



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

April 4, 2023

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM INITIAL STUDY (UP 22-12, IS 22-13, DR 22-01)

1. Project Title: Putah Storage
2. Permit Numbers:

Major Use Permit	UP 22-12
Initial Study	IS 22-13
Development Review	DR 22-01
3. Lead Agency Name and Address: County of Lake
Community Development Department
Courthouse, 3rd Floor, 255 North Forbes Street
Lakeport, CA 95453
4. Contact Person: Eric Porter, Associate Planner
(707) 263-2221
5. Project Location(s): 18830 Putah Lane
Middletown, CA 95421
014-500-03
6. Project Name & Address: Andrew Van Norman
18540 Spyglass Road
Hidden Valley Lake, CA 95457
7. General Plan Designation: Service Commercial
8. Zoning: C3-DR-SC, Service Commercial, Development Review,
Scenic Combining
9. Supervisor District: District 1
10. Flood Zone: "X"; small portion in the 2% flood plain (north property)
11. Slope: Flat
12. Fire Hazard Severity Zone: SRA; High Fire Risk
13. Earthquake Fault Zone: None
14. Dam Failure Inundation Area: Not located within Dam Failure Inundation Area
15. Parcel Size: ±5.02 Acres

16. Description of Project:

Major Use Permit for the development of an outdoor rental/storage area for RV's, trailers, vehicles, and equipment; 312 pre-fabricated mini storage units within four buildings; a 12,000 square foot, two (2) story commercial office/service commercial building with 4 individual store front spaces, construction of the necessary on site improvements and ancillary facilities. Each of the four office spaces will have a bathroom, shower and sink. The project is estimated to employ up to 15 people that would be locally hired.

The project will be constructed in phases:

- Phase 1 – Development of the outdoor storage within a secure fenced area.
- Phase 2 – Site preparation and placement of mini storage units.
- Phase 3 - Construction of a 60'x 200'commercial building with 4 rentable floor spaces.
- Phase 4 – Completion of all site improvements

Water

Water for this project would be supplied from an existing permitted groundwater well. A Water Analysis and Drought Management Plan were submitted by the applicant on April 4, 2023. The Water Analysis ("Analysis") was prepared by Northpoint Consulting and is dated March 30, 2023. The Analysis describes the number of employees, the water uses on site (primarily the bathrooms and irrigation), and operating characteristics of the facility, which assumes water demand from the 15 employees seven days per week, 365 days per year, which is deliberately overly-conservative.

The Analysis estimates a total daily water demand of 35 gallons per day per employee (525 daily gallons), which projects to a total of 191,625 gallons per year, or about 0.58 acre-feet per year. The existing well on site is drilled to a depth of 97 feet, and the static water level is about 14.7 feet below ground surface (bgs).

Lake County Pump and Water Services conducted a 4-hour groundwater production test on March 17, 2023. The well produced an average of 27.5 gallons per minute (GPM) over the duration of the test. The Analysis states that the daily demand for water is 0.36 GPM, representing 1.3% of the well's productive capabilities. Total daily demand for water is less than what two single family dwellings average per day – the EPA estimates 300 gallons per day (GPD) for single family dwellings on average.

The Analysis did not evaluate the aquifer, however given the low overall demand of the project and the consistent gallon output combined with the minimal drawdown of the well over the 4 hour test, there is sufficient water available to serve the project without depleting local water supply to other users of the aquifer.

Power

Power for the proposed facility would come from Pacific Gas and Electric (P.G.&E.) service. Although no energy calculations were submitted for this project, the projected demand would be up to 800 amps of total power needed based on similarly-sized projects. There are no grid capacity issues in this location, and on February 17, 2023, PG&E replied via letter that there were no issues serving this project.

FIGURE 1 – VICINITY MAP



Source: Lake County GIS Mapping, 2023

According to the application materials received, this project will employ up to 15 employees. One delivery/pickup per week is estimated following site construction. Hours of operation for the proposed office use would typically be between 8 am and 6 pm Monday through Friday, with deliveries and pickups restricted to 9 am - 7pm Monday through Saturday and Sunday from 12 pm to 5 pm.

Twenty-two (22) parking spaces, including one ADA-compliant parking spaces, are proposed in addition to an open loading zone.

Security

Security for the site includes a 6' tall chain link fence with screening slats, locked gates at the entrance, and a Knox Box to allow emergency services access to the site in the event of an emergency.

A Biological Assessment for the proposed project was conducted by Natural Investigations, Inc. dated July 14, 2022. A Cultural Resource Study for the project was prepared by Flaherty Cultural Resource Services, dated August 11, 2022.

Construction

Construction would occur in four (4) phases over an estimated five year period as follows:

- Phase 1 – Development of the outdoor storage within a secure fenced area.
 - Phase 2 – Site preparation and placement of four buildings containing mini storage units. Building A is 7,161 sf; Buildings B, C and D are each 13,128 sf in size
 - Phase 3 - Construction of a 60'x 200' commercial building with four rentable units.
 - Phase 4 – Completion of all site and landscaping improvements
- Up to 7 employees are projected during construction
 - Up to 15 average daily trips, including deliveries during construction

- All equipment used during construction will be stored in the center of the site on a previously-disturbed area
- Palliatives (water) will be applied to the ground during construction to reduce dust
- Construction is expected to last for 4 to 5 months, and would occur Monday through Saturday, from 7 a.m. to 6 p.m.
- Portable restrooms will be used during construction
- 6,000 cubic yards of material to be removed from the site or brought onto the site for driveway surfacing; the applicant has provided Grading and Drainage Plans for this project that show Best Management Practices during construction.

Probable construction equipment to be used:

- One (1) bulldozer (tracks)
- One (1) dump truck (tires)
- Pickup trucks (tires)
- One (1) skid loader (tires)
- One (1) auger (tires, for fence posts)
- One (1) trencher (tires)

Post – Construction Operations

- Hours of operation will be 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday for the office units, and 24 hours per day / seven days per week for the mini-storage units.
- Up to 10 employees per day would occupy the site
- Trips per day estimated at 360 Average Daily Trips (ADT)
- Chemicals used on site are limited to cleaning supplies, which will be kept in the office building in locked rooms with limited access.
- On-grid power is proposed
- Existing well will be used as a water source, and one (1) 5,000-gallon tank will be installed and reserved for fire suppression if needed

Since, during construction, the project would disturb more than one acre of the site to construct the storage units and the 12,000 sq. ft. office / manufacturing building, the project may be subject to the requirements State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Construction General Permit (CGP). If so, the SWRCB CGP would require the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which documents the stormwater dynamics at the site, the Best Management Practices (BMPs), and water quality protection measures that are used, and the frequency of inspections. BMPs are activities or measures determined to be practical, acceptable to the public, and cost effective in preventing water pollution or reducing the amount of pollution generated by non-point sources. Obtainment of a CGP is also a BPTC Measure for compliance with the SWRCB General Order.

17. Environmental Setting and Existing Conditions:

The Putah Storage project is located at 18830 Putah Lane, Middletown (APN 014-500-03), approximately ¼ mile from the Hidden Valley Lake highway 29 roundabout. The project site is located in the Middletown Planning Area. The site is flat with slopes less than 5%.

FIGURE 3 – ZONING MAP OF SITE AND SURROUNDING AREA



Source: Lake County GIS Parcel Viewer

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

- Lake County Department of Environmental Health
- Lake County Air Quality Management District
- Lake County Department of Public Works
- Lake County Department of Special Districts
- South Lake Fire Protection District
- Department of Motor Vehicles
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
- California Water Resources Control Board
- California Department of Public Health
- California Department of Forestry & Fire Protection (CALFIRE)
- California Department of Transportation (CALTRANS)

20. 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.?

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, per Public Resources Code §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 February 6, 2023. Middletown Rancheria requested consultation on February 10, 2023. On February 17, 2023, County staff requested dates and times for consultation availability, however no response was received. A meeting request was sent to the Middletown Rancheria Tribe on February 17, 2023 along with a consultation agenda, however the meeting was declined by the Tribe. Staff concluded consultation on April 4, 2023 due to non-response by the Tribe.

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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input checked="" 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 checked="" 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.

Prepared By:
Eric Porter, Associate Planner



Date: 4-4-2023

SIGNATURE

Mireya G. Turner, 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

I. AESTHETICS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
Except as provided in Public Resource Code Section 21099, would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2, 3, 4, 9
c) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9
d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9

Discussion:

- a) The General Plan Land Use Zone and Zoning District designation currently assigned to the Project site is Service Commercial (C3), Development Review (DR) and Scenic Combining (SC). The Lake County Zoning Ordinance allows for commercial mini-storage and office uses in the C3 land use zone with a major use permit when the building sizes exceed certain square footages as is the case with this proposal.

The “DR” overlay district requires either design review or development review depending on the size, scale and intensity of the use proposed. In the “C3” zoning district, DR refers to Development Review. Article 20 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance requires Development Review for projects located in the “C3” zoning district.

The “SC” Zoning District does not apply to commercial properties, however some consideration for potential impacts related to project visibility and lighting is considered herein. Lake County requires exterior lighting to comply with ‘darksky.org’ lighting recommendations regardless of the zoning of the property.

The mini storage and office buildings will be visible from Highway 29. The applicant is proposing a 6’ tall chain link fence with slats to help conceal the first 6’ of height of the project. The County is requiring exterior light suppression so that the project does not cause a conflict with the darksky.org exterior lighting in Lake County.

Less than Significant Impact

- b) The site is located at 18830 Highway 29 which is a locally scenic state highway. Article 34 of the Lake County zoning ordinance specifically exempts commercial and industrially-zoned properties from having to comply with most of the scenic corridor regulations primarily related to building height limits for residentially-zoned land. Lighting impacts are addressed further in this section.

There are no scenic resources, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings on or in the vicinity of this property. The Project parcel has a Scenic Corridor (SC) combining zone designation, which does not apply to commercially-zoned properties.

Less than Significant Impact

- c) The overall area is just beyond the more heavily-developed portion of Highway 29 to the north. The setting is somewhat pastoral, however the area (based on zoning) is intended for higher-intensity development such as this proposal. There are no public view corridors that are present on Highway 29 at this location.

Less than Significant Impact

- a) The Project has some potential to create additional light and/or glare through exterior lighting. The proposed use a commercial mini storage and office building. It is probable that people will visit the site after daytime hours to use the mini storage facility. It is likely that exterior lighting will be needed.

The applicant has provided a preliminary lighting plan with their submittal. The exterior lights do not appear to be downcast, and will need to be revised in a manner that complies with the recommended ‘darksky.org’ lighting regulations.

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measure AES-1:

AES-1: All outdoor lighting shall be directed downward onto the Project site and not onto adjacent properties. All lighting fixtures shall comply with the recommendations of www.darksky.org.

FIGURE 4 – VIEW OF SITE FROM HIGHWAY 29



Source: Google Earth Pro, 2023

FIGURE 5 – FACTORY SPECIFICATIONS OF PROPOSED LIGHTING

C-VT-A-SMWL/LGWL Series
 LED Vapor Tights - Wall Mount - Small & Large
 Replaces 100W/120W Incandescent

Small
Large

PRODUCT SPECIFICATIONS

OVERVIEW

- Initial Delivered Lumens: 900 (small), 1,200 (large)
- CRI: ≥ 70
- CCF: Neutral White 4000K
- Mounting: Wall
- Input Power: 14 Watts (small), 22 Watts (large)
- Dimmable: No
- Operating Range: -40°C (-40°F) - 50°C (122°F)
- Lifespan: Estimated 172,000 Hours (small), 118,000 Hours (large)
- Power Factor: > 0.9
- Total Harmonic Distortion: < 20%
- Limited Warranty: 5 Years*
- Replaces 100W Incandescent (small), 120W Incandescent (large)

DURABLE	VERSATILE	RECOMMENDED USE	INPUT VOLTAGE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rugged time-tested design • Sturdy housing and frosted glass globe 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protects against dust & moisture • Even clean light with several mounting options 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cold Storage • Manufacturing • Bridges & Tunnels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 120V Operation

Source: Material Submitted by Applicant

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
Would the project:					
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 13, 39
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13

Discussion:

- a) 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.

According to the California Department of Conversation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program the Project site is mapped as Farmland of Local Importance, however the C3 Service Commercial zoning of the site infers that this land is intended for non-agricultural use such as what is being proposed.

Less Than Significant Impact

- b) The Project site is zoned “C3-DR-SC”, Service Commercial, Development Review, Scenic Combining, which is consistent with its land use designation as Service Commercial as described in the County of Lake General Plan Chapter 3 – Land Use.

According to Lake County GIS mapping, none of the properties in the vicinity are under Williamson Act contracts, nor does the project appear to inhibit or prevent crop production on appropriately-zoned land in the vicinity.

Less Than Significant Impact

- c) Public Resources Code §12220(g) defines “forest land” as land that can support 10% native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits.

Public Resources Code §4526 defines “timberland” as land, other than land owned by the federal government and land designated by the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection as experimental forest land, which is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of a commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees.

Government Code §51104(g) defines “timberland production zone” as an area that has been zoned pursuant to Government Code Section 51112 or 51113 and is devoted to and used for growing and harvesting timber, or for growing and harvesting compatible uses.

The properties in the vicinity of the project site are not timber-producing lots, and the project does not propose a zone change that would rezone forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned for Timberland Production.

No Impact

- d) The Project site and surrounding properties do not contain forest lands, are not zoned for forest lands, nor are they identified as containing forest resources by the General Plan. Because forest land is not present on the Project site or in the immediate vicinity of the Project site, the proposed Project has no potential to result in the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

No Impact

- e) Lands surrounding the Project site consist of privately-owned, mostly developed land with Service Commercial and Heavy Industrial uses on most of the lots. Given the intensity and types of development in the vicinity, the proposed project would have no potential to convert farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use.

No Impact

III. AIR QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
Would the project:					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 21, 24, 31, 36
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 21, 24, 31, 36
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 21, 24, 31, 36
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors or dust) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 21, 24, 31, 36

Discussion:

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.

- a) The Project site is located within the Lake County Air Basin, which is under the jurisdiction of the Lake County Air Quality Management District (LCAQMD). The LCAQMD applies air pollution regulations to all major stationary pollution sources and monitors air quality. The Lake County Air Basin is in attainment with both state and federal air quality standards.

According to the USDA Soil Survey and the ultramafic, ultrabasic, serpentine rock and soils map of Lake County, serpentine soils have not been found within the project site. There are some mapped serpentine soils located across Highway 29 from the project site, however given the site mapping of serpentine soils in the area, this project would pose no threat of asbestos exposure during either the construction phase or the operational phase.

Due to the fact that the Lake County Air Basin is in attainment of both state and federal air quality standards, LCAQMD has not adopted an Air Quality Management Plan, but rather uses its Rules and Regulations to address air quality standards.

Construction impacts are limited to tilling the ground and preparing pads for the new buildings. This would occur over four (4) phases, and is anticipated to last between four and eight months.

Dust and fumes may be released as a result of vehicular traffic, including small delivery vehicles. Given the lack of slope on the site, the grading proposed would be minor in scale, and water must be applied to the ground during ground disturbance. Additionally, implementation of mitigation measures below would further reduce air quality impacts to less than significant.

Less Than Significant Impact

- b) The Project area is in the Lake County Air Basin, which is designated as in attainment for state and federal air quality standards for criteria pollutants (CO, SO₂, NO_x, O₃, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, VOC, ROG, Pb). Any project with daily emissions that exceed any of the thresholds of significance for these criteria pollutants should be considered as having an individually and cumulatively significant impact on both a direct and cumulative basis.

The application materials submitted indicate that near-term construction activities and long-term operational activities would not exceed any of the thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants. Lake County has adopted Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) thresholds of significance as a basis for determining the significance of air quality and greenhouse gas impacts. Using the California Emissions Estimator Model, air emissions modeling performed for this Project, in both the construction phase and the operational phase, will not generate significant quantities of ozone or particulate matter and does not exceed the Project-level thresholds. CO₂ emissions are addressed in the Greenhouse Gas section of this document.

Less Than Significant Impact

- c) Sensitive receptors (i.e., children, senior citizens, and acutely or chronically ill people) are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than the general population. Land uses that are considered sensitive receptors typically include residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, hospitals, convalescent homes, and retirement homes.

There are no schools, parks, childcare centers, convalescent homes, or retirement homes located in proximity to the Project site. The neighboring uses are primarily high intensity commercial and industrial uses such as tow yards, manufacturing and a U-Haul rental company.

There is some risk of airborne particulates during and after construction. The following mitigation measures will help bring these potential impacts to 'less than significant' levels:

AQ-1: Prior to obtaining the necessary permits and/or approvals for any phase, applicant shall contact the Lake County Air Quality Management District (LCAQMD) and obtain an Authority to Construct (A/C) permit for all operations and for any diesel-powered equipment and/or other equipment with potential for air emissions. Or provide proof that a permit is not needed.

AQ-2: All mobile diesel equipment used must be in compliance with state registration requirements. Portable and stationary diesel-powered equipment must meet all federal, state, and local requirements, including the requirements of the State Air Toxic Control Measures for compression ignition engines. Additionally, all engines must notify LCAQMD prior to beginning construction activities and prior to engine use.

AQ-3: The applicant shall maintain records of all hazardous or toxic materials used, including a Material Safety Data Sheet (MSDS) for all volatile organic compounds utilized, including cleaning materials. Said information shall be made available upon request and/or the ability to provide the LCAQMD such information in order to complete an updated Air Toxic emission Inventory.

AQ-4: 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. The use of white rock as a road base or surface material for travel routes and/or parking areas is prohibited.

AQ-5: All areas subject to infrequent use of driveways, overflow parking, etc., shall be surfaced with gravel, chip seal, asphalt, or an equivalent all weather surfacing. Applicant shall regularly use and/or maintain graveled area to reduce fugitive dust generations.

AQ-6: Palliatives such as water shall be applied to the site during all ground disturbance to minimize construction-related dust from spreading to other sites in the vicinity.

Less than Significant Impact with mitigation measures added

- d) The proposed project includes four (4) mini storage pods consisting of individual storage units, and one (1) 12,000 sf. office / manufacturing building containing four (4) 3,000 sq. ft. units intended for manufacturing and office use.

The proposed project would generate minimal amounts of carbon dioxide from vehicular traffic associated with customer use. Additionally, Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-6 would reduce impacts of dust generation from on-site roads and parking areas during and after construction.

Less than Significant Impact

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2, 5, 11, 12, 13, 16, 24, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 21, 24, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	13
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 13
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6

Discussion:

- a) Biological Resources Assessment (BA) was prepared by Natural Investigations Company and is dated July 14, 2022. The field survey for the BA resulted in the biologist stating that there are no sensitive species on the site. The Assessment in relevant part stated (Assessment, page 10):

The Project Areas are located in pasture habitat, which will be impacted by project implementation. Special-status plants have a low potential to occur in this heavily disturbed habitat.

A botanical survey was performed during our site survey. No special-status plants were observed within the Project Area. No special-status animal species have a moderate or high potential to occur in Project Areas. No special-status animals were observed within the Project Area. No direct impacts to special-status animals are expected from implementation of the proposed project. No direct impacts to listed species or special-status species are expected from implementation of the proposed project.

The Assessment made no recommendations for biological mitigation measures related to potential habitat modifications.

Less than Significant Impact

- b) According to the Lake County General Plan Chapter 9.1 Biological Resources, “the County should ensure the protection of environmentally sensitive wildlife and plant life, including those species designated as rare, threatened, and/or endangered by State and/or Federal government,” and upon review of the biological report on the parcel, it was determined that no substantial adverse effect will result to any sensitive species from the project.

Less Than Significant Impact

- c) According to the Biological Resources Assessment (BA), there are no wetlands and vernal pools or other isolated wetlands on the project site. Therefore, project implementation would not directly impact any wetlands.

Less Than Significant Impact

- d) The Biological Resources Assessment (BA) stated that no specific wildlife corridors exist within or near the Study Area.

Implementation of the Project will not 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.

Less than Significant Impact

The project does not propose to remove any trees. There are no mapped sensitive species on the site. Implementation of the Project does not conflict with any county or municipal policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

Less than Significant Impact

- e) The site contains no trees, so no Tree Conservation Plans are in place on the site. The applicant will plant new evergreen trees according to the Landscape Plan submitted for this project.

No Impact

- f) No special conservation plans have been adopted for this site and no impacts are anticipated.

No Impact

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
Would the project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14c, 15
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, 15

- c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? 1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, 15

Discussion:

- a) A Cultural Resources Report (CRR) for the proposed project was completed by Flaherty Cultural Resource Services to identify potentially significant cultural resources that may exist on site. Also, the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records search was completed by the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) on February 2023, and the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) returned the results of the Sacred Lands File (SLF) to the County.

On February 6, 2023, the County sent project information letters to the tribes offering consultation if any tribe chose to consult with the County. Middletown Rancheria requested consultation on February 10, 2023. Staff requested dates and times when consultation could occur, and sent an agenda and meeting request to the Tribe on February 17, 2023. The meeting request was declined by the Tribe. Staff contacted the Historic Preservation Officer on April 4, 2023 to follow up. The THPO for the Tribe, Michael Rivera, requested a discussion with the property owner to arrange a site visit. County staff contacted the applicant via email to inform him that that the Tribe wanted to visit the site.

The Flaherty Archaeological Survey yielded negative results following the site visit by the archaeologist. The author stated on page 1 of the survey that “(n)o cultural resources were discovered within the project boundaries.” The Tribal THPO however stated that there were sensitive tribal areas near the site, and their was potential for tribal items, relics and other items of significance on site.

The survey also stated that “... the possibility of buried or obscured cultural resources does exist.” The survey recommended that the County apply mitigation measures in case there were potentially significant relics, artifacts or otherwise that might be of Tribal significance. This is particularly important in Lake County, which is rich in Tribal culture and heritage.

Therefore, the County puts mitigation measures protecting potential tribally-sensitive sites from ground disturbance as a common practice.

Less than Significant Impacts with Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 incorporated:

CUL-1: 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 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.

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 findings.

- b) A California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records search was completed by the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) to determine if the Project would affect archaeological resources. The record search found that there are no known or mapped significant archaeological resources on this site.

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2

- c) The Project site does not contain a cemetery and no known formal cemeteries are located within the immediate site vicinity. In the event that human remains are discovered on the Project site, the Project would be required to comply with the applicable provisions of Health and Safety Code §7050.5, Public Resources Code §5097 et. seq. and CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(e). California Health and Safety Code §7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Pursuant to California Public Resources Code §5097.98(b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made by the Coroner.

If the Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the California Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted and the Native American Heritage Commission must then immediately notify the “most likely descendant(s)” of receiving notification of the discovery. The most likely descendant(s) shall then make recommendations within 48 hours, and engage in consultations concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code §5097.98. Mandatory compliance with these requirements would ensure that potential impacts associated with the accidental discovery of human remains would be reinterred in a respectful manner by the culturally-affiliated Tribe.

Less than Significant Impacts with Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2

VI. ENERGY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
Would the project:					
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resource, during construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5

Discussion:

- a) Onsite electricity will be supplied by on-grid power. It is probable that four (4) 200 amp services will be needed. There are some grid capacity issues in the Hidden Valley Lake vicinity, however PG&E was notified of this project and based on a letter received from them on February 17, 2023, they had no adverse comments and did not indicate that the site could not be served by on-grid power.

Staff estimates that a total of 800 amps will be needed; 400 amps for the manufacturing building and 400 amps for the storage units, site lighting and other power uses on site.

Less than Significant Impact

- b) Major use permit applications must describe each project's anticipated operational energy needs, identify the source of energy supplied for the project and the anticipated amount of energy per day, and explain whether the project will require an increase in energy demand and the need for additional energy resources.

As stated above, staff has estimated that this project will need a total of four (4) 200 amp services of 'on-grid' power. While there have been grid capacity issues in the Hidden Valley Lake area in the past, this specific area does not have a history of being at- or over-capacity for PG&E power.

Less than Significant Impact

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------	---------------

Would the project:

- a) Directly or indirectly cause potentially substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
 - i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special. Publication 42.
 - ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
 - iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
 - iv) Landslides?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 18, 19
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 19, 21, 24, 25, 30
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 18, 21
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5, 7, 39
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2, 4, 5, 7, 13, 39
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 14, 15

Discussion:

- a) The Project site is not located on a mapped earthquake fault, but is located in a seismically active area of California and is expected to experience moderate to severe ground shaking during the lifetime of the Project. That risk is not considered substantially different than that of other similar properties and projects in California.

Earthquake Faults (i)

According to the USGS Earthquake Faults map available on the Lake County GIS Portal, there are no earthquake faults within two (2) miles of the subject site. Because there are no known faults located on or near the Project site, there is no potential for the Project site to rupture during a seismic event. Thus, no rupture of a known earthquake fault is anticipated and the proposed Project would not expose people or structures to an adverse effects related rupture of a known earthquake fault as no structures for human occupancy are being proposed.

Less Than Significant Impact

Seismic Ground Shaking (ii) and Seismic-Related Ground Failure, including liquefaction (iii)

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. All proposed construction is required to be built under Current Seismic Safety Construction Standards, and no large structures are proposed on this project site.

Less Than Significant Impact

Landslides (iv)

The project site is flat with slopes less than 5%. There are no risks of landslides on the parcel due to the lack of slopes on site combined with the soil type (233) located on the entire site, which is relatively stable and not prone to landslides. According to the Landslide Hazard Identification Map prepared by the California Department of Conservation's Division of Mines and Geology, the area is considered generally stable.

As such, the site is not likely to expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects involving landslides, including losses, injuries or death.

Less Than Significant Impact

- b) The movement of approximately 6,000 cubic yards of earth is proposed to prepare the project site for development. The project involves tilling the soil to prepare for building pads and parking, and importing gravel for surfacing interior access aisles and parking areas. According to the material submitted for this project, including an engineered Grading and Erosion Control Plan, this would not involve any adverse effects on the potential for erosion or the loss of topsoil. The applicant will need to obtain a grading a building permit from the Lake County Community Development Department prior to construction, and potential impacts related to grading are assessed in this environmental review document.

Less Than Significant Impacts with Mitigation Measures GEO-1 through GEO-4:

GEO-1: Prior to any ground disturbance for building construction, the permittee shall submit erosion control and sediment plans to the Water Resource Department and the Community Development Department for review and approval. Said erosion control and sediment plans shall protect the local watershed from runoff pollution through the implementation of appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) in accordance with the Grading Ordinance. Typical BMPs include the placement of straw, mulch, seeding, straw wattles, silt fencing, and the planting of native vegetation on all disturbed areas. No silt, sediment, or other materials exceeding natural background levels shall be allowed to flow from the project area. The natural background level is the level of erosion that currently occurs from the area in a natural, undisturbed state. Vegetative cover and water bars shall be used as permanent erosion control after project installation.

GEO-2: Excavation, filling, vegetation clearing, or other disturbance of the soil shall not occur between October 15 and April 15 unless authorized by the Community Development Department Director. The actual dates of this defined grading period may be adjusted according to weather and soil conditions at the discretion of the Community Development Director.

GEO-3: The permit holder shall monitor the site during the rainy season (October 15 – May 15), including post-installation, application of BMPs, erosion control maintenance, and other improvements as needed.

GEO-4: A Grading Permit is required as part of this project. The project design shall incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to the maximum extent practicable to prevent or reduce the discharge of all construction or post-construction pollutants into the County storm drainage system. BMPs typically include scheduling of activities, erosion and sediment control, operation and maintenance procedures, and other measures in accordance with Chapters 29 and 30 of the Lake County Code.

- c) The primary geologic unit or soil type where the proposed Project site is situated is Type 233 – Still loam, stratified substratum. This very deep, well drained soil is on alluvial plains. Available water capacity is 7.5 to 10.0 inches. Surface runoff is very slow, and the hazard of erosion is slight. Some areas adjacent to stream channels are subject to rare periods of flooding. This unit is used mainly for orchards, vineyards, and hay and pasture. It is also used for homesite development, leaving staff to conclude that the proposed use is appropriate for this site.

Less Than Significant Impact

- d) The Uniform Building Code is a set of rules that specify standards for structures. All structures proposed require a building permit. All new construction proposed requiring a building permit is subject to the Uniform Building Code and California Building Code for foundation design to meet the requirements associated with publicly-accessible commercial buildings.

Less Than Significant Impact

- e) The proposed project will be served by public-use restrooms in certain buildings. ADA restrooms are required in commercial developments such as this one. Comments from the Lake County Environmental Health Division state that this site will need to coordinate all proposed septic systems with the Environmental Health Department for Lake County.

Less Than Significant Impact

- f) The project site does not contain any known unique geologic feature or paleontological resources. Disturbance of these resources is not anticipated.

Less than Significant Impact

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
Would the project:					
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 36
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 36

Discussion:

- a) The Project consists of a 5.02 acre parcel of land that would contain four significant buildings, each being over 12,000 sf. in size. The information submitted by the applicant shows that 360 average daily vehicle trips are projected once the ‘office’ units are leased. However, staff’s estimate of daily trips is closer to 100 daily trips following construction,

and between 10 and 20 daily trips during construction.

The project site is located within the Lake County Air Basin, which is under the jurisdiction of the Lake County Air Quality Management District (LCAQMD). The LCAQMD applies air pollution regulations to all major stationary pollution sources and monitors countywide air quality.

The Lake County Air Basin is in attainment for all air pollutants with a high air quality level, and therefore the LCAQMD has not adopted thresholds of significance for Greenhouse Gase (GHG) emissions. In the interim, emissions estimates have been calculated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) and compared with thresholds defined by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD).

The BAAQMD threshold for GHGe (including CO₂, CH₄, N₂O, HFCs, PFCs, SF₆) for projects other than stationary sources (power generating plants, mining sites, petroleum facilities, chemical plants, etc.) that are not under a GHG Reduction Plan is 1,100 metric tons of CO₂ per year.

The EPA estimates CO₂ emissions to be 404 grams of emissions per vehicle mile per vehicle. The applicant's estimate of 360 daily trips (and presumed average of 15 daily trips during construction) must estimate travel average travel (commute) distances between populated areas and the mini-storage / office complex. The nearest populated areas are Hidden Valley Lakes (about ¾ mile away), and Lower Lake (about 2 miles away). Assuming that 50% of the users of the facility come from these communities, and the remainder come from Middletown (about 8 miles away) or from elsewhere, the average distance traveled by these vehicles would be about 5 miles per car / van / pickup truck. With each vehicle emitting an average of 404 grams of CO₂ per mile, this would result in 360 trips x 5 miles x 404 grams of emissions per day. This would result in 727,200 grams of emissions per day, or about 0.73 tons of emissions per day, or about 266 tons of emissions per year based on the applicant's trip projections. Staff's trip projections however would yield about 1/3 of the applicant's projected daily trips.

The BAAQMD threshold for significant in terms of particulate emissions is 1,100 tons of emissions per project. According to the applicant's projected trips, it will take this project about 5 years to meet this threshold based on the applicant's vehicle projections and the assumptions included herein, and about 15 years for the project to meet the 'per project' threshold based on staff's projected Average Daily Trip estimate.

While the amount is greater than most typical projects in Lake County, the amount is less than the BAAQMD threshold for 'significance'.

Less than Significant Impact

- b) For purposes of this analysis, the Project was evaluated against the following applicable plans, policies, and regulations:
- The Lake County General Plan
 - The Lake County Air Quality Management District
 - AB 32 Climate Change Scoping Plan
 - AB 1346 Air Pollution: Small Off-Road Equipment

Policy HS-3.6 of the Lake County General Plan on Regional Agency Review of Development Proposals states that the County shall solicit and consider comments from local and regional agencies on proposed projects that may affect regional air quality. The County shall continue to submit development proposals to the Lake County Air Quality Management District for review and comment, in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) prior to consideration by the County. The proposed Project was sent out for review from the LCAQMD and the only concern was restricting the use of an onsite generator to emergency situations only. The applicant has not indicated that generators will be used under any circumstances.

The Lake County Air Basin is in attainment for all air pollutants with a high air quality level, and therefore the LCAQMD has not adopted an Air Quality Management Plan, but rather uses its rules and regulations for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. The proposed Project does not conflict with any existing LCAQMD rules or regulations and would therefore have no impact at this time.

On October 9, 2021, AB 1346 Air Pollution: Small Off-Road Equipment (SORE) was passed, which will require the state board, by July 1, 2022, consistent with federal law, to adopt cost-effective and technologically feasible regulations to prohibit engine exhaust and evaporative emissions from new small off-road engines, as defined by the state board. The bill would require the state board to identify and, to the extent feasible, make available funding for commercial rebates or similar incentive funding as part of any updates to existing applicable funding program guidelines to local air pollution control districts and air quality management districts to implement to support the transition to zero-emission small off-road equipment operations, and the applicant should be aware of and expected to make a transition away from SOREs by the required future date.

Less than Significant Impact

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
Would the project:					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5, 13, 21, 24, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5, 13, 21, 24, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 5

- | | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| d) | Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 2, 40 |
| e) | For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1, 3, 4, 5,
20, 22 |
| f) | Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1, 3, 4, 5,
20, 22, 35,
37 |
| g) | Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1, 3, 4, 5,
20, 35, 37 |

- a) Commercial storage prohibits storage of flammable and potentially dangerous materials such as gasoline, pesticides, fertilizers, alcohol due to fire and emission hazards. According to the material submitted for the proposed Project, all potentially harmful chemicals would be prohibited from being stored on site. The office building and storage units would use cleaners when needed; these will be kept in a locked and secured building with limited access by anyone other than employees.

The project will comply with Section 41.7 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance that specifies that all uses involving the use or storage of combustible, explosive, caustic, or otherwise hazardous materials shall comply with all applicable local, state, and federal safety standards and shall be provided with adequate safety devices against the hazard of fire and explosion, and adequate firefighting and fire suppression equipment.

The Lake County Division of Environmental Health, which acts as the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for Hazardous Materials Management, has been consulted about the project and the project is required to address Hazardous Material Management in the Property Management Plan, which has been reviewed by the Lead Agency to ensure the contents are current and adequate.

A spill containment and cleanup kit will be kept on site in the unlikely event of a spill. All employees involved in construction are presumed to be trained to properly use all equipment. Proposed site activities would not generate any additional hazardous waste.

All construction 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 in accordance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations.

Less Than Significant Impact

- b) The Project states that all chemicals, primarily cleaning supplies, will be stored in a secure, stormproof structure. Flood risk at the Project site is minimal and according to Lake County GIS Portal data and the Project is not located in or near an identified earthquake fault zone. Fire hazard risks on the Project site are mapped as “High”, and a 5,000 gallon water tank used exclusively for fire suppression if needed will be kept on site.

The project site does not contain any identified areas of serpentine soils or ultramafic rock, and risk of asbestos exposure during construction is minimal, although there are mapped serpentine soils located across Highway 29 from the subject site. The site preparation would require some construction equipment and would last for about four to six months. All equipment staging shall occur on previously disturbed areas on the site.

A spill kit would be kept on site in the unlikely event of a spill of hazardous materials. 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

- c) There are no schools located within one-quarter mile of the proposed Project site. The nearest school is the Coyote Valley Elementary School, which is located approximately one mile north of the project site.

No Impact

- d) The California Environmental Protection Agency (CALEPA) has the responsibility for compiling information about sites that may contain hazardous materials, such as hazardous waste facilities, solid waste facilities where hazardous materials have been reported, leaking underground storage tanks and other sites where hazardous materials have been detected. Hazardous materials include all flammable, reactive, corrosive, or toxic substances that pose potential harm to the public or environment.

The following databases compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 were checked for known hazardous materials contamination within one mile of the project site:

- The SWRCB GeoTracker database
- The Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor database
- The SWRCB list of solid waste disposal sites with waste constituents above hazardous waste levels outside the waste management unit.

The Project site is not listed in any of these databases as a site containing hazardous materials as described above.

No Impact

- e) The Project site is located approximately 15 miles from Lampson Field, administered by the Lake County Airport Land Use Commission, which has not adopted an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. In accordance with regional Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans, the site would not be located within an area of influence for the airport. Therefore, there will be no hazard for people working on site from Lampson Field.

No Impact

- f) Access to the Project site is Putah Lane, which is a 20' wide well-maintained gravel road at this location, and which is in compliance with California Public Resources Code §4290. The Project site does not contain any emergency facilities nor does it serve as an emergency evacuation route or is located adjacent to an emergency evacuation route. During long-term operation, adequate access for emergency vehicles via Putah Lane and connecting to Highway 29 will be available. Furthermore, the Project would not result in a substantial alteration to the design or capacity of any public road that would impair or interfere with the implementation of evacuation procedures, and improvements to Putah Lane on the project site are proposed. Because the Project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan, impacts are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Less than Significant Impact

- g) The Project site sits between an area of high fire risk. Reducing fuel by allowing the proposed development would reduce potential risk of wildfire. Additionally, the project proposes one 5,000 gallon tank for emergency use in the event of a wildfire.

The applicant would adhere to all federal, state, and local fire requirements and regulations for setbacks and defensible space required for any new buildings that require a building permit. All proposed construction will comply with current State of California Building Code construction standards. The applicant will be required to obtain a building permit with Lake County for conformance with local and state building codes and fire safety requirements.

Less than Significant Impact

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
Would the project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 29, 30
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 29, 30
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:					
i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 15, 18, 29, 32
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;					
iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or					

planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or

iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| d) In any flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 23, 32 |
| e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 29 |

Discussion:

- a) The Project parcel has no stream crossings or watercourses. The applicant has provided an engineered Drainage and Erosion Control plan with the submitted materials. The Plan proposes Best Management Practices during site disturbance (construction) for the four new buildings in order to retain stormwater on site and to prevent water migration onto other sites. There are two stormwater retention areas on site is also shown on the plans that have been engineered for a 10 year rain event.

Less Than Significant Impact

- b) Due to the existing exceptional drought conditions, on July 27, 2021, the Lake County Board of Supervisors passed an Urgency Ordinance (Ordinance 3106) requiring land use applicants to provide enhanced water analysis during a declared drought emergency. Ordinance 3106 requires that all project that require a CEQA analysis of water use include the following items in a Hydrology Report prepared by a licensed professional experienced in water resources:
- Approximate amount of water available for the project's identified water source,
 - Approximate recharge rate for the project's identified water source, and
 - Cumulative impact of water use to surrounding areas due to the project

Water for this project would be supplied from an existing permitted groundwater well. A Water Analysis and Drought Management Plan were submitted by the applicant on April 4, 2023. The Water Analysis ("Analysis") was prepared by Northpoint Consulting and is dated March 30, 2023. The Analysis describes the number of employees, the water uses on site (primarily the bathrooms and irrigation), and operating characteristics of the facility, which assumes water demand from the 15 employees seven days per week, 365 days per year, which is deliberately overly-conservative.

The Analysis estimates a total daily water demand of 35 gallons per day per employee (525 daily gallons), which projects to a total of 191,625 gallons per year, or about 0.58 acre-feet per year. The existing well on site is drilled to a depth of 97 feet, and the static water level is about 14.7 feet below ground surface (bgs).

Lake County Pump and Water Services conducted a 4-hour groundwater production test on March 17, 2023. The well produced an average of 27.5 gallons per minute (GPM) over the duration of the test. The Analysis states that the daily demand for water is 0.36 GPM,

representing 1.3% of the well's productive capabilities. Total daily demand for water is less than what two single family dwellings average per day – the EPA estimates 300 gallons per day (GPD) for single family dwellings on average.

The Analysis did not evaluate the aquifer, however given the low overall demand of the project and the consistent gallon output combined with the minimal drawdown of the well over the 4 hour test, there is sufficient water available to serve the project without depleting local water supply to other users of the aquifer.

Less Than Significant Impact

- c) The applicant has submitted a Storm Water Management Plan (Sheet no. SW0) with the intent of regulating stormwater on site. The Plan shows two stormwater retention areas, and proposes measures for Best Management Practices on site during site disturbance consisting primarily of straw wattles to channel stormwater into the retention areas. The management plan was engineered for a 10 year storm event, and was prepared by a licensed Civil Engineer.

As the locations of soil disturbance change, erosion and sedimentation controls should be adjusted accordingly to control stormwater runoff at the downgrade perimeter and drain inlets. Mitigation measures to be implemented include stabilizing disturbed soils with temporary erosion control or with permanent erosion control as soon as possible after grading or construction is completed, and establishing temporary or permanent erosion control measures prior to rain events. Typical Best Management Practices include the placement of straw, mulch, seeding, straw wattles, silt fencing, and planting of native vegetation on certain disturbed areas to prevent erosion.

Due to the proposed erosion control measures, the Project i) will not result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or off-site; ii) will not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or offsite; iii) will not 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; and iv) will not impede or redirect flood flows.

Less than Significant Impact

- d) The project site is not located in an area of potential inundation by seiche or tsunamis. The project site is designated to be in Flood Zone X with a small portion located in the 2% risk for flooding area, which is not regarded as being a significant flood risk. Soil (Type 233) at the project site is relatively stable, with a minimal potential to induce mudflows due to the soil composition and the lack of slope on the site.

Less than Significant Impact

- e) Lake County Ordinance 3106, passed by the Board of Supervisors on July 27, 2021, depicts how the applicant proposes to reduce water use during a declared drought emergency and ensures both the success and decreased impacts to surrounding areas. The project also proposes water metering and conservation measures as part of the standard operating procedures, and these measures will be followed whether or not the region remains in a drought emergency.

As part of the project's standard operational procedures, the project proposes to implement ongoing water monitoring and conservation measures that would reduce the overall use of water. These measures are included in the Water Use Management Plan (Section 15.2) as required by Ordinance No. 3106. On-going water conservation measures include:

- No surface water diversion
- The selection of plant varieties that are suitable for the climate of the region
- The use of driplines and drip emitters rather than spray irrigation
- Covering drip lines with straw mulch or similar materials to reduce evaporation
- Using water application rates modified from data obtained from soil moisture meters and weather monitoring
- Utilizing shutoff valves on hoses and water pipes
- Daily visual inspections of irrigation systems
- Immediate repair of leaking or malfunctioning equipment

Less Than Significant Impact

XI. LAND USE PLANNING	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
Would the project:					
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 20, 21, 22, 27

Discussion:

- a) The project site consists of 5.02 acres of undeveloped land in the Middletown Planning Area. The closest community growth boundary accessible by road is Hidden Valley Lake, which is approximately 3/4 miles away, while the Lower Lake community growth boundary is approximately 2 miles away. Putah Road terminates on the subject site, and likely will not be extended in the near future. The project will not divide an established community.

No Impact

- b) The General Plan Land Use Zone and Zoning District designation currently assigned to the Project site is Service Commercial (C3), Development Review and Scenic Combining (SC). The Lake County Zoning Ordinance allows mini storages and offices / manufacturing uses with a major use permit.

Less than Significant Impact

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
Would the project:					
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 26
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 26

Discussion:

- a) The Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan does not identify the portion of the Project parcel planned for development as having an important source of aggregate resources. There are no known mineral resources on the project site.

No Impact

- b) According to the California Geological Survey's Aggregate Availability Map, the Project site is not within the vicinity of a site being used for aggregate production. In addition, the site not delineated on the County of Lake's General Plan, the Middletown Area Plan nor the Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan as a mineral resource site. Therefore, the project has no potential to result in the loss of availability of a local mineral resource recovery site.

No Impact

XIII. NOISE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
Would the project:					
a) Result in the generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 13
b) Result in the generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 13

- c) Result in the generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels? 1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, 15

Discussion:

- a) According to Article 41.11, Table 11, noise related to construction and machinery related to operations are allowed to be 60 dB during the hours of 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. in commercially-zoned properties, and night decibel levels are allowed to be up to 55 dB. All noise levels are measured at the property lines.

Construction-related noise is not expected to be significant. Construction equipment will include bulldozer(s), dump truck(s), augers and trenchers. None of these vehicles will cause groundborne vibrations, and no activities are necessary that might cause groundborne vibrations or noise.

The proposed office / mini storage uses will not have noise-producing components, so no excessive project-related noise is anticipated.

Less than Significant Impact

- b) Under existing conditions, there are no known sources of ground-borne vibration or noise that affect the Project site such as railroad lines or truck routes. The construction equipment that will be used will not result in ground vibrations. The Project would not create any exposure to substantial ground-borne vibration or noise.

The Project is not expected to employ any pile driving, rock blasting, or rock crushing equipment during construction activities, which are the primary sources of ground-borne noise and vibration during construction. As such, impacts from ground-borne vibration and noise during near-term construction would be less than significant.

Less Than Significant Impact

- c) The Project site is located approximately 15 miles from Lampson Field, administered by the Lake County Airport Land Use Commission, which has not adopted an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

No Impact

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------	---------------

Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for 1, 3, 4, 5

example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? 1, 3, 4, 5

Discussion:

- a) The Project is not anticipated to induce significant population growth to the area. The increased employment will be up to five (5) employees to be hired locally.

No Impact

- b) The Project is not proposing housing, and the site is presently vacant. No increase in population related to this project is likely to occur.

No Impact

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------	---------------

Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 29, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37 |
| 1) Fire Protection? | | | | | |
| 2) Police Protection? | | | | | |
| 3) Schools? | | | | | |
| 4) Parks? | | | | | |
| 5) Other Public Facilities? | | | | | |

Discussion:

- 1) Fire Protection
 The South Lake Fire Protection District provides fire protection services to the proposed Project site. Development of the proposed Project would impact fire protection services by increasing the demand on existing County Fire District resources. To offset the increased demand for fire protection services, the proposed Project would be conditioned to provide a minimum of fire safety and support fire suppression activities and installations, including compliance with State and local fire codes, as well as a 5,000 gallon water tank for water supply reserves for emergency fire use.

2) Police Protection

The Project site falls under the jurisdiction of the Lake County Sheriff's Department and is easily reached by law enforcement due to its location near a populated area. The project provides characteristics that enable on-site security; this includes 1) placing a 6' tall chain link screening fence around the mini storage units as a physical barrier to secure the perimeter access and all points of entry; 2) installing a security alarm system to notify and record incident(s) where physical barriers have been breached; and 3) maintaining the premises such that visibility and security monitoring of the premises is possible. Accidents or crime emergency incidents during operation are expected to be infrequent and minor in nature.

3) Schools

The proposed Project does not involve population increases, and is not expected to significantly increase the population in the local area or place greater demand on the existing public school system by generating additional students.

4) Parks

The proposed Project will not increase the use of existing public park facilities and would not require the modification of existing parks or modification of new park facilities offsite.

5) Other Public Facilities

As the owners and operators currently reside in Lake County, and the small staff will be hired locally, and no impacts are expected.

Less than Significant Impact to Public Services.

XVI. RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
Would the project:					
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5

Discussion:

- a) As the owners and operators currently reside in Lake County, and the small staff will be hired locally, there will be no increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities.

No Impact

- b) The proposed Project does not include any recreational facilities and will not require the construction or expansion of existing recreational facilities.

No Impact

XVII. TRANSPORTATION	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
Would the project:					
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 20, 22, 27, 28, 35
b) For a land use project, would the project conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(1)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 20, 22, 27, 28, 35
c) For a transportation project, would the project conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(2)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 20, 22, 27, 28, 35
d) Substantially increase hazards due to geometric design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 20, 22, 27, 28, 35
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 20, 22, 27, 28, 35

Discussion:

a) Roadway Analysis

The project is located approximately ¾ miles south of Hidden Valley Lake on Putah Road, a flat dirt driveway terminating into a cul-de-sac at the project's entrance. Vehicles traveling to the site will use Putah Lane to California State Highway 29.

The Project site is situated on the south end of Putah Lane, which is classified as a local road. The access driveway off of Putah Lane is approximately 20 feet wide, meeting California Public Resource Code 4290 (PRC 4290) road standards for fire equipment access, and the road and site are flat, making turn-arounds for emergency vehicles simple to install.

The proposed Project does not conflict with any existing program plan, ordinance or policy addressing roadway circulation, including the Lake County General Plan Chapter 6 – Transportation and Circulation.

Less Than Significant Impact

Bicycle Lane and Pedestrian Path Analysis

The proposed Project does not conflict with any existing program plan, ordinance or policy addressing bicycle and/or pedestrian issues, including Chapter 6 of the General Plan.

Less than Significant Impact

- b) State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b) states that for land use projects, transportation impacts are to be measured by evaluating the proposed Project's vehicle miles traveled (VMT), as follows:

“Vehicle miles traveled exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact. Generally, projects within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop or a stop along an existing high quality transit corridor should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. Projects that decrease vehicle miles traveled in the project area compared to existing conditions should be presumed to have a less than significant transportation impact.”

To date, the County has not yet formally adopted its transportation significance thresholds or its transportation impact analysis procedures. As a result, the project-related VMT impacts were assessed based on guidelines described by the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) in the publication *Transportation Impacts (SB 743) CEQA Guidelines Update and Technical Advisory*, 2018. The OPR Technical Advisory identifies several criteria that may be used to identify certain types of projects that are unlikely to have a significant VMT impact and can be “screened” from further analysis. One of these screening criteria pertains to small projects, which OPR defines as those generating fewer than 110 new vehicle trips per day on average. OPR specifies that VMT should be based on a typical weekday and averaged over the course of the year to take into consideration seasonal fluctuations. The estimated trips per day for the proposed Project are between 20 to 40 during construction, and up to 360 trips per day during operation.

The facility will operate 24 hours per day. The estimated am and pm peak hour trips are 12% and 16% of the average daily trip total, or 42 a.m. peak hour trips between 7:00 and 9:00 a.m., and 56 p.m. peak hour trips between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m. Although these trips exceed the recommended level of significance, the roads serving the project including Putah Lane and Highway 29 next to the site are not at capacity, and the increase in trips is not regarded as significant based on comments received by CalTrans and Public Works.

Less than Significant Impact

- c) The Project is not a transportation project. The proposed use will not conflict with and/or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(2).

No Impact

- d) The Project does not propose any changes to road alignment or other features, does not result in the introduction of any obstacles, nor does it involve incompatible uses that could increase traffic hazards. Putah Lane will be improved leading into the site to assure PRC 4290 and 4291 compliance. The following mitigation measure is required for this project:

TRANS-1: Prior to operation, the applicant shall improve Putah Lane within 50' of the site in a manner that meets Public Resource Code (PRC) 4290 and 4291 commercial driveway standards. Further, the County Department of Public Works may require at its discretion improvements to Putah Lane adjacent to the site in a manner that the driveway approach meet County public road standards leading into the site.

Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation measure added.

- e) The proposed Project would not alter the physical configuration of the existing roadway network serving the area, and will have no effect on access to local streets or adjacent uses (including access for emergency vehicles). Internal gates and roadways will meet CALFIRE requirements for vehicle access according to PRC §4290, including adequate width requirements. Furthermore, as noted above under impact discussion (a), increased project-related operational traffic would be minimal. The proposed Project would not inhibit the ability of local roadways to continue to accommodate emergency response and evacuation activities. The proposed project would not interfere with the City's adopted emergency response plan.

Less Than Significant Impact

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
<p>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:</p>					
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, 15
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, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the +resource to a California Native American tribe?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, 15

Discussion:

- a) A Cultural Resources Report (CRR) for the proposed project was completed by Flaherty Cultural Resource Services to identify potentially significant cultural resources. A California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records search was completed by the Northwest Information Center (NWIC), and the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) returned the results of the Sacred Lands File (SLF) search. Finally, Flaherty conducted an intensive pedestrian survey within the Project Area on August 2, 2022, which turned up no evidence of historic tribal use of the site.

The CHRIS records search indicates that one prior study has been conducted within the Project Area, and one additional report has been completed outside the Project Area but within a 0.25-mile radius. No cultural resources have been previously recorded within the Project Area, though four resources have been recorded within 0.25 miles. These resources are all prehistoric in age and include one lithic scatter and three isolated artifacts. The SLF search returned positive results for Native American cultural resources within the Project vicinity. The NAHC provided a list of five tribes to be contacted for more information on these resources. No responses to our requests for information were received from the tribes listed by the NAHC. No cultural resources of any kind were identified during the field survey.

Based on the negative findings of the CHRIS search, field survey, and outreach efforts with local tribes, there is no indication that the Project will impact any historical or archaeological resources as defined under CEQA Section 15064.5 or tribal cultural resources as defined under Public Resources Code Section 21074. It is possible, but unlikely, that significant artifacts or human remains could be discovered during Project construction. If, however, significant artifacts or human remains of any type are encountered it is recommended that the Project sponsor contact the culturally affiliated tribe and a qualified archaeologist to assess the situation. The Sheriff’s Department must also be contacted if any human remains are encountered.

Notification of the project was sent to local tribes on February 6, 2023. Middletown Rancheria requested consultation on February 17, 2023. The County attempted to reach out to the Tribe and received no response until April 4, 2023, when the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer contacted staff via phone call. Staff then contacted the applicant to coordinate a site visit between the Tribe’s THPO and the applicant. The site visit is expected to occur within two weeks of today’s date.

In response to the Cultural Resources Report and the California Historical Resources Information System records search, both of which indicate no presence of tribal cultural resources on the Project site, the lead agency has determined that, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, no resources pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1 will be affected by the proposed Project. With mitigation measures CUL-1 and CUL-2, the impact will be less than significant.

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2

- b) In response to the Cultural Resources Report and the California Historical Resources Information System records search, both of which indicate no presence of tribal cultural resources on the Project site, the lead agency has determined that, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, no resources pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1 will be affected by the proposed Project. With mitigation measures CUL-1 and CUL-2, the impact will be less than significant.

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2

XIX. UTILITIES

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------	---------------

Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1, 3, 4, 5,
29, 32, 33,
34, 37 |
| b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1, 2, 3, 5,
6, 22, 31 |
| c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1, 2, 3, 5,
6, 22 |
| d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1, 2, 3, 5,
6, 35, 36 |
| e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1, 2, 3, 5,
6, 35, 36 |

Discussion:

- a) The proposed Project will be served by an existing onsite groundwater well and on-grid power located adjacent to the site for all project-related energy and water demands. The site will be served by restrooms and on-site septic systems.

The Project will not require or result in the relocation of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects

Less than Significant Impact

- b) The subject parcel is served by an existing permitted groundwater well.

Less than Significant Impact

- c) The project is required to coordinate with Lake County Environmental Health Department on the installation of any new septic systems, which will occur during building permit evaluation. The 5.02 acre site is large enough to accommodate new septic systems, and the soil on the site is permeable in a manner that will enable septic systems to be installed and safely used without potential for failing due to soil structure.

Less than Significant Impact

- d) The existing landfill has sufficient capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

Waste bins will consist of dumpsters with lids that will be located adjacent to each of the three mini-storage buildings and will be emptied weekly by South Lake Refuse. Recyclables will be separated from solid waste and stored in bins on site for weekly pickup by South Lake Refuse. Waste will be hauled to Clear Lake landfill by South Lake Refuse.

The project would not generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure.

Less than Significant

- e) The project will be in compliance with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Less than Significant

XX. WILDFIRE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:					
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 23, 25, 28, 29
b) Would the project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 23, 25, 28, 29
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 21, 23, 32

Discussion:

- a) The project will not further impair an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. The applicant will adhere to all regulation of California Code Regulations Title 14, Division 1.5, Chapter 7, Subchapter 2, and Article 1 through 5 shall apply to this project; and all regulations of California Building Code, Chapter 7A, Section 701A, 701A.3.2.A.

In February 2023, Lake County Planning Division staff conducted a PRC 4290 and 4291 site inspection and determined that the project parcel is compliant with 4290 requirements based on the physical characteristics of Putah Lane, the access point to the site.

Less Than Significant Impact

- b) The Project site is situated in a high fire risk hazard zone that had burned during the 2016 Valley Fire. The project site does not further exacerbate the risk of wildfire, or the overall effect of pollutant concentrations on area residents in the event of a wildfire; the site is flat, and is easily accessible by emergency response vehicles. A 5,000 gallon water tank will be reserved for emergency services use, and will have connectors that will enable fire service providers to connect hoses to the water tank for emergency use. The site will be surfaced with asphalt or gravel in a manner that will allow 75,000 pound emergency vehicles to access the site. The Project would improve fire access and the ability to fight fires at or from the Project site and other sites accessed from the same road through the upkeep of the property area and the installation of a PRC §4290-compliant water tank.

Less than Significant Impact

- c) The proposed Project, as described in the application documents and confirmed through site visits to the property, would not exacerbate fire risk through the installation of maintenance of associated infrastructure. The proposed Project will require maintenance to meet and/or maintain roadway and driveway standards. A 5,000 gallon steel or fiberglass fire suppression water tank will be located at the project site.

Less than Significant Impact

- d) There is little chance of increased risks associated with post-fire slope runoff, instability, or drainage changes based on the lack of slope on the Project parcel and on the stormwater mitigation measures proposed by the applicant.

Less than Significant Impact

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ALL
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ALL

projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

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

Discussion:

- a) According to the biological and cultural studies conducted, the Putah Storage project does not have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, 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 when mitigation measures are implemented.

With the implementation of mitigation measures described in the material submitted by the applicant that shows Best Management Practices to mitigate on-site stormwater impacts and other mitigation measures described throughout this initial study, the potential impact on the subject site and neighboring sites will be reduced to less than significant.

- b) Potentially significant impacts have been identified related to Aesthetics, Air Quality, Cultural and Tribal Resources, Geology and Soils and Transportation. 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.

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 any cumulatively considerable environmental impacts.

- c) The proposed project has the potential to result in adverse indirect or direct effects on human beings. In particular, Aesthetics, Air Quality, Geology/Soils, Cultural and Tribal Resources and Transportation 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.

Source List

1. Lake County General Plan
2. Lake County GIS Database
3. Lake County Zoning Ordinance
4. Middletown Area Plan
5. Putah Storage Application – Major Use Permit (UP 22-12)
6. U.S.G.S. Topographic Maps
7. U.S.D.A. Lake County Soil Survey
8. Lake County Important Farmland Map, California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program

9. Department of Transportation's Scenic Highway Mapping Program, (<https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways>)
10. Lake County Serpentine Soil Mapping
11. California Natural Diversity Database (<https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB>)
12. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory
13. Biological Resources Assessment for Putah Storage, prepared by Natural Investigations Company, July 14, 2022.
14. Cultural Resources Assessment for the Putah Storage project, prepared by Flaherty Cultural Resource Services, dated August 11, 2022.
15. California Historical Resource Information Systems (CHRIS); Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University; Rohnert Park, CA.
16. Water Resources Division, Lake County Department of Public Works Wetlands Mapping.
17. U.S.G.S. Geologic Map and Structure Sections of the Clear Lake Volcanic, Northern California, Miscellaneous Investigation Series, 1995
18. Official Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone maps for Lake County
19. 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
20. Lake County Emergency Management Plan
21. Lake County Hazardous Waste Management Plan, adopted 1989
22. Lake County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, adopted 1992
23. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection - Fire Hazard Mapping
24. National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)
25. FEMA Flood Hazard Maps
26. Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan
27. Lake County Bicycle Plan
28. Lake County Transit for Bus Routes
29. Lake County Environmental Health Division
30. Lake County Grading Ordinance
31. Lake County Natural Hazard database
32. Lake County Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan and Siting Element, 1996
33. Lake County Water Resources
34. Lake County Waste Management Department
35. California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
36. Lake County Air Quality Management District website
37. South Lake Fire Protection District
38. Site Visit – February 8, 2023
39. United States Department of Agriculture – Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey
40. Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List,
41. State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)
42. Lake County Groundwater Management Plan, March 31st, 2006.
43. Lake County Rules and Regulations (LCF) for On-Site Sewage Disposal
44. Lake County Municipal Code: Sanitary Disposal of Sewage (Chapter 9: Health and Sanitation, Article III)