and the Big Crack Fault to the south. The Gillem-Big Crack fault system is a 30-km long, approximately 15-km wide zone of north striking extensional faults (CDC 2019b, USGS 2019b). Though these fault systems surround the city of Tulelake, the area is not very seismically active, with no known earthquakes originating from them.

The project site does not lie within an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone.

The city of Tulelake is situated in the Tule Lake subbasin of the Upper Klamath River Groundwater Basin. Tulelake sump is located southwest of the city and all that remains of the Tulelake waterbody.

Discussion

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-Proilo 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. Surface rupture occurs when the ground surface is broken due to fault movement during an earthquake. The location of surface rupture generally can be assumed to be along an active or potentially active major fault trace. The site is not located within a currently designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The nearest fault is the Gillem-Big Crack fault system approximately 10 miles to the southwest. No active or potentially active faults have been mapped at the project site; therefore, potential for fault rupture at the site is low.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

No Impact. The project site and the entire Tulelake basin is in a seismically inactive region.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

No Impact. Liquefaction occurs when loose sand and silt that is saturated with water behaves like a liquid when shaken by an earthquake. The soils in the project area are poorly drained, with a rare flood frequency and a ponding frequency of 0 (California Soil Resource 2019). For

liquefaction to occur, the soils must be loose, granular sediment, there must be saturation of the sediment, and strong shaking. As discussed above, the soil is Tulebasin mucky, silty, clay-loam with poorly drained soils typical of lake basins (USGS 2019a).

iv. Landslides?

No Impact. The project area is situated on a 0-1% slope. Landslides are not prominent in the area and are not considered a significant threat to county inhabitants and/or visitors to the region.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed park improvements would include grading activities and possibly soil removal activities during construction. Vegetation would be planted, and erosion of soils would be controlled.

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?

No Impact. As discussed above (a)(iii), the soils on site are classified as a Tulebasin mucky, silty, clay-loam with poorly drained soils typical of lake basins (USGS 2019a). The project area is situated on a 0-1% slope. Landslides are not prominent in the area and are not considered a significant threat to county inhabitants and/or visitors to the region.

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?

No Impact. Expansive soil is not present within the project area.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

No Impact. Septic tanks and alternative wastewater disposal systems would not be installed on the project site. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in impacts to soils associated with the use of such wastewater treatment systems. The site previously held four, 2,000-gallon USTs when it operated as the former Bill's Shell Station as discussed in the previous site land use section.

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

No Impact. There is no known unique paleontological resource, site, or unique geologic feature in project area.

Mitigation Measures

None required due to no negative impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Affected Environment

California adopted Assembly Bill (AB) 32 and Senate Bill (SB) 97 to establish Greenhouse Gas reduction targets. These bills have determined that Greenhouse Gas emissions relate to global climate change and are a source of adverse environmental impacts. The County of Siskiyou has not established significant criteria for greenhouse gas emissions generated by a project and many regulatory agencies are sorting through suggested threshold and/or making project-by-project analyses. This approach is consistent with that suggested by CAPCOA and its technical advisory entitled *CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change through the California Environmental Quality Act Review (California Air Pollution Control Officers Association* [CAPCOA] 2008*):*

> *"In the absence of regulatory standards for GHG (Greenhouse Gas) emissions or other specific data to clearly define what constitutes a 'significant project', individual lead agencies may undertake a project-by-project analysis, consistent with available guidance and current CEQA practice."*

The impact that GHG emissions have on global climate change does not depend on whether the emissions were generated by stationary, mobile, or area sources, or whether they were generated in one region or another. Thus, consistency with the state's requirements for GHG emissions reductions is the best metric for determining whether the proposed zoning text amendment would contribute to global warming.

Discussion

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Less than Significant Impact. As discussed in the Air Quality section above, there would be some impact during construction due to the use of heavy equipment (i.e. diesel powered), and airborne particles (i.e. dust). Also mentioned above, this would be for a short duration until the project is complete. This would include combustion emissions during construction from various sources. During site preparation and construction of the project, Green House Gases would be emitted through the operation of construction equipment and from worker and builder supply vendor vehicles, each of which typically use fossil-based fuels to operate the combustion of fossil-based fuels creates Green House Gasses such as carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide. Furthermore, methane is emitted during the fueling of heavy equipment. Exhaust emissions from on-site construction activities would vary daily as construction activity levels change.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure GHG-1 would ensure that the proposed project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment, based on any applicable threshold of significance.

b) *Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?*

No Impact. The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure GHG-1: To the extent feasible, the following measures shall be incorporated into the design and construction of the project:

- On-site idling of construction equipment shall be minimized (no more than 5 minutes maximum);
- Biodiesel shall be used as an alternative fuel to diesel for at least 15 percent of the construction vehicles/equipment used if there is a biodiesel station within 5 miles of the project site;
- At least 10 percent of building materials shall be local to the extent feasible; and
- At least 50 percent of construction waste or demolition materials shall be recycled.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
9. Hazards and Hazardous Materials Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or	☐	☐	☐	☒

	emergency evacuation plan?				
g)	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Affected Environment

A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment was conducted for the project site (Rabe Consulting 2019). No on-site potential sources of hazardous wastes were observed in the visual survey. No hazardous sites were found in the government records search, with the exception of four sites:

- Simplot Soilbuilders located at South Highway 139 (0.27 miles from subject property), EPA ID: 110008262209.
- Tulelake High School located at 400 G Street (0.42 miles from subject property), EPA ID: 110002930847.
- Tulelake Irrigation District- Aqutic Pesticides NPDES, located at 2717 Havlina (0.15 miles from subject property), EPA ID: 110065914728. Site of interest dealing with pesticides and agricultural chemicals. No violations identified in quarterly reports.
- Tulelake WWTF located at 1000 Dean Callas Way (0.56 miles from subject property). Permit terminated for Clean Water Act; Category I noncompliance from April 2017 through December 2017 with permit terminated July 2018.

The project site itself was formerly Bill's Shell Station, with four, 2,000-gallon Underground Storage Tanks that were closed and removed, and three smaller USTs that were filled with a sand slurry in 1988 (CH2M 1995). The soil was tested by CH2M Environmental Laboratory and by North Coast Laboratories LTD. The soil sampling results are documented, and there is no letter associated with the results of the findings.

Discussion

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed land use would be a park. Normal operations would not introduce potentially hazardous materials. In addition, California law requires all businesses that use or store more than certain quantities of hazardous materials on-site to file hazardous materials business plans that list and map the located on onsite hazardous materials storage and use and that describe procedures in the event of an accident. Compliance with this law would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

While gas and diesel fuel would typically be used by construction vehicles, Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be utilized to ensure that no construction-related fuel hazards occur. Use, storage, transport and disposal of hazardous materials (including any hazardous wastes) during construction activities would be performed in accordance with existing local, state, and federal

hazardous materials regulations. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. This impact is considered less than significant.

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?*

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Construction activities would include the use of ordinary equipment fuels and fluids. In the unlikely event of a spill, fuels would be required to be controlled and disposed of in accordance with county and State regulations. Implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 would ensure that handling of materials during construction activities would not create a hazard to the public or the environment, thereby reducing potential impacts to less-than-significant levels.

c) *Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*

No Impact. No Schools are located within one-quarter mile of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

d) *Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?*

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed above in the Affected Environment section, the proposed project site was once the former Bill's Shell Station. The four, 2,000-gallon Underground Storage Tanks and building have been removed and the soil tested. Tests showed levels at a less than significant reading.

e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?*

No Impact. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

f) *Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

No Impact. The proposed project is the development of a park and associated infrastructure. Proposed park improvements would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

No Impact. Due to the project's location within city limits, there is an extremely low possibility of it exposing people or property to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Project construction plans shall include emergency procedures for responding to hazardous materials releases for materials that will be brought onto the site as part of construction activities. The emergency procedures for hazardous materials releases shall include the necessary personal protective equipment, spill containment procedures, and training of workers to respond to accidental spills/releases. All use storage, transport and disposal of hazardous materials (including any hazardous wastes) during construction activities shall be performed in accordance with existing local, state, and federal hazardous materials regulations.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
10. Hydrology and Water Quality Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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 a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	☐	☐	☒	☐
II. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	☐	☐	☒	☐
III. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	☐	☐	☒	☐
IV. Impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☒	☐

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Affected Environment

The city of Tulelake lies south of the Oregon-California border, with the Tule Lake Wildlife Refuge located west of the city. The city lies in the Tule Lake Basin, on the outskirts of the Klamath Lake Basin (USDA NRCS 2019b). Lost River runs north/south along the west side of Tulelake and flows into Tule Lake. The city is situated of what was once a shallow lake stretching from Sheepy Peak Ridge to the west, and approximately 13 miles east. Tule Lake was drained to create approximately 60,000 acres of agricultural farmlands and development.

Water quality is regulated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), which controls the discharge of pollutants to water bodies from point and non-point sources.

Groundwater is regulated by the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA), which was signed into legislation in 2014. This act requires governments and water agencies of high and medium priority basins to halt overdraft and bring groundwater basins into balanced levels of pumping and recharge. The Tule Lake basin is categorized as a medium priority basin (CDWR 2019). The Siskiyou County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors, the Tulelake Irrigation District, and the City of Tulelake serves on the Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA). Together, the GSA's are required to develop Groundwater Sustainability Plans for the Tule Lake subbasin by January 31, 2022 that will assess the current and projected future conditions of the basins. They will also establish management, monitoring activities and long-term goals.

Discussion

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not violate water quality standards or discharge requirements. However, the proposed project could potentially result in short-term (construction) water quality impacts.

Long-Term Operational Impacts. Consistent with the requirements of the Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit (NPDES Permit No.CAS612008), the proposed park would include low-impact development (LID) and sustainable design features that would protect water quality and retain potential runoff on-site, such as bioswales, preservation of adjacent undeveloped open space areas and landscaped areas. In addition, pathways would be constructed with permeable materials (i.e.,

permeable concrete, decomposed granite, permeable pavers) to promote infiltration of stormwater. With implementation of these LID and sustainable design features, long-term operation of the proposed park would have a less than significant impact on water quality.

Short-Term Construction Impacts. Construction of the proposed project would cause disturbances to the ground surface from earthwork, including excavating and grading. These activities could potentially increase the amount of sediment in site runoff. Increased sediment could negatively impact water quality and aquatic life downstream of the project site.

Materials used during construction could have chemicals that are potentially harmful to aquatic resources and water quality. Accidents or improper use of these materials could release contaminants to the environment. Additionally, oil and other petroleum products used to maintain and operate construction equipment could be accidentally released.

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

No Impact. The proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge as it would not draw on groundwater as a source of water supply.

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 a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project will not result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. The proposed project would increase impervious surfaces on the project site. However, the amount of increased impervious surface would be small, and the proposed project would include design features, such as permeable paving, bioswales and landscaped areas, to maximize water infiltration on the project site. During construction, BMPs would be implemented, consistent with the General Permit, so that on-site and off-site erosion and sedimentation would be controlled to the extent practicable. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. The proposed project would include minimal new impervious surfaces and would provide site features to maximize water infiltration and minimize any stormwater runoff that might result in flooding on- or off-site. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. As described above, the project includes design elements and measures, including BMPs to capture and allow for infiltration of stormwater runoff. Therefore, the proposed project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of the existing system nor would it provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. This impact is considered less than significant.

iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not significantly impede or redirect flood flows. See response iii. above.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

No Impact. There are no impacts related to flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation as the project is located inland from the coast, in an area with an average rainfall of 11 inches, and averages 23 inches of snow per year.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or substantial groundwater management plan. As discussed, the Groundwater Management Plan has not been implemented at the time of this study.

Mitigation Measures

None required due to no negative impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
11. Land Use and Planning				
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Affected Environment

The Property is located within city limits of Tulelake at the intersection of Main Street and Modoc Avenue. The current Tulelake Veterans Park is located immediately south of the Property. The current Veterans Park is composed of paved walkways with a manicured lawn. A bench is located on the west side of the park, with a bathroom located on the east side. Plaques in the park commemorate all veterans and those lost from the community.

The Property is irregular in shape, having the northern side shaped by the intersection of Main Street and Modoc Avenue, the west is bordered by Main Street, and Modoc Avenue borders the east side.

Tax Lot 090 is approximately 0.28 acres and Tax Lot 080 is approximately 0.18 acres. These tax lots were formerly Bill's Shell Station in the late 1970's through mid-1980. It consisted of four, 2,000 Underground Storage Tanks and an office with associated equipment. In the late 1980's, the four Underground Storage Tanks were removed and filled with a sand slurry. Sometime between 2011 and 2012, the building was removed from the property, leaving the entire aboveground portion of the property covered in asphalt and concrete. The entire property is covered in asphalt and cement: no topsoil was observed.

The area surrounding the subject property are zoned as commercial, with various businesses ranging from a sporting goods store, to a mini mart inhabiting the buildings around the project area.

Vegetation on the current Tulelake Veterans Park is comprised of a manicured lawn, six trees (five pine trees and one deciduous tree), various flowers and shrubs. The subject property has three deciduous trees on the northern side of the property.

The project area is part of the County Regional Park and Open Space Management Area and is designated as Commercial use.

Discussion

a) Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. The proposed project would not physically divide an established community. The Property is located within city limits and would be the expansion of the current park.

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?

No Impact. The proposed project would not impact nor conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation. The current zoning for the property is for commercial use and has been vacant since the late 1980s.

Mitigation Measures

None required due to no negative impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
12. Mineral Resources				
Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Affected Environment

Minerals are any naturally occurring chemical element or compound, or groups of elements and compounds, formed from inorganic processes and organic substances including, but not limited to, coal, peat and oil-bearing rock, but excluding geothermal resources, natural gas and petroleum. Rock, sand, gravel and earth are also considered minerals by the Department of Conservation when extracted by surface mining operations.

There are no known mineral resources within the project site or area around the site (CDC Mineral Land Classification 2019a).

Discussion

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?

No Impact. The proposed project is not located on or immediately adjacent to a mineral resource as there is no known mineral resources in the project area.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

No Impact. The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of any locally important mineral resource recovery site.

Mitigation Measures

None required due to no negative impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13. Noise				
Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Affected Environment

Sound is mechanical energy transmitted by pressure waves through a medium such as air. Noise can be defined as unwanted sound. Sound is characterized by various parameters that include the rate of oscillation of sound waves (frequency), the speed of propagation, and the pressure level or energy content (amplitude). In particular, the sound pressure level has become the most common descriptor used to characterize the loudness of an ambient sound level. Sound pressure level is measured in decibels (dB), with zero dB corresponding roughly to the threshold of human hearing, and 120-140 dB corresponding to the threshold of pain.

Existing Ambient Noise Environment

The proposed project encompasses approximately 0.42 acres of commercial space within city limits of the City of Tulelake. The primary contributors to the noise environment in the space include vehicle traffic on Highway 139, railroad traffic, sounds emanating from surrounding neighborhoods, including

voices, noises from adjacent businesses and the existing Tulelake Veterans park, and naturally occurring sounds such as wind and wind-generated rustling. Generally, intermittent short-term noises do not significantly contribute to longer-term noise averages.

Siskiyou County

The Siskiyou County General Plan Noise Element identifies land use compatibility standards for exterior community noise for a variety of land use categories for project planning purposes. For example, for residential land uses, an exterior noise level of 60 dBA Ldn (Day-Night Average Sound Level) is identified as being "acceptable" requiring no special noise insulation or noise abatement features unless the proposed development is itself considered a source of incompatible noise for a nearby land use. The Noise Element also describes the noise level for outdoor areas, such as farms and passively used open space areas, as 50 dBA Ldn. These outdoor noise levels are intended to "assures that a 45 dBA Ldn indoor level will be achieved by the noise attenuation with regular construction materials."

City of Tulelake

Limitations and standards on noise are generally enforced through a noise ordinance or a jurisdiction's municipal code. There is no adopted Noise Ordinance for City of Tulelake; thus, limits on noise are not regulated by the City of Tulelake Municipal Code. However, the County of Siskiyou Code of Ordinances Section 10-13.10 states, "*The best management practices shall be used throughout all phases of work to control dust, noise, and traffic, erosion and release of contaminants, so as to avoid adverse impacts on the public health, welfare, and safety and so as to avoid noise and/or the discharge of contaminants to the soil, water or atmosphere so as to avoid any violation of any applicable rules, regulations, ordinances, statutes, or other applicable law*."

Significant noise sources in the City of Tulelake include traffic on major roadways (Highway 139), railroad operations, and localized noise sources from commercial businesses. Ambient noise levels in areas away from major transportation routes are generally low. The noise environment of the project area, outside of major thoroughfares and railroads, is considered typical of commercial areas and public parks, corresponding to the 50dBA Ldn outdoor noise level.

Discussion

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?*

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Construction noise can be created from on-site and off-site sources. On-site noise sources would principally consist of the operation of heavy-duty diesel and gasoline-powered construction equipment. Off-site noise sources would include vehicles commuting to and from the job site, as well as from trucks transporting material to the construction area. These sources are described below:

Construction of the proposed project would require excavation and earthwork activities that could generate noise levels that exceed established thresholds. Although these activities could result in infrequent periods of high noise, this noise would not be sustained and would occur only during the temporary construction period. No pile driving or other construction activity that would generate

high noise levels or ground borne vibration would occur within the project site. Short term noise levels would be reduced to the extent practicable by the mitigation measures presented below. Implementation of Mitigation Measures NOISE-1 through NOISE-4 would reduce potential impacts to less-than significant levels.

b) Generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed project would require excavation and earthwork activities. Although these activities could result in infrequent periods of high noise, this noise would not be sustained and would occur only during the temporary construction period. No pile driving or other construction activity that would generate very high noise levels or ground borne vibration would occur on the project site. Therefore, this impact is considered 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 two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. As described in response (a) above, the proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure NOISE-1: During construction, the City shall require the contractor to ensure that all equipment is maintained in proper working order, including proper muffling.

Mitigation Measure NOISE-2: During construction, the contractor shall locate portable equipment as far as possible from adjacent residences.

Mitigation Measures NOISE-3: During construction, the contractor shall store and maintain equipment as far as possible from adjacent residences.

Mitigation Measures NOISE-4: If construction-related noise exceeds City standards for non-transportation sources, the City shall require the contractor to implement additional appropriate noise-reducing measures, including but not limited to, changing the location of stationary construction equipment, shutting off idling equipment, rescheduling construction activity, notifying adjacent residents in advance of construction work, or installing acoustic barriers around construction noise sources.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
14. Population and Housing				
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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Affected Environment

The proposed project would be located on a vacant lot adjacent to the existing Tulelake Veterans Park. Land uses in the project vicinity consist of commercial development.

Discussion

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)?

No Impact. The proposed project would not result in new housing, commercial, or industrial space would be developed as part of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. The project would not displace any people or housing as the project site is currently vacant.

Mitigation Measures

None required due to no negative impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
15. Public Services				
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:				
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Affected Environment

The project site is in a suburban area served by the existing public services:

Police Protection. Police protection to the project site is provided by the City of Tulelake Police Department. The city is currently served by two sworn officers for the population of 994 residents of Tulelake. The Tulelake Police Department is located at 470 C Street in Tulelake.

Fire Protection. The Tulelake area is serviced by a Volunteer Fire Department located at 1 Ray Oehlerich Way in Tulelake.

Schools. The project site is located within the boundaries of the Tulelake School District. Tulelake Basin Elementary School is located at 461 2nd Street (0.48 miles from project site), Tulelake High school is located at 850 Main Street (0.43 miles from project site), and Tulelake Basin Joint Unified is located at 400 G Street (0.17 miles from project site).

Parks. There is the current Tulelake Veterans Park located at 334 Main Street (adjacent to proposed project property). Another park located on First Street from B Street to C Street (approximately 0.15 miles from project site), includes a tennis court, jungle gym, and a shaded picnic area with restroom facilities. The Tulelake Fairgrounds located at 800 Main Street (0.45 miles from project site) includes a racetrack and baseball field. The High schools (mentioned above), have a paved track and two baseball fields, and the elementary school (mentioned above), has three baseball fields and a dirt track.

Discussion

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: Fire Protection, Police Protection, Schools, Parks, other public facilities?*

Less Than Significant Impact/No Impact. The proposed project would improve the site through the expansion of the current Tulelake Veterans Park. Use of the site would increase as a result of proposed improvements. However, visitors to the site are anticipated to come primarily from the local neighborhood, those people generally reside within walking distance of the project site. Because the project would not increase the population in the area, impacts associated with an increased demand for fire protection services or for police protection are considered less than significant.

Implementation of the proposed project would not result in any local or regional population increase. Therefore, the project would not require construction of new schools, or result in schools exceeding their capacities.

The proposed project is not expected to result in impacts to other public facilities.

Mitigation Measures

None required due to no negative impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
16. Recreation				
Would the project:				
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Affected Environment

There is the current Tulelake Veterans Park located at 334 Main Street (adjacent to proposed project property). Another park located on First Street from B Street to C Street (approximately 0.15 miles from project site), includes a tennis court, jungle gym, and a shaded picnic area with restroom facilities. The Tulelake Fairgrounds located at 800 Main Street (0.45 miles from project site) includes a racetrack and baseball field. The High schools (mentioned above), have a paved track and two baseball fields, and the elementary school (mentioned above), has three baseball fields and a dirt track.

Discussion

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?

No Impact. The proposed project would have no impact on existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities since the project provides recreational facilities and does not generate demand for such uses.

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?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The proposed project is the expansion of a recreational facility. Potential adverse effects on the environment have been addressed in this Initial Study. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in this Initial Study would reduce potentially adverse physical environmental impacts to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measures

None required due to no negative impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
17. Transportation/Traffic				
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines §15064.3, subdivision (b)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Affected Environment

Highway 139 provides regional access to the City of Tulelake. Local access is provided via Modoc Avenue or Main Street.

Discussion

a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would improve the project site for use as a neighborhood park. The focus of the proposed project is to address the aesthetics of the area. Implementation of the proposed project would not interfere with traffic on local roadways since the number of trips to a from the park would not generate a substantial number of peak AM and PM vehicle trips and would not significantly affect the existing or future traffic load and capacity of local roadways. This impact is less than significant.

b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines §15064.3, subdivision (b)?

No Impact. Section 15064.3 of the CEQA Guidelines establishes specific considerations for evaluating a project's transportation impacts. The CEQA Guidelines identify vehicle miles traveled (VMT), which is the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project, as the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts. Other relevant considerations may include the effects of the project on transit and non-motorized travel. Vehicle miles traveled exceeding an applicable threshold of significance for land use projects may indicate a significant impact. Generally, projects within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop or a stop along an existing high-quality transit corridor should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. Projects that decrease vehicle miles traveled in the project area, compared to existing conditions, should be presumed to have a less than significant transportation impact.

The project is not located within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop, or a stop along an existing high-quality transit corridor.

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

No Impact. The project would not change or alter the current boundaries of the subject property proposed for the project. The park would not substantially increase hazards for vehicles or park users due to a design feature or incompatible uses.

d) *Result in inadequate emergency access?*

No Impact. The proposed park project would not result in inadequate emergency vehicle access on the 0.42-acre lot. The park would have an open plan with ease of access from the surrounding streets.

Mitigation Measures

None required due to no negative impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
18. Utilities and Service Systems				
Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Affected Environment

Utilities and service systems for the project site are described below.

Water. The water supply for the project site would stem from existing infrastructure created for the Tulelake Veterans Park immediately south of the project. The water system for the proposed project would be supplied by the City of Tulelake, which obtains water from Well #5, located on the northwest corner of Highway Street in town. The well is chlorinated before delivered to customers and water samples are taken twice a month at Spring Street Analytical.

Wastewater. The City of Tulelake Wastewater Treatment Plant was upgraded in 2016. The upgrade consisted of two, lined treatment ponds fed by two S&L pumps, with the treatment ponds being supplied with a new Triple Point Aerators (air supply). The waste is recycled and pumped to two new effluent storage ponds where it is pumped to a feed line that supplies water for agricultural irrigation for farm cover crops.

Other Utilities. City of Tulelake garbage is provided by Siskiyou County Integrated Solid Waste Management Regional Agency.

Discussion

a) *Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing treatment facilities. The amount of additional water demand and wastewater generation would be proportionally small and would not exceed the capacity of existing facilities. This impact is considered less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Tulelake Well is known to have a good, static level and recovers quickly. It is recorded to have dropped approximately 15 feet, even in the drought years. The well is reported to recover quickly, with little variability from season to season. The project will not have a significant impact to the water supply.

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?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The projected wastewater generation resulting from implementation of the proposed project would be proportionally small and would not exceed the current capacity of existing facilities. This impact is considered less than significant.

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?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Operation of the proposed project is not anticipated to generate a significant amount of solid waste. Construction of the proposed project would generate construction waste. However, the amount of construction waste would not be substantial and would not result in a substantial reduction in the capacity of a landfill. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

e) *Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would promote recycling on-site. Receptacles for recyclable waste would be provided as part of proposed improvements and the City would contract with appropriate entities for the removal and processing of recyclable waste. The City of Tulelake currently complies with federal, State, and local statutes related to solid waste recycling. These programs would continue with implementation of the proposed project and potential impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

None required due to no negative impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
19. Mandatory Findings of Significance				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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 probably future projects.)	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Discussion

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?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. As described in the sections above, all environmental effects were determined to be less than significant or reduced below levels of significance with mitigations. The proposed project would result in the development of a park facility that could affect the environment. 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 probably future projects.)*

Less Than Significant Impact. The impacts of the proposed project are individually limited and not cumulatively considerable. The proposed project would result in development of a park to serve the existing residential community immediately to the north. All environmental impacts that could occur as a result of the project would be reduced to less than significant levels through implementation of the mitigation measures recommended in this Initial Study.

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

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. During project construction, the proposed project could result in environmental effects, such as short-term construction noise, air quality, and hazardous materials impacts. Implementation of the mitigation measures recommended in this Initial Study would ensure that construction of the proposed project would not cause adverse effects on human beings.

REPORT PREPARERS AND REFERENCES

A. REPORT PREPARERS

Rabe Consulting
421 Commercial Street
Klamath Falls, OR 97601

Andréa Rabe, Principal, Senior Environmental Consultant
Karly Law, Cultural Resources, RPA

B. REFERENCES

America's Scenic Byways. California. https://scenicbyways.info/state/CA.html. Website accessed April 29, 2019.

California Air Resources Board. 2019. Area Designations Maps/State and National. https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm. Website accessed July 11, 2019.

California Department of Conservation.

2019a. CGS Information Warehouse: Mineral Land Classification. https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=mlc. Website accessed May 3, 2019.

2019b. Fault Activity Map of California 2010. http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/. Website accessed April 30, 2019.

2019c. Siskiyou County. https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/Pages/Siskiyou.aspx. Website accessed July 2, 2019.

California Department of Water Resources. 2019. Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Basin Prioritization Dashboard. https://gis.water.ca.gov/app/bp-dashboard/p2/. Website Accessed July 8, 2019.

California Fire. 2019. Wildland Hazard & Building Codes. http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/siskiyou/fhszs_map.47.pdf. Website accessed May 3, 2019.

California Office of Historic Preservation. 2018. Listed California Historical Resources. http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/ListedResources/?view=county&criteria=47. Website accessed April 29, 2019.

California Soil Resource. 2019. SoilWeb. https://casoilresource.lawr.ucdavis.edu/gmap/. Website Accessed May 2, 2019.

CH2M Hill. 1995. Environmental Report of the former Bill's Shell Station. Redding, California.

City of Tulelake. 2019. City Administration. http://www.cityoftulelake.com/departments/city-administration. Website accessed May 1, 2019.

Public Works Department. http://www.cityoftulelake.com/departments/public-works-department. Website accessed May 1, 2019.

County of Siskiyou California. 2019. North East Plateau Air Basin. https://www.co.siskiyou.ca.us/bc/page/north-east-plateau-air-basin. Website Accessed 2 May 2019.

Rabe Consulting. 2019. Tulelake Veterans Park Expansion Phase 1 ESA. Report on file at Rabe Consulting, Klamath Falls, Oregon.

United States Climate Data. 2019. Tulelake, California. https://www.usclimatedata.com/climate/tulelake/california/united-states/usca1166.

United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2019a. Web Soil Survey. https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm. Website accessed April 30, 2019.

Quarternary Fault and Fold Database of the United States: Gillem-Big Crack Fault system (Class A) No. 3. 2019b. https://earthquake.usgs.gov/cfusion/qfault/show_report_AB_archive.cfm?fault_id=3&section_id=. Website Accessed May 2, 2019.

United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2019b. Klamath River Basin. https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/home/?cid=nrcs143_023523. Website Accessed May 2, 2019.