



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

Dated: February 15, 2022

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
INITIAL STUDY, IS 22-06**

1. **Project Title:** Nikki Island Resort
2. **Permit Number:** Design Review, DR 21-01
Initial Study, IS 22-06
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of Lake
Community Development Department
Courthouse – 255 North Forbes Street
Lakeport CA 95453
4. **Contact Person:** Eric Porter, Associate Planner (707) 263-2221
5. **Project Location(s):** 5835 & 5825 State Highway 20, Lucerne CA 95458
APNs: 034-421-20 and 21
6. **Project Sponsor's Name:** Nicole Farb
3724 Divisadero Street
San Francisco, CA 94123
7. **General Plan Designation:** CR and RC; Resort Commercial and Resource
Conservation
8. **Zoning:** “CR-FF-WW-SC”; Resort Commercial – Floodway
Fringe – Waterway – Scenic Combining Overlay District
9. **Supervisor District:** District Three (3)
10. **Flood Zone:** AE (both lots)
11. **Slope:** Flat
12. **Fire Hazard Severity Zone:** None
13. **Earthquake Fault Zone:** None
14. **Dam Failure Inundation Area:** Not located within Dam Failure Inundation Area
15. **Parcel Sizes:** 0.78 Acres (each lot)

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).

New resort featuring the following development:

- Nine (9) new resort overnight lodging units; two sizes (three are 12' x 14'; six are 12' x 24')
- Conversion of an existing residential structure (approx. 2175 square feet) to a lobby, dining room
- Conversion of the existing studio to an ADA bathroom
- Concrete patio with pool and in-ground hot tub secured with iron fence
- Outdoor kitchen area
- Fire pit with seating area
- Sauna
- Fourteen (14) parking spaces and one (1) ADA van accessible parking space.
- Decomposed granite walkways to be added
- Six (6) foot high perimeter wood fence
- Eight (8) foot high bamboo fence in between resort overnight lodging area and parking area
- Trash enclosure, approximately 14' x 12' in size
- Boat dock and pier (approved lakebed permit 2020-25 Farb)
- Removal of old asphalt driveway and existing 200 sq. ft. shed
- Removal of westerly driveway and gate (requested by CalTrans)
- On-site manager 7 a.m. to 7 p.m.; on site staff 7 p.m. to 7 a.m.

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

North: "CR-FF-WW-DR", Commercial Resort District-Floodway Fringe
Combining District-Waterway Combining District-Design Review Overlay
District; Vacant Lots and Residential

East: "R3-SC", Multi-Family Residential District-Scenic Combining
District/Church (on other side of State Highway Route 20)

South: "CR-FF-WW-DR", Commercial Resort District-Floodway Fringe
Combining District-Waterway Combining District-Design Review Overlay
District; Vacant Lot and Residential beyond.

West: Clear Lake

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

Lake County Community Development Department
 Lake County Department of Environmental Health
 Lake County Air Quality Management District
 Lake County Department of Public Works
 Lake County Department of Public Services
 South Lake County Fire Protection District (CalFire)
 Central Valley Water Resource Control
 Northshore Fire District
 California Department of Public Health

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

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.

Original and Subsequent Initial Study Prepared By:
Eric Porter, Associate Planner



February 15, 2022

Date: _____

SIGNATURE

Mary Darby, 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** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---------------------------|
| I. AESTHETICS <i>Would the project:</i> | | | | | | |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | | | X | | <p>The project site is zoned Resort Commercial and is located in between State Highway 20, a scenic highway, and Clear Lake, the primary natural resource within Lake County.</p> <p>The property is also designated as being within the Scenic Combining Overlay District, which is addressed in Article 34 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance.</p> <p>Article 34, part 34.2(b), states:</p> <p>(b) The “SC” combining district shall not be applied to commercial or industrial districts established by this Chapter.</p> <p>The proposed project consists of an existing single-story dwelling that will not change on the exterior other than paint and maintenance, and nine new / small overnight lodging units for the resort. The new units are single-story and incorporate natural wood siding and asphalt roofing tiles.</p> <div data-bbox="711 1024 1349 1457" data-label="Image"> </div> <p style="text-align: center;">TYPICAL RESORT LODGING UNIT ELEVATIONS</p> <p>The buildings are proposed to be about 17’ tall, which is consistent with the buildings in the surrounding area.</p> <p>The site is visible from Highway 20. The property is within the Scenic Combining Overlay District. However the scenic combining requirement does not apply to land that is commercially zoned. (Article 34)</p> <p>The applicant is proposing screening fencing along the side yards (a 6’ tall solid wood fence already exists between the properties and neighboring lots on either side). The existing fence is old and will be replaced by a new 6’ tall solid wood fence.</p> <p>The new structures have a total square footage of 2,200 sq. ft.; each overnight lodging unit is either 168 sq. ft., or 288 sq. ft.</p> | 7, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 33 |

| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|---------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>for the larger units. The scale, massing and colors of these overnight units are consistent with the neighborhood because of the size, scale and color of the units. The development of these units will not create significant adverse visual impacts</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p> | |
| <p>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</p> | | | X | | <p>No trees are proposed to be removed. There are no rock outcroppings on or adjacent to the site, and there are no historic buildings present on the site.</p> <p>The site has been developed since the 1970s with a single family dwelling, lawn and pavement. The proposed resort would remove 1,100 sq. ft. of pavement which will be replaced with 'grasscrete pavers' in order to allow grass to be grown in between the paver spokes.</p>  <p>Site as Viewed From Highway 20</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p> | 7, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 33 |
| <p>c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?</p> | | | X | | <p>The project site is located in an urbanized area within the Lucerne township. The site is served by public sewer and water, and has significant development in the vicinity.</p> <p>Because the Scenic Combining restrictions do not apply to commercially-zoned properties, the project will not conflict with any applicable zoning regulations or other regulations that apply to a scenic corridor.</p>  <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p> | 7, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 33 |
| <p>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</p> | | | X | | <p>The project has potential to contribute additional light or glare from exterior lighting and windows on the buildings. The applicant has submitted a Lighting Plan that shows fixture details for all exterior lighting. The standard for exterior</p> | 7, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 33 |

| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| | | | | | lighting in Lake County is to meet the lighting recommendations found in 'darksky.org' lighting criteria. The submitted plans for lighting meet the downcast criteria. All lighting shall be downcast and cannot shine into neighboring properties or onto public road. This is a standard condition of approval for all commercial projects. Less Than Significant Impact | |
| II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES <i>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.</i> <i>Would the project:</i> | | | | | | |
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | | | | X | The site is located in an urbanized portion of Lucerne. There are no agricultural uses in proximity to the subject site. No Impact | 5, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 32, 33 |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | | | | X | The immediate vicinity does not contain properties that are actively growing crops or that are in a Williamson Act contract. No Impact | 5, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 32, 33 |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | | | | X | The property is in an urbanized area in Lucerne. There are no timber-producing properties in the vicinity. No Impact | 5, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 32, 33 |
| 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. | 5, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 32, 33 |
| 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 site is located in an urbanized area. There are no agricultural or timber-producing lots in proximity to the subject site. No Impact | 5, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 32, 33 |
| III. AIR QUALITY <i>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.</i> <i>Would the project:</i> | | | | | | |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | | X | | | The project has some potential to result in some air quality impacts (primarily dust) during site preparation for the 9 overnight lodging units and the various site improvements, including the removal of 1,100 sq. ft. of asphalt as proposed. | 1, 8, 16, 17, 18, 21, 23, 24, 26, 30, 32, 33 |

| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>Construction of the project would take an estimated 1 to 2 months to complete.</p> <p>The site plan shows the parking area to be gravel, which would not generate substantive fugitive dust to the area.</p> <p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures added:</p> <p><u>AQ-1:</u> Diesel generators are prohibited during and after construction.</p> <p><u>AQ-2:</u> Construction and/or work practices that involve masonry, gravel, grading activities, vehicular and fugitive dust shall be management by use of water or other acceptable dust palliatives to maintain visibly-moist soil during construction.</p> <p><u>AQ-3:</u> The applicant shall have the primary access and parking areas surfaced with chip seal, asphalt or an equivalent all weather surfacing to reduce fugitive dust generation.</p> <p><u>AQ-4:</u> All areas subject to low use (driveways, overflow parking, etc.) shall be surfaced with gravel. Applicant shall regularly use and/or maintain graveled area to reduce fugitive dust generations.</p> | |
| b)) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under and applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard? | | | X | | <p>The overnight lodging units and the kitchen/lobby are unlikely to generate any significant pollutants following site preparation, and site preparation impacts can be mitigated by using water to prevent dust migration. Water will be used during site preparation as a palliative to minimize dust migration.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p> | 1, 8, 16, 17, 18, 21, 23, 24, 26, 30, 32, 33 |
| c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | | | X | | <p>The potential for dust migration can be significantly reduced with the use of water on the portions of the site that will have building pads prepared. This is a requirement within mitigation measure AQ-2.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p> | 1, 8, 16, 17, 18, 21, 23, 24, 26, 30, 32, 33 |
| d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors or dust) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? | | | X | | <p>The use of water on the site during site preparation to hold the soil in place will significantly reduce dust migration.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p> | 1, 8, 16, 17, 18, 21, 23, 24, 26, 30, 32, 33 |
| 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 | | <p>A Biological Resource Assessment was prepared for this site by Natural Investigations and is dated August 25, 2020. The Assessment concluded that “the great majority of the Property consists of disturbed or converted natural habitat that is now either in ruderal state, paved, or otherwise urbanized with gravel and fill dirt. Soil within this area appears to be fill material that was used to create a level lot above lake level, behind the sea wall. Vegetation within this habitat type consists of native valley oaks (<i>Quercus lobata</i>) mixed with a variety of native and nonnative ornamental species including edible fig (<i>Ficus carica</i>), English walnut (<i>Juglans regia</i>), wild mockorange (<i>Philadelphus lewisii</i>).</p> | 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 26, 31, 32, 33 |

| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
|--------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----------------|
| | | | | | <p>California bay (<i>Umbellularia californica</i>), and blue elderberry (<i>Sambucus nigra</i> ssp. <i>caerulea</i>).</p> <p>The understory is largely barren. This habitat type provides limited resources for wildlife and is utilized primarily by species tolerant of human activities; however, the canopy of the valley oak trees is utilized by a variety of birds. The disturbed and altered condition of these lands greatly reduces their habitat value and ability to sustain rare plants or diverse wildlife assemblages.</p> <p>Critical Habitat and Special-status Habitat No critical habitat for federally-listed species occurs within the Study Area. The Study Area does contain special-status habitats: riparian; and freshwater marsh. The CNDDDB reported no special-status habitats within the Study Area. The CNDDDB reported special-status habitats in a 10-mile radius outside of the Study Area: Clear Lake Drainage Cyprinid/Catostomid Stream; Clear Lake Drainage Seasonal Lakefish Spawning Stream; Coastal and Valley Freshwater Marsh; and Great Valley Mixed Riparian Forest.</p> <p>Listed Species / Special-status Species Observed During Field Survey During the field survey, no special-status species were detected within the Study Area.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures Because special-status species that occur in the vicinity could migrate onto the Study Area between the time that the field survey was completed and the start of construction, the following mitigation measures are included as follows:</p> <p>BIO-1: A pre-construction survey for special-status species shall be performed by a qualified biologist to ensure that special-status species are not present. If any listed species are detected, construction should be delayed, and the appropriate wildlife agency (CDFW and/or USFWS) should be consulted and project impacts and mitigation reassessed.</p> <p>If construction activities would occur during the nesting season (usually March to September), a preconstruction survey for the presence of special-status bird species or any nesting bird species should be conducted by a qualified biologist within 500 feet of proposed construction areas. If active nests are identified in these areas, CDFW and/or USFWS should be consulted to develop measures to avoid “take” of active nests prior to the initiation of any construction activities. Avoidance measures may include establishment of a buffer zone using construction fencing or the postponement of vegetation removal until after the nesting season, or until after a qualified biologist has determined the young have fledged and are independent of the nest site. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, adverse impacts upon special-status bird species and nesting birds would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p>BIO-2: Pier and/or dock replacement shall be coordinated with the Lake County Water Resource Department and the CA Department of Fish and Wildlife; the Lake County Planning Department, and the Lake County</p> | |

| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
|--------------------|---|---|---|---|--|-----------------|
| | | | | | <p>Building Department prior to any construction occurring.</p> <p>BIO-3: All work in Clear Lake shall be done during the 'work window' required by the Department of Fish and Wildlife.</p> <p>BIO-4: No work shall occur within the area identified as 'Tule habitat', and all work performed within Clear Lake shall adhere to the regulations established by the CA. Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, and by the County of Lake.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation measures added</p> | |

| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 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 | | | <p>The Biological Resources Assessment submitted stated in relevant part: "A formal assessment of the Study Area identified 2 -jurisdictional water features: open water (Clear Lake) and a tule marsh. Potential direct adverse impacts to these water resources could occur during construction by modification or destruction of lakebeds or riparian vegetation, or by increased erosion and sedimentation in receiving water bodies due to soil disturbance.</p> <p>"The new dock will require the installation of piers in the water, but the project footprint of the piers is not greater than the existing, dilapidated piers. Existing piers will be removed. Any loss of aquatic habitat will be offset by the areas restored. Implementation of erosion control and silt control measures are required by the encroachment permit; this will ensure that aquatic bed disturbances are minimized. Therefore, no mitigation is required. However, State and federal aquatic permits may be required before working in the lake or lakebed.</p> <p>"During construction of the proposed project, surface water quality has the potential to be degraded from storm water transport of sediment from disturbed soils or by accidental release of hazardous materials or petroleum products from sources such as heavy equipment servicing or refueling. This is a potentially significant impact. However, sediment and erosion control measures will be implemented. The total area of ground disturbance during construction of the project is not likely to exceed 1 acre. If this threshold is exceeded, the project proponent will need to enroll for coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity."</p> <p>The Assessment submitted by the applicant was routed to Water Resources and to the California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife for review. The Dept. of Fish and Wildlife offered the following comments:</p> <p>The Fish and Wildlife Department had no issues with the proposed replacement of the dock and pier if the applicant does:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What they say in their project description 2. They don't modify the tules in any way 3. They don't have any of the docks or pilings go into the existing tules on the property 4. Perform the work during the work window. <p>Mitigation measures have been added to minimize the potential riparian impacts associated with this project and which will reduce the impacts to 'less than significant'.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation measures added</p> | 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 26, 31, 32, 33 |

| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 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 | | According to the Biological Resource Assessment submitted for this project, there are no Federally- or State- protected wetlands on the subject site. The site contains a 4' tall sea wall between the lake and the property, and the applicant has provided erosion control measures to prevent erosion from entering the Clear Lake. Less Than Significant Impact | 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 26, 31, 32, 33 |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | | | X | | The project includes the replacement of the old and deteriorating dock and pier. The materials submitted by the applicant show work being done 'in season' to help minimize the risk to fish in Clear Lake. The Vanderwall Erosion Control plans submitted show measures that will limit or prevent erosion related to site disturbance from entering the Clear Lake through the use of water channeling via straw wattles, which will retain stormwater on site during most rain events. Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation measures added | 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 26, 31, 32, 33 |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | | | X | | According to Section 21083.4 of the California Public Resources Code, if a county determines that there may be a significant effect to oak woodlands, mitigation measures must be put in place in order to alleviate the impact created through the conversion of oak woodlands. There are no mapped conservation easements on this site that might otherwise require a tree replacement plan. Further, the applicant has indicated that no trees would be removed during the development of the site. Less Than Significant Impact | 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 26, 31, 32, 33 |
| 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 | | No special conservation plans have been adopted for this site and no impacts are expected. Less Than Significant Impact | 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 26, 31, 32, 33 |
| 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 Assessment was undertaken by Natural Investigations, Inc., and dated September 2020. According to the Study, Based on the negative findings of the CHRIS and SLF searches, as well as the negative findings of the field survey, there is no indication that the Project will impact any historical resources as defined under CEQA Section 15064.5, unique archaeological resources as defined under CEQA Section 21083.2(g), or known Native American resources. For these reasons, no further cultural resources work is recommended at this time. Mitigation Measures: <u>CUL-1:</u> Should any archaeological, paleontological, or cultural materials be discovered during site development, all activity shall be halted in the vicinity of the find(s), the applicant shall notify the culturally affiliated Tribe, and a qualified archaeologist to evaluate the find(s) and recommend mitigation procedures, if necessary, subject to the approval of the Community Development Director. Should any human remains be encountered, the applicant | 5, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33 |

| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>shall notify the Sheriff's Department, the culturally affiliated Tribe, and a qualified archaeologist for proper internment and Tribal rituals per Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and Health and Safety Code 7050.5.</p> <p>CUL-2: All employees shall be trained in recognizing potentially significant artifacts that may be discovered during ground disturbance. If any artifacts or remains are found, the culturally affiliated Tribe shall immediately be notified; a licensed archaeologist shall be notified, and the Lake County Community Development Director shall be notified of such finds.</p> <p>Potential impacts can be mitigated to 'Less than Significant' with CUL-1 and CUL-2.</p> | |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? | | | X | | <p>The site has been previously disturbed with a residence, grass and asphalt. No traces of historic tribal use of the site were discovered during the on-site evaluation undertaken by Natural Investigations, Inc., and no findings of significance were discovered through the CHRIS data base researched by the surveying archaeologists.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p> | 5, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33 |
| c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | | X | | | <p>According to the prior site development and the cultural assessment performed, it is highly unlikely that any human remains are present on the site. If any are found, they are to be addressed through the requirements of CUL-1 stated above.</p> <p>Can be mitigated to 'Less than Significant' with CUL-1 and CUL-2.</p> | 5, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33 |
| VI. ENERGY <i>Would the project:</i> | | | | | | |
| a) Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources, during project construction or operation? | | | X | | <p>The applicant will use on-grid power for this project. Power demands for each overnight lodging unit are very low; each unit will have several power outlets, an overhead light and fan, and some outdoor lighting along the paths and the units. There are no grid issues in the Lucerne area.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p> | 16, 23, 26, 33 |
| b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? | | | X | | <p>There are no mandates for renewable energy within the Lake County Zoning Ordinance associated this project.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p> | 16, 23, 26, 33 |
| VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS <i>Would the project:</i> | | | | | | |
| <p>a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</p> <p>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist- Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to</p> | | | X | | <p><u>Earthquake Faults</u> There are no mapped earthquake faults on or adjacent to the subject site.</p> <p><u>Seismic Ground Shaking and Seismic-Related Ground Failure, including liquefaction.</u> The site's soil is mapped to be type 124-Cole Variant clay loam. This soil type is generally stable and is not particularly prone to liquefaction.</p> <p><u>Landslides</u> The site is flat, the likelihood of a landslide is remote.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p> | 3, 4, 5, 14, 15,, 16, 17, 18, 23, 25, 26, 29, 30, 32, 33 |

| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 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? | | | X | | <p>Grading activities associated with this project are limited to the removal of 1,100 sq. ft. of asphalt, and preparing 9 building pads for the overnight lodging units – these units are a total of 2,200 sq. ft. in size. The type 124 soil is not overly erosive, and the flat terrain of the site will make erosion and loss of topsoil minimal.</p> <p>Further, the applicant has provided Erosion Control plans that show Best Management Practices to further mitigate any potential stormwater erosion, particularly that would otherwise drain into Clear Lake.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p> | 3, 4, 5, 14, 15,, 16, 17, 18, 23, 25, 26, 29, 30, 32, 33 |
| 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 mapped as 124-Cole Variant clay loam. This very deep, moderately well drained soil is on flood plains. Slope is 0 to 2 percent. The vegetation in areas not cultivated is mainly annual grasses, torbs, and a few scattered oaks.</p> <p>Permeability of this Cole Variant soil is slow. Available water capacity is 8 to 10 inches. Surface runoff is slow, and the hazard of erosion is slight. The shrink-swell potential is high. This soil is subject to rare periods of flooding or ponding during prolonged, high-intensity storms.</p> <p>Some areas are used for homesite development.</p> <p>The main limitations are the slow permeability and the hazard of flooding or ponding.</p> <p>If this unit is used for homesite development, the main limitations are the slow permeability, high shrink-swell potential, low load bearing capacity, and the hazard of flooding.</p> <p>The high shrink-swell potential and the low load bearing capacity of the soil should be considered when designing and constructing foundations, concrete structures, and paved areas. The effects of shrinking and swelling can be reduced by maintaining a constant soil moisture content around the foundation area and by backfilling with material that has low shrink-swell potential.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p> | 3, 4, 5, 14, 15,, 16, 17, 18, 23, 25, 26, 29, 30, 32, 33 |

| 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 | | There is no significant risk to life or property based on the type of development proposed and based on the soil categorization and characteristics. Less Than Significant Impact | 3, 4, 5, 14, 15,, 16, 17, 18, 23, 25, 26, 29, 30, 32, 33 |
| 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 | | The project site will be served through a public sewer line. No Impact | 3, 4, 5, 14, 15,, 16, 17, 18, 23, 25, 26, 29, 30, 32, 33 |
| f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | | | X | | There are no unique paleontological or geologic features on the site according to the Cultural Resources Assessment undertaken for this project. Less Than Significant Impact | 5, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33 |
| 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 | | In general, greenhouse gas emissions from construction activities include the use of construction equipment, trenching, landscaping, haul trucks, delivery vehicles, and stationary equipment (such as generators, if any are used). Given that the project site area is flat and will require very minimal grading, greenhouse gas emissions resulting from construction would be negligible and would not result in a significant impact to the environment. Further, the use of generators is prohibited except during emergency situations such as power outages. Less than Significant Impact | 1, 18, 21, 23, 24, 26, 30, 33 |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | | | | X | This project will not conflict with any adopted plans or policies for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. No Impact | 1, 18, 21, 23, 24, 26, 30, 33 |
| 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 | | The resort will not be storing hazardous materials on site. There may be some fuel brought onto the site for construction activities, however no gasoline or other hazardous materials will be stored on site during and after construction occurs. All equipment shall be maintained and operated in a manner that minimizes any spill or leak of hazardous materials. Hazardous materials and contaminated soil shall be stored, transported, and disposed of consistent with applicable local, state and federal regulations. Less Than Significant Impact | 1, 5, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 26, 29, 30, 31, 33 |
| 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 | | The project does not need any chemicals that might be regarded as hazardous other than standard cleaning supplies. Cleaning supplies will be kept in the main building in a locked and secure custodial closet. Less Than Significant Impact | 1, 5, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 26, 29, 30, 31, 33 |

| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| 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 | The proposed project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. No Impact | 1, 5, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 26, 29, 30, 31, 33 |
| 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 | The project site is not listed as a site containing hazardous materials in the databases maintained by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). No Impact | 1, 5, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 26, 29, 30, 31, 33 |
| 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 | The project is not located within two (2) miles of an airport and/or within an Airport Land Use Plan. No Impact | 8, 16, 18, 22, 23, 26, 33 |
| f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | | | X | | The project would not impair or interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Less Than Significant Impact | 4, 5, 13, 15, 16, 23, 26, 29, 33 |
| g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? | | | | X | The site is located not in a Severe Fire Hazard Area (State Responsibility Area). No Impact | 2, 6, 9, 13, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 29, 33 |
| 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 | | The property will connect to a public water system. The waste discharge resulting from storm water on the site will be able to percolate into the soil based on the small (4,000 sq. ft. ±) footprint of the existing and proposed structures on the 1.5 acre site. Less Than Significant Impact | 4, 6, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 26, 30, 31, 33 |
| b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? | | | X | | The site is served by a public water system. There are no capacity issues associated with this water source in the Lucerne area. Less Than Significant Impact | 4, 6, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 26, 30, 31, 33 |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface | | | X | | The waste discharge resulting from storm water on the site will be able to percolate into the soil based on the small (4,000 sq. ft. ±) footprint of the construction proposed on the 1.5 acre site, combined with the mitigation measures shown on the Erosion Control plan and incorporated herein by reference. The site is flat, and with the mitigation measures proposed, the likelihood of storm-related runoff migrating from the site to neighboring sites or into Clear Lake is extremely limited given the small footprint of the project. Less Than Significant Impact | 4, 6, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 26, 30, 31, 33 |

| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| <p>runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;</p> <p>iii) Create or contribute to runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff;</p> <p>iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?</p> | | | | | | |
| d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? | | | X | | <p>The site is located in a mapped AE flood plain, so all buildings must be secured to the ground, and floors required to be designed in a manner that meets freeboard flood zone requirements. This occurs through the building permit review process. The site is not located in a tsunami or seiche zone.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p> | 4, 6, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 26, 30, 31, 33 |
| e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? | | | X | | <p>There are no water quality control plans adopted that involve this property.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p> | 4, 6, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 26, 30, 31, 33 |
| XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING <i>Would the project:</i> | | | | | | |
| a) Physically divide an established community? | | | | X | <p>The proposed project site would not physically divide an established community.</p> <p>No Impact</p> | 8, 16, 23, 26, 33 |
| 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 | | <p>This project is consistent with the Lake County General Plan, the Shoreline Communities Area Plan and the Lake County Zoning Ordinance. The site is zoned for resort usage, and the scale of the project is appropriate for the 1.5 acre site and the overall area, which is characterized by single-story buildings. The scale and massing of the existing and proposed buildings is single story and consistent with its surroundings. The colors of the proposed buildings are consistent with their surroundings. The zoning is Resort Commercial, and hotels / motels under 16 units are outright permitted uses in this zone.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p> | 8, 16, 23, 26, 33 |
| 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 | <p>The Aggregate Resource Management Plan (ARMP) does not identify this site as having an important source of aggregate.</p> <p>No Impact</p> | 5, 14, 15, 16, 25, 26, 33 |
| 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 | | | | X | <p>Neither the County of Lake's General Plan, the Shoreline Communities Area Plan nor the Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan designates the project site as being a locally important mineral resource recovery site.</p> | 5, 14, 15, 16, 25, 26, 33 |

| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|------------------------|
| plan? | | | | | No Impact | |
| 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 | | | Short-term increases in ambient noise levels to uncomfortable levels could be expected during project grading and/or construction. Mitigation measures will decrease these noise levels to an acceptable level. Less Than Significant with the following mitigation measures incorporated: <u>NOI-1:</u> All construction activities including engine warm-up shall be limited Monday Through Friday, between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. to minimize noise impacts on nearby residents. Back-up beepers shall be adjusted to the lowest allowable levels. This mitigation does not apply to night work. <u>NOI-2:</u> Maximum non-construction related sounds levels shall not exceed levels of 55 dBA between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and 45 dBA between the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. within residential areas as specified within Zoning Ordinance Section 21-41.11 (Table 11.1) at the property lines. | 16, 17, 23, 26, 33 |
| b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | | | X | | The project is not expected to create unusual groundborne vibration due to site development or facility operation. The low level truck traffic during construction and for deliveries would create a minimal amount of groundborne vibration. Less Than Significant Impact | 16, 17, 23, 26, 33 |
| c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | | | | X | The site is not located within the vicinity of a public or private air strip. No Impact | |
| 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 project is not anticipated to induce population growth. Less than Significant Impact | 16, 23, 26, 33 |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | | | X | No housing will be displaced as a result of the project. No Impact | 16, 23, 26, 33 |
| XV. PUBLIC SERVICES <i>Would the project:</i> | | | | | | |
| a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical | | | X | | The project does not propose any new housing or other uses that would necessitate the need for new or altered government | 7, 16, 18, 19, 23, 26, |

| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|----------------------------------|
| 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? | | | | | facilities. The site is served by the Lake County Sheriff's Department, the Northshore Fire District; CalTrans (Highway 20), and Special Districts (sewer and water connections). These public agencies were notified of this project, and no adverse comments were received. Less Than Significant Impact | 33 |
| 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 project will not have any impacts on existing parks or other recreational facilities. No Impact | 16, 23, 26, 33 |
| 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 | This project will not necessitate the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities. No Impact | 16, 23, 26, 33 |
| 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 project site is served by Highway 20, a paved State Highway. This project was routed to CalTrans, who had no adverse comments regarding increased construction, delivery or related trips generated by this project. CalTrans has requested that the northern driveway be shut off to ingress and egress; the applicant has shown this on the plans submitted. Less Than Significant Impact | 7, 8, 13, 16, 18, 23, 26, 29, 33 |
| b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)? | | | X | | The proposed operation would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) subdivision (b) as Lake County is a Rural County and trip lengths can frequently exceed 20 miles per trip to access retail outlets, restaurants, gas stations, et cetera. Less Than Significant Impact | 7, 8, 13, 16, 18, 23, 26, 29, 33 |
| c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | | | X | | No changes to Highway 20 are proposed, nor do any appear to be needed. Approximately 1,100 sq. ft. of interior asphalt will be removed with this project and will be replaced by pavers that allow vegetation to grow between the spokes of the pavers ('Grass-crete'). Less than Significant Impact | 7, 8, 13, 16, 18, 23, 26, 29, 33 |

| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| d) Result in inadequate emergency access? | | | | X | As proposed, this project will not impact any existing emergency accesses. No Impact | 7, 8, 13, 16, 18, 23, 26, 29, 33 |
| 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 site does not contain resources that would be eligible for being listed in the California Register of Historical Resources or are locally significant. Less than Significant Impact | 5, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33 |
| 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 | | | The County has provided mitigation measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 that are prescriptive if any potentially significant artifacts, items or any human remains are discovered during the process of site disturbance. Implementation of CUL-1 and CUL-2 would reduce potential impacts to Less than Significant. | 5, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33 |
| 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 site is served by the nearby public water and sewer system. Power is available to the site via overhead power lines that exist along Highway 20. Storm water drainage can be maintained on site given the flat terrain of the site and the small footprint of the new non-permeable structures (4,000 sq. ft. ±). Less Than Significant Impact | 7, 16, 18, 19, 23, 26, 33 |
| b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years? | | | X | | There are no capacity issues associated with the water supply system that serves this area. Less Than Significant Impact | 7, 16, 18, 19, 23, 26, 33 |
| 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 | | The site is served by a public sewer system. No new septic systems are proposed, nor are they needed. Less Than Significant Impact | 7, 16, 18, 19, 23, 26, 33 |
| d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure? | | | X | | The existing landfill has sufficient capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs for at least the next 4 years according to the Director of the Landfill. Less Than Significant Impact. | 7, 16, 18, 19, 23, 26, 33 |

| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|---|---------------------------|
| e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | | | X | | All requirements related to solid waste will apply to this project. Solid waste disposal is not projected to be excessive. Less Than Significant Impact | 7, 16, 18, 19, 23, 26, 33 |

| 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) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | | | X | | The site is not located in a mapped High Fire area and is on the edge of Clear Lake. The site is positioned in such a way that access into and out of the site is direct from Highway 20. The number of overnight guests will at most be 18 (assuming 2 per room); trips generated in the event of an emergency evacuation would not exceed 19 trips, assuming 2 cars per lodging unit and one employee. Less Than Significant Impact | 2, 6, 9, 13, 16, 17, 23, 26, 29, 33 |
| 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 flat and lacks significant vegetation (fuel load). The site is served by the Northshore Fire District, and is next to Highway 20, which would be the path of travel for fire trucks. There are no obvious factors that would increase the risk of this site to exposing occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire. Less Than Significant Impact | 2, 6, 9, 13, 16, 17, 23, 26, 29, 33 |
| 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 site is already connected to public water. There are no water or sewer capacity issues at this location. The road leading to the site is a fully paved State Highway; no further improvements to this Highway are needed. Less Than Significant Impact | 2, 6, 9, 13, 16, 17, 23, 26, 29, 33 |
| 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 | | There is little chance of risks associated with post-fire slope runoff, instability or drainage changes given the flat terrain of the site and its surroundings. Less Than Significant Impact | 2, 6, 9, 13, 16, 17, 23, 26, 29, 33 |
| XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE | | | | | | |
| a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | | X | | | The project proposes a small resort. As proposed, this project is not anticipated to significantly impact habitat of fish and/or wildlife species or cultural resources with the incorporated mitigation measures pertaining to nesting bird habitats, as described above and based on the Biological Survey that was submitted, and based on the characteristics of the site. Less Than Significant Impact | 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, Cultural / Tribal Resources and Noise. Implementation of and compliance with mitigation measures identified in each section 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 proposed project has potential to result in adverse indirect or direct effects on human beings. In particular, to Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural / Tribal Resources, and Noise have the potential to impact human beings. Implementation of and compliance with mitigation measures identified in each section as conditions of approval would not result in substantial adverse indirect or direct effects on human beings and impacts would be considered less than significant. | All |

* Impact Categories defined by CEQA

REFERENCES

1. Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2014. *Rules and Compliance*, accessed on December 03, 2021 <<https://www.baaqmd.gov/rules-and-compliance>>.
2. Board of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2016. *California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection SRA Fire Safe Regulations*. January 1, 2016.
3. California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey. 2020. *Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation*, accessed December 02, 2021 <<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/>>.
4. California Department of Conservation. 2015. *Landslide Inventory (Beta)*. <<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/lis/app/>>.
5. California Department of Conservation. 2021. *California Geological Society*. <<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/mlc/>>.
6. California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2021.
7. California Department of Transportation. 2015. *Scenic Highways, California State Scenic Highways*. <Highways. <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways>>.
8. California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research. 2018. *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA*. December 2018. <https://opr.ca.gov/docs/20190122-743_Technical_Advisory.pdf>.
9. California Legislative Information. *PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE – PRC DIVISION 4. FORESTS, FORESTRY AND RANGE AND FORAGE LANDS [4001 - 4958]*. <https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=PRC§ionNum=4290>.

10. California State Water Resources Control Board. *GeoTracker Database Search*. <<https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov>>.
11. Vacant
12. Vacant
13. 2020. *Fire Hazard Severity Zones*. <<https://gispublic.co.lake.ca.us/portal/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=e68893fda34e495ab5f053f6a96b305c>>.
14. *Biological Survey prepared by Natural Investigations, Inc., and dated August 25, 2020*.
15. *Known Fault Lines*. <<https://gispublic.co.lake.ca.us/portal/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=98f7705afb0a49aa982be98ea28cca6b>>.
16. *Lake County Parcel Viewer*. <<https://gispublic.co.lake.ca.us/portal/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=87dfc0c535b2478bb67df69d6d319eca>>.
17. *Slope and Terrain Viewer*. <<https://gispublic.co.lake.ca.us/portal/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=de53cdcea0c44a53a2b9f444e729960c>>.
18. *Lake County Zoning Ordinance*. Adopted 1986. Articles 1 through 72, as Amended through October 5, 2021.
19. County of Lake, Environmental Health. 2017. *Hazardous Materials Management (CUPA)*, <www.lakecountycalifornia.gov/Page1670.aspx>.
20. Department of Toxic Substances Control. 2021. Envirostor. <<https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>>.
21. EPA United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2021. Multisystem Search. <<https://enviro.epa.gov/facts/multisystem.html>>.
22. *Advanced Facility Search*; Federal Aviation Administration, ADIP. <<https://adip.faa.gov/agis/public/#/airportSearch/advanced>>.
23. *Lake County General Plan*; Lake County. 2008.
24. *Lake County Air Quality Management District, Rules and Regulations*. Lake County Air Quality Management District. 2006. Latest Update on: August 9, 2006.
25. *Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan*; Lake County Planning Department, Resource Management Division. 1992. November 19, 1992.
26. *Project Description and Supplemental Materials*, received 4-8-2021.
27. *Cultural Resource Assessment*; Natural Investigations, Inc., and dated September, 2020.
28. *Cultural Resource history*; Sonoma State. 2018. Northwest Information Center.
29. *Emergency Operations Plan*; Office of Emergency Services. 2020., *Lake Operation Area*. July 2020.

30. *General Waste Discharge Requirements and Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Waste Associated with Cannabis Cultivation Activities*; State Water Resources Control Board. 2019. *Order WQ 2019-0001-DWQ*, <https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2019/wqo2019_0001_dwg.pdf>.
31. State Water Resources Control Board. 2021. *GEOTRACKER*. <<https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>>.
32. *Soil Survey*; United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. Web. <<https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>>.
33. *Site, Erosion Control and Landscape Plans*; Vanderwall Engineering, site plans received on 4-8-2021; landscape plan received on 2-4-2022. Erosion Control plans received on February 16, 2022.