



**CITY OF LAKEPORT
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
INITIAL STUDY / ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
(ER 15-02)**

INITIAL STUDY AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The application for Amendment of the City of Lakeport General Plan and Zone Change is subject to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, Title 17 of the City of Lakeport Municipal Code, and City Council Resolution No. 1160, all of which deal with environmental review procedures.

Project Title: Building Acquisition for New Police Department
General Plan Amendment & Zone Change

Permit Number: GPA 15-01; ZC 15-01

Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Lakeport
Community Development Department
City Hall—225 Park Street
Lakeport CA 95453

Contact Person and Phone Number: Kevin M. Ingram, Community Development Director
(707) 263-5615 x11

Project Location(s): 2025 South Main Street, Lakeport
APN: 005-045-42

Project Sponsor's Name and Address: City of Lakeport
225 Park Street
Lakeport, CA 95453

General Plan Designation: Existing: Major Retail
Proposed: Public and Civic Uses

Zoning: Existing: C-2 Major Retail
Proposed: PCU Public and Civic Uses

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

The City of Lakeport is processing an application for a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change for property located at 2025 South Main Street, Lakeport (APN 005-045-42) to allow for the relocation of the City's Police Station to this site. The existing 4,460 square foot structure was constructed in 2002 and utilized by the Social Security Administration for their Lake County operations. No exterior changes are proposed to the existing building. Proposed development improvements will be limited to: minor interior remodel, construction of a 6 to 7 foot chain link fence with privacy slats around the south parking lot area to be utilized for police vehicle parking and the placement of an emergency generator.

The current general plan land use designation and zoning district is Major Retail (C-2). A general plan amendment and zone change to Public and Civic Uses is required to allow for the operation of a police station at this location, per Section 17.16.020(D) of the City of Lakeport Zoning Ordinance.

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

This project is located within the KMART Shopping Center at the southern end of the City of Lakeport. The existing structure is located on the eastern side of the Shopping Center adjacent to the main entrance along South Main Street. The shopping center currently consists of KMART and O'Reilly Auto Parts both of which are zoned C-2, Major Retail. South Main Street is located directly to the east of this site. Property to the northeast of the project site is vacant and zoned C-2, Major Retail. Property to the southeast of this site is zoned R-5, Resort/Residential and is a part of the Victorian Village Planned Development.

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

Lake County Air Quality Management District—(use of generator)

Location Map



ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

DETERMINATION

On the basis of the initial evaluation that follows:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. A TIERED ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, no further environmental document is required. FINDINGS consistent with this determination will be prepared.”

Initial Study prepared by:



Kevin M. Ingram, Director

March 5, 2015

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

I. **AESTHETICS:** The proposed amendments of the Lakeport General Plan and Rezoning of land under the Lakeport Zoning Ordinance will not result in direct aesthetic impacts.

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	

Response I a): The proposed General Plan Amendment, Zone Change and future site improvements will not have a substantial adverse effect on an established scenic vistas. Figure 16 of the City of Lakeport General Plan (Conservation, Open Space, Parks and Recreation Element) details environmentally sensitive areas, including view corridors. No view corridors exist in the vicinity of the project. There is **no impact**.

Response I b): The project will not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway. There are no designated scenic highways within the City of Lakeport. This project is not visible from State Highway 29. There is **no impact**.

Response I c): Proposed development associated with the operation of the City of Lakeport Police Department at this site includes the erection of a six to seven foot high chain link fence with privacy slats extending from the rear of the existing building and encompassing the southern parking lot. The purpose of the fenced area is to screen and provide security for the housing of the Department’s vehicle fleet and other miscellaneous equipment. Fence slating is proposed to screen the vehicle storage area from passing traffic along South Main Street and customer parking areas within the shopping center. Fence slating is proposed to be consistent and complimentary to the color scheme of the existing building. Potential impacts are considered to be **less than significant**.

Response I d): The inclusion of additional lighting at this site will likely be required to provide for additional security for the public and Police Department staff. Additional lighting will adhere to applicable lighting and glare performance standards contained in Section 17.28.010(B) of the Lakeport Zoning Ordinance. All lighting will be shielded, boxed, or directed at a downward angle so as to minimize the generation of light upon adjacent properties or any of the surrounding streets. This potential impact is considered to be **less than significant** at this time.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impact to forest resources, including timberland are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				X
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X

Response II a): Staff reviewed the State of California Important Farmland Map for Lake County and visited the web site for the State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection (<ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2006/lak06.pdf>), and found that the subject property is not considered to be prime farmland, unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance. The project site is located in an urban/built-up area according to the Important Farmland Map. The proposal will not result in the conversion of prime farmland to non-agricultural use. There is **no impact**.

Response II b): The site is not zoned for agricultural uses and City and County records indicate that it is not subject to a Williamson Act contract. There is **no impact**.

Response II c), d): The site is not zoned for forest uses or timberland and the project will not result in the loss or conversion of existing forest land. **No impact** is anticipated.

Response II e): There are no aspects of the project that would result in the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. There is **no impact**.

III. AIR QUALITY:

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
c) 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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X

Response III a): The Lake County Air Basin is designated as an attainment area (at or below required State and Federal standards). The proposed General Plan Amendment, Zone Change and future site improvements associated with this project will not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the County's air quality program. There is **no impact**.

Response III b): Minor site improvements, most notably the construction of fencing, will result in very minimal and temporary localized increases in particulate air pollution related to construction activities at this site. The LCAQMD typically submits comments that require normal precautions to be taken during site preparation and construction to prevent dust, such as watering and use of palliatives, no burning of vegetative wastes, and managed heavy equipment idling. The parcel is not located in a mapped serpentine area. Potential impacts are considered to be **less than significant**.

Response III c): The proposed General Plan Amendment, Zone Change and future site improvements will not directly result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant not currently in attainment. Proposed site improvements include the installation of an emergency backup generator and propane tank. The proposed generator will be utilized only during occurrences of electrical power failure and will be supplied by propane and not diesel. The City will be responsible for obtaining and complying with all permitting regulations of the LCAQMD related to the use of generators at this site. The Lake County region is currently under attainment levels for all criteria pollutants. Potential impacts are considered to be **less than significant**.

Response III d, e): Approval of the General Plan Amendment and Zone Change together with the proposed minor site improvements are not expected to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or result in the creation of objectionable odors. Sensitive receptors in the City of Lakeport include residences, schools, parks, medical offices and convalescent homes. The existing building is located within a developed commercial area located more than 300 feet from the nearest residence. The project is not anticipated to result in the creation of any objectionable odors. There is **no impact**.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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?				X
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Service?				
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

Response IV a): The proposed General Plan Amendment, Zone Change and future site improvements will not directly result in any substantial adverse effects on candidate, sensitive, or special status species. The existing property consists of a 4,460 square foot building and associated parking area. Future site improvements are limited to the construction of a six to seven foot high security fence, new signage, security lighting & cameras and minor interior remodel. Existing landscaping, including mature trees, will be maintained. There is **no impact** associated with the approval of this project.

Response IV b): The project site does not include riparian vegetation or serve as habitat region for any identified sensitive natural community. There is **no impact** associated with the approval of this project.

Response IV c): No wetlands or vernal pools exist at this site. The project will utilize existing stormwater facilities at this site. There is **no impact** associated with the approval of this project.

Response IV d): There are numerous policies and measures included in the Conservation Element of the 2009 General Plan that serve to protect and preserve important natural and biological resources (pages VII-9 through VII-10 of the 2009 Lakeport General Plan). The above-referenced policies include requirements limiting the amount of ground disturbance during construction activities. Approval of the proposed General Plan Amendment, Zone Change and future site improvements will not directly result

in substantial adverse impacts to movement of 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. The subject property is in an urban/built-up area and includes only minimal site improvements. There is **no impact** associated with the approval of this project.

Response IV e): The proposed General Plan Amendment, Zone Change and future site improvements will not directly result in any conflicts with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. No native trees will be impacted as a result of the project. There is **no impact** associated with the approval of this project.

Response IV f): There are no applicable Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or any other local, regional, or state conservation plans affecting the subject property. There is **no impact** associated with the approval of this project.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES:

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?				X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?				X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X

Responses V a), b), c), d): The change to the land use designation and zoning will not result in an impact to potential historical resources at this site. Future site improvements are minor in nature and do not have the potential to result in any impacts to potential historical or archaeological resources at this site. There is **no impact** related to this issue associated with the proposed actions.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS:

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to 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.				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X
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?				X
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X

Response VI a.i, ii, iii): The Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones map prepared by the California Geological Survey for the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act identifies Alquist-Priolo zones in the northern and southern sections of Lake County, but none in the City of Lakeport. This map is incorporated into the City’s General Plan (Figure 17, Safety Element).

The General Plan describes the seismic hazards in the vicinity of Lakeport and indicates that the City is “located in a highly active earthquake area and the potential exists for a significant seismic event in the future.”¹ East of the site, near the Clear Lake Shoreline, there is a potentially active fault rupture zone. Potentially active rupture zones are faults which have been active in the past 2,000 years. Little is known about this shoreline fault rupture zone; however, it represents a potential significant hazard and must be taken into consideration when development occurs in the vicinity.²

There are **no impacts** identified related to the potential rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, or seismic-related ground failure associated with the proposed General Plan Amendment, Zone Change and future site improvements as the proposed use is not likely to result in a notable intensification of use beyond that of previous uses at this site.

Response VI a. iv): No potential adverse effects related to landslides are anticipated as a result of the project. There is **no impact**.

Response VI b), c), d): No new site development beyond the construction of a six to seven foot high security fence is proposed for this project. The change in land use designation and zoning will not result in substantial soil erosion, loss of topsoil or include new construction upon expansive soil. There is **no impact** associated with the approval of this project.

Response VI e): Adequacy of the site’s soils to support septic tanks or other alternative waste water disposal systems is not applicable as the City’s sewer system currently serves the project site. No septic tanks are proposed in conjunction with this project. There is **no impact**.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				X
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				X

Response VII a): Approval of this project would not result in a significant increase in greenhouse gas emissions beyond that of previous uses at this site. There is **no impact** associated with the approval of this project.

Response VII b): There is no indication that the proposed General Plan Amendment and Zone Change will conflict with any plan, policy or regulation related to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. There is **no impact**.

¹ Lakeport General Plan, Safety Element, Pg. X-1

² Ibid.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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?			X	
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?			X	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
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 for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?				

Response VIII a), b): The proposed General Plan Amendment and Zone Change associated with the relocation of City police service operations to this site does not include any provisions that include the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. Proposed improvements to the site include the installation of small propane tank and generator for use by the police station in times of power failure or other emergencies. The City will be responsible for the obtaining and compliance with any required permits from the Lake County Air Quality Management District for the use of and operation of generators at this site. Potential impacts are considered to be **less than significant**.

Response VIII c): This project is not located within a quarter-mile of an existing or proposed school. There is **no impact**.

Response VIII d): A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was prepared for this project site in February 2015 by Davis Environmental Sciences. The purpose of a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment is to provide information regarding recognized environmental conditions on or near the subject property including any previous use that would involve the housing of hazardous materials. This assessment included a review listings of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to applicable Government Code Sections, and found that this site is not listed as a site containing hazardous materials.³ There is **no impact**.

Response VIII e), f): The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport or public use airport which would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. The project is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip which would result in a safety hazard for people working or residing in the project area. There is **no impact**.

Response VIII g): Approval of the General Plan Amendment and Zone Change associated with the relocation of police operations to this site will not directly interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency response systems. The site is adequate for the operation of all general police operations and is not located in an area prone to risks associated with flood, earthquakes or wildland fire. Data and telecommunications infrastructure upgrades are proposed as part of the minor interior remodel to ensure that the facility is able to serve the needs of the general public during an emergency. The Fire District has the ability to respond to emergencies affecting the site. There is **no impact**.

Response VIII h): The project site is not located within an area that has an elevated potential to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wild land fires as there are no wild lands adjacent to the subject property. **No impact** is identified.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:

³ Pgs. 11-21, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Davis Environmental Sciences (February 2015)

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				X
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flood on- or off-site?				X
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i) Expose people or structures to a				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

Response IX a), b): The proposed General Plan Amendment, Zone Change and future site improvements will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. The City’s water supply is not dependent on any underground aquifers in the immediate vicinity. The proposed project is not anticipated to result in any increased water demand beyond that of previous tenant at this site. Proposed site improvements will not result in any new demand for water service and as such the proposed improvements will not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.

Response IX c) – f): The existing building is located within a developed shopping center with an adequate storm water drainage system designed to properly manage both anticipated runoff and pollution resulting from storm events at this site. The proposal will not result in any alteration of the exiting drainage pattern or water course. There is **no impact** associated with the approval of this project.

Response IX g): This project does not include provisions for the supply of any new housing. No housing is proposed and therefore there is **no impact**.

Response IX h- i): The project site is located within the X (0.2% annual chance of flooding), also referred to as the 500 floodplain but is not located within the 100 year flood zone. The project is not located within a dam inundation zone. There is **no impact** associated with the approval of this project.

Response IX j): The Safety Element of the City’s General Plan includes a discussion regarding potential seiche impacts in the City related to the formation of large waves on Clear Lake as a result of earthquakes, winds, or wave motions. Figure 18 of the General Plan identifies a seiche inundation zone along the Clear Lake shoreline which extends landward to South Main Street in this area. However, the Safety Element also notes that the “risks associated with seiche are considered to be relatively low when compared to the risks from earthquake and liquefaction”⁴ in our area. Seiche waves are a potential hazard in Lakeport but there is no indication that they will detrimentally impact the subject property. There is **no impact** associated with the approval of this project.

⁴ Lakeport General Plan, Safety Element, Pg. X-3

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING:

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

Response X a): The proposed General Plan Amendment, Zone Change and relocation of City police services proposes to utilize an existing building at this site and will not divide an established community. The proposed project will not impact nearby residences or businesses in terms of access or any other ingress or egress issues. **No impact** has been identified.

Response X b): The proposed project involves the relocation of existing police services from its current location at Forbes and Ninth Streets to this new location. The Lakeport General Plan recognizes that *“The volume of traffic which passes through Lakeport is increasing, irrespective of locally-generated land use and traffic changes occurring within the City’s Planning Area. Traffic enforcement requires an increasing police presence on city streets. Similarly, as unincorporated areas develop, and/or become annexed to the City, increasing demands will be placed on available personnel and equipment (Safety Element, Page X-6).”* Relocation of police services to the larger facility at this site will assist in the long-term need to provide expanded police services to accommodate future growth over the next 20 to 30 years. A General Plan Amendment and Zone Change to Public and Civic Uses is necessary to the facilitation of this relocation. The proposed use of this site for the performance of public service type uses is consistent with previous utilization of this site by the Social Security Administration.

The relocation of police services will not result in significant positive or negative change in response time for police related services. According to the Lakeport Police Chief, on duty officers generally report to the station at the beginning and end of their patrol shifts but police units responding to service requests are in the field throughout the city at all times.

There is **no impact** associated with the approval of this project.

Response X c): There is no applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan in place at the present time which affects the subject property. There is **no impact** associated with this issue.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES:

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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?				X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X

Response XI a): There are no mining or mineral extraction operations within the Lakeport City limits or the Sphere of Influence. Page VII-4 of the General Plan’s Conservation Element notes that there is no active mineral extraction or mining operations in the City and also indicates that the Plan “prohibits any mining or mineral extraction activities within the City.” There is **no impact**.

Response XI b): No mineral recovery sites are located in the City; **no impact** has been identified.

XII. NOISE:

Would the project result in:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?				X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing			X	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
without the project?				
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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

Response XII a): The relocation of City police operations to this site will not expose persons to noise levels in excess of standards established in the Lakeport Zoning Ordinance. The proposed project is located more than 300 feet from the nearest residence and is located in a commercially zoned area. Excessive noise in commercially-zoned areas is defined in Section 17.28.010 of the Municipal Code as noise or other sound emissions which exceed 70 dBA for any 15-minute period in any one-hour period during the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. The allowable noise level decreases to 55 dBA during the evening and early morning hours. Residential limits are 60 dBA during the day and 45 dBA at night. The periodic use of emergency sirens will not result in weighted hourly ambient noise ratings in excess of that which is permitted in the Lakeport Zoning Ordinance. This is a **less than significant impact**.

Response XII b): The General Plan Amendment, Zone Change and relocation of police operations will not result in the generation of any groundborne vibration. There is **No impact**.

Response XII c), d): All future activities and uses at this site will be subject to the noise guidelines set forth in Chapter 17.28 of the Lakeport Municipal Code. The periodic use of emergency sirens associated with police operations at this site will not result in weighted hourly ambient noise ratings in excess of that which is permitted in the Lakeport Zoning Ordinance. This is a **less than significant impact**.

Response XII e), f): The subject property is not located within an airport land use plan or in the vicinity of a private airstrip which would generate substantial noise impacts. There is **no impact**.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING:

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Response XIII a) - c): The approval of this project will not result in the creation or displacement of any housing. The relocation of police services within the City will not result in any impacts that are likely to affect demand for housing in the City. There is **no impact** associated with the approval of this project.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i) Fire protection?				X
ii) Police protection?			X	
iii) Schools?				X
iv) Parks?				X
v) Other public facilities?				X

Response XIV a): The proposed General Plan Amendment and Zone Change will not result in any significant impacts to the provision of public services and utilities:

Fire protection: The existing building is in compliance with all fire code requirements and proposed uses at this site will not result in an increased demand for fire protection services. **No Impact.**

Police protection: The proposed project involves the relocation of existing police services from its current location at N. Forbes St. and Ninth St. to this new location. The existing facility at N. Forbes & Ninth Streets is limited in its ability to provide adequate and necessary security to police staff and the general public. The relocation to this new site will result in positive impacts related to security for police staff as the existing building at the project site allows for separate entrances for staff and the general public.

Regarding Police protection, the Lakeport General Plan also recognizes that *“as unincorporated areas develop, and/or become annexed to the City, increasing demands will be placed on available personnel and equipment (Safety Element, Page X-6).”* Relocation of police services to the larger facility at this site will assist in the long-term need to provide expanded police services to accommodate future growth over the next 20 to 30 years.

The relocation of the police department facility will not result in significant positive or negative change in response time for police related services. According to the Lakeport Police Chief, on duty officers generally report to the station at the beginning and end of their patrol shifts but police units responding to service requests are in the field throughout the city at all times.

Potential impacts are considered to be **less than significant**.

Schools: The proposed relocation of police facilities to this site will not result in any changed demand for school services in the City nor will it result in any significant positive or negative change in the level of service provided by the police to local schools. **No Impact.**

Parks & other public facilities: This proposed General Plan Amendment and Zone Change does not include any new housing or plan to provide any services which would result in the need for additional parks or other public facilities. **No Impact.**

XV. RECREATION:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

Response XIV a), b): This proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezone does not include any new housing or plan to provide any services which would result in the need for additional parks or other recreational facilities. **No Impact.**

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC:

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			X	
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
safety of such facilities?				

Response XVI a) and d): The proposed General Plan Amendment, Zone Change and relocation of police services will not conflict with any plans, ordinances or policies related to the effective implementation of the City’s circulation system, including streets and pedestrian facilities. The proposed use of this site for the City’s police operations will not result in the generation of additional peak hour traffic or trips beyond that of the previous use of this site as Lake County’s Social Security Administration office. Proposed uses of this site do not include the alteration of circulation patterns on the physical property beyond that of fencing off the parking area south of the existing building for use by official police vehicles only. No changes to circulation patterns or ingress and egress are proposed for the KMART shopping center.

The Lakeport Zoning Ordinance 17.23.050 sets forth required number of parking spaces necessary for different uses. The parking standards of the Zoning Ordinance does not specify a standard parking ratio for government administrative offices. The closest applicable use is that of public service uses or general commercial administrative offices which both prescribe one parking space for each two hundred and fifty square feet of floor area. At its maximum the 4,460 square foot building would require a minimum of 18 parking spaces. This number is likely to be reduced once use areas such as evidence holding rooms and other similar areas are subtracted from the applicable square footage requirements. Nonetheless, even with the removal of parking area to be utilized for police vehicle fleet storage the site currently contains more than the minimum required 18 parking spaces.

This project will result in **less than significant impacts** related to circulation patterns at this site.

Response XVI b): This CEQA checklist question asks if the project will exceed, individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the “county congestion management agency.” Lake County has not established a congestion management agency according to City Staff. As such, this question is not applicable to this project and there is **no impact**.

Response XVI c): There are no components of the project that will result in a change in air traffic patterns including either the volume or the location of air traffic in the vicinity of the project. **No impact** is identified.

Response XVI e): The proposed General Plan Amendment and Zone Change associated with the relocation of the City’s police department will not result in any changes to the site’s existing circulation pattern that would impede access by emergency personnel. There is **no impact**.

Response XVI f): An existing bus stop is located directly adjacent to this property to east along South Main Street. No changes in the Lake County Transit location of this existing transit stop are proposed as a part of this project. The City is encouraged to provide, at a minimum, a bench and trash receptacle for use by the bus patrons as a means of controlling the existing litter problem at this bus stop location. **No impacts** are associated with the approval of this project.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the projects projected demand in addition to the providers existing commitments?				X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the projects solid waste disposal needs?			X	
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	

Response XVII a)- e): The existing building is served with adequate connections to both water and wastewater at this site. Adequate treatment capacity for both water and wastewater is available through the City of Lakeport Municipal Service District (CLMSD), and the project will not require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities. Expected water and sewer demand for the relocation of police services to this site will not result in the need for any upgrades to the existing water and sewer connections. Usage is expected to be equal to or less than that of previous uses at this site. **No Impact** is identified for this issue at this site.

Please see the hydrology section of this report for discussion regarding storm water facilities.

Response XVII f), g): Approval of the proposed General Plan Amendment and Zone Change will not create solid waste issues. The City contracts with Lakeport Disposal for its solid waste disposal and all residents and businesses are subject to mandatory garbage service. Most solid waste from Lakeport is transferred to the East Lake landfill, located on a 32 acre parcel just outside the City of Clearlake. The landfill has a total capacity of 6 million cubic yards and is expected to reach total capacity between 2020 and 2025.⁵ Therefore, the project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity and is expected to comply with all applicable solid waste regulations.

An existing dumpster enclosure is already existing at this site and is adequately sized to serve this proposed project. Solid waste generation associated with the police department’s general administrative operations as this site is expected to be equal to or less than that of previous uses at this site. Access to the existing dumpster by Lakeport Disposal will be inhibited by the construction of the proposed security fence around the rear parking lot and police staff will be responsible for locating the dumpster outside of the new fence on scheduled pick up dates. Future police station operations are also encouraged to provide a properly sized trash receptacles near the entrance of the building and existing bus stop to assist with the existing litter issue that has developed at this site. These potential impacts are considered to be **less than significant**.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	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 an endangered, rare or threatened species; or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X	
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past			X	

⁵ Draft EIR, City of Lakeport General Plan Update, Pg. 3-158

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

Response XVIII a) - c): Proposed activities associated with the relocation of police services to this location (i.e. interior remodel, construction of fence, placement of generator, etc.) is not subject to CEQA but has been referenced in this report as a means of describing the total impacts of this proposed project. The General Plan Amendment and Zone Change will not result in any impacts with the potential to degrade the quality of environment either directly or cumulatively. The proposed uses associated with this project are consistent and similar with previous uses at this site. This project will not result in any potentially significant impacts and no mitigation measures have been identified as being necessary to reduce environmental impacts to a less than significant level. **All environmental impacts associated with this proposed project have been identified as having either no impact or as being less than significant.**

CONCLUSION AND MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE: The purpose of this General Plan Amendment and Zone Change is to facilitate the relocation of existing City of Lakeport police operations from their current location at N. Forbes & Ninth Street to this new location at 2025 South Main Street. A General Plan land use designation change and Zone Change from the current designation of Major Retail to Public and Civic Uses is necessary for the reporting that this project is consistent with the City of Lakeport General Plan as required by Zoning Ordinance Section 17.16.040 prior to occupancy of the site.

Proposed activities associated with the relocation of police services to this location will utilize the existing building at this site and does not involve any substantial new improvements. Proposed uses are generally consistent with the previous use of this site for governmental administrative services by the Social Security Administration.

Based upon the analysis contained within this Initial Study Checklist and conducted in conformance with the guidelines of CEQA, the Lakeport Community Development Department recommends the adoption of a Negative Declaration for this proposed project.