



October 6, 2020

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM INITIAL STUDY (IS 19-45)

1. **Project Title:** William Clark Parcel Map
2. **Permit:** Initial Study (IS 19-45) for Parcel Map (PM 19-03)
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of Lake
Community Development Department - Planning Division
Courthouse – 255 North Forbes Street
Lakeport CA 95453
4. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Eric Porter – Associate Planner (707) 263-2221
5. **Project Location:** 8845 Red Hill Road, Kelseyville, California 95451
APN: 011-015-16
6. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** William Clark
8910 Bridge Arbor
Upper Lake, CA 95485
7. **General Plan Designation:** Rural Residential
8. **Zoning:** “RR-B5-SC (2.5ac)” Rural Residential – Special Lot Size/Density – Scenic Combining District
9. **Supervisor District:** Five
10. **Flood Zone:** None
11. **Slope:** Generally flat
12. **Fire Hazard Severity Zone:** Very High
13. **Earthquake Fault Zone:** None Mapped
14. **Dam Failure Inundation Area:** None
15. **Proposed Parcel Sizes:** 10.17 acres (Parcel A)
6.00 acres (Parcel B)

16. Description of Project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary).

The applicant is requesting approval of a parcel map to allow one lot to be split into two parcels. According to the Tentative Parcel Map dated June 11, 2019, the applicant is proposing the following:

- Parcel A would be approximately 10.17 acres in size.
- Parcel B would be approximately 6.00 acres in size.

The site is accessed by Red Hills Road, a paved County-maintained road. There are two dwellings on the site that would remain following this parcel map recordation. The site is served by two on-site septic systems, a well, a gravel driveway, and a small storage shed. The applicant has indicated that the only development that is being contemplated is an interior remodel to an existing house on the property through the ministerial Building Permit process. The applicant is proposing a shared well including an easement for the benefit of Parcel B. Please see map below.

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

- *North:* One 40 acre parcel zoned "A" Agriculture that contains a productive agricultural use and no dwellings.
- *South:* One 60 acre parcel zoned "PDR", Planned Development Residential that is undeveloped.
- *East and West:* Two parcels approximately 10 acres in size (each) and zoned "RR" Rural Residential. Both parcels are developed with dwellings.

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

Lake County Community Development Department
Lake County Department of Public Works - Road Division
Lake County Department of Public Works – Surveyor
Lake County Public Services
Lake County Water Resource Department
Lake County Special Districts
Lake County Department of Environmental Health
Kelseyville Fire Protection District
California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire)

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

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

Notification of the project was sent to local tribes on August 28, 2019. To date, one letter was received by the Yocha Dehe Tribe who had no issues with this proposal.

20. Attachments

- a. Project Description
- b. Tentative Parcel Map
- c. Summary Form
- d. Notice of Intent
- e. Notice of Completion
- f. Biological Assessment

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

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

Initial Study Prepared By:
Simone Hingston, Assistant Planner
Eric Porter, Associate Planner

Date: _____

SIGNATURE
Scott DeLeon – Director; Community Development Department

SECTION 1

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, and then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures, which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:

 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

KEY: 1 = Potentially Significant Impact

2 = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation

3 = Less Than Significant Impact

4 = No Impact

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?		X			According to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, the project site is designated as “Grazing Land” which does not qualify as Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance or Unique Farmland. In addition, no development is proposed. Therefore, the proposed project will not have a significant impact on high value farmland. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 18, 41, 42
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?		X			The project parcel is not a Williamson Act contract, nor will this land division affect any nearby properties that do have Williamson Act contracts. The proposed project is consistent with the “RR” Rural Residential Zoning District. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 18, 41, 42
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?			X		This property is zoned “RR” Rural Residential and the General Plan Designation is High Density Residential (HDR). The project would not result in the rezone of forest land, timber land, or Timberland Production lands. No Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 18, 41, 42
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?			X		The project would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. No Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 18, 41, 42
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?		X			The project would not induce changes to existing farmland that would result in its conversion to non-agricultural use. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 18, 41, 42
III. AIR QUALITY						
<i>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</i>						
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?		X			The proposed division of one (1) parcel into two (2) parcels according to the Tentative Parcel Map (PM 19-02) dated April 9, 2019 would not conflict with and/or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. The applicant has indicated that the only development that is being contemplated is an interior remodel to an existing house on the property through the ministerial Building Permit process. There are no plans to further disturb any soil on the site. There may be some additional trips associated with the interior remodel, however these construction-related trips are anticipated to be less than trips that would normally be generated by a typical single family dwelling (9.55 Average Daily Trips according to the International Transportation Engineer’s Manual, 9 th edition). Less than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 13, 30, 31, 34, 41, 42

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
b) Violate any air quality standard or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in an existing or projected air quality violation?		X			The Lake County Air Basin is designated as an attainment area. There are no obvious pollutants associated with a land division. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 13, 30, 31, 34, 41, 42
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		X			The project parcel is located in an area that is sparsely developed with some nearby residential dwellings and agricultural uses. The act of dividing land will not increase pollutants unless future construction occurs on either parcel. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 13, 30, 31, 34, 41, 42
d) Result in substantial emissions (such as odors or dust) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?		X			The division of one (1) parcel into two (2) parcels according to the Tentative Parcel Map (PM 19-03) dated June 11, 2019 would not result in increased emissions which would adversely affect a substantial number of people. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 13, 30, 31, 34, 41, 42
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X			A Biological Study was prepared by Jacobzoon and Associates, dated January 3, 2020. The Study states that the California Department of Fish and Wildlife's California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) identified twenty-six (26) special-status plant species and eight (8) special-status wildlife species as having a moderate or high potential to occur within the area, and that impacts could occur if vegetation removal or development is proposed. The site visit conducted as a part of the Study found that there were no sensitive flora or fauna species on the site, or any special status species that were observed, but that some may occur on-site during a different season. However, the project proposes a simple land division and no development or vegetation removal is proposed. Therefore, no significant impacts to sensitive species or other biological resources would occur as a result of the Parcel Map. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 14, 15, 16, 18, 23, 27, 33, 36, 38, 41, 42
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X			There are no riparian habitats or other mapped sensitive habitats on this site, and the removal of riparian or any other vegetation is not proposed as part of this project. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 14, 15, 16, 18, 23, 27, 33, 36, 38, 41, 42
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?			X		No jurisdictional waters of the U.S. are identified on the property. No Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 14, 15, 16, 18, 23, 27, 33, 36, 38, 41, 42

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		X			There are no recorded wildlife corridors or native wildlife nursery sites on the project property and the project would not substantially interfere with movement of native species. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 14, 15, 16, 18, 23, 27, 33, 36, 38, 41, 42
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		X			The project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 14, 15, 16, 18, 23, 27, 33, 36, 38, 41, 42
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			X		The project would not conflict with any established conservation plan. No Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 14, 15, 16, 18, 23, 27, 33, 36, 38, 41, 42
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X			A Cultural Resource Survey was performed by Wolf Creek Archeological Research dated October 4, 2019. The survey concluded that it is unlikely that cultural and historic resources exist on-site. In addition, no development or ground disturbance is proposed. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 17, 41, 42
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X			The Cultural Resource Survey concluded that it was unlikely that any archeological resources exist on the site. The project is a land division, and no site disturbance is proposed in conjunction with the division of land. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 17, 41, 42
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X			The Cultural Resource Survey concluded that it was unlikely that any human remains are present on the site. No ground disturbance is proposed in conjunction with the division of land. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 17, 41, 42
VI. ENERGY <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?		X			The division of one (1) parcel into two (2) parcels according to the Tentative Parcel Map dated April 9, 2019 would not consume excessive amounts of energy. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?		X			The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct an energy plan. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:		X			<p><u>Earthquake Faults</u> The project site is not within an Earthquake Fault Zone as established by the California Geological Survey in accordance with the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act. The proposed project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects due to earthquakes.</p> <p><u>Seismic Ground Shaking and Seismic-Related Ground Failure, including liquefaction.</u> Lake County contains numerous known active faults. Future seismic events in the Northern California region can be expected to produce seismic ground shaking at the site. However, risks related to ground shaking, ground failure, and liquefaction would not be increased as a result of this project.</p> <p><u>Landslides</u> According to the Lawrence Livermore landslide map series for Lake County, 1979, the area is considered generally stable with a marginal landslide risk. The proposed project would not result in an increased risk of landslides at this area.</p> <p>The land division would not have any impact on geology or soils since no development or ground disturbance is proposed. Any future development would be in compliance with all applicable Uniform Building Code regulations designed to ensure seismic safety. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 36, 41, 42
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X			<p>According to the soil survey of Lake County, prepared by the U.S.D.A, the soil within the project is as follows:</p> <p>138 - Glenview-Arrowhead complex, 5 to 15 percent slopes. This map unit is on volcanic hills.</p> <p>This unit is about 60 percent Glenview very gravelly loam and 20 percent Arrowhead extremely gravelly sandy loam. The components of this unit are so intricately intermingled that it was not practical to map them separately at the scale used. Permeability of the Glenview soil is moderately slow. Surface runoff is medium, and the hazard of erosion is moderate. The Arrowhead soil type has a moderate rate of erosion.</p> <p>However, the division of one (1) parcel into two (2) parcels according to the Tentative Parcel Map dated April 9, 2019 would not result in a substantial soil erosion and/or the loss of topsoil.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 36, 41, 42
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?		X			<p>According to the soil survey of Lake County, prepared by the U.S.D.A., the soil at the site is considered "generally stable" and there is a less than significant chance of landslide, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse as a result of the project.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 36, 41, 42

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			X		<p>According to the soil survey of Lake County, prepared by the U.S.D.A., the soil at the site is considered “generally stable” The shrink-swell potential for the project soils is light and there is a less than significant chance of landslide, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse as a result of the project. There would be no risk to life or property.</p> <p>No Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 36, 41, 42
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?		X			<p>Both proposed parcels are developed with dwellings on individual septic systems. There are no adverse comments that were received by Environmental Health, and there do not appear to be any issues associated with these existing septic systems. No new septic systems are proposed.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 36, 41, 42
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X		<p>Both parcels are developed with dwellings, and no ground disturbance is proposed. No impact to paleontological resources or geologic features is expected.</p> <p>No Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 36, 41, 42
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?		X			<p>In general, GHG emissions from construction activities include the use of construction equipment, grading landscaping, haul trucks, worker commute vehicles, and stationary equipment (such as generators, if any). Greenhouse gas emissions are anticipated to be very low, since no site development is proposed.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X		<p>The proposed division of one (1) parcel into two (2) parcels according to the Tentative Parcel Map dated June 11, 2019 would not conflict with any adopted plans or policies for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>No Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?		X			<p>The proposed division of one (1) parcel into two (2) parcels according to the Tentative Parcel Map dated June 11, 2019 would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment, since no development is proposed. No transportation of hazardous chemicals is needed, nor is any proposed.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 41, 42

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X		<p>As proposed, the project consists of creating two parcels from the parent parcel. This action would not create a significant hazard to the public involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 41, 42
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X		<p>The project is the division of land and would not emit hazardous materials or substances, since no new development is proposed.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 41, 42
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X	<p>The subject property is not listed as a site containing hazardous materials in the database maintained by the Environmental Protection Agency and California Department of Toxic Substance Control.</p> <p>No Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 41, 42
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				X	<p>The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport.</p> <p>No Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 41, 42
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X	<p>The project would not impair or interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Red Hills Road is a paved County-maintained road with direct access to State Highway 29, which would serve as the evacuation route. The applicant shall adhere to all applicable local and state emergency access requirements.</p> <p>No Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 41, 42

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?		X			<p>The project site is located within a mapped High Fire area. However, the project will not increase the public's risk to wildland fire since no development is being proposed, and since both parcels already contain houses. The permit holder shall operate in full compliance with fire safety rules and regulations and instruct all project workers that the project involves working within and adjacent to flammable vegetation. All activities shall be performed in a safe and prudent manner with regards to fire prevention.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 41, 42
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?		X			<p>The action proposed is to divide one lot into two parcels. No development is proposed, and no activities are proposed that might otherwise violate water quality or waste discharge requirements. No activities are proposed that would degrade surface or ground water quality.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 26, 27, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, 41
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?		X			<p>The project would not have any increased impact on ground water supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge since no new development is being proposed.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 26, 27, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, 41
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or off-site; ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or iv) impede or redirect flood flows? 		X			<p>The division of one (1) parcel into two (2) parcels according to the Tentative Parcel Map dated June 11, 2019 would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site and/or area. Since no development is being proposed, the project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site. The project would not add impervious surfaces since the driveway leading to Parcel B already exists (please see driveway photo below).</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 26, 27, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, 41
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?		X			<p>The project site is not located in an area of potential inundation by seiche or tsunami.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 26, 27, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, 41

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?			X		The project would not conflict with or obstruct water quality or management plans. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 26, 27, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, 41
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Physically divide an established community?			X		The project would not physically divide a community. The property is already developed with two dwellings and will be subdivided accordingly. No new roads are proposed or needed; the driveways serving both dwellings already exist. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 41, 42
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X		The proposed project would not conflict with the General Plan, and is consistent with the densities allowed within the General Plan for residential development. The proposed project would not conflict with the Kelseyville Area Plan, which has no specific policies regarding land division within the boundary of the Plan. The project is consistent with the Lake County Zoning Ordinance, which allows five acre lots in the Rural Residential zoning district, provided the correct process (e.g. Parcel Map) is undertaken to create the parcels. The full zoning of this property is RR-B5-SC; Rural Residential – Frozen (5 acre minimum), Scenic Combining District. The RR zone allows lots as small as five acres. The B5 designation means that the lots cannot be further divided below five acres, and the SC Scenic Combining Overlay District limits building heights for residential buildings based on their distance from the source of the Combining District – in this case it is Red Hills Road. Since no development is imminent, there is no conflict with these zoning designations for this property. The project is consistent with these plans and will avoid and/or mitigate an adverse environmental effect. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 41, 42
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X	The Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan does not identify a source of minerals at this site. No Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 28, 41, 42
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				X	The County of Lake's General Plan, the Kelseyville Area Plan, nor the Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan designates the project site as being a locally important mineral resource recovery site. No Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 28, 41, 42
XIII. NOISE <i>Would the project result in:</i>						
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				X	No construction is proposed as the result of this project, which is a simple division of land. No Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X		The project is not expected to create unusual ground-borne vibration since no site development is proposed. No Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X		The division of one (1) parcel into two (2) parcels according to the Tentative Parcel Map dated June 11, 2019 is not anticipated to induce population growth. Both parcels contain existing dwellings. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 41, 42
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X		No people or housing would be displaced as a result of the project. No Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 41, 42
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire Protection? Police Protection? Schools? Parks? Other Public Facilities?			X		. The property is served by CalFire and the Kelseyville Fire Department; the Lake County Sheriff's Department, the Kelseyville Unified School District; local and regional parks, paved County road, on-grid power, septic and a well. No new construction is being contemplated by the owner, and both parcels already contain dwellings. The division of one (1) parcel into two (2) parcels according to the Tentative Parcel Map dated June 11, 2019 does not necessitate the need for new or altered government facilities Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 41, 42
XVI. RECREATION <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X		The division of one (1) parcel into two (2) parcels according to the Tentative Parcel Map dated June 11, 2019 will not have any significant impacts on existing parks or other recreational facilities. The applicant will be required to pay Quimby Park Fees prior to recording the final map; those fees are specifically intended to be used for park land acquisition and development within Lake County. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 41
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X		The project does not contain recreational facilities and will not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. No Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 41

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
XVII. TRANSPORTATION <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?		X			The properties are accessed from Red Hills Road, a paved County-maintained road with 10' travel lanes and 1' to 2' wide shoulders on either side. There are no plans to improve Red Hills Road at this time, and there are no program plans, ordinances or policies that would require improvements to Red Hills Road as the result of this land division. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 18, 21, 24, 29, 30, 35, 37, 39, 41, 42
b) For a land use project, would the project conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(1)?		X			This proposal is not a public transportation project, and as such would not conflict and/or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(1). Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 18, 21, 24, 29, 30, 35, 37, 39, 41, 42
c) For a transportation project, would the project conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(2)?		X			This land division is not a transportation project, and would not be inconsistent with CEQA 15064.3, subdivision (b)(2). Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 18, 21, 24, 29, 30, 35, 37, 39, 41, 42
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?		X			The two driveways and Red Hills Road are existing. No changes to the driveways or to Red Hills Road are being proposed. The project would not result in inadequate emergency access, and there are no 'line of sight' issues with either driveway as it intersects Red Hills Road. The project was routed to CalTrans and to the Lake County Department of Public Works (the County road authority); neither agency had adverse comments about this proposal. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 18, 21, 24, 29, 30, 35, 37, 39, 41, 42
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?		X			No changes to Red Hills Road or to the driveways would occur by this proposal. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 18, 21, 24, 29, 30, 35, 37, 39, 41, 42
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES <i>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</i>						
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or		X			The Cultural Resource Survey undertaken by Wolf Creek Archeology Services yielded no significant artifacts on either parcel. There were three 'dump sites' that dated back to the 1940s and earlier, however there were no significant or potentially significant relics related to Tribal Culture that were discovered during the site study, and the Archeologist concluded that it was very unlikely that any Tribal relics or other items that would make this site a candidate for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources would be present. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 17, 41, 42

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.		X			See Response to Section XVIII(a). According to the Cultural Resource Survey undertaken for this site, the site does not contain significant items as described within Public Resources Code section 5024.1. All eleven area tribes were notified of this action; only the Yocha Dehe Tribe responded, and had no issues with this proposal. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 17, 41, 42
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X		The project parcel is currently served by on-grid power, private well and private septic systems. No relocation of any of these facilities is anticipated or proposed. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 18, 29, 31, 37, 41, 42
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?		X			The property is served by an existing well. There are no known water deficiencies in this area, and no additional development is proposed. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 18, 29, 31, 37, 41, 42
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?		X			Both parcels are served by private on-site septic systems. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 18, 29, 31, 37, 41, 42
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?		X			No additional solid waste is anticipated, since both parcels are already developed. The Director of the Solid Waste Disposal facility has indicated that the current waste disposal site has adequate capacity for the next five years, and has room for future expansion if and when it is needed. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 18, 29, 31, 37, 41, 42
e) Negatively impact the provision of solid waste services or impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?		X			Lake County has provisions for on-site waste storage, which must be kept in a safe manner. In this case the property is served by a public solid waste disposal company, which is responsible in part for assuring compliance with federal, state and local waste management requirements. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 18, 29, 31, 37, 41, 42
f) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X		No new development will occur on either parcel. No Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 18, 29, 31, 37, 41, 42

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
XX. WILDFIRE						
<i>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</i>						
a) Impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?		X			The project would not impair any emergency response or evacuation plans. The project site is located mostly in a very high fire hazard severity zone, however this project would not further exacerbate the risk to individuals residing on either property. No development is proposed. No changes to the evacuation routes are proposed, and the applicant will be required to adhere to all Federal, State and local fire requirements/regulations through specific conditions of approval found in all land divisions in Lake County.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 13, 18, 21, 25, 30, 33, 35, 37, 41, 42
					Less Than Significant Impact	
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?		X			The site is primarily located in a very high fire risk area. This project would not increase wildfire risks beyond those that currently exist. . Most of the site is relatively flat but has dense shrub and tree growth. Given the slope (mild to moderate) and prevailing wind direction (from the north – northwest), it is unlikely that this project would increase the potential pollutant rate in the event of a wildfire in the vicinity.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 13, 18, 21, 25, 30, 33, 35, 37, 41, 42
					Less Than Significant Impact	
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?		X			The tentative parcel map does not propose any new infrastructure, nor does any appear to be needed. The property is already served with all utilities, and no road improvements appear to be necessary. The applicant needs to remove some of the fuel load on the property, however this is not typically required by land division actions, but instead by new construction (defensible space).	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 13, 18, 21, 25, 30, 33, 35, 37, 41, 42
					Less Than Significant Impact	
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?		X			The site slope if generally between 5 and 15 percent. There are no floodways or drainage channels passing through the property, and none of the nearby properties were recently burned and would subsequently be prone to landslides moreso than sites that contain rooted vegetation.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 13, 18, 21, 25, 30, 33, 35, 37, 41, 42
					Less Than Significant Impact	
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE						
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X			As proposed with incorporation of mitigation measures, the proposed project is not anticipated to significantly impact and/or 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.	ALL

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			X		Potentially significant impacts have been identified related to Air Quality, Biological Resources and Cultural Resources. These impacts in combination with the impacts of other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects could cumulatively contribute to significant effects on the environment. However, implementation of and compliance with mitigation measures identified in each section as well as project conditions of approval would avoid or reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels and would not result in cumulatively considerable environmental impacts.	ALL
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X		The project has some potential to have environmental impacts related to Air Quality, Biological and Cultural Resources. The proposed mitigation measures would ensure that there would be less than significant direct and indirect impacts.	ALL

* Impact Categories defined by CEQA

**Sources List

1. Lake County General Plan
2. Lake County Zoning Ordinance
3. Kelseyville Area Plan, Adopted 1995
4. Chapter 17 (Subdivision Regulations) of the Lake County Code.
5. Tentative Parcel Map (PM 19-03) Application Package
6. Chapter 13 (Hazardous Vegetation) of the Lake County Code
7. Chapter 25 of the Lake County Code
8. U.S.G.S. Topographic Maps
9. California Department of Transportation’s Scenic Highway Mapping Program
http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/index.htm
10. U.S.D.A. Lake County Soil Survey
11. Lake County Important Farmland Map, California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/ciff/>
12. Lake County Serpentine Soil mapping
13. Lake County Air Quality Management District
14. California Department of Fish and Wildlife California Natural Diversity Database
<https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB>
15. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory
<https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html>
16. Biological Resources Assessment, prepared by Jacobzoon and Associates and dated January 3, 2020.
17. Archeological Resource Survey for the subject site, prepared by Wolf Creek Archeological Resources and dated October 4, 2019.
18. County of Lake Parcel Viewer <http://gispublic.co.lake.ca.us/portal/home/>
19. U.S.G.S. Geologic Map and Structure Sections of the Clear Lake Volcanic, Northern California, Miscellaneous Investigation Series, 1995
20. Official Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Maps for Lake County
21. Lake County Emergency Management Plan
22. California Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStar Database
<http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>

23. Environmental Protection Agency Superfund Sites Mapped Search
<https://www.epa.gov/superfund/search-superfund-sites-where-you-live>
24. Lake County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, adopted 1992
25. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, fire hazard mapping
26. National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)
27. FEMA flood hazard maps
28. Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan
29. Lake County Draft Regional Transportation Plan 2017,
<http://www.lakeapc.org/docs/2017%20RTP-Draft.pdf>
30. Lake County Department of Public Works, Roads Division
31. Lake County Department of Environmental Health
32. Landslide Hazards in the Eastern Clear Lake Area, Lake County, California, Landslide Hazard Identification Map No. 16, California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, DMG Open –File Report 89-27, 1990
33. Lake County Natural Hazard database
34. Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List: www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public
35. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection - Fire Hazard Mapping
36. National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)
37. Kelseyville Fire Protection District
38. Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
39. 2010 Lake County Regional Transportation Plan, Dow & Associates, October 2010
40. Lake County Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, 1996
41. Agency and Tribal Comments
42. Site Visit; July 15, 2020