

DRAFT INITIAL STUDY and ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

FOR

LAKEPORT EVA BRIDGE PROJECT

November 2023

**Lead Agency:
City of Lakeport**



Lead Agency Contact:
Victor Fernandez, Associate Planner
City of Lakeport
225 Park Street, Lakeport, California 95453
(707) 263-5615

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PROJECT SUMMARY	1
II. LOCATION AND PROJECT SETTING	3
III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION	3
IV. ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS	3
V. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED	3
DETERMINATION:	5

FIGURES AND APPENDICES

Figure 1: Location Map

Figure 2: Site Plan

Appendix A: Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP)

Appendix B: CalEEMod Output Files

Appendix C: Biological Resources Assessment

I. PROJECT SUMMARY

Date: November 2023

Project Title: Lakeport EVA Bridge Project

Lead Agency: City of Lakeport

Contact: Victor Fernandez, Associate Planner
City of Lakeport
225 Park Street, Lakeport, California 95453
(707) 263-5615

Applicant: Hailey Del Grande
Danco Communities
5251 Ericson Way, STE A
Arcata, CA 95521

Location: The proposed Lakeport EVA Bridge Project (Project) site is in the central-west portion of the City of Lakeport, linking Craig Avenue and Wrigley Street via a bridge. The Project site covers approximately 1-acre. The Project site is bordered by commercial storage units to the north, disturbed grassland and commercial businesses to the east, fallowed agricultural land to the south, and riparian forest and oak woodland to the west.

Coastal Zone: No

Affected Parcel(s): 025-441-43

City of Lakeport General Plan Land Use Designation: Residential

City of Lakeport Zoning Designation: R-1, Low-Density Residential

Anticipated Permits and Approvals:

- 1) City of Lakeport approval of the Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration
- 2) City of Lakeport Environmental Review Permit

Tribal Cultural Resources:

On September 20, 2023, in response to request for notification of projects pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 (Public Resources Code 21073, 21074, 21080.3.1, 21080.3.2, 21082.3, 21083.09, 21084.2, and 5097.94), the City of Lakeport provided notification and provided 30-days to request consultation to the Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians and Big Valley Band of Pomo Indians regarding the Lakeport EVA Bridge Project

(proposed project). As of the date of this Initial Study, no requests for consultation have been received from the Native community regarding the project.

CEQA Requirement:

The proposed project is subject to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Lead Agency is the City of Lakeport. The purpose of this Initial Study (IS) is to provide a basis for determining whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or a Negative Declaration. This IS is intended to satisfy the requirements of the CEQA (Public Resources Code, Div. 13, Sec. 21000-21177) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sec 15000-15387).

CEQA encourages lead agencies and applicants to modify their projects to avoid significant adverse impacts (CEQA Section 20180(c)(2) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15070(b) (2)).

Section 15063(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines states that an IS shall contain the following information in brief form:

- 1) A description of the project including the project location
- 2) Identification of the environmental setting
- 3) Identification of environmental effects by use of a checklist, matrix, or other method, provided that entries on a checklist or other form are briefly explained to provide evidence to support the entries
- 4) Discussion of means to mitigate significant effects identified, if any
- 5) Examination of whether the project would be consistent with existing zoning, plans, and other applicable land use controls
- 6) The name of the person or persons who prepared and/or participated in the Initial Study

II. LOCATION AND PROJECT SETTING

The proposed Lakeport EVA Bridge Project (Project) site is in the central-west portion of the City of Lakeport, linking Craig Avenue and Wrigley Street via a bridge across Forbes Creek. The Project site is located on APN 025-441-43 across approximately 1-acre.

The parcel currently supports riparian forest, fallowed agricultural land, and disturbed grassland. The Project site is bordered by commercial storage units to the north, disturbed grassland and commercial businesses to the east, fallowed agricultural land to the south, and riparian forest and oak woodland to the west.

III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project applicant proposes to construct an emergency vehicle access (EVA) bridge across Forbes Creek in Lakeport, Lake County, California. The proposed EVA bridge project (Project) involves construction on an approximately 1-acre parcel, which will link Wrigley Street to the south with Craig Avenue to the north.

The proposed bridge crossing Forbes creek is intended for emergency vehicle access only. At the existing end of Wrigley street a 12' wide gravel access road will be constructed that will lead to the proposed bridge crossing of Forbes Creek. The 12' wide gravel road will continue from the bridge and connect into Craig Ave and gates or removable bollards will be installed to prevent non-emergency vehicles from accessing the creek crossing. The bridge structure will be 12' clear width with crash rated vehicle barrier railings. The bridge will be constructed of steel with either steel decking or concrete decking and the bridge will clear span the channel so that no work is necessary inside of the creek channel itself. The proposed bridge will sit on concrete abutments located a min of 5' beyond the top of the creek bank. It is anticipated that the abutments will either be drilled piers or spread footings. The bridge will be designed to HS20-44 load rating per AASHTO standards and will be designed so that the bottom of the bridge is a minimum of 1' above the 100-year stream flow elevation.

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

An environmental checklist follows this section and addresses all potential adverse effects resulting from the proposed project. No significant adverse effects are expected from any of the proposed activities.

V. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a **"Potentially Significant Impact"** or **"Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated"** as indicated by the checklists on the following pages.

	Aesthetics		Agriculture and Forestry Resources	X	Air Quality
X	Biological Resources	X	Cultural Resources		Energy
X	Geology/Soils		Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Hazards & Hazardous Materials
	Hydrology/Water Quality		Land Use/Planning		Mineral Resources
X	Noise		Population/Housing		Public Services
	Recreation		Transportation/Traffic		Tribal Cultural Resources
	Utilities/Service Systems		Wildfire		Mandatory Findings of Significance

An explanation for all checklist responses is included, and all answers consider the whole action involved and the following types of impacts: off-site and on-site; cumulative and project-level; indirect and direct; and construction and operational. The explanation of each issue identifies (a) the threshold of significance, if any, used to evaluate each question; and (b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance. All mitigation measures required for the project are provided in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) (see Appendix A).

In the checklist the following definitions are used:

"Potentially Significant Impact" means there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant.

"Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" means the incorporation of one or more mitigation measures can reduce the effect from potentially significant to a less than significant level.

"Less Than Significant Impact" means that the effect is less than significant, and no mitigation is necessary to reduce the impact to a lesser level.

"No Impact" means that the effect does not apply to the proposed project, or clearly will not impact nor be impacted by the proposed project.

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency on the basis of this initial evaluation)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>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.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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.</p>

Signature

Date

Victor Fernandez, Associate Planner
Name and Title

I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Thresholds of Significance: The project would have a significant effect on aesthetics if it would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway; substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings (if the project is in a non-urbanized area) or conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality (if the project is in an urbanized area); or create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

DISCUSSION

The Project site is bordered by commercial storage units to the north, disturbed grassland and commercial businesses to the east, fallowed agricultural land to the south, and riparian forest and oak woodland to the west. Land area in the project vicinity is designated as Residential, High Density Residential, or Open Space Parkland under the City of Lakeport General Plan, with the land directly southwest being outside the City of Lakeport's City Limit Boundary.^{1,2} The Project will involve construction activities on an approximately 1-acre parcel that currently supports riparian forest, fallowed agricultural land, and disturbed grassland. There are no General Plan designated scenic viewpoints in the Project area.

¹ City of Lakeport General Plan Map. <https://www.cityoflakeport.com/Planning/General%20Plan%20Map.pdf>. Accessed August 2023.

² City of Lakeport, Lakeport Zoning Map. <https://www.cityoflakeport.com/Planning/Lakeport%20Zoning%20Map.pdf>. Accessed August 2023.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

I.a-b) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project site is not located within a City- or County-mapped or designated scenic vista or within a scenic resources area. Review of view corridors for the City of Lakeport defines those views that need protecting are those views of Clear Lake and Mount Konocti to the east. The Project consists of construction of a roadway bridge across Forbes Creek, so would not impact those view corridors. The Project will not substantially damage scenic resources within a State scenic highway. The Project site is located approximately 0.2 miles west of State Route 29 which is designated as an Eligible State scenic highway but is not a Designated scenic highway.³ Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact.

I.c) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project development would consist of installing a prefabricated bridge structure across Forbes Creek, linking Wrigley Street to the south with Craig Avenue to the north. No building structures are proposed as part of the Project. The development will be consistent with the City of Lakeport Development Standards. The proposed Project does not conflict with any local zoning regulations and would not detract from the scenic quality of the area; therefore, the Project would have less than significant impact.

I.d) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project may include street lighting associated with the bridge roadway. Nighttime lighting is necessary to provide and maintain safe, secure, and attractive environments. The City of Lakeport encourages incorporation of those principals identified by the Dark Sky Association, that reduces light pollution. The City has developed conditions of approval that implement those dark sky principles, that include reduction of offsite glare as well as requiring all outdoor lighting be downlit. With the implementation of that standard lighting condition, the Project would not have substantial light or glare that would affect day or nighttime views in the area. Therefore the impacts will be less than significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation required.

FINDINGS

The proposed project would have a **Less Than Significant Impact** on Aesthetics.

³ Caltrans California State Scenic Highway System Map.
<https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aaca>. Accessed August 2023.

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

Thresholds of Significance: The project would have a significant effect on agriculture and forestry resources if it would convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (hereafter “farmland”), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural uses; conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract; conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), timberland (as defined by PRC section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)); Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; or 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 forestland to non-forest use.

DISCUSSION

The Project will involve construction on an approximately 1-acre parcel located in the western portion of City of Lakeport, within Lake County. The Project site is bisected by Forbes Creek, and currently supports riparian forest, fallowed agricultural land, and disturbed grassland.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

II.a-e) No Impact. Under the California Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), the Project site consists of Farmland of Local Importance and Urban and Built-Up Land, with no portion of the Site under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the Project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. No portion of the Site is designated, zoned, or utilized for agricultural or forestry use, so the Project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production, no impact would occur.

The Project consists of roadway bridge construction, linking Craig Avenue and Wrigley Street. The bridge development will not affect the Creek or surrounding riparian areas. Additionally, the Project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use, as the Project area is not designated or zoned as timberland or forest land. The Project would not involve other changes in the existing environment or result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use. No impact would occur as a result of Project implementation.

MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation required.

FINDINGS

The proposed project would have a **No Impact** on Agricultural and Forestry Resources.

III. AIR QUALITY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Thresholds of Significance: The project would have a significant effect on air quality if it would conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans; result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable

federal or state ambient air quality standard; expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people.

DISCUSSION

The approximately 1-acre Project site is within the City of Lakeport. The Project will involve installing a bridge across Forbes Creek, linking Wrigley Street and Craig Avenue. The bridge will be assembled off-site. Bridge footings will be drilled into the ground and constructed outside of the top of bank. A crane will be used to place the prefabricated bridge on the footings.

The California Emissions Estimator (CalEEMod) ver. 2020.4.0 was used to estimate emissions of the Project. The following discussion and impact analysis are directly referencing this report. Modeling results are provided in Table 1 and the CalEEMod output files are provided in Appendix B.

Environmental Setting

The City of Lakeport lies within the Lake County Air Basin and the Lake County Air Quality Management District (LCAQMD) on the western shore of Clear Lake. Summers are typically warm and dry, with an average annual high temperature of 94 degrees Fahrenheit. Winters are cool and wet, with an average annual low temperature of 30 degrees Fahrenheit. The prevailing wind is westerly, with occasional strong gusty winds in winter. During autumn and winter, nighttime radiational cooling between storm periods often leads to formation of inversions and ground fog, especially in canyon basins near Lakeport. Inversions occur in conjunction with masses of very stable air, which tend to not move vertically and can become trapped in the lower and sheltered areas. Considerable air stagnation can occur if the inversion condition continues for several days. The inversion may persist until the onset of a Pacific storm. More intense heating at the surface in spring will generally initiate convection and good ventilation. In summer, region wide elevated inversions may be present, restricting the layer in which mixing and dilution of surface air may occur.

Criteria Air Pollutants

The Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA) establishes the framework for modern air pollution control. The FCAA, enacted in 1970 and amended in 1990, directs the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to establish ambient air quality standards. These standards are divided into primary and secondary standards. The primary standards are set to protect human health, and the secondary standards are set to protect environmental values, such as plant and animal life. The FCAA requires the EPA to set National Ambient Air Quality Standards for the six criteria air pollutants. These pollutants include particulate matter (PM), ground-level ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur oxides, nitrogen oxides, and lead.

Air Quality Standards

The Clean Air Act requires states to develop a general plan to attain and maintain the standards in all areas of the country and a specific plan to attain the standards for each area designated nonattainment. These plans, known as State Implementation Plans or SIPs, are developed by state and local air quality management agencies and submitted to EPA for approval.

The SIP for the State of California is administered by the CARB, which has overall responsibility for statewide air quality maintenance and air pollution prevention. California's SIP incorporates individual federal attainment plans for each regional air district. SIPs are prepared by the regional air district and sent to CARB to be approved and incorporated into the California SIP. Federal attainment plans include the technical foundation for understanding air quality (e.g., emission inventories and air quality monitoring), control measures and strategies, and enforcement mechanisms.

The CARB also administers the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) for the 10 air pollutants designated in the California Clean Air Act. The 10 state air pollutants include the six federal criteria pollutant standards listed above as well as visibility-reducing particulates, hydrogen sulfide, sulfates, and vinyl chloride. The federal and state ambient air quality standards are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: California and National Ambient Air Quality Standards

Pollutant	Averaging Time	California Standards	National Standards	
		Concentration	Primary	Secondary
Ozone	1 Hour	0.09 ppm (180 µg/m ³)	— (Footnote 1)	—
	8 Hour	0.070 ppm (137 µg/m ³)	0.070 ppm (137 µg/m ³)	Same as Primary Standard
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM10)	24 Hour	50 µg/m ³	150 µg/m ³	Same as Primary Standard
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	20 µg/m ³	—	
Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5)	24 Hour	—	35 µg/m ³	Same as Primary Standard
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	12 µg/m ³	12 µg/m ³	
Carbon Monoxide	1 Hour	20 ppm (23 mg/m ³)	35 ppm (40 mg/m ³)	—
	8 Hour	9.0 ppm (10 mg/m ³)	9 ppm (10 mg/m ³)	—
Nitrogen Dioxide	1 Hour	0.18 ppm (339 µg/m ³)	0.100 ppm (188 µg/m ³)	—
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	0.030 ppm (57 µg/m ³)	0.053 ppm (100 µg/m ³)	Same as Primary Standard
Sulfur Dioxide	1 Hour	0.25 ppm (655 µg/m ³)	0.075 ppm (196 µg/m ³)	—
	24 Hour	0.04 ppm (105 µg/m ³)	0.14 ppm (365 µg/m ³)	—
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	—	0.030 ppm (80 µg/m ³)	—
Lead	30-Day Average	1.5 µg/m ³	—	—
	Calendar Quarter	—	1.5 µg/m ³	—

Pollutant	Averaging Time	California Standards	National Standards	
		Concentration	Primary	Secondary
	Rolling 3-Month Average	—	0.15 µg/m ³	Same as Primary Standard
Visibility-Reducing Particles	8 Hour	See Footnote 2	No National Standards	
Sulfates	24 Hour	25 µg/m ³		
Hydrogen Sulfide	1 Hour	0.03 ppm (42 µg/m ³)		
Vinyl Chloride	24 Hour	0.01 ppm (26 µg/m ³)		
Notes: 1 - The national 1-hour ozone standard was revoked by U.S. EPA on June 15, 2005. 2 - Statewide VRP Standard (except Lake Tahoe Air Basin): Particles in sufficient amount to produce an extinction coefficient of 0.23 per kilometer when the relative humidity is less than 70 percent. This standard is intended to limit the frequency and severity of visibility impairment due to regional haze and is equivalent to a 10-mile nominal visual range. µg/m ³ = micrograms per cubic meter mg/m ³ = milligrams per cubic meter ppm = parts per million CARB = California Air Resources Board Source: Air Quality Standards and Attainment Status, Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). Website: https://www.baaqmd.gov/about-air-quality/research-and-data/air-quality-standards-and-attainment-status . Accessed August 2023.				

Federal and state air quality laws require identification of areas not meeting the ambient air quality standards. These areas must develop regional air quality plans to eventually attain the standards. Under both federal and state Clean Air Act, the Lake County Air Basin is in attainment for all ambient air quality standards; therefore, the LCAQMD has not been required to develop any regional air quality plans.^{4,5}

The City of Lakeport has not established specific CEQA significance thresholds. Where available guidance provided by the applicable air district can be used to make significance determinations for the CEQA questions listed above; however, LCAQMD does not provide published thresholds for use by lead agencies in Lake County.

The primary pollutants of concern during project construction and operation are ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Ozone is a secondary pollutant that can be formed miles away from the source of emissions through reactions of ROG and NO_x emissions in the presence of sunlight. Therefore, ROG and NO_x are termed ozone precursors. Although the LCAB is currently in attainment of all state and federal air quality standards, if the Project emits a substantial quantity of ozone precursors, the Project may contribute to an

⁴ Lake County Air Quality Management District. 2021. Lake County Air Quality Management District, Lake County, California Official Website. Website: <https://www.lcaqmd.net/>. Accessed August 2023.

⁵ City of Lakeport. 2008. Draft Environmental Impact Report. Website: <https://www.cityoflakeport.com/Planning/Draft%20EIR%20General%20Plan%20Update/Draft-EIR---General-Plan-Update---City-o-116200865514PM.pdf>. Accessed August 2023.

exceedance of the ozone standard. PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} were also addressed, as substantial project emissions may contribute to an exceedance for these pollutants as well.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

III.a) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project will involve installing a bridge across Forbes Creek, linking Wrigley Street and Craig Avenue. The bridge will be assembled off-site. Bridge footings will be drilled into the ground and constructed outside of the top of bank. A crane will be used to place the prefabricated bridge on the footings. Federal and state air quality laws require identification of areas not meeting the ambient air quality standards. These areas must develop regional air quality plans to eventually attain these standards. Under both federal and state Clean Air Act, the Lake County Air Basin is in attainment for all ambient air quality standards; therefore, the LCAQMD has not been required to develop any regional air quality plans.⁶⁷⁸ A key purpose of the LCAQMD is to enforce local, state, and federal air quality laws, rules and regulations in order to meet the Ambient Air Quality Standards and protect the public from air toxics through regulation. Projects that comply with applicable rules and regulations would not conflict or obstruct LCAQMD's ability to remain in attainment with air quality standards. There are currently no applicable air quality plans in the Lake County Air Basin for the proposed Project to conflict with. Thus, the impact is considered less than significant.

III.b) Less Than Significant Impacts with Mitigation Incorporation. Since the LCAQMD has no project-level thresholds of significance for the LCAB, thresholds of significance from the BAAQMD will be used for this analysis.

In developing thresholds of significance for air pollutants, the BAAQMD considered the emission levels for which a project's individual emissions would be cumulatively considerable. If a project exceeds the identified significance thresholds, its emissions would be cumulatively considerable, resulting in significant adverse air quality impacts to the region's existing air quality conditions. Project construction and operational impacts are assessed separately below.

Construction Emissions

Construction activities associated with development of the proposed Project would include site preparation, grading, drilling, paving, and architectural coatings where necessary. The bridge itself will be prefabricated. Emissions from construction-related activities are generally short-term in duration but may still cause adverse air quality impacts. During construction, fugitive dust would be generated from earth-moving activities. Exhaust emissions would also be generated from off-road construction equipment and construction-related vehicle trips. Emissions associated with construction of the proposed project are discussed below.

⁶ Ambient Air Quality Standards Designation Tool, California Air Resources Board. <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/aaqs-designation-tool>. Accessed September, 2023.

⁷ Lake County Air Quality Management District, Lake County, California Official Website. Website: <https://www.lcaqmd.net/>. Accessed September, 2023.

⁸ City of Lakeport. 2008. Draft Environmental Impact Report. Website: <https://www.cityoflakeport.com/Planning/Draft%20EIR%20General%20Plan%20Update/Draft-EIR---General-Plan-Update---City-o-116200865514PM.pdf>. Accessed September, 2023.

Construction Fugitive Dust (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5})

During construction (grading), fugitive dust (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) would be generated from site grading and other earth-moving activities. Most of this fugitive dust will remain localized and be deposited near the Project site.

The BAAQMD does not have a quantitative threshold for fugitive dust. The BAAQMD's Air Quality Guidelines recommend that projects determine the significance for fugitive dust through application of best management practices (BMPs). Therefore, impacts related to fugitive dust from the construction of the proposed Project may be potentially significant without the inclusions of sufficient dust control measures. Mitigation Measure (MM) AIR-1 requires the inclusion of BMPs recommended by the BAAQMD to reduce potential impacts related to fugitive dust emissions from use of construction equipment. With incorporation of MM AIR-1, short-term construction impacts associated with violating an air quality standard or contributing substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation would be less than significant.

Construction Emissions: ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀ (exhaust), PM_{2.5} (exhaust)

Table 2 provides the construction emissions estimate for the proposed Project. Please refer to Appendix B for details regarding assumptions used to estimate construction emissions. The duration of construction activity and associated equipment represent a reasonable approximation of the expected construction fleet as required pursuant to CEQA guidelines.

Table 2: Construction Annual and Daily Average Emissions (Unmitigated Average Daily Rate)

Parameter	Air Pollutants			
	ROG	NO _x	PM ₁₀ (Exhaust)	PM _{2.5} (Exhaust)
Construction 2023, tons/yr	0.061	0.47	0.02	0.02
Construction 2024, tons/yr	0.14	0.85	0.04	0.04
Total Project Construction Emissions (tons/year)	0.2	1.31	0.06	0.06
Total Project Construction Emissions (pounds/year)	441	2889	133	133
Average Daily Emissions (pounds/day)¹	1.91	12.51	0.58	0.58
Significance Threshold (pounds/day)	54	54	82	54
Exceeds Significance Threshold?	No	No	No	No
Notes: ¹ Calculated by dividing the total number of pounds by the total 231 working days of construction for the entire construction period. Calculations use unrounded numbers. lbs = pounds NO _x = oxides of nitrogen PM ₁₀ = particulate matter 10 microns in diameter PM _{2.5} = particulate matter 2.5 microns in diameter				

Parameter	Air Pollutants			
	ROG	NO _x	PM ₁₀ (Exhaust)	PM _{2.5} (Exhaust)
ROG = reactive organic gases Source: CalEEMod Output (Attachment A).				

As shown in Table 2, estimated emissions from construction of Project would not exceed any applicable threshold and would be less than significant.

Operational Emissions

As previously discussed, the pollutants of concern include ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Full buildout of the Project is anticipated to occur in 2024. As the Project only includes development of a bridge and no habitable structures, minimal operational emissions are expected from the Project itself.

The proposed Project would not result in net operational-related air pollutants or precursors that would exceed the applicable thresholds of significance. Therefore, Project operations would not be considered to have the potential to generate a significant quantity of air pollutants; long-term operational impacts associated with the Project's criteria pollutant emissions would be less than significant. To further reduce potential impacts, Mitigation Measure AIR-1 shall be implemented.

MITIGATION MEASURES

MM AIR-1 During construction activities, the following Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be implemented to control dust:

- Exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
- All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
- All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour.
- All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks shall be paved as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
- A publicly visible sign shall be posted with the telephone number and person to contact regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours of a complaint or issue notification.

III.c) Less Than Significant Impacts with Mitigation Incorporation. The closest sensitive receptors are single-family residences located approximately 400 ft south of the proposed site. construction emissions would be below applicable thresholds and be temporary in nature. Therefore, the relatively small amount of emissions generated and the short duration of the construction period would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Project operations would involve vehicular traffic along the bridge, therefore, substantial pollutant concentrations are not expected. Impacts related to construction fugitive dust would be less than significant with incorporation of MM AIR-1.

III.d) Less Than Significant Impact. During construction, the various diesel-powered vehicles and equipment in use on-site could create localized odors. These odors would be temporary and are not likely to be noticeable for extended periods of time beyond the Project site. In addition, once the Project is operational, there would be no new source of odors from the Project except vehicular traffic similar to nearby roadways. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

FINDINGS

The proposed project would have a **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated** on Air Quality.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Thresholds of Significance: CEQA defines "significant effect on the environment" as "a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment" (California Public Resource Code § 21068). Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15065, a Project's effects on biological resources are deemed significant where the Project would do the following:

- a) Substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species,
- b) Cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels,
- c) Threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or
- d) Substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal.

In addition to the Section 15065 criteria, Appendix G within the CEQA Guidelines includes six additional impacts to consider when analyzing the effects of a project. Under Appendix G, a project's effects on biological resources are deemed significant where the project would do any of the following:

- e) 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 CDFW or USFWS;
- f) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS;
- g) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means;
- h) 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;
- i) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; or
- j) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

These criteria were used to determine whether the potential effects of the Project on biological resources qualify as significant.

DISCUSSION

The Project developments would consist of installing a prefabricated bridge structure across Forbes Creek that will link Wrigley Street to the south with Craig Avenue to the north. The site parcel currently supports riparian forest, fallowed agricultural land, and disturbed grassland.

A Biological Resources Evaluation for the Project (Biological Report) was prepared by Colibri Ecological Consulting, LLC in August 2023 (see Appendix C for full report and references), to assess whether the Project will affect protected biological resources pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines. Such resources include species of plants or animals listed or proposed for listing under the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) or the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) as well as those covered under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), the California Native Plant Protection Act, and various other sections of California Fish and Game Code (CFGC). The biological resource evaluation also addresses Project-related impacts to regulated habitats, which are those under the jurisdiction of the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), or California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW).

IMPACT ANALYSIS

IV.a) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation. The Project site supports intermittent drainage, riparian forest, nonnative grassland, and fallowed agricultural land. The Project site is bisected by Forbes Creek, an intermittent drainage.

The USFWS species list for the Project included three species listed as threatened, endangered, or candidate under the FESA (USFWS 2023a, Table 1, App A of Appendix C). Of those three species, none are expected to occur on or near the Project site due to either (1) the lack of habitat, (2) the Project site being outside the current range of the species, or (3) the presence of development that would otherwise preclude occurrence (Table 1 of Appendix C).

Searching the CNDDDB for records of special-status species from the Lakeport 7.5-minute USGS topographic and the eight surrounding quads produced 258 records of 65 species (Table 1, Appendix C). Of those 65 species, 16 are not given further consideration because they are not CEQA-recognized as special-status species or are considered extirpated in California (Appendix C). Of the remaining 49 species, 18 are known from within 5 miles of the Project site (Table 1, Figure 4 of Appendix C). Of those species, only the Clear Lake hitch (*Lavinia exilicauda chi* – ST) could occur on or near the Project site (Table 1 of Appendix C). In addition, purple martin (*Progne subis* – SSSC) and pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus* – SSSC) were identified in the nine-quad search and could occur on or near the Project site (Table 1 of Appendix C).

Searching the CNPS inventory of rare and endangered plants of California yielded 61 species (CNPS 2023, App C of Appendix C), 5 of which have a rank of 2B, and 30 of which have a rank of 1B (Table 1 of Appendix C). None of those species are expected to occur on or near the Project site due to (1) lack of habitat, (2) the Project site being outside the current range of the species, or (3) lack of detection during the 18 July 2023 field survey (Table 1 of App C).

A total of 44 plant species (23 native and 21 nonnative), one reptile species, and 23 bird species were observed during the BRE survey (Table 2 of Appendix C).

Clear Lake Hitch

There is one CNDDDB record of Clear Lake hitch, a state listed as threatened fish, from within 5 miles of the Project site from 1962 (CDFW 2023). Forbes Creek on the Project site could provide spawning and juvenile foraging habitat for this species. However, Forbes Creek has been heavily modified in and around its connection to Clear Lake and drains into the lake through a heavily urbanized area. The petition to list this species under the CESA cited no evidence of this species in Forbes Creek for several years prior to 2013 (Bonham 2013). However, recent survey data show Clear Lake hitch have been using lower Forbes Creek in recent years and have been reported up to 0.29 miles downstream of the proposed Project site (Clear Lake Hitch Observation Program 2023; Sarah Ryan, personal communication, 2023). Therefore, the potential for this species to occur is moderate.

Purple Martin

The nearest CNDDDB occurrence of Purple martin, a state species of special concern, is approximately 13 miles from the Project site (CNDDDB 2023). However, the Project site supports potential nesting habitat along Forbes Creek. The Project site contains open areas and riparian forest that may provide foraging habitat. Potential nest sites are limited, and much of the foraging habitat is disturbed. Therefore, the species has a low potential to occur on the Project site.

Pallid Bat

There are no CNDDDB occurrence records of pallid bat, recognized as a Species of Special Concern by the CDFW, from within 5 miles of the Project site (CDFW 2023). However, the Project site supports potential day roost habitat in the form of tree hollows and snags along Forbes Creek. The Project site contains open areas and riparian forest that may provide foraging habitat. Potential roost sites are limited, however, to possible tree cavities. Therefore, the species has a low potential to occur on the Project site.

The Project could adversely affect three special-status animal species that could occur on or near the Project site. Construction activities such as excavating, trenching, or using other heavy equipment that disturbs or harms a special-status species could constitute a significant impact. Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, and BIO-3 will be included to reduce the potential impacts to a less than significant level.

IV.b) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation. The Project will impact riparian habitat along Forbes Creek. The proposed bridge installation is anticipated to impact an approximately 750-square-foot area (15 feet x 50 feet) of riparian forest dominated by red willow and Himalayan blackberry, a nonnative shrub. Based on the abundance of Himalayan blackberry in the local area and at this location, including on and adjacent to the impact area, recolonization after Project completion is expected to occur naturally and probably within one growing season. Therefore, Project-related impacts to Himalayan blackberry will be negligible, don't meet the threshold of significance, and consequently require no mitigation. However, to mitigate potential impacts to native trees or shrubs, mitigation measure BIO-4 will be implemented to reduce the potential impact to a less than significant level.

IV.c) Less Than Significant Impact. This Project, which will result in temporary and permanent impacts to riparian forest, nonnative grassland, and fallowed agricultural land, will not have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means as less than significant impacts to wetlands will occur.

IV.d) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation. The proposed Project could impede the use of nursery sites for native birds protected under the MBTA and CFGC. Migratory birds are expected to nest on and near the Project site. Construction disturbance during the breeding season could result in the incidental loss of fertile eggs or nestlings or otherwise lead to nest abandonment. Disturbance that causes nest abandonment or loss of reproductive effort can be considered take under the MBTA and CFGC. Loss of fertile eggs or nesting birds, or any activities resulting in nest abandonment, could constitute a significant effect if the species is particularly rare in the region. Construction activities such as

excavating, trenching, and grading that disturb a nesting bird on the proposed Project site or immediately adjacent to the construction zone could constitute a significant impact.

The Project could also impede the use of nursery sites for Clear Lake hitch, a state listed as threatened fish. Clear Lake hitch may use Forbes Creek for spawning and juvenile rearing in spring and early summer. Mitigation Measures BIO-5 and BIO-1 are included to reduce the potential effect to a less than significant level.

IV.e-f) No Impact. This Project, which will result in temporary and permanent impacts to riparian forest, nonnative grassland, and fallowed agricultural land, will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance as no such ordinances are pertinent to the Project; or conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan as no such plan has been adopted. The proposed Project would have no impact.

MITIGATION MEASURES

BIO-1: Protect Clear Lake hitch

1. To the extent practicable, construction shall be conducted during the non-rainy season (June through October) and when Forbes Creek is dry.
2. Stormwater and sediment controls, including silt containment fence and fiber rolls, shall be installed prior to any ground disturbing work to prevent sedimentation of potential spawning and rearing habitat for Clear Lake hitch.
3. All refueling, maintenance, and staging of equipment and vehicles will occur at least 100 feet from riparian habitat or bodies of water and in a location where a potential spill would not drain directly toward aquatic habitat (e.g., on a slope that drains away from the water source). Equipment will be checked daily for leaks prior to the initiation of construction activities. A spill kit will be placed near the creek and will remain readily available during construction in the event that any contaminant is accidentally released.
4. If it is not possible to schedule construction during the non-rainy season (June through October) and when Forbes Creek is dry:
 - a. Before construction activities begin, a qualified biologist shall conduct a training session for all construction personnel working within 50 feet of Forbes Creek. At a minimum, the training will include a description of Clear Lake hitch and its habitat, the specific measures that are being implemented to protect this species for the Project, and the boundaries within which the Project may be accomplished.

- b. Immediately prior to all construction activities within 50 feet of Forbes Creek, a qualified biologist shall conduct a visual pre-construction survey for Clear Lake hitch 250 feet upstream and 250 feet downstream from the project site. The qualified biologist shall then monitor all construction activities within 50 feet of Forbes Creek to ensure impacts to Clear Lake hitch and its habitat are avoided. The qualified biologist will stop work if Clear Lake hitch behavior is affected by Project activities. In such cases, work may need to be redirected to other areas or postponed until Clear Lake hitch is no longer present in the reach of Forbes Creek potentially affected by Project activities.

BIO-2: Protect nesting purple martin

1. To the extent practicable, construction shall be scheduled to avoid the nesting season, which extends from May through August.
2. If it is not possible to schedule construction between September and April, pre-construction surveys for nesting purple martins shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to ensure that no active nests will be disturbed during Project implementation. A pre-construction survey shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to the initiation of construction activities. During this survey, the qualified biologist shall inspect all potential nest substrates (trees or snags with cavities) in and immediately adjacent to the impact areas. If an active nest is found close enough to the construction area to be disturbed by these activities, the qualified biologist shall determine the extent of a construction-free buffer to be established around the nest. If work cannot proceed without disturbing the nesting birds, work may need to be halted or redirected to other areas until nesting and fledging are completed or the nest has failed for non-construction related reasons.

BIO-3: Protect roosting pallid bat

1. A pre-construction clearance survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to ensure that no roosting pallid bats will be disturbed during the implementation of the Project. A pre-construction clearance survey shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to the initiation of construction activities. During this survey, the qualified biologist shall inspect all potential roosting habitat in and immediately adjacent to the impact areas. If an active roost is found close enough to the construction area to be disturbed by these activities, the qualified biologist shall determine the extent of a construction-free buffer to be established around the roost. If work cannot proceed without disturbing the roosting bats, work may need to be halted or redirected to other areas until the roost is no longer in use.

BIO-4: Mitigate impacts to riparian vegetation.

1. To the extent practical, avoid impacting riparian vegetation.
2. If impacts to valley oak, red willow, or other riparian trees or shrubs are unavoidable, the Project applicant shall implement the tree replacement and maintenance requirements detailed in the

Streambed Alteration Agreement issued by the CDFW for the Project. Those requirements are likely to involve replacing trees or shrubs that are damaged or removed by replanting native species at a 3:1 ratio (replaced to lost) and ensuring a performance criterion of 70 percent survival of plantings for a minimum period of five consecutive years, including up to three years with supplemental irrigation and a minimum of two years without such assistance.

BIO-5: Protect nesting birds.

1. To the extent practicable, construction shall be scheduled to avoid the nesting season, which extends from February through August.
2. If it is not possible to schedule construction between September and January, pre-construction surveys for nesting birds shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to ensure that no active nests will be disturbed during the implementation of the Project. A pre-construction survey shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to the initiation of construction activities. During this survey, the qualified biologist shall inspect all potential nest substrates in and immediately adjacent to the impact areas. If an active nest is found close enough to the construction area to be disturbed by these activities, the qualified biologist shall determine the extent of a construction-free buffer to be established around the nest. If work cannot proceed without disturbing the nesting birds, work may need to be halted or redirected to other areas until nesting and fledging are completed or the nest has otherwise failed for non-construction related reasons.

FINDINGS

The proposed project would have a **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated** on Biological Resources.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Thresholds of Significance: The project would have a significant effect on cultural resources if it would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5; cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5; or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

DISCUSSION:

A records search was conducted by the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) for A Project immediately south of the proposed Project on April 20, 2022 by reviewing pertinent NWIC base maps that reference cultural resources records and reports, historic-period maps, and literature for Lake County, which included a review of all study reports on file within a one-quarter mile radius of the project area (NWIC File No. 21-1389)(see Appendix D). The records search showed that there has been one cultural resource study, S-31281, that covers approximately 100% of the proposed project area (Flaherty 2005). This Project area contains no recorded archaeological resources. The State Office of Historic Preservation Built Environment Resources Directory (OHP BERD) lists no recorded buildings or structures within or adjacent to the proposed project area. In addition to these inventories, the NWIC base maps show no recorded buildings or structures within the proposed project area.

On September 20, 2023, in response to request for notification of projects pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 (Public Resources Code 21073, 21074, 21080.3.1, 21080.3.2, 21082.3, 21083.09, 21084.2, and 5097.94), the City of Lakeport provided notification and provided 30-days to request consultation to the Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians and Big Valley Band of Pomo Indians regarding the Lakeport EVA Bridge Project (proposed project). As of the date of this Initial Study, no formal requests for consultation have been received from the Native community regarding the project; however, project- related communication was received from the Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians. In response to the Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians request for a cultural monitor to be present on-site during any and all ground disturbance to be undertaken by the Project, Mitigation Measure CUL-3 has been included below.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

V.a-b) No Impact. As set forth in Section 5024.1(c) of the Public Resources Code, in order for a cultural resource to be deemed "important" under CEQA and thus eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR), it must meet at least one of the following criteria:

1. is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California History and cultural heritage; or
2. is associated with the lives of persons important to our past; or
3. embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possess high artistic value; or
4. has yielded or is likely to yield, information important to prehistory or history (ALTA, 2019).

As discussed in the NWIC Records search, no cultural resources are documented within the project area. In addition, review of historic registers and inventories indicate that no historical landmarks or points of interest are present within the project area, nor are there any National Register-listed or eligible properties within a half-mile radius of the project area. No impact would occur.

V.b-c) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation. As discussed above, no cultural resources are documented within the project area. Review of historical literature and maps gave no indication of historic-period activity within the proposed project area. The 1938 and 1951 Lakeport USGS

15-minute topographic quadrangle fail to depict any buildings or structures. With this information in mind, there is a low potential for unrecorded historic-period archaeological or built environment resources to be within the proposed project area. The project, as presently designed, is not anticipated to have an adverse effect on cultural resources. However, the City provides two recommendations, which prescribe protocol to follow in the event of advertent discovery of cultural resources or human remains and are included as Mitigation Measures CUL-1, CUL-2, and CUL-3 below. With mitigation incorporated, a less than significant impact would occur.

MITIGATION MEASURES

CUL-1: If previously unidentified cultural resources are encountered during project implementation, any persons on-site shall avoid altering the materials and their stratigraphic context. A qualified professional archaeologist shall be contacted to evaluate the situation. Project personnel shall not collect cultural resources. [Prehistoric resources include, but are not limited to, chert or obsidian flakes, projectile points, mortars, pestles, and dark friable soil containing shell and bone dietary debris, heat-affected rock, or human burials. Historic resources include stone or abode foundations or walls; structures and remains with square nails; and refuse deposits or bottle dumps, often located in old wells or privies.]

CUL-2: If human remains are encountered on-site, all work must stop in the immediate vicinity of the discovered remains and the County Coroner and a qualified archaeologist must be notified immediately so that an evaluation can be performed. If the remains are deemed to be Native American and prehistoric, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) must be contacted by the Coroner so that a "Most Likely Descendant" can be designated and further recommendations regarding treatment of the remains is provided.

CUL-3: A cultural monitor from the Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians shall be present on-site for any and all ground disturbance to be completed under the project. The project contractor shall consult with the Tribe at least three weeks prior to the start of any ground disturbing activities and shall also provide the Tribe with the anticipated construction schedule and plans.

FINDINGS

The proposed project would have a **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated** on Cultural Resources.

VI. ENERGY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Thresholds of Significance: The project would have a significant effect on energy if it would result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources, during project construction or operation; or require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

DISCUSSION

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) provides electricity and natural gas service to the City. In 2021, approximately 91 percent of the electricity PG&E supplied was from GHG-free sources including nuclear, large hydroelectric, and eligible renewable sources of energy.⁹

IMPACT ANALYSIS

VI.a-b) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project will involve installing a bridge across Forbes Creek, linking Wrigley Street and Craig Avenue. The bridge will be assembled off-site. Bridge footings will be drilled into the ground and constructed outside of the top of bank. A crane will be used to place the prefabricated bridge on the footings.

During construction, the Project would consume energy in two general forms: (1) the fuel energy consumed by construction vehicles and equipment; and (2) bound energy in construction materials, such as asphalt, steel, concrete, pipes, and manufactured or processed materials. Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards would provide guidance on construction techniques for the plant house to maximize energy conservation and it is expected that contractors and the City have a strong financial incentive to use recycled materials and products originating from nearby sources in order to reduce materials costs. As such, it is anticipated that materials used in construction and construction vehicle fuel energy would not involve the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy.

⁹ Renewable Energy and Storage, 2022. Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E). Website: https://www.pge.com/corp_responsibility/reports/2022/pf03_renewable_energy_storage.html. Accessed September, 2023.

Project operations are anticipated to require minimal energy, for purposes such as street lighting, as applicable. Operational energy would also be consumed during each vehicle trip associated with the proposed use for maintenance or otherwise.

As discussed in Impact XVII – Transportation/Traffic, once constructed the proposed Project would not generate additional on-going vehicle trips except for maintenance or inspection. The length of these trips and the individual vehicle fuel efficiencies are not known; therefore, the resulting energy consumption cannot be accurately calculated. Additionally, with the installation of the bridge, circulation and access to surrounding areas will be improved, potentially reducing travel times and related energy consumed. Adopted federal and State vehicle fuel standards have continually improved since their original adoption in 1975 and assists in avoiding the inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary use of energy by vehicles.

As discussed previously, the proposed Project would be required to implement and be consistent with existing energy design standards at the local and state level, such as Title 24. The Project would also be subject to energy conservation requirements in the California Energy Code and CALGreen. Adherence to state code requirements would ensure that the Project would not result in wasteful and inefficient use of non-renewable resources due to building operation. For the above reasons, the proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency, and impacts would be less than significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation required.

FINDINGS

The proposed project would have a **Less Than Significant Impact** on Energy Resources.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Thresholds of Significance: The project would have a significant effect on geology and soils if it would directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: 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, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, or landslides; result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse; 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; have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks

or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater; or directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

DISCUSSION

Seismicity

The City of Lakeport is situated in an active earthquake area and the potential exists for a seismic event in the future. While the City is not in an active fault zone, the Maacama Fault Zone lies west of the City and the Big Valley, Konocti Bay, and Red Road Fault Zones lie to the south of the City.¹⁰ No major potentially damaging earthquakes have occurred within the past 200 years along any faults within Lake County.

The majority of faults in Lake County are located in the Cobb Mountain and Hopland Grade areas, running southeasterly to the southern County line. The southeastern portion of the County also appears to have considerable earthquake faults. There are also active faults within the vicinity of the City of Lakeport, including the San Andreas Fault, located approximately 30 miles (48 km) to the west, and the Healdsburg Fault, located approximately 15 miles (24 km) to the west. These faults have been responsible for moderate to major earthquakes in the past. The maximum earthquake magnitudes that can come from these fault lines are 8.25 for the San Andreas fault and 6.75 for the Healdsburg fault (Earth Metrics Inc., 1989). The largest earthquake to affect the City was the 1906 San Francisco earthquake, which had a magnitude of 8.3. Although shaking was severe, overall damage in Lakeport was minor and generally limited to the fall of decorative masonry and chimneys.

Landslides

Landslides are a notable geologic constraint to development in the Lakeport Planning Area. The landslide potential of an area is a function of the area's hydrology, geology, and seismic characteristics. Clay soils, which underlie many hillsides in Lakeport, are particularly susceptible to sliding. Although landslides generally occur in areas with steep slopes, they may occur on slopes with a grade of 20 percent or less in geologically unstable areas. Since zones of moderate to high landslide potential exist in Lakeport, soils tests carried out by a registered soil engineer or geologist are essential wherever landslide potential is indicated or suspected. Foundations for structures built in areas with steep slopes in excess of 20 percent must be carefully engineered to avoid increasing landslide risk (City General Plan, 2009).

Sediments and Soils

The Lakeport area is located on a sediment-filled valley next to Clear Lake. Exposed materials within the area are limited to serpentinite and quaternary sediments. These sediments are described as poorly consolidated to unconsolidated mixtures of sand, silt, clay, and gravel derived from older rock in the adjacent mountains. Because of the low strength of the quaternary sediments, they are subject to rapid erosion and shallow slumping.

¹⁰ California Department of Conservation. AQ Zapp: California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/>. Accessed September 2023.

The Lakeport region is composed of a variety of geological features. For example, oak woodlands occur in inland valleys and foothills usually with a hard pan or rocky soil between 4 and 20 feet deep. Additionally, chaparral communities occur in the inland foothills on dry slopes and ridges with shallow soils and are often found on serpentine soils. There are a number of areas in Lake County that contain serpentine rock and soils, including areas within the Lakeport Planning Area. These areas have been mapped and identified to contain regulated amounts of asbestos, and, unless adequately mitigated, the disturbance of serpentine soils will release asbestos into the air and water. The areas mapped within the Lakeport Planning Area (refer to Figure 19, Serpentine Rock and Soils, in the City's General Plan) are mostly within the southern and central portions of the City of Lakeport, with smaller areas scattered throughout the northern part of the City.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

VII.a.i) Less Than Significant Impact. The purpose of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act is to mitigate the hazard of surface faulting by preventing the construction of buildings used for human occupancy over an area with known faults. Unlike damage from ground shaking, which can occur at great distances from the fault, impacts from fault rupture are limited to the immediate area of the fault zone where the fault breaks along the ground surface. The Site does not overlap a fault line or zone (MTA, 2011). Impacts from fault rupture would not be expected to occur within the Project area. Additionally, the proposed Project does not include the installation of any habitable structures. The Project will be required to adhere to all relevant building codes, including the California Building Code (CBC) requirements and those adopted by reference in the Bakersfield Municipal Code. Adherence to local and State regulations would result in a less than significant impact.

VII.a.ii) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project area is located about 9 miles east of the Maacama Fault, 34 miles east of the San Andreas Fault, and 7 miles northwest of the Big Valley Fault. The Project is not situated in an Earthquake Fault Zone area. However, the proposed project site may have a moderate chance of experiencing ground shaking within the next 50 years (Branum et al., 2016). As noted above, the City of Lakeport is situated in an active earthquake area and is vulnerable to seismic activity and the associated secondary impacts of shaking. However, all development, including the Project, is subject to the latest version of the California Building Code (CBC) standards, as well as Title 24 of the California Administrative Code, which would minimize any potential geological risks. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

VII.a.iii-iv) No Impact. The Project site is bisected by Forbes Creek, an intermittent drainage. The Project site also supports riparian forest, nonnative grassland, and fallowed agricultural land. These site conditions would preclude the likelihood of a landslide. Specific construction practices on the property would make the potential of liquefaction or landslides negligible. As a result, the Project would not be situated on or within an area of potential liquefaction or landslides, and no impact would occur.

VII.b) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project may require excavation and groundbreaking activities to build the footprint of the bridge and associated storm drains and roadways. Under the proposed Project, pursuant to Policy LU 7.4 of the City's General Plan and the General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit (Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ) (discussed further under

Section IX, Hydrology and Water Quality, below), the Project contractor would be required to implement stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs) such as straw bales, fiber rolls, and/or silt fencing structures to assure the minimization of erosion resulting from construction and to avoid runoff into sensitive habitat areas, such as Forbes Creek, limit ground disturbance to the minimum necessary, and stabilize disturbed soil areas as soon as feasible after construction is completed. With implementation of appropriate BMPs, the proposed Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil and a less than significant impact would occur.

VII.c) Less Than Significant Impact. As previously discussed, the Site and immediate vicinity is not within an area of potential major liquefaction or landslides and is generally flat in nature (less than 10 percent slope). Additionally, the Site is not located within a mapped Alquist-Priolo special studies zone. While Lakeport is located in a highly active earthquake area, the proposed Project development is minimal and would not induce landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. As noted earlier, the bridge will be designed and constructed in accordance with the latest California Building Standard Codes for bridges. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact.

VII.d) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is underlain by still loam, stratified substratum, Cole variant clay loam, and Wappo loam with 2 to 8% slopes. The Project site is at an elevation of 1367–1385 feet above mean sea level. Wappo loam is moderately well drained with very slow permeability, while Still loam soil is well drained with moderately slow permeability. These soils are generally defined as non-expansive. Cole variant clay loam is somewhat poorly drained with slow permeability and some expansive properties. Since the proposed bridge development and associated minor roadway improvements would be designed and graded in accordance with the latest version of the CBC, the potential for the Project to be susceptible to expansive soils would be minimized and a less than significant impact would occur.

VII.e) No Impact. Development of the proposed Project does not include septic tanks, alternative wastewater disposal systems, or sewer connections. Therefore, no impact would occur from development of the Project.

VII.f) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation. No paleontological resources or unique geologic features have been identified in the Project area and the likelihood of them being present in this area is considered very low. However, the potential exists for unique paleontological resources or site or unique geological features to be encountered within the Project area, as ground-disturbing construction activities, including grading and excavation, would be required for the proposed Project. Incorporation of mitigation measure GEO-1 will provides specific requirements in the event any fossil(s) are encountered during construction of the proposed Project. Thus, less than significant impact would occur with mitigation incorporated.

MITIGATION MEASURES

GEO-1: In the event that fossils or fossil-bearing deposits are discovered during Project construction, the contractor shall notify a qualified paleontologist to examine the discovery and

excavations within 50 feet of the find shall be temporarily halted or diverted. The area of discovery shall be protected to ensure that fossils are not removed, handled, altered, or damaged until the site is properly evaluated, and further action is determined. The paleontologist shall document the discovery as needed, in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards (Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 1995), evaluate the potential resource, and assess the significance of the finding under the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. The paleontologist shall notify the appropriate agencies to determine procedures that would be followed before construction is allowed to resume at the location of the find. If the Project proponent determines that avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist shall prepare an excavation plan for mitigating the effect of the Project-based on the qualities that make the resource important. The plan shall be submitted to the City of Lakeport for review and approval prior to implementation.

FINDINGS

The proposed project would have a **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated** on Geology and Soils.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions (GHG), 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"/>
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"/>

Thresholds of Significance: The CEQA Guidelines define a significant effect on the environment as “a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment.” To determine if a project would have a significant impact on GHGs, the type, level, and impact of emissions generated by the project must be evaluated.

The following GHG significance thresholds are contained in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, which were amendments adopted into the Guidelines on March 18, 2010, pursuant to SB 97. A significant impact would occur if the project would:

- Generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; or
- Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.

Project-level Thresholds

Section 15064.4(b) of the CEQA Guidelines' amendments for GHG emissions states that a lead agency may take into account the following three considerations in assessing the significance of impacts from GHG emissions.

- Consideration #1: The extent to which the project may increase or reduce GHG emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting.
- Consideration #2: Whether the project emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the lead agency determines applies to the project.
- Consideration #3: The extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions. Such regulations or requirements must be adopted by the relevant public agency through a public review process and must include specific requirements that reduce or mitigate the project's incremental contribution of GHG emissions. If there is substantial evidence that the possible effects of a particular project are still cumulatively considerable notwithstanding compliance with the adopted regulations or requirements, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must be prepared for the project.

Newhall Ranch

In the California Supreme Court decision in the *Center for Biological Diversity et al. vs. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Newhall Land and Farming Company* (62 Cal.4th 204 [2015], and known as the Newhall Ranch decision), the Supreme Court was concerned that new development may need to reduce GHG emissions more than existing development to demonstrate it is meeting its fair share of reductions. New development does do more than its fair share through compliance with enhanced regulations, particularly with respect to motor vehicles, energy efficiency, and electricity generation. If no additional reductions are required from an individual project beyond that achieved by regulations, then the amount needed to reach the 2020 target is the amount of GHG emissions a project must reduce to comply with Statewide goals.

The State's regulatory program implementing the 2008 Scoping Plan is now fully mature. All regulations envisioned in the Scoping Plan have been adopted by the responsible agencies and the effectiveness of those regulations have been estimated by the agencies during the adoption process and then are tracked to verify their effectiveness after implementation. Governor Brown, in the introduction to Executive Order B-30-15, states "California is on track to meet or exceed the current target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, as established in the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32)." The progress was evident in emission inventories prepared by CARB, which showed that the State inventory dropped below 1990 levels for the first time in 2016.¹¹ The 2017 Scoping Plan Update includes projections indicating that the State will meet or exceed the 2020 target with adopted regulations.¹² The State now projects that it will meet the 2020 target and achieve continued progress towards meeting the 2017 Scoping Plan target for 2030.

The 2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality (2022 Scoping Plan) lays out a path to achieve targets for carbon neutrality and reduce anthropogenic greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 85 percent below 1990 levels no later than 2045, as directed by Assembly Bill 1279. The actions and outcomes in the plan will achieve: significant reductions in fossil fuel combustion by deploying clean technologies and fuels, further reductions in short-lived climate pollutants, support for sustainable development, increased action on natural and working lands to reduce emissions and sequester carbon, and the capture and storage of carbon.¹³

DISCUSSION

Environmental Setting

Greenhouse gases and climate change are cumulative global issues. The CARB and EPA regulate GHG emissions within the State of California and the U.S., respectively. Meanwhile, the CARB has the primary

¹¹ California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2018. Climate Pollutants Fall Below 1990 Levels for the First Time. Website: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/news/climate-pollutants-fall-below-1990-levels-first-time>. Accessed September, 2023.

¹² California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2017. The 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update, the Proposed Strategy for Achieving California's 2030 Greenhouse Gas Target. January 17, 2017. Website: https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/2030sp_pp_final.pdf. Accessed September 2023.

¹³ 2022 Scoping Plan, California Air Resources Board. <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/2022-scoping-plan-documents>. Accessed September, 2023.

regulatory responsibility within California for GHG emissions. Local agencies can also adopt policies for GHG emission reduction.

Many chemical compounds in the Earth's atmosphere act as GHGs as they absorb and emit radiation within the thermal infrared range. When radiation from the sun reaches the earth's surface, some of it is reflected into the atmosphere as infrared radiation (heat). Greenhouse gases absorb this infrared radiation and trap the heat in the atmosphere. Over time, the amount of energy from the sun to the earth's surface should be approximately equal to the amount of energy radiated back into space, leaving the temperature of the earth's surface roughly constant. Many gases exhibit these "greenhouse" properties. Some of them occur in nature (water vapor, carbon dioxide [CO₂], methane [CH₄], and nitrous oxide [N₂O]), while others are exclusively human made (like gases used for aerosols).

The principal climate change gases resulting from human activity that enter and accumulate in the atmosphere are listed below.

Carbon Dioxide

Carbon dioxide enters the atmosphere through the burning of fossil fuels (oil, natural gas, and coal), solid waste, trees and wood products, and chemical reactions (e.g., the manufacture of cement). Carbon dioxide is also removed from the atmosphere (or "sequestered") when it is absorbed by plants as part of the biological carbon cycle.

Methane

Methane is emitted during the production and transport of coal, natural gas, and oil. Methane emissions also result from livestock and agricultural practices and the decay of organic waste in municipal solid waste landfills.

Nitrous Oxide

Nitrous oxide is emitted during agricultural and industrial activities, as well as during combustion of fossil fuels and solid waste.

Fluorinated Gases

Hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorinated chemicals, and sulfur hexafluoride are synthetic, powerful climate-change gases that are emitted from a variety of industrial processes. Fluorinated gases are often used as substitutes for ozone-depleting substances (i.e., chlorofluorocarbons, hydrochlorofluorocarbons, and halons). These gases are typically emitted in smaller quantities, but because they are potent climate-change gases, they are sometimes referred to as high global warming potential gases.

Potential Environmental Impacts

For California, climate change in the form of warming has the potential to incur and exacerbate environmental impacts, including but not limited to changes to precipitation and runoff patterns, increased agricultural demand for water, inundation of low-lying coastal areas by sea-level rise, and

increased incidents and severity of wildfire events.¹⁴ Cooling of the climate may have the opposite effects. Although certain environmental effects are widely accepted to be a potential hazard to certain locations, such as rising sea level for low-lying coastal areas, it is currently infeasible to predict all environmental effects of climate change on any one location.

Emissions of GHGs contributing to global climate change are attributable in large part to human activities associated with the industrial and manufacturing, utility, transportation, residential, and agricultural sectors. Therefore, the cumulative global emissions of GHGs contributing to global climate change can be attributed to every nation, region, and city, and virtually every individual on Earth. A project's GHG emissions are at a micro-scale relative to global emissions but could result in a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to a significant cumulative macro-scale impact.

Regulatory Requirements

California has adopted statewide legislation addressing various aspects of climate change and GHG emissions mitigation. Much of this legislation establishes a broad framework for the state's long-term GHG reduction and climate change adaptation program. The governor has also issued several executive orders (EOs) related to the state's evolving climate change policy. Of particular importance are AB 32 and SB 32, which outline the state's GHG reduction goals. The 2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality (2022 Scoping Plan) lays out a path to achieve targets for carbon neutrality and reduce anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions by 85 percent below 1990 levels no later than 2045, as directed by Assembly Bill 1279.

The control of GHGs is generally regulated at the state level and is typically approached by setting emission reduction targets for existing sources of GHGs, setting policies to promote renewable energy and increase energy efficiency, and developing statewide action plans.

GHG Threshold Applied in the Analysis

The City of Lakeport adopted their most recent General Plan (City of Lakeport General Plan 2025) in 2009, which includes city-wide goals and strategies for reducing GHG emissions. The 2025 General Plan does not identify thresholds for determining the significance of GHG emissions during construction or operation of individual development projects.¹⁵ The City of Lakeport has not adopted a GHG reduction plan. In addition, the City has not completed the GHG inventory, benchmarking, or goal-setting process required to identify a reduction target and take advantage of the streamlining provisions contained in the CEQA Guidelines amendments adopted for SB 97 and clarifications provided in the CEQA Guidelines amendments adopted on December 28, 2018. Furthermore, there are no recommendations provided by the LCAQMD for projects in the LCAB. As such, there are not formally adopted or recommended project-level thresholds of significance provided by either the LCAQMD or the City of Lakeport.

¹⁴ Moser et al. 2009. Moser, Susie, Guido Franco, Sarah Pittiglio, Wendy Chou, Dan Cayan. 2009. The Future Is Now: An Update on Climate Change Science Impacts and Response Options for California. Website: http://www.susannemoser.com/documents/CEC-500-2008-071_Moseretal_FutureisNow.pdf. Accessed September, 2023.

¹⁵ City of Lakeport. 2009. General Plan 2025. Website: https://www.cityoflakeport.com/Planning/Lakeport%20General%20Plan%202025/City-of-Lakeport-General-Plan-2025_Augus-8312009103657PM.pdf. Accessed September, 2023.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

VIII.a-b) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project may contribute to climate change impacts through its contribution of GHGs. The proposed Project would generate a variety of GHGs during construction, including several defined by AB 32, such as CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O from the exhaust of equipment, construction hauling trips, and worker commuter trips.

In the absence of an adopted numeric GHG emissions threshold consistent with the State's 2030 target, the Project's GHG emissions impact determination is based on the extent to which the Project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions. The Project's GHG emissions are provided for informational purposes only.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency published a rule for the mandatory reporting of greenhouse gases from sources that in general emit 25,000 metric tons or more of carbon dioxide (CO₂) per year. As shown in the CalEEMod results (Appendix B), the Project is estimated to produce a maximum of approximately 156.07 metric tons per year of CO₂ during construction. This represents approximately 0.007% of the reporting threshold. During the construction of the proposed Project, a total of approximately 233.7 MTCO₂e would be emitted. Neither the City of Lakeport, the LCAQMD, nor the BAAQMD have an adopted thresholds of significance for construction related GHG emissions. Because impacts from construction activities are temporary in nature and occur over a relatively short-term period, they contribute a relatively small portion of the overall lifetime Project GHG emissions. In addition, GHG emission reduction measures for construction equipment are relatively limited. The impact is therefore considered less than significant.

The proposed Project is not a land-use development project that would generate additional vehicle trips. The development is a bridge linking two streets, thereby improving circulation and access to the surrounding areas. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in a net increase in operational GHG emissions. As such, the proposed Project would not interfere or obstruct implementation of an applicable GHG emissions reduction plan. The proposed Project would be consistent with all applicable local plans, policies, and regulations for reducing GHG emissions. Any impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation required.

FINDINGS

The proposed project would have a **Less Than Significant Impact** on Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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"/>
f) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Thresholds of Significance: The project would have a significant effect on hazards and hazardous materials if it were to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; 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 create a significant hazard to the public or the environment; result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area if 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; or impair the implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; or expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

DISCUSSION

A material is considered hazardous if it appears on a list of hazardous materials prepared by a federal, state, or local agency, or has characteristics defined as hazardous by a federal, state, or local agency. Chemical and physical properties such as toxicity, ignitability, corrosiveness, and reactivity cause a substance to be considered hazardous. These properties are defined in the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 22, §66261.20-66261.24. A "hazardous waste" includes any hazardous material that is discarded, abandoned, or will be recycled. Therefore, the criteria that render a material hazardous also cause a waste to be classified as hazardous (California Health and Safety Code, §25117).

IMPACT ANALYSIS

IX.a-b) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project involves construction and operation of a bridge across Forbes Creek in the western portion of the City of Lakeport, linking Craig Avenue and Wrigley Street.

While excavating, trenching, grading and construction activities may involve the limited transport, storage, use or disposal of hazardous materials, such as the fueling/servicing of construction equipment onsite, the activities would be short-term or one-time in nature and would be subject to federal, state, and local health and safety regulations. Long-term operation of the proposed Project would involve little or no transport, storage, use or disposal of hazardous materials.

There are several federal, state and local requirements and regulations that are designed to minimize risks from accidental releases of hazardous materials and the proposed Project will be in compliance with all applicable requirements and regulations. Hazardous material storage and use during construction will be stored and operated in compliance with the minimum requirements of the Uniform Fire Code and the California Fire Code. Some of the requirements are secondary containment for liquids, fire water sprinklers over inside storage/use areas, and non-combustible construction materials. In addition, the Project would be required to comply the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program through the submission and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan during construction activities to prevent contaminated runoff from leaving the Project site.

With implementation of the proposed Project, there are no reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions that would create a significant hazard to the public due to the release of hazardous materials. Impacts are considered less than significant.

The operational phase of the proposed Project would occur after construction is completed and access to the bridge is available for vehicular traffic. This development does not routinely transport, use, or dispose of hazardous materials, or present a reasonably foreseeable release of hazardous materials, with the exception of common maintenance-related hazardous materials such as cleaners, paint, petroleum products, etc. The proposed Project would not create a significant hazard through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, nor would a significant hazard to the public or to the environment through the reasonably foreseeable upset and accidental conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment occur.

IX.c) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation. As previously discussed, the site is located in an area with urban uses, with the site bordered by commercial storage units to the north, disturbed

grassland and commercial businesses to the east, fallowed agricultural land to the south, and riparian forest and oak woodland to the west. Single-family residences are located approximately 400 ft south of the site. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile radius of the Project site. Although the construction phase may utilize small amounts of hazardous materials, all hazardous materials utilized on-site would be used and disposed of in accordance with all applicable federal, State, and local regulations. In order to help minimize potential impacts associated with the proposed Project, Mitigation Measure AIR-1 is required as described above in the Section III, Air Quality, above, which requires all equipment to be utilized under the Project is maintained in good working condition. In addition, use of hazardous materials would be limited to construction which will be conducted in accordance to Best Management Practices (BMPs). Furthermore, when the proposed Project commences, all hazardous materials at the Site would be required to be stored, handled, and transported in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations. With mitigation incorporated, a less than significant impact would occur.

IX.d) No Impact. The location of the proposed Project and adjacent properties has been checked against the lists of hazardous materials sites maintained by the State of California. The proposed Project is not located on a site included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5. Therefore, no impact would occur.

IX.e) No Impact. The proposed Project is not included in an airport land use plan, is not within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Thus, there would be no impact.

IX.f) Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activities may take place within right-of-ways of existing roadways. Construction activities will be temporary in nature and will not cause any road closures that could interfere with any adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. The construction contractor will be required to work with the City and County (public works, police/fire, etc.) if and when roadway diversions are required to ensure that adequate access is maintained for residents and emergency vehicles. Additionally, operation of the Project will improve emergency access to the western portion of the City of Lakeport. As such, any impacts will be less than significant.

IX.g) No Impact. The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. The proposed Project may entail installation of a continuous sidewalk, widened road, and as a result some replacement of utility poles which would not increase exposure of people or property to wildland fires. Therefore, no impact would occur.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Refer to Mitigation Measure AIR-1 in Section III, Air Quality, above.

FINDINGS

The proposed project would have a **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated** to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Thresholds of Significance: The project would have a significant effect on hydrology and water quality if it would violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality; substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin; substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site, 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 impede or redirect flows; in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation; or conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

DISCUSSION

The City of Lakeport currently obtains its water from two primary sources: groundwater sources and water from Clear Lake treated at the City's water treatment plant. The groundwater supply consists of four wells located in Scotts Valley. Two of the wells are on Scotts Creek adjacent to the City's old pumping plant and two wells are located on the Green Ranch. Seasonal fluctuation in the underground water table means that the wells are only viable for portions of the year. When water supply from the wells in Scotts Valley is limited, the City relies on treated surface water from Clear Lake (City General Plan, 2009). The Project site is located approximately one mile west of Clear Lake.

The City of Lakeport and the Project site are under the jurisdiction of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB), which is under the direction of the California State Water Resources Control Board. The Clean Water Act and the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act provide regulatory responsibility to these two agencies for regulating and protecting water quality.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program addresses water pollution by regulating point sources that discharge pollutants to waters of the United States. Created in 1972 by the Clean Water Act, the NPDES permit program grants authority to State governments to perform many permitting, administrative, and enforcement aspects of the program. Within California, the NPDES permit program is administered by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB).

IMPACT ANALYSIS

X.a-b) T Less Than Significant Impact. The Project will involve installing a bridge across Forbes Creek, linking Wrigley Street and Craig Avenue. The bridge will be assembled off-site. Bridge footings will be drilled into the ground and constructed outside of the top of bank. A crane will be used to place the prefabricated bridge on the footings. The proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality. The proposed bridge would be constructed in accordance with the most recent standards set by all regulatory agencies, including but not limited to the City and State and local water quality control boards (SWRCB and NCRWQCB). Additionally, the Project would be subject to the Statewide General Construction Permit, which requires the preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that specifies erosion and sediment control construction and post-construction BMPs to reduce or eliminate construction-related and operational impacts on receiving water quality. It is not anticipated that the Project would decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge; therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. Therefore, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact.

X.c.i-iv) Less Than Significant Impact. Proposed Project development would result in an increase in impervious surface area from existing conditions. Proposed Project development would include construction and post-construction BMPs, including updated drainage facilities, to accommodate Project-related increases in storm water flows designed according to current federal, State, and local regulatory standards. Therefore, the increase in impervious surface and associated construction would

not result in substantial erosion or siltation. Additionally, mitigation measures mentioned in this document will prevent erosion or siltation of Forbes Creek. No alteration of the course of a river or stream would result from Project development due to BMPs outlined in the SWPPP and NDPEs permits. Therefore, a less than significant would occur as a result of the Project.

Site drainage would continue to be directed towards the City's stormwater drainage system, underground storm water detention system and landscape areas, which would reduce the amount of surface runoff. Additionally, the proposed Project would not be anticipated to 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, as the project would be required to implement BMPs to minimize the potential for this to occur. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Map 06033C0491D effective September 30, 2005, Forbes Creek is designated as Regulatory Floodway With Base Flood Elevation or Depth. The proposed bridge development will not impede or redirect flows, significantly increase the amount of surface runoff, or contribute significant amounts of runoff that would exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage systems. The bridge footings will be constructed in accordance with the Building Standards as outlined in local, State, and if applicable, federal policies.

It is not anticipated to significantly change the drainage patterns associated with the development. All project features, including culverts, gutters and on-site detention, would meet the most recent regulations set by the City, CVRWQCB, and any other applicable regulatory agencies.

Currently, the site is vacant and undeveloped. Under the City's General Plan (Policy LU 7.4), the City shall require all construction to employ stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs). Implementation of BMPs would improve the quality and/or control the quantity of runoff with measures such as, detention ponds, constructed wetlands, updated drainage facilities, and construction practices which regulate erosion control. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact.

X.d) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project will involve construction on an approximately 1-acre parcel that currently supports riparian forest, fallowed agricultural land, and disturbed grassland. The proposed development will be a bridge across the Regulatory Floodway of Forbes Creek, so that the development itself is not in the Flood Zone. As shown on the California Department of Conservation, Tsunami Maps and Data, the project Site is not located within a tsunami inundation zone. With the implementation of BMPs associated with SWPPP, the risk of release of pollutants due to project inundation will be minimized. According to the FEMA flood map and Figure 18 (Seiche Inundation Zone) of the Lakeport General Plan, the proposed site is clear of any seiche inundation zones. Less than significant impacts would occur.

X.e) Less Than Significant Impact. A SWPPP, listing BMPs to prevent construction pollutants and products from violating any water quality standard or waste discharge requirements, would be prepared for the proposed Project, per the General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit (Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ). Therefore, the proposed Project is not anticipated to conflict with or obstruct

implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Less than significant impacts would occur.

MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation required.

FINDINGS

The proposed project would have a **Less Than Significant Impact** on Hydrology and Water Quality.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: The project would have a significant effect on land use and planning if it would physically divide an established community or 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.

DISCUSSION

Currently, land use in Lakeport is approximately 76 percent commercial/residential, 5 percent industrial, and 19 percent open space/governmental/agriculture. Marketing efforts promote Lakeport's appeal as a vacation and recreation destination. In recent years City leaders have emphasized various economic development strategies in an effort to make the City the focal point of economic and community activity for the County and the region.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

XI.a-b) No Impact. The Project developments would consist of installing a prefabricated bridge structure across Forbes Creek that will link Wrigley Street to the south with Craig Avenue to the north. Construction and operation of the Project itself would not cause any land use changes in the surrounding vicinity nor would it divide an established community. The immediate vicinity of the proposed Project site is comprised of single-family residences, commercial, and agricultural activities. The proposed Project has no characteristics that would physically divide the City of Lakeport. Access to the existing surrounding establishments will improve as a result of the Project. The proposed Project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation and would remain consistent with local land use and zoning policies. No impacts would occur as a result of Project implementation.

MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation required.

FINDINGS

The proposed project would have **No Impact** on Land Use and Planning.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>
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"/>

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: The project would have a significant effect on mineral resources if it would 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 or 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.

DISCUSSION

The proposed Project is not located in an area of known rock, aggregate, sand, or other mineral resource deposits of local, regional, or State residents. In addition, as supported by the City of Lakeport's General Plan, there are no mineral extraction or other mining operations at present within the Lakeport city limits or Sphere of Influence. Sand, gravel, and borax deposits are extracted in the Scotts Valley and Big Valley Areas, approximately 20 miles from the City. These mining operations have a significant impact on ground water capacity, siltation of streams, and highway traffic. The current Lakeport General Plan prohibits any mining or mineral extraction activities within the City and calls for the City to work with the County of Lake to discourage such land uses within the City's Sphere of Influence (City General Plan, 2009).

IMPACT ANALYSIS

XII.a-b) No Impact. The Project area does not contain mineral resources that are of value locally, to the region, or to residents. The Project area is not identified as a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. Therefore, the proposed Project would not interfere with materials extraction or otherwise cause a short-term or long-term decrease in the availability of mineral resources. No impact would occur.

MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation required.

FINDINGS

The proposed project would have **No Impact** on Mineral Resources.

XIII. NOISE. Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: The project would have a significant effect on noise if it would 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; or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels; or expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels (for a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport or an airport land use plan, or where such as plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport).

DISCUSSION

Currently, the main sources of noise in the surrounding areas include traffic on local roadways, residential noise (lawn movers, audio equipment, voices, etc.), commercial and agricultural activity related noise. As noted in the City's General Plan, the primary noise generators within the City of Lakeport are vehicular traffic, boaters on Clear Lake, and events at the racetrack at the County Fairgrounds (2009). Traffic noise volume depends primarily on traffic speed, volume, and vehicle type. The main motor vehicle noise source is tire noise, which increases with speed.

Certain land uses are particularly sensitive to noise and vibration, including residential, school, and open space/recreation areas where quiet environments are necessary for enjoyment, public health, and safety.

Table 3 (Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards) included in the Noise Element of the City's General Plan includes the maximum exterior noise levels for different use types, including but not limited to residential development and schools, which have a standard of 60 dBA or less (provided below).

Table 3: Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards

Land Use	Maximum Exterior Noise Level
Residential Development	Up to 60db
Transient Lodging: Motel and Hotel	Up to 60db
School, Library, Church, Hospital and Nursing Home	Up to 60db
Auditorium, Concert Hall, Amphitheater, Sports Arena	Up to 70db
Sports Arena, Outdoor Spectator Sports	Up to 75db
Playgrounds, Neighborhood Parks, Open Space	Up to 70db
Golf Course, cemetery	Up to 70db
Office Building, Business, Commercial & Professional	Up to 65db
Industrial, Manufacturing, Utilities	Up to 70db

The City of Lakeport includes noise regulations in Chapter 17.28 (Performance Standards) of Title 17 (Land Use, Zoning, and Signs) of the *Lakeport Municipal Code* (LMC). Within the City, excessive noise is considered a nuisance and is discouraged. Specifically, within the residential zoning districts, maximum 15-minute sound levels within any one-hour equivalent sound pressure levels (A-weighted -dBA) shall be limited to 60 dBA during the hours of 7:00am to 10:00pm and 45 dBA during the hours of 10:00pm to 7:00am. Project work would be limited to the daytime hours of 7:00am to 7:00pm, Monday through Friday and between 8:00AM and 7:00PM on Saturdays and Sundays. However, the City may allow construction between 7:00PM and 7:00AM on any day if it can be demonstrated that noise would not adversely impact the neighborhood, or in the event of necessity as determined by the Building Official.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

XIII.a-b) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation. The sensitive receptors located in the vicinity of the Site include single-family residences approximately 400 ft. south of the site. As noted in the City’s General Plan, several principal streets and highways are noted that are projected to experience a significant increase in noise over 60 decibels (dBA).

As a result of Project development, increased noise levels at the site would be anticipated during the Project’s construction phases, as Project construction would require the use of heavy machinery to prepare the site for the bridge, including drilling and ground preparation. Construction-related activities and the associated heavy equipment would cause temporary increase in noise, and temporary groundborne vibration and groundborne noise, which may be high at times and exceed noise standards within proximity to the sensitive receptors (including residences) in close proximity to the site; however, these impacts would only be associated with construction and would be temporary in nature. Upon buildout, the proposed bridge would not result in a substantial permanent increase in noise levels, since residential and commercial activities already exist in the area.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1 and NOI-2 will limit when construction may occur, require neighboring landowners be notified of construction activities, and require equipment utilized for the Project to be equipped with muffles to lessen noise impacts. Thus, less than significant impacts would occur with mitigation incorporated.

MITIGATION MEASURES

NOI-1: Construction noise shall be limited through operational standards. Construction activities shall be limited to between the hours of 7:00AM and 7:00PM Monday through Friday and between 8:00AM and 7:00PM on Saturdays and Sundays. The City may allow construction between 7:00PM and 7:00AM on any day if it can be demonstrated that noise would not adversely impact the neighborhood, or in the event of necessity as determined by the Building Official. Neighboring landowners shall be notified of the anticipated construction schedule prior to the commencement of construction activities.

NOI-2: All equipment driven by internal combustion engines shall be equipped with mufflers, which are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment. The construction contractor shall utilize "quiet" models of air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists. At all times during project construction, stationary noise-generating equipment shall be located as far as practicable from sensitive receptors and placed so that emitted noise is directed away from residences. Unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines shall be prohibited. Construction staging areas shall be established at locations that would create the greatest distance between the construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the project Site during all project construction activities, to the extent feasible. The construction contractor shall designate a "noise disturbance coordinator" who shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator shall be responsible for determining the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, poor muffler, etc.) and instituting reasonable measures as warranted to correct the problem. A telephone number for the disturbance coordinator shall be conspicuously posted at the construction site.

XIII.c) No Impact. The Project area is not located within the vicinity of private airstrip or an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The nearest airport to the Site, Lampson Field Airport, a public use airport, is located approximately four miles southeast of the Site. No impact would occur as a result of Project implementation.

FINDINGS

The proposed Project would have **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated** on Noise.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and/or businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: The project would have a significant effect on population and housing if it would induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and/or businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure); or displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

DISCUSSION

The City of Lakeport has an estimated population of 4,967, with 2508 housing units as of 1/1/2023 per data from California Department of Finance.¹⁶ The City plans to extend services and infrastructure in the urban boundary to accommodate growth.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

XIV.a-b) No Impact. The proposed Project consists of development of a bridge in the western part of Lakeport, linking Craig Avenue and Wrigley Street. The Project will improve circulation and access in the western part of the City and additionally provide temporary construction jobs to the local workforce. There are no new homes or businesses associated with the proposed Project, nor would Project implementation displace people or housing. Therefore, no population will be induced from the Project. There will be no impact.

MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation required.

FINDINGS

The proposed project would have **No Impact** on Population and Housing.

¹⁶ Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, Department of Finance. <https://dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/>. Accessed September, 2023.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: The project would have a significant effect on public services if it would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or result in the 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 (a) fire protection, (b) police protection, (c) schools, (d) parks, or (e) other public facilities.

DISCUSSION

The proposed Project site is served by the Lakeport Fire Protection District. The Lakeport Fire Protection District is a special district, independent all-risk fire district, located in the county seat of Lake County, on the west shore of Clear Lake. The Lakeport Fire Protection District is approximately one mile northwest of the proposed project location.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

XV.a-b) Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed above, fire protection services at the proposed Project site are currently provided by the Lakeport Fire Protection District and would continue to be with Project development. The Project would be required to comply with all applicable fire and building safety codes (California Building Code and Uniform Fire Code) to ensure fire safety elements are incorporated into final Project design, including the providing designated fire lanes marked as such. The proposed roadway will be required to provide appropriate widths and turning radii to safely accommodate emergency response and the transport of emergency/public safety vehicles. As a result, appropriate fire safety considerations will be included as part of the Project final design. The proposed Project area is served by the City of Lakeport Police Department located approximately one mile to the southeast. The Project site does not contain police protection facilities that would need to be altered as a result of the proposed development. The Project is not expected to require closure of either Wrigley Street or Craig Avenue. The Department would not need to expand its existing service area or construct a new facility to serve the Project site.

The proposed Project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth, therefore, less than significant impacts would occur.

XV.c-e) No Impacts. The proposed Project would not increase the number of residents in the School District or the City, as the Project does not include residential units. Because the demand for schools, parks, and other public facilities is driven by population, the proposed Project would not increase demand for those services. As such, the proposed Project would result in no impact.

MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation required.

FINDINGS

The proposed project would have a **Less Than Significant Impact** on Public Services.

XVI. RECREATION. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>
b) 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"/>

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: The project would have a significant effect on recreation if it would 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 or include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

DISCUSSION

The City of Lakeport’s parks and recreation facilities contribute to the connectivity, character, health and culture of the community. Lakeport is known for its popular recreational activities, such as boating, bass fishing, wakeboarding, swimming, sailing, and kayaking and is a destination for many tourists.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

XVI.a-b) No Impacts. The proposed Project involves construction of a bridge across Forbes Creek, linking Craig Avenue and Wrigley Street. The proposed Project would not encroach upon any existing recreational areas or any planned recreational areas. The proposed Project does not include the

construction of residential uses and would not directly or indirectly induce population growth. Therefore, the proposed Project would not cause physical deterioration of existing recreational facilities from increased usage or result in the need for new or expanded recreational facilities. The Project would have no impact to recreational facilities.

MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation required.

FINDINGS

The proposed project would have **No Impact** on Recreation.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: The project would have a significant effect on transportation if it would conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities; conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b); substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); or result in inadequate emergency access.

DISCUSSION

Roads within the City limits are maintained by the Streets Division of the City of Lakeport Public Works Department, in addition to curb and gutter, drainage systems and structures, and right-of-way improvements within the City, including but not limited to asphalt overlays and repairs, street signs, pavement markings, culvert maintenance and replacement, and other street related projects (City of Lakeport Public Works, n.d.).

The City of Lakeport is a member of the Lake Area Planning Council (APC), which is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the Lake County region. Primarily, the RTPA ensures that appropriate local transportation planning is administered in accordance with the Transportation

Development Act (TDA), the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), and the Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) program. (Lake APC, n.d.).

As noted in the City's 2025 General Plan, "Lakeport's roadway network is defined and constrained by two barriers: Clear Lake on the East and State Highway 29 on the West. The majority of the city is laid out in a rectangular grid pattern which is interrupted by hilly terrain. In these hilly areas the street system becomes discontinuous and through traffic is difficult. Many of the City's streets are narrow, not improved to current standards, and will require upgrading...Although construction of the State Highway 29 freeway has reduced congestion downtown, it is now a barrier inhibiting east-west circulation through the Planning Area" (2009).

As stated in the City's 2025 General Plan, traffic volumes are expected to increase as the population increases in both the City of Lakeport and County of Lake.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

XVII.a-b) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project site is in the central-west portion of the City of Lakeport, and proposed Project implementation would link Craig Avenue and Wrigley Street via a bridge across Forbes Creek. The proposed Project site is located on APN 025-441-43 across approximately 1 acre. The parcel currently supports riparian forest, fallowed agricultural land, and disturbed grassland. The Project site is bordered by commercial storage units to the north, disturbed grassland and commercial businesses to the east, fallowed agricultural land to the south, and riparian forest and oak woodland to the west.

The Project components would require periodic trips associated with maintenance and inspection, however, these trips would be sporadic and as such, level of service standards would not be exceeded. In addition, the Project would not modify or impact any existing streets or roadways. The proposed Project would not cause a substantial increase in traffic, create any additional congestion at any intersections, or conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b). The proposed Project is not anticipated to conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, as several improvements would occur. Additionally, the Project will improve circulation in the area by linking Craig Avenue and Wrigley Street. A less than significant impact would occur.

XVII.c) Less Than Significant Impact. The roadways adjacent to the proposed Project are pre-existing and a significant change in use is not proposed. The proposed improvements would be designed in accordance to all City standards to ensure the features would be safe and would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections. Less than significant impacts would occur.

XVII.d) No Impacts. The proposed Project would not result in inadequate emergency access on the existing road system. Construction schedules within roadways will be coordinated with police/fire/emergency services. Adequate emergency access will be maintained at all times. The site and surrounding vicinity are currently developed to meet pertinent design criteria to provide adequate

emergency access in accordance with all design standards and requirements. Additionally, the Project development will improve circulation and emergency access to nearby areas. No impact would occur as a result of Project implementation.

MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation required.

FINDINGS

The proposed project would have a **Less Than Significant Impact** on Transportation.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code §21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code §5020.1 (k)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code §5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code §5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Thresholds of Significance: The project would have a significant effect on Tribal Cultural Resources if it would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code §21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Places or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code §5020.1(k), or is 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 §5024.1.

DISCUSSION

As discussed under Section V, Cultural Resources, above, a Cultural Records Search was conducted by the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) for the proposed Project on April 20, 2022 by reviewing pertinent NWIC base maps that reference cultural resources records and reports, historic-period maps, and literature for Lake County, which included a review of all study reports on file within a one-quarter mile radius of the project area (NWIC File No. 21-1389).

On September 20, 2023, in response to request for notification of projects pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 (Public Resources Code 21073, 21074, 21080.3.1, 21080.3.2, 21082.3, 21083.09, 21084.2, and 5097.94), the City of Lakeport provided notification and provided 30-days to request consultation to the Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians and Big Valley Band of Pomo Indians regarding the Lakeport EVA Bridge Project (proposed project). As of the date of this Initial Study, no requests for formal consultation have been received from the Native community regarding the project, however, the Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians requested site monitoring during construction related activities.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

XVIII.a.i) No Impacts. As discussed under Section V, Cultural Resources, in order for a cultural resource to be deemed “important” under CEQA and thus eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR), it must meet at least one of the following criteria (as set forth in Section 5024.1(c) of the Public Resources Code):

1. is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California History and cultural heritage; or
2. is associated with the lives of persons important to our past; or
3. embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possess high artistic value; or
4. has yielded or is likely to yield, information important to prehistory or history (ALTA, 2019).

As provided in the Cultural Records Search, the records search showed that there has been one cultural resource study, S-31281, that covers approximately 100% of the proposed project area (Flaherty 2005) (see Appendix D). The Project area contains no recorded archaeological resources. The State Office of Historic Preservation Built Environment Resources Directory (OHP BERD) lists no recorded buildings or structures within or adjacent to the proposed project area. In addition to these inventories, the NWIC base maps show no recorded buildings or structures within the proposed project area. While the proposed project area is described as within the tribal territory of the Kulanapo, there were no specific references to Native American resources in or adjacent to the proposed Project area found in the ethnographic literature (Barrett 1908:18, Stewart 1935). No impact would occur.

XVIII.a.ii) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation. As described above, on September 20, 2023, in response to request for notification of projects pursuant to Assembly Bill 52 (Public Resources Code 21073, 21074, 21080.3.1, 21080.3.2, 21082.3, 21083.09, 21084.2, and 5097.94), the City of Lakeport provided notification and provided 30-days to request consultation to the Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians and Big Valley Band of Pomo Indians regarding the Lakeport EVA Bridge Project (proposed project). As of the date of this Initial Study, no requests for formal consultation have been received from the Native community regarding the project, however, the Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians requested site monitoring during construction related activities.

Although no archaeological resources have been identified, it does not preclude the possibility of such resources, including cultural or Tribal cultural resources or human remains, existing within the Project area.

Due to the potential for unrecorded Native American and archaeological resources and human remains at the Site, Mitigation Measures CUL-1, CUL-2 and CUL-3 are included, which describes the prescribed protocol in the event inadvertent archaeological discovery(ies) are made, including the discovery of human remains, and describes the monitoring as requested by the Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians. With mitigation incorporated, a less than significant impact would occur.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Refer to Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-3 in Section V, Cultural Resources, above.

FINDINGS

The proposed Project would have a **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated** on Tribal Cultural Resources.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: The project would have a significant effect on utilities and service systems if it would require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects; not have sufficient

water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years; result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments; 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; or not comply with federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

DISCUSSION

The City of Lakeport Public Works Department serves the incorporated Lakeport community. The Department consists of several divisions which are responsible for water, sewer, underground utilities (installation and maintenance), storm drain system maintenance, and public park maintenance and operations.

Water Service

The Water Division continuously monitors the quality of the water that is provided to Lakeport's water customers and holds the responsibility of providing safe drinking water as its highest priority. The Water Division operates and maintains four wells, a surface water treatment facility, and distribution system to individual meters. The Division also works with developers and customers on water service issues during project design, during service installation and to address future needs.

Sewer Service

The Sewer Division of the Lakeport Public Works Department is responsible for the safe collection, treatment, and disposal of sewage and wastewater generated by residential, commercial and industrial customers inside the City of Lakeport. All of the City's wastewater activities are done in a manner compliant with State and County health and safety regulations. The primary directive of the Sewer Division is to ensure that Lakeport's streams, waterways and Clear Lake are free from disease-causing bacteria and viruses that are harmful to the public health.

Storm Drainage System/Wastewater

The Streets Division of the City of Lakeport Public Works Department provides for the maintenance and minor construction of all City streets, curb, gutter, drainage systems structures, and right-of-way improvements. This includes asphalt overlays and repairs, street signs, pavement markings, culvert maintenance and replacement, and other street related projects. The Streets Division also provides many additional public service functions, including providing traffic control devices for parades and other special events. The wastewater operations and service entity is governed by a Board of Directors, which also acts as the City Council (City Public Works, Streets Division, n.d.).

Within the Streets Division there is the Underground Utility Construction staff which installs and maintains new and existing water and sewer systems to private property, and within dedicated easements throughout the City. This division works on emergency water breaks and sewer stoppages and schedules repair or replacement of water distribution and collection systems deficiencies.

Solid Waste Service

Lakeport Disposal provides solid waste and recycling collection services to commercial, residential, and industrial customers within the incorporated limits of Lakeport. The nearest active landfill is Eastlake Landfill (17-AA-0001) in Clearlake, California, located approximately 28 miles from the project Site. The Eastlake Landfill has a daily permitted disposal of approximately 200 tons per day.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

XIX.a) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would not require the construction or expansion of any new water or wastewater facilities. The Project does not involve reconstruction of the water main or displacement of any of the existing water service utilities, therefore there will be no impacts to these existing utilities. The Project construction will require electric power; however, no impacts to existing power grid is expected. The riparian forest and nonnative grassland on the Project site were crossed by existing utility lines. Appropriate buffer will be maintained with these existing utilities.

No impacts to telecommunications is expected. The Project may require some grading of the area under the bridge which would not modify the existing topography of the area significantly. Water usage for the construction and operation of the proposed Project would be minimal and existing entitlements and resources have the capacity to serve any water needs for the proposed Project. As noted in Section IV and Section X, the proposed Project will implement stormwater controls and develop a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) identifying specific BMPs to be implemented to minimize the amount of sediment and other pollutants associated with construction sites from being discharged in stormwater runoff. The impact will be less than significant.

XIX.b) Less Than Significant Impact. Water usage for the construction and implementation of the Project would be minimal and existing entitlements and resources have the capacity to serve any water needs for the Project and have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project during normal, dry and multiple dry years. Less than significant impacts will occur as a result.

XIX.c) No Impacts. The proposed Project involves construction and operation of a bridge, hence, the population is not expected to increase as a result of the Project. Therefore, the proposed Project would not require additional or expanded infrastructure relating to municipal water or wastewater treatment. The Project, as proposed, would not include any updates to the utilities managed by the Sewer Division. No impacts to wastewater system would occur.

XIX.d) Less Than Significant Impact. Proposed Project construction would generate solid waste in the form of construction debris that would need to be disposed of at the Eastlake Landfill Facility. Construction debris includes concrete, asphalt, wood, drywall, metals, and other miscellaneous and composite materials. Much of this material would be recycled and salvaged to the maximum extent feasible. Materials not recycled would be disposed of at local landfills. The proposed Project site is currently undeveloped and would not require any demolition of existing structures. The proposed development includes construction of a bridge, and as such, proposed Project operation is not expected to generate solid waste. Less than significant impacts would occur.

XIX.e) No Impacts. Additionally, the proposed Project would be required to comply with applicable State and local regulations, including regulations pertaining to disposal of recyclable materials. With adequate landfill capacity at existing landfills and compliance with regulations, no impacts would occur.

MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation required.

FINDINGS

The proposed project would have a **Less Than Significant Impact** on Utilities and Service Systems.

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

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: The project would have a significant effect on wildfire if it would impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; 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; 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; or 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 challenges.

DISCUSSION

The combination of vegetation, topography, climate, and population density create a significant potential for hazards from wildfires within the Lakeport Planning Area. There are many vacant and undeveloped areas within the City and its Sphere of Influence, particularly on the west side of Highway

29 and the northern portions of the City, including mobile home parks. Rugged topography and highly flammable vegetation make residential development potentially unsafe unless adequate fire safety measures are taken (City General Plan, 2009).

The area within the City is served by the Lakeport Fire Protection District. Any location within City limits can be reached within three to five minutes. Locations within the Sphere of Influence can be reached in five to seven minutes. This rapid response time can be attributed to the combination of full-time staff and emergency personnel in the Lakeport Fire Protection District and a large number of volunteers.

The CalFire Fire Hazard Severity Zones Map was developed to guide construction standards for building permits, use of natural hazard disclosure at time of sale, guide defensible space clearance around buildings, set property development standards, and considerations of fire hazard in city and county general plans.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

XX.a) Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Lakeport is developing an emergency response plan. The streets surrounding and adjacent to the Project site are mainly used by the residential areas in the vicinity of the site and are not main thoroughfares through the City. The Project itself involves linking Craig Avenue and Wrigley Street to improve connectivity, access and safety. Construction activities could result in minor delays for emergency vehicles or law enforcement; however, access to Craig Avenue and Wrigley Street will remain available through other existing City roadways. This would ensure the passage of emergency and passenger vehicles in the event of an emergency, including wildfire. The Project related activities would not be anticipated to significantly impact the capacity of the street system, the Project would have a less than significant impact.

XX.b-c) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project area is located in a Local Responsibility Area per CalFire's Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ) Viewer. Per Lake County, the site is within a 'High' FHSZ. The proposed bridge development will connect Craig Avenue to north with Wrigley Street in the south, in close proximity to Parallel Drive and the onramps to State Route 29. The close proximity of State Route 29 provides a quick access for emergency evacuation and would not exacerbate wildfire risk. The Project is in a growing residential area, and the addition of an emergency vehicle access bridge would improve accessibility and safety to residents in that growing area. The Project would have less than significant impacts.

XX.d) Less Than Significant Impact. The area is flat in nature which would limit the risk of downslope flooding and landslides, and limit any wildfire spread. Furthermore, the Project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including drainage challenges. Therefore, there would be no impact on wildfire risk or spread of pollutants from such thereafter. Additionally, implementation of the Project's grading and stormwater features would help stabilize the Project area from negative impacts related to stormwater runoff, as the Project proposes features to better manage, direct, and contain runoff, and has been designed to maintain stormwater flows within the Project area. Less than significant impacts would occur.

MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation required.

FINDINGS

The proposed project would have a **Less Than Significant Impact** on Wildfire.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: The project would have a significant effect on mandatory findings of significance if it would 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; have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.); or have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

DISCUSSION

The proposed Project involves construction and operation of a bridge across Forbes Creek, linking Craig Avenue and Wrigley Street in the western portion of the City of Lakeport.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

XXI.a) Less Than Significant Impacts with Mitigation Incorporation. The analyses of environmental issues contained in this Initial Study indicate that the proposed Project is not expected to have substantial impact on the environment or on any resources identified in the Initial Study. Mitigation measures have been incorporated as described in each impact area to reduce all potentially significant impacts to *less than significant*.

XXI.b) Less Than Significant Impact. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(i) states that a Lead Agency shall consider whether the cumulative impact of a project is significant and whether the effects of the project are cumulatively considerable. The assessment of the significance of the cumulative effects of a project must, therefore, be conducted in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probable future projects. Due to the nature of the Project and consistency with environmental policies, incremental contributions to impacts are considered less than cumulatively considerable. All Project-related impacts were determined to be either less than significant, or less than significant after mitigation. The proposed Project would not contribute substantially to adverse cumulative conditions, or create any substantial indirect impacts (i.e., increase in population could lead to an increased need for housing, increase in traffic, air pollutants, etc.). Due to buildout of the area and existing land constraints, it is not anticipated that further development will occur in the area in the foreseeable future. As such, Project impacts are not considered to be cumulatively considerable given the lack of proposed new development in the area and the insignificance of Project-induced impacts. The impact is therefore *less than significant*.

XXI.c) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would not generate any potential direct or indirect environmental effect that would have a substantial adverse impact on human beings including, but not limited to, exposure to geologic hazards, air quality, water quality, traffic hazards, noise, and fire hazards. With mitigation incorporated, all potential impacts associated with the proposed project would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. A less than significant impact would occur.

MITIGATION MEASURES

FINDINGS

The proposed project would have a **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated** on Mandatory Findings of Significance.

FIGURES

Figure 1	Regional Map
Figure 2	Location Map
Figure 3	Site Plan

APPENDIX A

Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP)

APPENDIX B

CalEEMod Output Files

APPENDIX C

Biological Resources Assessment

APPENDIX D

CHRIS Records Search Results